

ANALYSIS OF TEXTUAL VARIANTS
OF THE BOOK OF MORMON



THE CRITICAL TEXT OF
THE BOOK OF MORMON

Volume One
The Original Manuscript



Volume Two
The Printer's Manuscript

PART ONE

Copyright ■ 1830 Preface
1 Nephi 1 – Alma 17:26

PART TWO

Alma 17:26 – Moroni 10:34
Testimony of Three Witnesses
Testimony of Eight Witnesses



Volume Four
Analysis of Textual Variants

PART ONE

Title Page ■ Witness Statements
1 Nephi 1 – 2 Nephi 10

PART TWO

2 Nephi 11 – Mosiah 16

PART THREE

Mosiah 17 – Alma 20

PART FOUR

Alma 21 – 55

PART FIVE

Alma 56 – 3 Nephi 18

PART SIX

3 Nephi 19 – Moroni 10
Addenda

Analysis of Textual Variants of the Book of Mormon

Royal Skousen



THE FOUNDATION FOR ANCIENT RESEARCH AND MORMON STUDIES

BRIGHAM YOUNG UNIVERSITY

PROVO, UTAH

2014

© 2004, 2005, 2006, 2007, 2008, 2009 Royal Skousen
and the Foundation for Ancient Research and Mormon Studies

All rights reserved.

*This book may not be reproduced, in whole or in part, in any form,
including but not limited to printed, electronic, or digital means,
without written permission from the copyright holders.*

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS CATALOGUING-IN-PUBLICATION DATA

Skousen, Royal.

Analysis of textual variants of the Book of Mormon / Royal Skousen.

p. cm. — (The critical text of the Book of Mormon ; v. 4)

Includes bibliographical references.

1. Book of Mormon—Criticism, Textual. I. Title. II. Series.

BX8627.S56 2004

289.3'22 — dc22

2004010131

ISBN: 978-0-934893-07-1 [Part One]

ISBN: 978-0-934893-08-4 [Part Two]

ISBN: 978-0-934893-11-4 [Part Three]

ISBN: 978-0-934893-12-1 [Part Four]

ISBN: 978-0-934893-13-8 [Part Five]

ISBN: 978-0-934893-78-7 [Part Six]

PRINTED IN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Table of Contents

■ Introduction

- 3 Principles of Textual Criticism
 - The Original Text
 - Textual Variants
 - Conjectural Emendations
- 9 Publishing the Critical Text Project
- 10 Discussion of the Readings
 - Scriptural Citations
 - Bolding and Italics
 - Spellings
 - Punctuation
 - Versification
 - Manuscript Transcriptions
 - Quotations
 - Pronunciations
 - Variables
 - Constant References
- 14 Citing the Textual Variants
 - Standard Textual Sources
 - Early Sources for the Title Page
 - Variant Specifications
 - Adding and Deleting Words
 - Indicating Whether the Original Manuscript Is Extant
 - Changes within a Textual Source
 - Ambiguities in the Manuscripts
 - Additions and Deletions in the Manuscripts
 - Types of Manuscript Changes
 - Changes Made by Different Scribes
 - Lemmatized Variants
 - Special Symbols
- 23 Acknowledgments

■ Analysis of Textual Variants

- 27 Title Page
- 37 Witness Statements
- 41 1 Nephi 1–22
- 469 2 Nephi 1–33

Table of Contents

933	Jacob 1–7
1071	Enos, Jarom, Omni
1121	The Words of Mormon
1133	Mosiah 1–29
1573	Alma 1–63
2873	Helaman 1–16
3177	3 Nephi 1–30
3557	4 Nephi
3583	Mormon 1–9
3713	Ether 1–15
3889	Moroni 1–10
3963	Addenda

*Analysis of Textual Variants
of the Book of Mormon*

[THIS PAGE LEFT INTENTIONALLY BLANK]

Introduction

Principles of Textual Criticism

■ **The Original Text**

The purpose of this volume of the critical text (volume 4) is to determine the original English-language text of the Book of Mormon, to the extent that it can be determined by human means. I will generally refer to this text as simply the original text (that is, without repeating the attribute “English-language”). In other words, the term “original text” does not refer to the ancient-language text that the Book of Mormon was translated from. Basically, the original text refers to the English-language text that Joseph Smith saw by means of the interpreters and the seer stone. Although I myself believe that Joseph actually saw words of English, it is also possible that the English-language text he saw was in his mind’s eye rather than literally in the physical instruments. Under either interpretation, the term “original text” refers to the English-language text that Joseph received by revelation, but not necessarily to what Joseph dictated or what his scribes wrote down. Obviously, we do not have access to what Joseph himself actually saw. And of the current text of the Book of Mormon, only 28 percent is extant in the original manuscript (the text that the scribes wrote down as Joseph dictated the Book of Mormon). The printer’s manuscript (the copy of the original manuscript that Joseph’s scribes later made) is fully extant except for three manuscript lines. But this second manuscript is already twice removed from what was revealed to Joseph Smith. We also know that the 1830 edition (the first printed edition) was set from the original manuscript for about one-sixth of the Book of Mormon text (namely, from somewhere in Helaman 13 through the end of Mormon). That part of the 1830 edition is also twice removed from the original text. The rest of the 1830 edition was taken from the printer’s manuscript, so five-sixths of the 1830 edition is thrice removed from the original text.

■ **Textual Variants**

Most of the changes discussed here in volume 4 will involve textual variation for some word or phrase. In citing each of these passages, I list the specific individual variants according to 22 textual sources: namely, the original manuscript (when extant), the printer’s manuscript, and 20 significant editions of the Book of Mormon. I will refer to editions published by the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints as LDS editions. Similarly, editions published by the Reorganized Church of Jesus Christ of Latter Day Saints (now

named the Community of Christ) will be referred to as RLDS editions. Also, I will distinguish between the two churches as the LDS Church and the RLDS Church, but these names should be understood as convenient references to the official names of these churches. I will also maintain this terminology when referring to the differing LDS and RLDS textual traditions.

Generally speaking, I rely on the earliest extant source (or sources) in determining the reading of the original text. In many instances, usage elsewhere in the text will strongly support the earliest reading. As an example, consider the following case of textual variation:

1 Nephi 12:18
 and a great and a terrible gulf divideth them
 yea even the [*sword* 0 | *word* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST]
 of the justice of the eternal God

The unknown scribe 2 in the original manuscript (represented by the number 0) wrote “the **sword** of the justice of the eternal God”. When Oliver Cowdery copied this passage into the printer’s manuscript (represented by the number 1), he misread scribe 2’s original *sword* as *word*, with the result that all the editions (from the 1830 edition to the 1981 LDS edition, represented as A through T) have read “the **word** of the justice of the eternal God”. The critical text will accept the earliest reading. Significantly, usage elsewhere in the Book of Mormon strongly supports this use of *sword*. Nowhere else is there any reference to “the word of God’s justice”, but there are seven other references to “the sword of God’s justice”:

Alma 26:19	the sword of his justice
Alma 60:29	the sword of justice
Helaman 13:5	the sword of justice (two times)
3 Nephi 20:20	the sword of my justice
3 Nephi 29:4	the sword of his justice
Ether 8:23	the sword of the justice of the eternal God

Note in particular that the phraseology in the last example (Ether 8:23) is precisely the same as the original reading in 1 Nephi 12:18. Throughout this volume, I will usually refer to usage elsewhere in the text when evaluating the variant readings.

One particular problem that arises in the Book of Mormon text is that the grammatical usage, especially in the earliest sources, is nonstandard. Generally speaking, I will accept such nonstandard usage, even though it may very well be that in some cases the original text read according to standard usage. As an example, consider how the scribes wrote down the past-tense form *drowned* in the manuscripts. Oliver Cowdery always wrote the standard form, *drowned*. Scribe 3 of the original manuscript also wrote down the standard past-tense form but with the spelling *drownd*. On the other hand, scribe 2 of the original manuscript wrote down *drownded*. In the following list, Oliver Cowdery is the scribe except as noted:

	ORIGINAL MANUSCRIPT	PRINTER’S MANUSCRIPT
1 Nephi 4:2	drownded (scribe 2)	drowned
1 Nephi 8:32	drownd (scribe 3)	drowned
1 Nephi 17:27	drowned	drowned
1 Nephi 18:13	drowned	drowned

Introduction

Alma 63:8	drowned	drowned
3 Nephi 8:9	<not extant>	drowned
3 Nephi 9:4	<not extant>	drowned
3 Nephi 10:13	<not extant>	drowned

The critical text will accept *drownded* in the one place where we have evidence for its occurrence (namely, in 1 Nephi 4:2), even though all other occurrences of the past-tense form support *drowned*. It is possible that scribe 2 of the original manuscript (or even Joseph Smith) is responsible for the introduction of the nonstandard form *drownded*. But *drownded* is an actual form in dialectal English and the original text may have actually read *drownded*. Therefore, the critical text will accept it as the original text but only for this one occurrence in the earliest text (the original manuscript). In all other cases, the critical text will read *drowned* since in each of those cases the earliest textual sources support *drowned*. Of course, such a decision implies that dialectal variants can occur in the original text. Modern editing practice dictates that variation in grammatical usage should be removed from texts, but the critical text will allow grammatical variation, including dialectal forms that would be removed in normal editing.

The Book of Mormon critical text will otherwise standardize the spelling. Although scribe 3 of the original manuscript wrote *drownd* instead of *drowned*, the critical text will use the standard spelling *drowned* to represent what he wrote down. Both *drownd* and *drowned* represent the same linguistic form. Scribe 3 typically added *d* rather than *ed* to verbs to spell the regular past-tense form (as in *complained*, *dreamd*, and *feard*). There is no need for the critical text to follow the idiosyncratic spellings of the manuscript scribes (or the occasionally odd spelling in the early editions) unless, of course, the spelling makes an actual difference in word form (such as *drownded* would).

Sometimes the earliest extant reading will use an unusual word or involve an awkward expression. In such cases, I look for historical evidence to support such usage. As an example, consider the use in the original text of the archaic verb *engraven* (instead of the now current *engrave*):

1 Nephi 19:1
wherefore I did make plates of ore
that I might **engraven** upon them the record of my people
and upon the plates which I made I did **engraven** the record of my father

In a few editions, there have been some sporadic replacements of these two instances of *engraven* with the standard *engrave*. Of course, the real question here is whether *engraven* should be accepted as the reading of the original Book of Mormon text. By checking the historical evidence, we find that the infinitive form *engraven*, according to the Oxford English Dictionary (OED), existed in English at one time but is now obsolete. The OED citations of this verb date from 1605 through 1713. The use of the verb *engraven* here in 1 Nephi 19:1 (and three other places in the text) appears to be intentional and will therefore be maintained in the critical text.

Sometimes I will consider evidence from biblical language (either from the King James Bible or from the original Hebrew and Greek that underlie the biblical translation). For instance, in discussing the following verse, it is helpful to realize that the Book of Mormon expression is a biblical literalism and should not be emended:

1 Nephi 3:28

and it came to pass that **Laman** was angry with me and also with my father
and also was Lemuel
for he hearkened unto the words of Laman

This passage has caused some difficulty in transmission because the conjoined subject *Lemuel* is delayed. The meaning, of course, is that both Laman and Lemuel were angry with Nephi and their father, Lehi. Yet this use of the delayed conjoined subject is found in the original Hebrew Bible and the Greek New Testament as well as in the King James Bible (which provides a literal translation of this biblical construction):

2 Samuel 15:17

and **the king** went forth
and all the people after him

Matthew 2:3

when Herod the king had heard *these things*
he was troubled
and all Jerusalem with him

Similar usage is found in the Book of Mormon. Here are some examples with the same kind of delayed conjoined subject as in 1 Nephi 3:28:

1 Nephi 4:28

and it came to pass that when Laman saw me
he was exceedingly frightened
and also Lemuel and Sam

Alma 63:2

and **he** did observe to do good continually to keep the commandments
of the Lord his God
and also did his brother

Helaman 9:38

insomuch that **the five** were set at liberty
and also was Nephi

3 Nephi 3:19

therefore **this Gidgiddoni** was a great prophet among them
and also was the chief judge

Ether 2:16

and it came to pass that **the brother of Jared** did go to work
and also his brethren

Such usage in the Book of Mormon as well as in the biblical text supports the use of the delayed conjoined subject in 1 Nephi 3:28 despite its awkwardness for modern-day readers.

■ Conjectural Emendations

Even after investigating other sources (historical, dialectal, and biblical), we occasionally find cases where the earliest reading is problematic and even impossible. In many instances of this kind, we discover that scribes, typesetters, and editors have emended the text. Each of these cases must be thoroughly investigated to determine whether the emendation is the correct one. And in some cases, neither the earliest reading nor its emendations may be acceptable. Such a situation may lead to the possibility of conjectural emendation. As an example of an early attempt to emend an impossible reading, consider the following reading in the original manuscript:

1 Nephi 7:5 (lines 5–6 on page 10 of the original manuscript)

the lord did soften the hart of ishmael and also his ^{hole}hole

Scribe 3 of the original manuscript initially wrote *hole*, then inserted the same word (*hole*) above the line, so that the corrected text reads “and also his hole hole”. Clearly, this reading is unacceptable. When Oliver Cowdery copied this sentence into the printer’s manuscript, he interpreted “his hole hole” as “his household”, which is one possible emendation. But usage elsewhere in the Book of Mormon text suggests that the correct emendation should be “his whole household”. For instance, all other Book of Mormon instances of *household* involve a universal quantifier, either *all* or *whole* or the negative equivalent, *none*. Consider ten cases in positive clauses where we find either *all* or *whole* as the universal quantifier:

all his household	1 Nephi 5:14, 2 Nephi 4:10, 2 Nephi 4:12, Alma 23:3, Ether 9:3, Ether 10:1, Ether 13:20, Ether 13:21
his whole household	Alma 22:23
all your household	Alma 34:21

The example in Alma 22:23 (“his whole household”) suggests that the original text in 1 Nephi 7:5 also read “his whole household”. Such a conjectural emendation would explain why scribe 3 ended up repeating *hole* in the original manuscript: *hole* and *whole* are homophones while *hole* and *-hold* are nearly identical in pronunciation.

It is instructive here to consider what I would do in this case if the original manuscript were not extant for this passage. If this were the case, the earliest textual source would be the printer’s manuscript, with its reading “Ishmael and also his household”. Without the reading of the original manuscript (“Ishmael and also his hole hole”, with its repeated occurrence of *hole*), I would not be justified in emending the text of 1 Nephi 7:5 since there is nothing inherently wrong with “Ishmael and also his household”. In fact, the plausibility of the current reading explains why no edition of the Book of Mormon has ever emended Oliver Cowdery’s phraseology here in 1 Nephi 7:5 to read “Ishmael and also his **whole** household” (or “Ishmael and also **all** his household”). If the original manuscript were not extant here, I would simply have to say that, except for this one case, all the Book of Mormon instances of *household* have a universal quantifier. So just because an earliest reading is unique within the text is no excuse for an emendation. Statistically, there will always be unique readings in any text of sufficient length.

The crucial restriction on conjectural emendation is that there must be something actually wrong with the earliest extant reading. The initial motivation for proposing a conjectural emendation is that none of

the readings (either the earliest reading or subsequent emendations) make any sense, after taking into account evidence from the history or dialects of the English language or, when appropriate, evidence from the King James Bible and from Hebrew and Greek, the original languages of the biblical scriptures. And before accepting a proposed conjectural emendation, we must consider whether there is scribal evidence in the manuscripts (or from manuscript transmission in general) that would explain how the earliest textual reading might have been derived from the proposed conjectural emendation. We also look for evidence from usage elsewhere in the Book of Mormon (and sometimes from usage in older English, especially in the King James Bible, or in the original biblical sources) that would support the conjectural emendation. In other words, the emendation must be supported by evidence from manuscript transmission and by consistency in usage.

Occasionally in this volume, I will discuss cases of possible revision to the text. A revision is not an attempt to restore the original reading, but instead represents how the current text might read so that modern readers would be able to comprehend it. As an example, consider the case of the following Hebrew-like participial phrase in the original text:

1 Nephi 3:16–18

and all this he hath done because of the commandment
for he **knowing** that Jerusalem must be destroyed
because of the wickedness of the people
for behold they have rejected the words of the prophets . . .

For the 1840 edition, Joseph Smith emended *knowing* to the past-tense *knew*. Evidence elsewhere in the text shows that *knowing* is not an error but is indeed the correct reading for this passage. However, if the text is to be emended, a more reasonable possibility is to revise the past-tense *knew* to the present-tense *knoweth* or *knows* (given that the preceding and following indicative clauses are in the present tense, not the past tense). I will not refer to this revision as a conjectural emendation since I do not believe that the original text for 1 Nephi 3:17 read *knoweth* or *knows*. The critical text will maintain the original participial form, *knowing*.

Throughout this volume, I have tried to credit those who have suggested changes to the text (either conjectural emendations or revisions). When a suggested change has already appeared in print, I cite the earliest published source that I can find for that suggestion. In many cases, various individuals have communicated their suggestions directly to me. It is surprising how it has helped to have others looking for problematic readings in the text—difficult readings that I have been oblivious to until they were pointed out to me. Of course, some of these suggested emendations have turned out to have insufficient evidence to support their adoption. In other cases, further investigation of a problematic reading has sometimes led me to propose a different emendation in the text. I discuss all of these cases of proposed changes and credit those who first suggested them.

Publishing the Critical Text Project

In May 2001 the first two volumes of the critical text project of the Book of Mormon were published by the Foundation for Ancient Research and Mormon Studies (FARMS), now a part of Brigham Young University. These volumes present transcripts of the two manuscripts:

- Volume 1 *The Original Manuscript of the Book of Mormon:
Typographical Facsimile of the Extant Text*
568 pages (including 41 pages of introduction and 16 pages of
black-and-white ultraviolet and color photographs of fragments)
- Volume 2 *The Printer's Manuscript of the Book of Mormon:
Typographical Facsimile of the Entire Text in Two Parts*
1008 pages (bound in two parts, including 36 pages of introduction
and 8 pages of color photographs of the manuscript)

A typographical facsimile presents an exact reproduction of the text in typescript. The text is transcribed line for line and without any corrections or expansions. Original spellings and miswritings are retained. All scribal changes in the manuscripts—whether crossouts, erasures, overwriting, or insertions—are reproduced. A continuously running text for the extant portions of the original manuscript has been provided, with conjectured text placed sublinearly. Both volumes contain introductions that present a brief history of the manuscripts, the symbols used in the transcription system (plus examples of their use), and a physical description of the manuscripts.

These two volumes present the earliest textual sources for the Book of Mormon. All known fragments of the original manuscript have been identified, interpreted, and pieced together (to the extent possible). With the publication of these two volumes, all the legitimate manuscript sources for the Book of Mormon text are now accessible.

Ultimately, there will be four printed volumes and one electronic collation in the complete critical text. The other volumes are:

- Volume 3 *The History of the Text of the Book of Mormon*
Volume 4 *Analysis of Textual Variants of the Book of Mormon*
Volume 5 *A Complete Electronic Collation of the Book of Mormon*

The third volume discusses the transmission of the text, from the manuscripts through the major editions. The fourth volume discusses cases of textual variance and attempts to determine the original English-language reading of the text. The electronic collation is a lined-up comparison of the important textual sources and specifies every textual variant in the Book of Mormon. The collation includes the readings of the two manuscripts and 20 editions of the Book of Mormon, from the first edition in 1830 to the current LDS and RLDS editions (as of 2003).

The publication of this first part of volume 4 initiates the central task of the critical text project: the attempt to recover the original text of the Book of Mormon. Originally, I had planned to publish volume 3 before volume 4, but I subsequently realized that in order to discuss the overall history of the text, from the manuscripts to the current editions, I needed to first establish the original text, to the extent possible,

by going through the entire text verse by verse, from the title page to the end of the book of Moroni. It also turns out that the amount of material for volume 4 is immense, and this will require publishing this volume in parts of about 500–700 pages each. Instead of waiting for all of volume 4 to be finished, I have decided to publish each successive part as it is completed. A preliminary analysis of the entire Book of Mormon has already been done as well as the computer collation (although it too is preliminary). This first part of volume 4 begins with the title page and the two witness statements and then covers 1 Nephi 1 through 2 Nephi 10. Relying on the preliminary analysis and the computerized collation, I am able within this first part of volume 4 to cite changes elsewhere in the text, ones that will be more fully discussed in subsequent parts of volume 4. The computerized collation will also be constantly referred to in this volume, but like volume 3, it can be released only after all the parts of volume 4 are completed, especially since I need to make minor corrections and changes to the collation as I progress through this analysis.

I do not discuss every variant in the text in volume 4. Generally speaking, I will restrict the discussion to substantive variants in the text. Such variants involve actual changes in words or phrases or in the spelling of Book of Mormon names. Other kinds of changes—such as those involving capitalization, punctuation, and the spelling of standard English words (sometimes referred to by the technical term “accidentals”)—are generally not discussed in this volume (unless such changes make a difference in meaning or interpretation). These minor variants will be listed in the computerized collation (volume 5). Under the term “substantive variant”, I also include variants involving grammatical usage (such as the change of “they **was** yet wroth” to “they **were** yet wroth” in 1 Nephi 4:4). The various editions of the Book of Mormon have constantly undergone changes in grammatical usage. Each type of grammatical change will be discussed at least once in volume 4 (usually at its first occurrence in the text), but not every instance of grammatical change will be individually analyzed or even listed in volume 4. Rather, I will leave such a comprehensive analysis of each type of grammatical change to volume 3. In that volume, I will provide a listing of every instance where the text has undergone each of these grammatical changes (as well as instances where the text has been left unchanged).

Discussion of the Readings

■ **Scriptural Citations**

Volume 4 discusses significant cases of textual variation and conjectural emendation in the Book of Mormon. The passages are discussed in the order of their appearance within the current Book of Mormon text. In each case, I first cite the passage and its relevant variants, thus specifying the text that will be the focus of the ensuing discussion for that passage. After the discussion, which may be lengthy at times, I conclude with a brief summary. In some cases, the summary will be omitted when I refer the reader to another passage where the issue is fully discussed.

Usually the citation of a passage will involve a textual variant but not always. In cases of conjectural emendation, there will typically be no textual variation listed for the word or phrase under consideration. In such cases, that word or phrase will be set in bold, as in the following example where all 22 textual sources, including the original manuscript, read “**in** the wilderness” but for which I propose that the original text actually read “**into** the wilderness”:

1 Nephi 4:33
that he should be a free man like unto us
if he would go down **in** the wilderness with us

The discussion that follows this citation gives the evidence for why the invariant *in* is probably a mistake for *into*.

Citations will typically be given according to how they read in the original text (as proposed in this volume of the critical text project). This means that if the preceding example from 1 Nephi 4:33 were to be cited elsewhere with respect to some other textual issue, the prepositional phrase would read “into the wilderness” — that is, in accord with the proposed original text rather than as the earliest reading (in this case, “in the wilderness”).

■ **Bolding and Italics**

In general, bolding will be used throughout volume 4 to highlight text that is appropriate for the discussion. Bolding is never original to the scriptural text but has been added to citations to help the reader identify a germane word or phrase. The only time italics will be used in citations is when the King James Bible is being cited (and only when the typeset words in the King James Bible are in italics). Italics were used by the King James translators to represent words in the English text for which there is no corresponding Hebrew or Greek word in the biblical text.

■ **Spellings**

The spelling of standard English words will be regularized in all the citations unless a spelling variant indicates a specific difference in meaning or interpretation. I have decided to follow the spelling conventions of today, including such accidentals as capitalization, the use of apostrophes, and the spellings of compound nouns (whether separated by a space or a hyphen or set as a single word). This regularization of accidentals also applies to the spelling of the King James citations. The spellings in current editions of the King James Bible are often not the original spellings used when that version was first printed in 1611. There is nothing particularly canonical about the King James spellings. In many instances, the Book of Mormon editions have never followed the traditional King James spellings in those passages from the King James Bible that are quoted in the Book of Mormon.

On the other hand, the spelling of a Book of Mormon name may be different from how it appears in the current editions. In a number of cases, evidence from the earliest textual sources shows that the spelling for a name needs to be emended. Some examples include the following prominent Book of Mormon names:

CURRENT NAME	ORIGINAL NAME
Amale k ites	Amlicites
Gad i anton	Gad d ianton
Kish k umen	Kishcumen
Mori a nton	Mori o nton
Mule k	Mulo ch
Pahora n	Parhoro n
Zenoc k	Zenoc h

Except where each particular name is discussed in volume 4, the critical text will spell Book of Mormon names according to the original spelling (as determined by evidence from the earliest textual sources).

■ **Punctuation**

Generally speaking, citations in the text follow the style of the original manuscript—that is, without any punctuation at all. This decision also applies to quotations from the King James Bible. The only punctuation mark that will generally be supplied in citations is the apostrophe, as in the case of the possessive form in “he taketh three **days’** journey” (in the 1 Nephi preface). Similarly, capitalization will be used for names and for the first word at the beginning of an original chapter in the text (thus we have “**And** now I Nephi” at the beginning of 1 Nephi 6). In order to facilitate reading the text without any punctuation or sentence-initial capitalization, I will cite passages by setting the text on a new line whenever there is a suitable break in the phraseology. In order to help the reader process a sentence in a short citation within the discussion itself, I will use a slash (/) to represent a break in the phraseology, as in “and if I should say it / it would be done” (1 Nephi 17:50). Occasionally, a colon (:) will be used at a break to show that the subsequent text is logically connected to the preceding text. Sometimes, in order to avoid an unnecessarily long citation or to facilitate understanding a long citation, words will be omitted. Such minor abridgments will be represented by a row of three baseline dots (. . .), the normal way to represent an ellipsis. On some occasions, dashes (—) are used in citations to show that a phrase or clause is parenthetical.

■ **Versification**

Throughout this volume, I will use the LDS versification (dating from the 1879 LDS edition) for indicating the location of each passage. Originally, I had hoped to have also used the RLDS versification in this volume, but the difficulties in specifying the alternative versification for so many citations would have led to difficulties in typesetting, not to mention the inordinate extra work needed to avoid errors. The transcripts in volumes 1 and 2 of the critical text do provide the RLDS versification for each manuscript page or fragment. And the electronic collation (volume 5) gives the RLDS versification. In fact, that collation presents all four of the different chapter and versification systems that have appeared in Book of Mormon editions for over the last century and a half (the 1852 LDS system, followed by the 1874 RLDS edition; the 1879 LDS system, followed by all subsequent LDS editions; the 1892 RLDS system; and the 1908 RLDS system, followed by all subsequent RLDS editions).

■ **Manuscript Transcriptions**

Occasionally in volume 4, it will be necessary to cite the transcriptions of the original and printer’s manuscripts (found in volumes 1 and 2 of the critical text). Such citations are set in a monospace font, so they are easily recognized. For this volume, some of the details in those transcriptions are removed when they have no relevance to the discussion at hand. I do not review here the symbols used in the transcriptions; they can be found in the introductions to volumes 1 and 2.

■ Quotations

In the discussion itself (not the citations), double quote marks will be used for quoting phrases and clauses, italics for specific words, and single quote marks for meanings. Punctuation will be placed outside the quote marks (as is common in linguistics) unless the punctuation mark is crucially a part of the quotation.

■ Pronunciations

When the pronunciation of a word or phrase is represented, the sounds will be placed within slashes, as in /mæn/, the pronunciation of the word *man*. Generally speaking, the phonetic symbols will be those of the International Phonetic Alphabet (IPA) except that I will use the symbols š, ž, č, and ĵ for the palatal obstruents rather than the ʃ, ʒ, tʃ, and dʒ of the IPA. Occasionally, there will be a need to represent a syllable break within a pronunciation. In such a case, a period will be used to stand for the syllable boundary, as in the two-syllable pronunciation /sei.əθ/ for *saith* (that is, *sayeth*). Unless otherwise noted, Hebrew and Greek transliterations are phonetically based rather than orthographically.

■ Variables

When referring to phrases, it is sometimes necessary to use variables to stand for certain classes of words. The capital letters X, Y, and Z are reserved for such variables, as in the expression “all manner of X”, where X stands for any noun phrase. An alternative way to represent such variability is to use angle brackets, as in “all manner of <noun phrase>”. Characterizing the form of phrases may also involve optional elements, which can be given in parentheses, as in “a great and (a) marvelous work” (which stands for either “a great and a marvelous work” or “a great and marvelous work”). Slashes can be also used to represent a single-word choice, as in “it had came/come to pass” (which stands for either “it had **came** to pass” or “it had **come** to pass”). Square brackets are used to add interpretive elements, as in the explanation that the clause “those that were a scoffing at them” historically meant ‘those that were [in the process of] scoffing at them’ (as discussed under 1 Nephi 8:28).

■ Constant References

For each passage in volume 4 that I analyze, I attempt to keep the discussion self-contained. For instance, complete bibliographic citations are usually given within the discussion itself, not in a separate bibliography or even in a footnote or endnote. By treating the textual variants in the order they appear in the Book of Mormon and by referring the reader to discussion elsewhere when necessary, I hope to avoid the need for an index to volume 4.

A few standard works will be constantly referenced within the text. For those cases, I list the full bibliography here and generally refer to them by a simplified title within the analyses themselves. Besides the volumes of the critical text project, we have the following constant references:

Oxford English Dictionary (OED)

The Compact Oxford English Dictionary, second edition (complete text reproduced micrographically). Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1991.

Introduction

Merriam-Webster's Collegiate Dictionary

Merriam-Webster's Collegiate Dictionary, eleventh edition. Springfield, Massachusetts: Merriam-Webster, 2003.

Merriam-Webster's Dictionary of English Usage

Merriam-Webster's Dictionary of English Usage. Springfield, Massachusetts: Merriam-Webster, 1994.

King James Bible

The Holy Bible Containing the Old and New Testaments. Salt Lake City, Utah: The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, 1979.

Hebrew Bible (the Masoretic text)

Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia, edited by Karl Elliger and Wilhelm Rudolph. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelstiftung Stuttgart, 1977.

Septuagint (the Greek Old Testament)

Septuaginta, edited by Alfred Rahlfs. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1935.

Greek New Testament

Novum Testamentum Graece, edited by Barbara and Kurt Aland, Johannes Karavidopoulos, Carlo M. Martini, and Bruce M. Metzger, fourth revised edition. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1993.

Latin Vulgate

Biblia Sacra Iuxta Vulgatam Versionem, edited by Robert Weber, Bonifatius Fisher, and others. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1983.

Doctrine and Covenants (usually cited according to the two earliest versions of the text)

A Book of Commandments for the Government of the Church of Christ. Independence, Missouri: W. W. Phelps, 1833 [facsimile edition, Herald House, 1972].

Doctrine and Covenants of the Church of the Latter Day Saints. Kirtland, Ohio: F. G. Williams, 1835 [facsimile edition, Herald House, 1971].

Documentary History of the Church (DHC)

History of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, 7 volumes. Salt Lake City, Utah: Deseret Book, 1948–1951.

Citing the Textual Variants

■ Standard Textual Sources

In this part of the introduction, I first provide a complete list of the 22 textual sources that are found in the computerized collation (and that are constantly cited in this volume). The first column lists the single-character symbols as they appear within a variant specification. The second column lists how I typically refer to them within the regular text (that is, outside of a variant specification). In addition, I provide a brief description for each textual source.

Introduction

MANUSCRIPTS

- 0 Ⓞ the original manuscript, 1828–1829 (28 percent extant, not counting the lost 116 pages); written down by Oliver Cowdery and other scribes from dictation by Joseph Smith
- 1 Ⓟ the printer’s manuscript, August 1829–March 1830; a handwritten copy of the original manuscript

EDITIONS

- A 1830 the first edition, published in Palmyra, New York; printed by E. B. Grandin, with typesetting by John Gilbert; set from the printer’s manuscript except for Helaman 13–Mormon 9, which was set from the original manuscript
- B 1837 the second edition, published in Kirtland, Ohio; printed by the Church, with major editing by Joseph Smith
- C 1840 the third edition, published in Nauvoo, Illinois; typeset, stereotyped, and printed in Cincinnati, Ohio, by Shepard and Stearns, with minor editing by Joseph Smith (including a few restored phrases from the original manuscript); various impressions printed with stereotyped plates in Nauvoo (up through 1842)
- D 1841 the first British edition, published in Liverpool, England; printed by J. Tompkins for Brigham Young, Heber C. Kimball, and Parley P. Pratt; this edition is basically a retypesetting of the 1837 edition
- E 1849 the second British edition, published in Liverpool, England; printed by Richard James for Orson Pratt, with minor editing by Pratt
- F 1852 the third British edition, published in Liverpool, England; typeset by William Bowden for Franklin D. Richards, with printing from stereotyped plates; the second impression from the stereotyped plates (also in 1852) includes a considerable number of changes based on the 1840 edition; the stereotyped plates were later taken to Utah and used to print additional issues of this edition (up through 1877)
- G 1858W a private edition published in New York City by James O. Wright (also issued in 1860 with a new introduction by Zadoc Brook); this edition is based on the 1840 edition and was used by RLDS church members until their first edition was published in 1874
- H 1874R the first RLDS edition, published in Plano, Illinois (later issued from Lamoni, Iowa); this edition is based on both the 1840 Nauvoo edition and the 1858 Wright edition
- I 1879 a major LDS edition published in Liverpool, England; typeset by William Budge for Orson Pratt, with minor editing by Pratt; two sets of stereotyped plates were produced, of which one set remained in England and the other was taken to Utah; for this edition Pratt divided up the original chapters and assigned the verse numbers that have continued in the LDS text
- J 1888 a large-print LDS edition published in Salt Lake City, Utah, by the *Juvenile Instructor*
- K 1892R the second RLDS edition, published in Lamoni, Iowa; a large-print edition, printed in double columns

Introduction

- L 1902 a missionary edition published in Kansas City, Missouri; printed by Burd and Fletcher
- M 1905 a missionary edition published in Chicago, Illinois; prepared by German Ellsworth and printed by Henry C. Etten; for the third impression of this edition (in 1907), Ellsworth made some editorial changes in the plates
- N 1906 a large-print edition published in Salt Lake City, Utah, by *The Deseret News*
- O 1907 a vest-pocket edition published in Salt Lake City, Utah, by the Deseret Sunday School Union
- P 1908R the third RLDS edition, a major edition published in Lamoni, Iowa, with numerous corrections based on the printer's manuscript
- Q 1911 a large-print edition published in Chicago, Illinois; prepared by German Ellsworth and printed by Henry C. Etten (the date 1911 is uncertain)
- R 1920 a major LDS edition published in Salt Lake City, Utah; printed in Hammond, Indiana, by W. B. Conkey; double columns and chapter summaries are introduced into the LDS text, with considerable grammatical editing, plus some restoration of readings from earlier editions
- S 1953R the current RLDS edition, published in Independence, Missouri; a minor revision of the 1908 RLDS edition
- T 1981 the current LDS edition, published in Salt Lake City, Utah; a revision of the 1920 LDS edition, with some restoration of original readings by examination of the two manuscripts

For a complete discussion of these editions, see volume 3.

■ Early Sources for the Title Page

In addition, there are seven early sources listed in the computerized collation and referred to in this volume whenever the title page for the Book of Mormon is discussed. Like the two manuscripts, these early sources have been given numerical symbols:

- 2 CC-LC the first copyright certificate, Library of Congress copy (11 June 1829)
- 3 CC-LDS the second copyright certificate, LDS Church copy (11 June 1829)
- 4 CC-1829 a typeset version of the title page, submitted with the copyright certificate to the Library of Congress, probably printed by E. B. Grandin (11 June 1829)
- 5 WS-1829 *Wayne Sentinel* (26 June 1829)
- 6 PRF-1830 proof sheet for the title page, 1830 edition (printed in August 1829)
- 7 CC-1830 copyright certificate, 1830 edition, printed on the verso (that is, the reverse) of the title page in the 1830 edition (published as part of the 1830 edition in March 1830)
- 8 WS-1830 *Wayne Sentinel* (26 March 1830)

These seven additional sources are numbered in the sequence in which they were produced. With respect to the original and printer’s manuscripts and the first three editions (namely 0, 1, A, B, and C), the order of production is as follows for the text of the title page:

0 2 3 4 5 1 6 A 7 8 B C

The original manuscript preceded all the other textual sources but is not extant for the title page.

■ Variant Specifications

A typical variant specification in the computerized collation and in citations in this volume will read as in the following example:

1 Nephi 2:14
 wherefore they [*did do* 01A | *did* BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
 as he commanded them

Each variant specification begins and ends with a square bracket (as in []). Within the variant specification, a vertical bar separates each variant (as in [| | … |]). For each variant, I first give the text followed by a space and then the list of the textual sources having that variant. Thus in the above example, the first variant is *did do* followed by 01A, which means that the original and printer’s manuscripts as well as the 1830 edition have the reading “wherefore they **did do** as he commanded them”. On the other hand, the second variant is *did*, followed by B through T, which means that the reading “wherefore they **did** as he commanded them” is found in the 1837 edition and all subsequent editions.

■ Adding and Deleting Words

Frequently, in comparing the textual sources, we find that a word or phrase may have been added or deleted during the transmission of one textual source to another. In such cases, the null variant will have only spacing before its list of textual sources, as in the following two examples:

1 Nephi 2:7
 and it came to pass that he built an altar of stones
 and [*he* 01APS | BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRT] made an offering unto the Lord
 and gave thanks unto the Lord our God

1 Nephi 2:20
 yea even a land which I have prepared for you
 [0 | *yea* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST] a land which is choice above all other lands

In the first example, the original text had the subject pronoun *he* at the beginning of the second main clause, but the 1837 edition omitted it; thus after the vertical bar, there is only a space before the listing of the variants (beginning with the B that stands for the 1837 edition). In the second example, the *yea* found in the printer’s manuscript and all subsequent editions did not occur in the original manuscript; thus after the square bracket that begins the variant specification, there is only a space before the 0 that stands for the original manuscript.

■ Indicating Whether the Original Manuscript Is Extant

If the original manuscript is not extant for the particular variant under consideration, then the symbol 0 will be missing from the list, as in the following example at the beginning of 1 Nephi:

1 Nephi preface
they call [1ABDEFIJLMNOPQRS | *the name of* CGHKT] the place Bountiful

In order to facilitate the discussion, sometimes a variant will be specified for the original manuscript even when it is not extant. Usually such instances of conjecture are based on spacing considerations between extant fragments and usage elsewhere in the text. In each case, the accompanying discussion will make it clear that the conjectured reading for the original manuscript is not actually extant but that other considerations lead to conjecturing such a reading.

■ Changes within a Textual Source

Sometimes the change is made in the manuscript itself or between different printings of the same edition. I use the symbol for ‘greater than’ (>) to show this kind of change, as in the following example involving the printer’s manuscript:

1 Nephi 2:6
he pitched his [*tent* 0ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST | *tents* > *tent* 1] in a valley

Oliver Cowdery (the scribe here in the printer’s manuscript) initially wrote the plural *tents*, then corrected it to *tent*. The original manuscript had the singular *tent* (as do all the editions). This same symbol is used for a change in an edition. In the early editions, typesetters sometimes made alterations in the type during the press run. This kind of variant is referred to as an in-press change. For instance, at the beginning of 1 Nephi, the compositor for the 1837 edition originally set “and **have** seen many afflictions”; but later, while printing off the sheets, he noticed that his copy-text (the 1830 edition) read “and **having** seen many afflictions”, so he corrected the type and then continued printing. As a result, some 1837 copies read *have* while others read *having* (7 out of 18 copies I have examined have the original but incorrect *have*). This in-press change is cited as follows:

1 Nephi 1:1
I Nephi having been born of goodly parents
therefore I was taught somewhat in all the learning of my father
and [*haveing* 1 | *having* ACDEFGHIJKLMNQRST | *have* > *having* B] seen
many afflictions in the course of my days . . .

The variant for the 1837 edition reads *have* > *having*, which means that *have* was replaced by *having*. Also note from this example that whenever a variant specification is provided, the accidentals for each variant (such as spelling and capitalization) are given. Thus the above variation specification tells us that in the printer’s manuscript the spelling for *having* is *haveing*. In addition, this specification indirectly tells us that the original manuscript is not extant for this word: the symbol 0 stands for the original manuscript, but here in this variant specification, 0 is missing.

Another source of change within an edition is in later printings of the same edition (typically from stereotyped plates). For instance, the first printing of the 1852 LDS edition was from stereotyped plates, but before the second printing of that edition (also in 1852), numerous changes were made in the plates, including ones based on consulting the 1840 Nauvoo edition. In the following example, the first printing had *near*, a change introduced in the 1841 British edition (D) and followed by the 1849 British edition (E), the copy-text for the 1852 British edition (F). But for the second printing of the 1852 edition, *near* was replaced by *nearer*, the earlier reading and, in particular, the reading of the 1840 edition (C). This change is therefore represented as *near* > *nearer* in the variant specification for the 1852 edition:

1 Nephi 2:5
 and he traveled in the wilderness in the borders which was
 [*nearer* 01ABCGHIJKLMNOPQRST | *near* DE | *near* > *nearer* F] the Red Sea

■ Ambiguities in the Manuscripts

Sometimes in the manuscripts, a particular word may be ambiguously written. For instance, the scribes frequently wrote *a* and *o* alike, with the result that in some cases one cannot be sure which word was actually intended. For instance, in the original manuscript for 1 Nephi 13:24, scribe 2 wrote the word *Bare*, but his *a* is written such that the word could also be read as *Bore*. In volume 1 of the critical text, this word is transcribed as *B[a|o]re* (see line 26 on page 21 of \mathcal{C}), but in the collation, I spell out each possibility and separate them by a slash (/):

1 Nephi 13:24
 it contained the fullness of the gospel of the Lamb of whom the twelve apostles
 [*Bare / Bore* 0 | *bear* 1ABCGHIJKLMNOPQRST] record
 and they [*Bare / Bore* 0 | *bear* 1ABCGHIJKLMNOPQRST] record
 according to the truth which is in the Lamb of God

■ Additions and Deletions in the Manuscripts

If a change within a manuscript or edition involves the deletion or addition of a word or phrase, the word NULL will appear, as in the following examples:

1 Nephi 2:9 (the addition of “the fountain of” in \mathcal{C})
 continually running
 into [NULL > *the fountain of* 0 | *the fountain of* 1ABCGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
 all righteousness

1 Nephi 3:21 (the deletion of “the Lord” in \mathcal{D})
 that they might be faithful in keeping
 the commandments of [0ABCGHIJKLMNOPQRST | *the Lord* > NULL 1] God

1 Nephi 8:1 (the deletion of “and” in the second printing of the 1852 edition)
 we had gathered together all manner of seeds of every kind
 both of grain [01ACGHIJKLMNOPQRST | *and* BDE | *and* > NULL F] of every kind
 and also of the seeds of fruits of every kind

1 Nephi 10:18 (the addition of “for all men” in the second printing of the 1852 edition)
 and the way is prepared
 [for all men 0CGHIJKLMNOPQRT | 1ABDEPS | NULL > for all men F]
 from the foundation of the world

■ Types of Manuscript Changes

Manuscript changes often involve more than simply word changes. There may be a change in the ink flow, a change in the medium, or a change in the scribe. When we have only the greater-than symbol (>) in a manuscript change, we should assume that the scribe is the same and that the correction is identical to the original writing in terms of level of ink flow. When there is some difference, symbols will typically be added to the greater-than symbol to show what kind of difference is involved. In the following, I list the symbols for representing the various types of manuscript differences and give an example of each type:

>+ *the change involves more ink flow*

1 Nephi 4:21
 and he [*soposing* 0 | *supposeing* >+ *supposed* 1 | *supposed* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
 me to be his master Laban

>- *the change involves less ink flow*

1 Nephi 2:19
 blessed art thou [NULL >- *Nephi* 0 | *Nephi* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST]

>% *the change involves erasure of the original ink*

1 Nephi 3:10
 when we had [*come* >% *gone* 0 | *come* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST | *gone* T] up
 to the land of Jerusalem

>p *the correction is in pencil (graphite rather than ink)*

Mosiah 4:14
 and fight and quarrel one with another
 and [*save* >p *serve* 1 | *serve* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST] the devil

>b *the correction is in blue ink (unlike the normal black ink)*

Alma 36 preface
 The [*Commadmments* 0 | *Commandment* >b *Commandments* 1 |
Commandments AEFIJLMOQ | *commandments* BCDGHKNPRST] of Alma
 to his son Helaman

>jg *the correction was made by John Gilbert, the 1830 compositor (that is, the 1830 typesetter)*

2 Nephi 17:23
 where there were a thousand vines
 [*that* >jg *at* 1 | *at* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST] a thousand silverlings

>js *the correction was made by Joseph Smith in his editing for the 1837 edition*

1 Nephi 2:6

he pitched his tent in a valley

[*beside* 0A | *beside* >js *by the side of* 1 | *by the side of* BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]

a river of water

Occasionally, for one part of a manuscript change, the ink flow may be weaker, but for another part of that same change, the ink flow may be heavier, as in the following example:

>+- *the first part of the correction was heavy in ink flow but the second part was weak*

2 Nephi 20:5

and [*their* >+- *the* 1 | *the* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] staff in their hand

Cases of this sort are quite rare in the manuscripts.

■ Changes Made by Different Scribes

Sometimes a different scribe is responsible for a manuscript correction. In this volume, I represent such changes by first placing a scribe symbol before the original text to indicate which scribe wrote that text, and then I place a different scribe symbol before the corrected text to show who made the change. The following symbols are used to stand for the various manuscript scribes:

□ *scribes for the original manuscript*

§1 Oliver Cowdery

§2 unknown scribe x

§3 unknown scribe y

§4 Joseph Smith

□ *scribes for the printer's manuscript*

§1 Oliver Cowdery

§2 unknown scribe z

§3 Hyrum Smith

Here are a few examples of changes made at some later time by other scribes:

□ *Oliver Cowdery corrects scribe 2 of the original manuscript*

1 Nephi 3:16

and all this he hath done because of the commandment

[§2 NULL >- §1 *of the Lord* 0 | *of the Lord* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST]

□ *Oliver Cowdery corrects scribe 3 of the original manuscript*

1 Nephi 7:17

according to my faith

which is in [§3 *me* > §1 *thee* 0 | *thee* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST]

Introduction

- *Scribe 2 corrects scribe 3 of the original manuscript*
1 Nephi 8:30
behold he saw other multitudes pressing
[§3 forwards >+ §2 forward 0 | forward 1 ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
- *Oliver Cowdery twice corrects Hyrum Smith in the printer's manuscript*
Mosiah 29:18
yea remember [§3 NULL > §1 King 1 | king ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRT | King ps] Noah
his wickedness and his [§3 abomination > §1 abominations 1 |
abominations ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
- *Oliver Cowdery twice corrects scribe 2 of the printer's manuscript*
Mosiah 29:21
[§2 yea > §1 ye 1 | Ye APS | ye BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRT] cannot
[§2 death > remove > §1 dethrone 1 | dethrone ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
an iniquitous king save it be through much contention

In the original manuscript, changes by a different scribe typically involve corrections in usage, while in the printer's manuscript such changes are usually the result of proofing against the original manuscript.

■ Lemmatized Variants

Occasionally, the variant specification for a longer phrase may involve some complex changes, with the result that it may be easier to represent each of the variants as a separate lemma. For instance, I represent the substantive variation on the title page (or on the half-title) as follows:

title page or half-title: attribution at the end

- by Joseph Smith Junior author and proprietor 234516A78
- translated by Joseph Smith Junior BC*DEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST
- translated by Joseph Smith C^c

The 1840 edition (represented by the letter C) appears in two states. For the last printing of this edition (in 1842), the *Junior* at the end of *Joseph Smith* was dropped (Joseph Smith Senior had died in September 1840). When I use this lemmatized format to represent the textual variants, I use the asterisk (*) to represent the initial state of a textual source and a raised *c* to represent the corrected state. Similar instances of the asterisk and the raised *c* can be found when specifying the initial and corrected states in the manuscripts, as in the following example where I specify the title for the second book of Nephi:

book title for 2 Nephi

- The Book of Nephi 0*1*
- The Second Book of Nephi 0^c1^cABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST

Within the subsequent discussion, these variant states of the two manuscripts can be represented as \mathcal{O}^* , \mathcal{O}^c , \mathcal{P}^* , and \mathcal{P}^c . Similarly, different states in the editions can be represented in this way, such as 1840* and 1840^c. In this last example, 1840^c would refer to a change in a later printing of the 1840 edition (such as the dropping of *Junior* from Joseph Smith's name in the 1842 printing, mentioned above).

■ Special Symbols

Finally, a couple of special symbols may occasionally appear in the variant specification. One is the elongated *s*, represented as *f*, that the scribes sometimes wrote in the manuscripts:

1 Nephi 8:31
 and he also saw other multitudes
 [*pr/sing* 0 | *feeling* 1ABCDEF GHIJKLMNOPQRST] their way
 towards that great and spacious building

Another example is when a piece of type is inverted in an edition. In such cases, the typesetter—either accidentally or intentionally—turned a piece of type upside down when he set the type. The tilde (~) before a letter *x* is used to indicate that that letter *x* was inverted, as in the following example:

2 Nephi 7:3
 I clothe the [*heavens* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLNPRST | *heaven~s* F | *heaven* MOQ] with blackness

Here the 1852 compositor accidentally set the final *s* of *heavens* upside down. Obviously, such typos are not substantive, but they are represented in the collation since they give us clues as to the carefulness of the typesetting.

All of the symbols for citing variants can be found on the reference card provided with each printed part of volume 4.

Acknowledgments

This volume could not have been produced without the help of many individuals. In volume 3, I provide an extensive listing of those who have assisted me in various ways throughout this long project. In this introduction, I wish to particularly acknowledge those who have helped me in preparing volume 4 (in particular, this first part). Alison Coutts, director of publications for the Foundation for Ancient Research and Mormon Studies (FARMS), has served as first reader for this part of volume 4 and has provided helpful insights in making sure that the text is accessible to the more general reader. David Calabro, a graduate student in Hebrew studies at the University of Chicago, has served as second reader. David has been especially helpful in considering alternative interpretations of my analyses. In many places throughout this volume, the reader will find references to suggestions that David has made in helping me analyze the text and evaluate alternative interpretations. Don Brugger, associate director of publications at FARMS, has served as the main editor for this project and has provided a constant reminder to me of the standard rules of usage. My own style allows for more variability than what would be allowed in normal editing, so he must definitely not be held responsible for the numerous instances of what some might view as errors in usage throughout my own writing in this volume. The final reader for this first part of volume 4 is Paula Hicken, associate editor at FARMS, who served as copy editor. I also wish to thank Larry Draper and William Eggington for reading portions of the manuscript and providing valuable suggestions. Ultimately, I am responsible for the entire volume and whatever lapses may be found in it. As in all large texts, there will be errors in the publication of the critical text project, and I would appreciate any suggestions for correction that readers may have.

Introduction

I also wish to thank the leadership of FARMS for providing the guidance and financial support necessary for producing this major undertaking, especially this fourth volume that serves as the central focus of the Book of Mormon critical text project. For this first part of volume 4, I wish to thank the following officers and directors of FARMS: Noel Reynolds, Doug Chabries, Dan Peterson, and Jerry Bradford. In addition, Lynn Henrichsen, the chair of my academic department at Brigham Young University, has provided valuable support, including some reduction in teaching and committee assignments in order to further the work of this volume.

Jonathan Saltzman, typographer and designer extraordinaire, has played a crucial role in assuring that this critical text volume will be not only readable but indeed beautiful to the eye. He has so often anticipated the needs of this project. His work continually reminds me that if something is worth printing, it is worth typesetting well. Without his expertise, the critical text would be a completely different entity.

As always, I wish to thank my wife, Sirkku, for her continuing support of this project. Indeed, without her, this critical text project would have failed to reach fruition. I am eternally grateful for her love and support in everything that I do.

I am also grateful to the support my children have given over the years to this project. In fact, two of them, Lawrence and Christina, have worked on the project and helped to prepare the transcripts of the two manuscripts and edit the first two volumes of the critical text, now in print. All have been encouraging and supportive and have participated in many ways, including listening to Dad explain so many of the findings of this project. In appreciation for their love, I would like to dedicate this volume to them:

Mikko, Lawrence, Angela, Christina, Nathaniel, Benjamin, and Stephen

I am so grateful that they are all my children, in this life and in the next.

—ROYAL SKOUSEN

12 March 2004

Analysis of Textual Variants

[THIS PAGE LEFT INTENTIONALLY BLANK]

Title Page

■ half title

- | | |
|---|------------------------|
| □ NULL | 1ABDF ^c KNR |
| □ <i>The Book of Mormon</i> | CEF*GHPST* |
| □ <i>Book of Mormon</i> | IJLMOQ |
| □ <i>The Book of Mormon</i>
<i>Another Testament of Jesus Christ</i> | T ^c |

■ title page

- | | |
|-----------------------------|------------------------------|
| □ <i>The Book of Mormon</i> | 234516A78BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST |
|-----------------------------|------------------------------|

All textual sources (besides the original manuscript, which is not extant here) give “The Book of Mormon” as the title on the title page. However, in the printed editions there is some variation in the title printed on the preceding leaf, which is called the half title (providing one was printed). For two LDS editions (the 1852 and the 1981), there were changes to the half title between the first and subsequent printings. In such cases, the asterisk following a capital letter refers to the first printing of an edition, the superscript *c* to a corrected, or later, printing.

In a number of editions (namely, all relevant LDS editions from 1879 through 1911), the initial definite article *the* is lacking on the half title (that is, we have just “Book of Mormon”). Based on the consistent use of the definite article on the title page, *the* belongs on the half title. Of course, technically the half title is not a part of the Book of Mormon text.

We should also note that beginning with the 1982 printing of the 1981 LDS edition, the subtitle “Another Testament of Jesus Christ” follows “The Book of Mormon”, but only on the half title (as well as on the book’s cover), never on the actual title page. This restrictive usage suggests that the additional wording is more an explanation of the book’s purpose than an actual emendation to the title itself. It should also be noted that the word *testament* never occurs in the Book of Mormon itself; its use here in the subtitle consciously parallels the use of the terms *Old Testament* and *New Testament* in the King James Bible. On the other hand, the more familiar nouns *testimony* and *witness* are found throughout the Book of Mormon text, as well as in “The testimony of three witnesses . . . And also the testimony of eight witnesses” (the original headings for the witness statements).

Summary: Based on the earliest textual sources, the title is “The Book of Mormon”; the initial definite article *the* should be included; the current LDS subtitle, “Another Testament of Jesus Christ”, serves as an explanation of the book’s purpose.

■ **title page: first paragraph**

*wherefore it is an abridgment of the record
of the people of Nephi
and also of the Lamanites*

□ NULL

2

□ *written to the Lamanites*

34516A78BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST

which are a remnant of the house of Israel

Here the Library of Congress copy of the copyright certificate (represented by the number 2) dropped the phrase “written to the Lamanites”. The error occurred because the clerk’s eye skipped from the first “the Lamanites” to the second one (“and also of **the Lamanites** written to **the Lamanites**”). The two other firsthand copies of the original title page—the LDS copy of the copyright certificate (represented by the number 3) and the printer’s manuscript (represented by the number 1)—have this phrase. The Library of Congress copy was, of course, retained by the government and has never served as a copy for any of the printed versions of the title page. The current text, which derives from the printer’s manuscript, thus maintains the original phrase “written to the Lamanites”.

The two copyright certificates and the printer’s manuscript version all appear to be independent copies of the original manuscript’s title page, no longer extant. (If ☉, the original manuscript, were extant here, it would be represented in the collation by the number 0.) The two copyright certificates are in the hand of R. R. Lansing, the clerk for the federal court of northern New York, but the punctuation for the two copyright certificates is considerably different, suggesting that both were independently copied from ☉. The title page for the printer’s manuscript was copied by Oliver Cowdery some time later, probably in August 1829, and has virtually no punctuation (only a pair of dashes and a wavy line). Presumably the original manuscript had no punctuation at all (as is the case with extant portions of the original manuscript).

A printed version of the title page (represented by the number 4) was also submitted along with the Library of Congress copyright certificate. This first printed form of the title page was presumably set by the printer Egbert B. Grandin of Palmyra, who later that summer agreed to print the first edition of the Book of Mormon. Grandin also published the title page in the 26 June 1829 issue of his newspaper, the *Wayne Sentinel* (represented by the number 5). Although there is some variation, the punctuation for these two printed versions indicates that they derive from the LDS copy of the copyright certificate, not the Library of Congress copy. (Of course, the unique loss of “written to the Lamanites” in the Library of Congress version also shows this.) The *Wayne Sentinel* version appears to have been reset from the printed title page that was submitted to the Library of Congress.

The fact that we have three independent firsthand copies of the original title page means that we can be very sure about the reading of the title page, even though the original title page is not extant. The three copies are nearly always identical. In a few cases, one copy will deviate from the other two. In these cases, we always follow the majority reading, as in this example involving “written to the Lamanites”.

Summary: The original text of the title page has the longer phraseology “and also of the Lamanites written to the Lamanites”; this phrase was accidentally shortened when the Library of Congress copyright certificate was produced.

■ **title page: first paragraph**

written to the Lamanites

[*which* 234516A8 | *who* 7BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *are a remnant of the house of Israel*

The 1830 title page was copied from the printer’s manuscript (represented by the number 1). Initially, several copies of a proof sheet for the title page (represented by the number 6) were printed. Later, the title page was corrected (and the leading expanded) and eventually placed with the remaining pages of the first gathering of the 1830 edition (pages 1–16). (Here the letter A is used to stand for the 1830 title page.) The reverse side of the title page in the 1830 edition (represented by the number 7) repeats the text of the title page. In fact, the reverse page reproduces the entire copyright certificate. The LDS copyright certificate must have been used to reproduce the legal language of the copyright, but the actual title-page language on the reverse page was set from one of the proof sheets of the title page since the punctuation on the reverse page is virtually identical with the 1830 title page (although the all capitals used to set the names for deity on the title page were removed). It was undoubtedly easier to typeset from an already printed proof sheet than from the handwriting found on the actual copyright certificate.

The second published version of the title page appears in the 26 March 1830 issue of the *Wayne Sentinel* (represented by the number 8). This version was copied directly from the title page of the 1830 edition. Although some of the punctuation was altered, the words in all capitals were copied without alteration.

As he was setting the reverse of the title page, the 1830 compositor accidentally replaced *which* with *who* in the phrase “written to the Lamanites **which** are a remnant of the house of Israel”. This change was unintentional since the compositor set *which* on the title page as well as later for the 26 March 1830 issue of the *Wayne Sentinel*. Of course, the form *who* is what we expect in modern English. In the editing for the 1837 edition, the *which* on the title page was intentionally replaced by *who*, in accord with Joseph Smith’s editing for the 1837 edition (for which he generally replaced *which* with *who* or *whom* whenever the *which* referred to people). A similar 1837 change of *which* to *who* is found later on the title page:

title page: second paragraph

which is a record of the people of Jared

[*which* 234516A78 | *who* BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] were scattered

at the time the Lord confounded the language of the people

Generally speaking, the original text of the Book of Mormon uses the relative pronoun *which* as well as *who* to refer to people (just like the King James Bible); both editing practice and errors in transmission have replaced most of these cases of *which* with *who*. Like most grammatical changes,

this change of *which* to *who* will usually not be discussed in this volume. Instead, a comprehensive discussion regarding the editing of *which* can be found in volume 3 under WHICH. All the original uses of the relative pronoun *which* will, of course, be restored in the critical text.

Summary: Restore the original archaic relative pronoun *which* wherever it was used in the earliest textual sources to refer to people.

■ **title page: first paragraph**

written and sealed [2345 | *up* 16A78BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
and hid [*up* 234516A78BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST | PS] *unto the Lord*

■ **title page: first paragraph**

sealed [*up* 2345 | 16A78BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *by the hand of Moroni*
and hid up unto the Lord

Here the original text read “sealed and hid up” in the first instance, then “sealed up by the hand of Moroni and hid up” in the second instance. The two copyright certificates (each independently copied from the original manuscript) read this way as well as the 26 June 1829 issue of the *Wayne Sentinel* (which derives from the LDS copyright certificate). However, in the printer’s manuscript version of the copyright (also copied from the original manuscript), Oliver Cowdery altered the use of the adverbial *up* by adding it in the first instance and dropping it in the second, thus producing “sealed up and hid up” (which is rather awkward) and “sealed by the hand of Moroni and hid up” (which is also awkward).

Elsewhere in the text, in references to the “sealing (up)” of a sacred text, we have 14 cases of “seal up” but 9 without the *up*. So either reading is possible. Since the two independent copyright certificates retain the original reading for these two cases of “seal (up)”, the current text for the title page should be altered.

Similar errors involving *up* have been quite frequent in the transmission of the text. Elsewhere there are 18 examples where *up* has either been accidentally lost or added to the text. We also note that for the first instance in the title page of “hid up unto the Lord”, the 1908 RLDS edition accidentally dropped the *up*. This error continues in the current RLDS text. There are ten other occurrences of “hid (it) up” in the text, including of course the second instance of “hid up unto the Lord” on the title page, so there is no grammatical reason for removing the *up* after *hid* in the first instance.

Summary: Follow the two independent copyright certificates in determining the reading of the adverbial *up* after *sealed* in the title page, thus giving “written and sealed and hid up unto the Lord” and “sealed up by the hand of Moroni and hid up unto the Lord”; also maintain both cases of *hid up* in the title page.

■ **title page: first paragraph**

to come forth in due time

by [*the* 234516A78BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQS | RT] way

of [234516A78BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQS | *the* RT] *Gentile*

The 1920 LDS edition replaced “by the way of Gentile” with “by way of the Gentile”. This change was a conscious one since it is marked in the committee copy. One possible source for this change is the usage found in 1 Nephi 15:17: “and he meaneth that it shall come by way of the Gentiles”. Nonetheless, the singular *Gentile* was retained in the title page. Of course, the singular use of *Jew* and *Gentile* is characteristic of the language in the title page: “and also to Jew and Gentile . . . and also to the convincing of the Jew and Gentile”. Note incidentally that *Jew* is preceded by *the* in only the second of these two cases of *Jew*, and that *Gentile* is not preceded by *the* in either case. Thus the lack of *the* before *Gentile* in “by the way of Gentile” is consistent with the rest of the language in the title page.

In addition, there is some variation with regard to the use of *the* before *way* in the expression “by (the) way of X”:

title page	by the way of Gentile
title page	by way of commandment
1 Nephi 15:17	by way of the Gentiles
1 Nephi 19:3	by way of commandment
2 Nephi 19:1	by the way of the Red Sea
Alma 5:62	by way of command
Alma 5:62	by way of invitation
Alma 60:2	by the way of condemnation
Helaman 3:10	by the way of shipping
Moroni 10:2	by way of exhortation

So with or without *the* before *way*, either reading is possible. Thus there is nothing wrong with the original “by the way of Gentile” in the title page.

Summary: Restore the original reading “by the way of Gentile” in the title page since the definite article does occur before *way* elsewhere in the text and there is no *the* before *Gentile* anywhere else in the title page.

■ **title page: at the juncture between the first and second paragraphs**

an abridgment taken from the book of Ether

[: 2BCDGHK | . 3456A78 | 1EFIJLMNOQRT | ; PS]

also

[, 23456A78BCDGHKPRST | 1 | ; EFIJLMNOQ]

which is a record of the people of Jared

Except for the printer’s manuscript (which is without punctuation here), the earliest copies and printed editions of the title page interpreted *also* as belonging to the following relative clause

(“also which is a record of the people of Jared”), not the preceding participial phrase (“taken from the book of Ether also”). Beginning with the 1849 edition, the LDS editions have used punctuation that attaches *also* to the preceding text. This is undoubtedly the correct interpretation. It doesn’t make sense to say that the book of Ether is **also** a record of the people of Jared, as if it were anything else. On the other hand, the book of Ether is definitely an addition to the “abridgment of the record of the people of Nephi and also of the Lamanites”.

The Book of Mormon has one other example where *also* modifies the preceding text but not a following relative clause:

Jacob 5:24
look hither and behold another branch **also**
which I have planted

Thus the 1849 adjustment to the punctuation in the title page is the correct decision.

Summary: In the title page, we accept the punctuation that attaches the word *also* to the preceding “an abridgment taken from the book of Ether”.

■ **title page: second paragraph**

to [*shew* 234516A78BCDEFGILMPS | *show* HJKNOQRT] *unto the remnant of the house of Israel*

In almost every instance, the earliest textual sources prefer the archaic verb *shew* rather than the more modern *show*. In the early transmission of the text, some of these examples of *shew* were accidentally replaced by the more expected *show*. In fact, it is possible that in the original text there were no examples of *show*, only *shew*. In any event, beginning with the 1888 edition, LDS editors started a process of systematically replacing *shew* with *show*, so that the current LDS text has only *show*, while the RLDS text has kept most of the original examples of *shew*. See the discussion under SHEW in volume 3.

Summary: Restore the form of *shew* or *show* that is supported by the earliest textual sources; in this case (as in most), we have *shew*.

■ **title page: second paragraph**

to *shew* *unto the remnant of the house of Israel*
[*how* 234516A78 | *what* BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *great things*
the Lord hath done for their fathers

The archaic expression “how great things” is found in the King James Bible (six times), as in Mark 5:19 (“and tell them how great things the Lord hath done for thee”). In modern English, of course, we expect “what great things”, which is how Joseph Smith edited the title page for the 1837 edition. He made a similar change a little later:

1 Nephi 7:11

yea and how is it that ye have forgotten
 [*how* 0A | *how* >js *what* 1 | *what* BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] great things
 the Lord hath done for us

Unlike the change in the title page, Joseph directly marked this particular change in the printer’s manuscript. In his later editing for the 1837 edition, Joseph discontinued making this change, thus leaving the remaining six occurrences of “how great things” unchanged in the text of the Book of Mormon (2 Nephi 1:1, Mosiah 27:16, Alma 62:50, Ether 4:14, and twice in Ether 6:30). The result is that the current text is uneven with respect to this particular expression. Joseph often paid more attention to editorial and stylistic details in the beginning phase of his editing than he did later on.

Summary: The original text consistently uses the archaic expression “how great things” (eight times); Joseph Smith replaced only the first two occurrences with the modern “what great things”.

■ title page: second paragraph

and now if there

- *be fault / it be the mistake* 23^c4516A78
- *be a fault / it be the mistake* 3*
- *are faults / they are the mistakes* BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST

of men

For the 1837 edition, Joseph Smith edited the text here in two ways. First of all, he shifted everything to the plural, thus changing *fault* to *faults*, *it* to *they*, and *mistake* to *mistakes*. He also replaced the subjunctive *be* with the indicative *are* (also in the plural). Interestingly, a similar passage is found near the end of the text:

Mormon 8:17
 and if there be faults
 they be the faults of a man

Here the subjunctive *be* was not editorially changed to the indicative. Unlike the example found in the title page, this one is already in the plural (*faults* and *they*), so there was no need to edit that passage to the plural. In any case, this second example shows that at least the subjunctive usage in the title page example could have been left unedited.

In the LDS copyright certificate, R. R. Lansing initially wrote “a fault”, but then he immediately crossed out the extra *a*. Frequently scribes accidentally write what they expect.

Summary: Restore the subjunctive and the singular usage of the original text in the title page for “if there be fault / it be the mistake of men”.

■ **title page: at the end of the second paragraph**

*that ye may be found spotless
at the judgment seat of Christ*

[234516A78BDEIJLMNOPQRST | MORONI CGHK | NULL > MORONI F]

In the 1840 edition, the name *Moroni* was added at the end, thus directly acknowledging him as the author of the title page. Joseph Smith is probably responsible for this additional information. Nonetheless, such an acknowledgment is unnecessary since the text of the title page already makes it clear that Moroni wrote at least some of the title page (note the language “sealed up by the hand of Moroni”, plus the references in the title page to the book of Ether, an abridgment that Moroni wrote).

The corrected plates for the 1852 LDS edition followed the 1840 edition by adding Moroni’s name, but then the 1879 edition removed it. The 1908 RLDS edition removed Moroni’s name, so the current RLDS text ignores the 1840 emendation.

Simply listing an author’s name at the end of a document is definitely not characteristic of the Book of Mormon text. Normally, an author recognizes himself at the beginning of a book or section by declaring his name within the text, such as Nephi’s famous beginning in 1 Nephi 1:1 (“I Nephi having been born of goodly parents”). For similar examples, see Enos in Enos 1:1, Jarom in Jarom 1:1, Omni in Omni 1:1–2, Amaron in Omni 1:4, Chemish in Omni 1:9, Mormon in the Words of Mormon 1:1, Zeniff in Mosiah 9:1, Mormon in Mormon 1:1, and Moroni in Mormon 8:1.

Often an author will declare his name at the beginning of his writing, such as Amaleki in Omni 1:12 (“Behold I am Amaleki the son of Abinadom”). Such direct identifications are also found at the beginning of an epistle (Parhoron in Alma 61:2) or at the ending of epistles (Moroni in Alma 54:14 and in Alma 60:36, Helaman in Alma 58:41, and Giddianhi in 3 Nephi 3:9–10). And in one case, the author declares his name at both the beginning and ending of an epistle (Ammoron in Alma 54:16 and Alma 54:23–24).

Other times the main author may directly state the name of the author whose writing is being quoted: thus Nephi introduces Jacob at the beginning of 2 Nephi 6, Mormon introduces Zeniff in the preface at the beginning of Mosiah 9, and Moroni introduces Mormon’s epistle in Moroni 8. And at the beginning of Alma 36, 38, and 39, Mormon identifies Alma’s discourses to his sons as “The commandments of Alma”.

The point here is that there is not one example of any quoted text ending simply with the name of the author. Every example of an author’s name is integrated into the text by means of some kind of phrase or clause. Thus the use of *Moroni* on the title page in the 1840 edition is clearly uncharacteristic of the text.

Summary: There is no need to add Moroni’s name at the end of the title page; such usage is uncharacteristic of the Book of Mormon text.

■ title page or half title: attribution at the end

- *by Joseph Smith Junior author and proprietor* 234516A78
- *translated by Joseph Smith Junior* BC*DEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST
- *translated by Joseph Smith* C^c

The 1830 title page refers to Joseph Smith as “author and proprietor”, with no mention of him as the translator. This same attribution is found in the eight-witness statement: “Joseph Smith Junior the author and proprietor of this work”. Beginning with the 1837 edition, both attributions are changed so that they refer to Joseph Smith as the translator. The title page subsequently reads “translated by Joseph Smith Junior” and the eight-witness statement as “Joseph Smith Junior the translator of this work”.

The original use of “author and proprietor” follows the copyright language itself (printed on both copyright certificates):

In conformity to the act of the Congress of the United States, entitled “An act for the encouragement of learning, by securing the copies of Maps, Charts, and Books, to the **authors and proprietors** of such copies, during the times therein mentioned;” and also, to the act entitled “An act supplementary to an act entitled ‘An act for the encouragement of learning, by securing the copies of Maps, Charts, and Books, to the **authors and proprietors** of such copies during the times therein mentioned,’ and extending the benefits thereof to the arts of Designing, Engraving[,] and Etching historical and other prints.”

It appears that Joseph Smith used the phrase “author and proprietor” since the statute provided copyright protection only to “authors and proprietors”. Thus there is no mention of a translator in the 1830 title page. This attribution is, of course, not part of the original text of the Book of Mormon, so there is nothing inappropriate about altering it to read more accurately as “translated by Joseph Smith Junior”. In fact, the attribution could just as well read “revealed through the Prophet Joseph Smith”.

Part of the problem with the language “author and proprietor” is that the original law provided copyright to the author or the proprietor of a work. (Normally, the proprietor of a work would be its author, but not necessarily.) Joseph Smith could have rightly claimed that he was the proprietor of the Book of Mormon. But the continual use of the plural conjunct “authors and proprietors” in the copyright language, reproduced in print on the copyright certificate itself, led to the use of the singular conjunct “author and proprietor”. In other words, the conjoined noun phrase “authors and proprietors” acts as a segregatory conjunct rather than as a combinatory conjunct, which means that copyright can be held by both authors and proprietors (that is, by **either** an author **or** a proprietor). For discussion of the difference between combinatory and segregatory coordination, see pages 953–955 in Randolph Quirk, Sidney Greenbaum, Geoffrey Leech, and Jan Svartvik, *A Comprehensive Grammar of the English Language* (London: Longman, 1985). In further support of this interpretation (that the original copyright language meant ‘author or proprietor’), see note 1 on page 204 in Sidney B. Sperry, *The Problems of the Book of Mormon* (Salt Lake City, Utah: Bookcraft, 1964).

Title Page

Elsewhere, Joseph Smith always referred to himself as the translator of the Book of Mormon, not its author. Both of the witness statements refer to Joseph translating from the plates (“they have been translated by the gift and power of God” and “as many of the leaves as the said Smith has translated”). Further, in the preface to the 1830 edition, Joseph indicated as much:

I would inform you that I **translated** by the gift and power of God
and caused to be written one hundred and sixteen pages . . .

and being commanded of the Lord
that I should not **translate** the same over again . . .

they did read contrary from that which I **translated**
and caused to be written . . .

if I should **translate** the same over again
they would publish that which they had stolen . . .

therefore thou shalt **translate** from the plates of Nephi
until ye come to that which ye have **translated** which ye have retained

There is no reference in Joseph Smith’s own words to his claiming authorship for the Book of Mormon. The authors are Mormon and Moroni, as indicated on the title page.

In the 1840 edition as well as the subsequent 1858 Wright edition and all the RLDS editions except for the 1892 edition, the identification of Joseph Smith as the translator is found on the half title rather than at the bottom of the title page.

In the half title for the 1842 Nauvoo reprinting of the 1840 edition, Joseph Smith removed the *Junior* from his name since his father had died in September 1840. Such practice follows the custom of the time. Subsequent editions have nonetheless continued adding the *Junior*, probably because one of the eight witnesses was his father, who is identified as “Joseph Smith Senior”.

Summary: The identification of Joseph Smith as the translator should be maintained; the earlier “author and proprietor” found in the 1830 edition was used to guarantee that the copyright laws would apply to the book; the additional specification of *Junior* needs to follow Joseph Smith’s name to distinguish him from Joseph Smith Senior, one of the eight witnesses.

Witness Statements

■ three-witness statement

*which is a record of the people of Nephi
and also of the Lamanites [his 1A | their BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] brethren*

The 1837 edition replaced *his* with *their*, but *his* will work. In the case of *his*, the antecedent is *Nephi*, while *the people of Nephi* is the antecedent for *their*. Since either possessive pronoun is possible, the critical text will restore the original reading. Of course, the witness statements are not part of the actual Book of Mormon text. In any event, Joseph Smith was probably responsible for the change to *their* in the 1837 edition.

Summary: Restore the original *his* in the phrase “and also of the Lamanites his brethren” since there is nothing really wrong with referring to *Nephi* rather than *the people of Nephi* as the antecedent.

■ three-witness statement

*we beheld and [bear 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST | bare HK] record
that these things are true*

The archaic simple past-tense *bare* and the base (and present-tense) form *bear* are identically pronounced in modern English, which has sometimes led to difficulty in interpreting which tense is meant in the Book of Mormon text. We cannot rely on the scribes’ spellings to determine which tense was intended since the scribes frequently interchanged these two homophones. Instead, we have to look at the context. If the surrounding verbs use the past tense, then we probably have a case of the past-tense *bare*. If, on the other hand, the context has verbs in the present tense, then we generally choose the present-tense *bear*.

In this example from the three-witness statement, *bear/bare* is conjoined with another past-tense form, *beheld*. The 1874 and 1892 RLDS editions have the past-tense spelling *bare*, but all the other textual sources have the present-tense *bear*. The example here in the three-witness statement parallels John the Baptist’s testimony as found in John 1:34:

THREE-WITNESS STATEMENT

we **beheld** and **bare** record
that these things are true

KING JAMES BIBLE

and I **saw** and **bare** record
that this is the Son of God

There are four other examples in the Book of Mormon text like this one in the three-witness statement, and they are all found in Nephi’s vision of the tree of life. Like John 1:34, these parallel

examples also involve the first person pronoun *I* and, more importantly, conjoin *bare* with a preceding verb of perception in the past tense:

1 Nephi 11:32

and I **saw** and **bare** record

1 Nephi 11:36

I **saw** and **bare** record

that the great and spacious building was the pride of the world

1 Nephi 12:7

and I also **saw** and **bare** record

that the Holy Ghost fell upon twelve others

1 Nephi 14:27

and I Nephi **heard** and **bare** record

that the name of the apostle of the Lamb was John

For each of the five Book of Mormon examples, the apparent intended verb form is the past-tense *bare* rather than the present-tense *bear*. For a complete discussion of *bear* versus *bare*, see under BEAR in volume 3.

There are two other uses of *bear/bare* in the witness statements, but these clearly refer to the testimony that these witnesses are giving as they release these statements to the public. Notice that the witnesses use a sequence of present-tense verbs to refer to their act of testifying:

three-witness statement

and we also **know** that . . .

wherefore we **know** of a surety that . . .

and we also **testify** that . . .

and we **declare** with words of soberness that . . .

and we **know** that . . .

wherefore to be obedient unto the commandments of God

we **bear** testimony of these things

and we **know** that . . .

eight-witness statement

and this we **bear** record with words of soberness that . . .

and **know** of a surety that . . .

and we **give** our names unto the world to witness unto the world that . . .

and we **lie** not

The three-witness statement makes it very clear that although the three witnesses bore record at the time of the vision, this was not enough. They were specifically commanded to bear their testimony forever afterwards:

three-witness statement

and we declare with words of soberness

that an angel of God **came** down from heaven

and he **brought** and **laid** before our eyes

that we **beheld** and **saw** the plates and the engravings thereon

and we know that it is by the grace of God the Father and our Lord Jesus Christ that we **beheld** and **bare** record that these things are true and it is marvelous in our eyes nevertheless the voice of the Lord commanded us that we **should bear** record of it wherefore to be obedient unto the commandments of God we **bear** testimony of these things

The voice of the Lord told the three witnesses that the plates were “translated by the gift and power of God”, so at that revelatory moment they bore record that “these things are true”. Even so, the voice of the Lord commanded them to bear record publicly; thus the three-witness statement was prepared and published.

Summary: Interpret the verb form for the conjoined verb *bear* (in the three-witness statement) as the past-tense *bare*, thus “we beheld and bare record”; usage in the King James Bible (John 1:34) supports the use of the past-tense form.

■ **eight-witness statement**

- *And also the testimony of eight witnesses* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPS
- *The testimony of eight witnesses* T

The 1981 LDS edition made the heading for the eight-witness statement like the heading for the three-witness statement (“The testimony of three witnesses”) by removing the initial words “and also”. However, the use of “and also” reminds the reader of the more physical and supplementary nature of the testimony of the eight witnesses. These words also provide a connection to the preceding testimony, thus their use is wholly appropriate.

Summary: Retain “and also” before the eight-witness statement since such words clearly show the connective relationship of the secondary eight-witness statement to the primary three-witness statement.

■ **eight-witness statement**

- Joseph Smith Junior*
- *the author and proprietor* 1A
 - *the translator* BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST
- of this work*

As noted in the discussion of the title page, Joseph Smith Junior was originally identified as the “author and proprietor” of the Book of Mormon. Since the eight-witness statement is not, properly speaking, part of the Book of Mormon text, there is nothing inappropriate about changing the attribution there so that it is more accurate.

Summary: As on the title page, Joseph Smith Junior should continue to be referred to as the translator of the Book of Mormon.

[THIS PAGE LEFT INTENTIONALLY BLANK]

1 Nephi

1 Nephi Narrative Structure

■ book title for 1 Nephi

- *The Book of Nephi* 1*
- *The First Book of Nephi* 1^cABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST

The original text had four individual books with the title “The Book of Nephi”. There was no numbering to distinguish between 1 Nephi, 2 Nephi, 3 Nephi, and 4 Nephi. The first and second books were distinguished early on when the words *first* and *second* were supralinearly inserted in the manuscripts, sometimes with heavier ink flow, sometimes with lighter—in either case, the insertion was not immediate. For 3 Nephi and 4 Nephi, the original manuscript apparently read “The Book of Nephi” since the printer’s manuscript and the 1830 edition both read that way. (For this later part of the text, \mathcal{P} and the 1830 edition are firsthand copies of \mathcal{C} .) In other words, the manuscript scribes made no attempt to emend the book titles for 3 Nephi and 4 Nephi as they had done for 1 Nephi and 2 Nephi.

The subsequent editing of these four book titles has been inconsistent, as seen in the following comparison (for which the capitalization has been standardized and any punctuation ignored):

1 Nephi title	
The Book of Nephi	1*
The First Book of Nephi	1 ^c ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST
2 Nephi title	
The Book of Nephi	0*1*
The Second Book of Nephi	0 ^c 1 ^c ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST
3 Nephi title	
The Book of Nephi	1ABCDEFGHIHKP
III Nephi / The Book of Nephi	IJLMNQ
3 Nephi / The Book of Nephi	O
Third Nephi / The Book of Nephi	RT
Third Book of Nephi	S
4 Nephi title	
The Book of Nephi	1ABCDEFGHIHKP
IV Nephi / The Book of Nephi	IJLMNQ
4 Nephi / The Book of Nephi	O
Fourth Nephi / The Book of Nephi	RT
Fourth Book of Nephi	S

The distinction for the last two books of Nephi was first made by Orson Pratt in the 1879 LDS edition when he added the extra headings “III Nephi” and “IV Nephi” before “The Book of Nephi”. These extra headings for the last two books have continued in all subsequent LDS editions. On the other hand, the 1953 RLDS edition solved the lack of distinction by adding the ordinals *third* and *fourth* to the original book title. Even so, a new inconsistency with respect to 1 Nephi and 2 Nephi was introduced into that edition: the definite article *the* was deleted from the book titles for 3 Nephi and 4 Nephi.

There are four books of Nephi, but they are not all written by the same Nephi. The Nephi of the first two books is the same person—namely, the son of Lehi. The Nephi of the third book is the son of the Nephi who was the son of Helaman (that is, Helaman’s grandson), while the Nephi of the fourth book is the son of the Nephi of the third book (that is, Helaman’s great-grandson).

Summary: According to the original text, there are four books identically named “The Book of Nephi”; the critical text proper will maintain the unnumbered representation, but for reference purposes, the books are, of course, distinguished as 1 Nephi, 2 Nephi, 3 Nephi, and 4 Nephi.

■ placement of the first chapter of 1 Nephi

- | | |
|--|-----------|
| (1) <i>The first Book of Nephi</i>
Chapter 1st
<i>his reign & ministry</i>
<i>An account of Lehi</i>
<i>. . . I Nephi wrote this record</i> | 1 |
| (2) <i>THE FIRST BOOK OF NEPHI</i>
<i>HIS REIGN AND MINISTRY</i>
Chapter I
<i>An account of Lehi</i>
<i>. . . I Nephi wrote this record</i> | ACDEFGHK |
|
<i>THE FIRST BOOK OF NEPHI</i>
<i>HIS REIGN AND MINISTRY</i>
Chapter 1
<i>An account of Lehi</i>
<i>. . . I Nephi wrote this record</i> |
BPS |
| (3) <i>THE FIRST BOOK OF NEPHI</i>
<i>HIS REIGN AND MINISTRY</i>
<i>An account of Lehi</i>
<i>. . . I Nephi wrote this record</i>
Chapter 1 | IJLMNOQRT |

The word *chapter* was not original to the Book of Mormon text. Here, at the beginning of the first book of Nephi, there was a need to determine where the first chapter should start. Three different possibilities are found, listed above as 1, 2, and 3. In the printer’s manuscript (the original manuscript is not extant here), Oliver Cowdery inserted the chapter specification too early,

placing it between the title of the book (“The First Book of Nephi”) and the following appositive (“his reign and ministry”). The preface at the beginning of this first book of Nephi (from “An account of Lehi” to “I Nephi wrote this record”) summarizes the entire narrative of 1 Nephi; thus the first chapter for 1 Nephi should begin after the book preface, not before it (assuming, of course, that chapter identifications should actually be included within the text itself).

It appears that Joseph Smith himself specified the placement of the original chapter breaks. In the translation process, Joseph seems to have seen some visual indication at the end of a section that the section was ending; perhaps the last words of the section were followed by blankness. Recognizing that the section was ending, Joseph then told the scribe to write the word *chapter*, with the understanding that the appropriate number would be added later. Scribal evidence from the original and printer’s manuscripts supports this interpretation. Oliver Cowdery’s *Chapter* is always written rapidly and with the same ink flow as the surrounding text. But his chapter numbers are almost always written with heavier ink flow and more carefully. In many cases, Oliver took time to add serifs to his roman numerals. And in one case, the chapter number was written in blue ink while all the surrounding words (including the word *Chapter*) were written using the normal black ink.

The use of the word *chapter* and the corresponding numbers is not a part of the original text and can therefore be considered noncanonical. But the breaks that Joseph Smith apparently saw can be considered a part of the original text and should be indicated in the text, perhaps by placing extra white space between sections.

Summary: Although the word *chapter* (and its accompanying numbering system) was added by the Book of Mormon scribes, this referencing system was ultimately derived from textual breaks that were apparently in the original text; these breaks can be represented within the critical text itself by means of extra white space rather than by a system of chapter designations.

■ changes in the chapter system

For the 1879 LDS edition, Orson Pratt broke up the original chapter system. The original chapters are generally longer and tend to end whenever there is a natural break in the narrative. Orson Pratt’s chapter breaks, on the other hand, tend to occur when there is a thematic change. Thus in the original chapter system, a single long chapter is devoted to the story of Nephi and his brothers returning to Jerusalem to obtain the plates of brass, whereas in the current LDS text this story is divided into five chapters. Similarly, single discourses (such as Alma’s commandments to his sons Helaman and Corianton) are, in the original chapter system, undivided and long chapters, but Pratt’s system breaks them up into several thematically defined and shorter chapters.

In a few cases, Orson Pratt rejected the chapter breaks found in the original system. In other words, his chapters occasionally cross over and thus ignore some of the original chapter breaks. For instance, in 1 Nephi, his chapter 19 covers not only the end of the original chapter V but also the first part of the original chapter VI.

Throughout this volume of the critical text (as well as in volume 3), the numbers for the original Book of Mormon chapters will be represented by means of roman numerals. On the other hand, arabic numerals will be used when referring to the LDS chapters. For instance, a reference

in 1 Nephi to “chapter VII” in the original chapter system will correspond to “chapter 22” in the current LDS system. In the manuscripts, Oliver Cowdery used roman numerals to assign numbers to the original chapters. Roman numerals were used in all the early Book of Mormon editions, so they can be thought of as a kind of archaism that stands for the older, original chapter system. The 1879 LDS edition adopted arabic numerals for Orson Pratt’s new chapter system when it was introduced in that edition. The RLDS editions have continued with the original chapter system, but beginning with the 1908 third edition, the RLDS chapter numbers switched from roman numerals to arabic ones.

Summary: Orson Pratt’s revised chapter system (used in all LDS editions from 1879 on) is based more on thematic structure than on the narrative structure of the original chapter system; the RLDS editions have continuously maintained the original system.

■ **paragraphing and versification**

The 1830 typesetter added paragraphing to the text, although some of the resulting paragraphs are very long and extend over several pages when a discourse is involved. For instance, the original last chapter of 1 Nephi (chapter VII) covers over three full pages and is set in the 1830 edition as two paragraphs, with the first paragraph covering most of the chapter.

The original paragraphs (dating from the 1830 edition) were numbered in the 1852 LDS edition, thus creating the first (albeit primitive) system of versification. In some cases, the 1830 paragraphs were too long, so the 1852 editors further divided up these paragraphs. For instance, the last chapter of 1 Nephi (chapter VII, mentioned just above) was divided into five numbered paragraphs in the 1852 edition.

When Orson Pratt created the new chapter system for the 1879 LDS edition, he also created a full-fledged versification system. By making the chapters smaller, Pratt was able to make sure that the verses never ended up as large paragraphs (as was often the case in the 1852 edition). In addition, no chapter ever reached one hundred verses, thus making referencing simpler.

As noted above, the RLDS text has always retained the original chapter system. Each of the first three RLDS editions (1874, 1892, and 1908) has a different versification system, with each one becoming progressively more refined in its division. The first RLDS edition (1874) followed the paragraph numbering of the 1852 LDS edition, while the second edition (1892) broke up the verses more finely, and the third edition (1908) continued this process of increasing division. Of course, since the original chapter system has been retained in the RLDS text, verse numbers for some of the longer chapters exceed two hundred.

Although the current numbered chapters and verses are not a part of the original text, they are absolutely necessary for referencing the text. Scriptural passages cited in volumes 3 and 4 of this critical text will be identified by means of the familiar LDS referencing system. In volumes 1 and 2, the manuscript pages are identified using both the LDS and RLDS referencing systems.

Within a critical text proper, the less intrusive way to use these referencing systems would be to place the chapter and verse numbers in the margins: the left margin could be reserved for the LDS system, the right margin for the RLDS system. In this way, both systems would be available

for referencing, and neither system would interfere with the reading of the text itself. Further, the RLDS system would provide reference to the original textual breaks that Joseph Smith apparently saw as he translated the text. And finally, by removing the versification within the text, we might also free ourselves from the tradition of writing each verse as a short separate paragraph, a practice that allows for easy scripture citation but hinders a flowing reading of the text. A more natural system of paragraphing could then be added to the text, if desired.

Summary: The critical text proper could use both the LDS and RLDS referencing systems by placing the chapter and verse numbers in the left and right margins, respectively, so that neither system would interfere with the other or with the flow of the text itself.

1 Nephi Preface

■ 1 Nephi preface

*he taketh three [days 1L | days' ADEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST | day's BC] journey
into the wilderness with his family*

Joseph Smith apparently never provided any information to his scribes regarding accidentals like punctuation and capitalization. As a consequence, the two manuscripts do not show any original apostrophes. In a few cases, the apostrophe was later added either in heavier ink flow or in pencil by the scribe or the 1830 typesetter. Although the original manuscript is not extant here, the printer's manuscript is and it reads simply as *days*. The placement of the apostrophe was therefore determined in the typesetting. The 1830 typesetter correctly set *days* as a plural possessive (*days'*), but the next two editions set it as if it were a singular possessive (*day's*). In every instance involving a possible apostrophe, we let the context determine whether an apostrophe is needed and, if so, where to place it.

Summary: The critical text will follow the standard text in placing the apostrophe at the end of *days* (thus we have “three days’ journey”).

■ 1 Nephi preface

*Nephi taketh his brethren
and [returns 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPS | returneth RT] to the land of Jerusalem*

Here the 1920 LDS edition made the conjoined verb *return* agree in its ending with the preceding verb *take*—that is, the original “taketh . . . and returns” was replaced by “taketh . . . and returneth”. Although the *-eth* ending dominates in the preface, there is one other example of the *-s* ending in the preface: “the Lord **warns** Lehi to depart out of the land of Jerusalem”. Moreover, the 1920 edition itself allows this kind of inconsistency with conjoined verbs, as in the following example:

Mosiah 3:19 (1920 text)
unless he **yields** to the enticings of the Holy Spirit
and **putteth** off the natural man
and **becometh** a saint through the atonement of Christ the Lord
and **becometh** as a child

The original text sometimes mixes the two possible third person singular endings, the archaic *-(e)th* and the modern *-(e)s*. For a more complete discussion of the competition between these two forms, see INFLECTIONAL ENDINGS in volume 3.

Summary: Restore the mixed use of the *-eth* and *-s* third person singular endings in the conjoined construction “taketh . . . and returns”.

■ 1 Nephi preface

Nephi’s brethren [rebelleth 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPS | rebel RT] against him

In the King James Bible, the third person *-(e)th* ending is restricted to the singular. However, in the original text of the Book of Mormon, this ending is frequently found in the third person plural as well. (On the other hand, the modern third person singular ending *-(e)s* is not extended into the plural.) In general, editors of the Book of Mormon have removed these plural uses of the biblical *-(e)th* ending, although not consistently. Since such uses are “biblical” sounding, they do not seem particularly ungrammatical to modern readers, so some cases have remained. In fact, it is worth noting that in southern English dialects of Early Modern English, the third person singular *-eth* ending was often extended to the third person plural. For discussion, see page 169 in Charles Barber, *Early Modern English* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 1997). Also see the grammatical discussion in volume 3 under INFLECTIONAL ENDINGS.

Summary: Whenever supported by the earliest textual evidence, restore the biblical *-(e)th* ending, even in the plural (as here in the 1 Nephi preface).

■ 1 Nephi preface

they [call 1ABCGHIJKLMNQRST | called DE | called > call F] the name of the place Bountiful

Except for Nephi’s identification at the end, the preface to 1 Nephi is in the present tense, which gives the preface a currency and vividness that a normal historical narrative would lack. In one place, however, the 1841 typesetter accidentally set the present-tense *call* as *called*. This error was copied into the second British edition (1849), as well as into the first printing of the third British edition (1852). In correcting the 1852 stereotyped plates, the editors changed the past-tense form *called* back to *call*, probably by reference to the 1840 edition. (Elsewhere, the 1840 edition was frequently used to correct the 1852 plates. See the example from 1 Nephi 10:18, which is listed below in the discussion of the next variant.)

It should be noted that the preface to 1 Nephi is also written in the third person except at the end, when Nephi switches to the first person (“I Nephi wrote this record”). This change in person serves as a transition to the main narrative (“I Nephi having been born of goodly parents therefore I was taught somewhat in all the learning of my father”).

Summary: Except for Nephi’s identification at the end, the entire preface to 1 Nephi reads in the historical present and in the third person.

■ 1 Nephi preface

they call [1ABDEFIJLMNOPQRS | *the name of* CGHKT] *the place Bountiful*

The 1840 edition added the extra words “the name of” after the verb *call*. These additional words were not the result of grammatical editing since either reading is possible. Instead, the change derives from Joseph Smith’s editing for the 1840 edition when he used the original manuscript to restore a few phrases that had been accidentally deleted when the printer’s manuscript had been copied from the original manuscript. There are three well-established examples, all found in 1 Nephi:

1 Nephi 8:18

but they would not come unto me
[*and partake of the fruit* 0CGHKPRST | 1ABDEFIJLMNOQ]

1 Nephi 10:18

and the way is prepared
[*for all men* 0CGHIJKLMNOQRT | 1ABDEPS | NULL > *for all men* F]
from the foundation of the world

1 Nephi 18:18

yea even they were near to be cast
[*with sorrow* 0CGHKPRST | 1ABDEFIJLMNOQ] into a watery grave

The original manuscript is not extant for the first leaf of 1 Nephi, but it seems likely that the 1840 change of “they call the place Bountiful” to “they call the name of the place Bountiful” is a fourth example of where Joseph Smith restored a phrase by referring to the original manuscript.

The phraseology “call the name of X Y” seems redundant in English; thus the loss of “the name of” can readily happen. There is another place in the text where “the name of” was accidentally dropped, in this instance by the 1830 typesetter:

Mosiah 24:20

and they called [*the name of* 1| ABCDEFGHIJKLMNPOQRST] the valley Alma

Regarding the naming of geographical places, we have six other examples in the text of “call the name of X Y”:

1 Nephi 2:8	he called the name of the river Laman
1 Nephi 16:13	and we did call the name of the place Shazer
2 Nephi 5:8	we should call the name of the place Nephi
Alma 50:13	and they called the name of the city Moroni
Alma 50:14	and they called the name of the city or the land Nephihah
Ether 2:13	and they called the name of the place Moriancumer

But there are also examples of “call X Y”:

1 Nephi 17:6	and we called the place Bountiful
2 Nephi 5:8	wherefore we did call it Nephi
Mosiah 23:19	and they called the land Helam

These examples show that we must not assume that every case of “call X Y” is an error for “call the name of X Y”. Cases of variation do exist. Thus the 1 Nephi preface reads “they call the name of the place Bountiful”, but in 1 Nephi 17:6 the text reads “we called the place Bountiful” (and here the original manuscript is extant).

David Calabro points out (personal communication) that biblical Hebrew uses both expressions. Consider the language of the King James Bible (which here follows the Hebrew) in describing Jacob’s naming of Bethel:

Genesis 35:7

and he built there an altar and **called the place** El Beth-el
because there God appeared unto him
when he fled from the face of his brother

Genesis 35:15

and Jacob **called the name of the place** where God spake with him
Beth-el

Thus the Book of Mormon variation here is just like the biblical variation.

Summary: The 1840 reading “they call the name of the place Bountiful” most probably reflects the reading of the original manuscript and should therefore be maintained.

■ 1 Nephi preface

they cross the large waters into the promised land
[&C. 1|&c. ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRS | etc.]| *and so forth* T]
this is according to the account of Nephi

The 1981 LDS edition removed the three remaining examples in the text of the Latin *et cetera*—by either translating it into an appropriate English expression (as here) or by deleting it. Joseph Smith had earlier removed one example (for the 1837 edition), and the 1920 LDS edition deleted 12 examples and replaced 4 with the phrase “and so forth”. See the discussion in volume 3 under ETC. The critical text will, of course, restore the original *etc.* in all 20 cases since it did occur in the original text.

Summary: Restore the original *etc.* wherever it is found in the earliest textual sources.

■ 1 Nephi preface

this is according to the account of Nephi
or in other words I Nephi wrote this record

Karl Franson (personal communication, 2 October 2003) has suggested that here at the end of the preface to 1 Nephi, the pronoun *I* should actually be the roman numeral *I* and that the language stands for ‘one Nephi’, a kingly title. Franson’s argument is based on the following:

- (1) The pronoun *I* and the roman numeral *I* can be written identically and can therefore be mixed up.

- (2) John Gilbert, the 1830 compositor, set the punctuation here so that there are no commas setting off *Nephi*:

This is according to the account of Nephi;
or, in other words, **I Nephi** wrote this record.

The 1840 edition was the first one to place commas around *Nephi* (thus explicitly treating *Nephi* as an appositive). The 1892 RLDS edition removed the comma after *Nephi*, perhaps accidentally. Here is a summary of the variation in the punctuation:

I Nephi wrote	IABD
I, Nephi, wrote	CEFGHIJLMNOQRT
I, Nephi wrote	KPS

- (3) The entire preceding portion of the 1 Nephi preface is in the third person; only here at the end does the text suddenly shift to the first person. This exception in the person would be removed if *I Nephi* were interpreted as ‘one Nephi’ or ‘first Nephi’.

In dealing with this proposed emendation, we should first note that there is no evidence from the manuscripts that Oliver Cowdery or any other scribe ever mixed up the pronoun *I* with the roman numeral *I*. These two *I*s were always written differently. The pronoun *I* was always written as a script form of the letter *I*. (All scribes except scribe 3 of \mathcal{O} wrote the pronominal *I* as a capital script *I*; scribe 3 of \mathcal{O} wrote the pronominal *I* as a lowercase script *i*.) The only time Oliver Cowdery ever wrote a block capital *I* was when he was adding chapter numbers. The block letter *I* was never used by Oliver or any other scribe for writing the pronoun *I*. There is not even a hint of mix-up, even in scribal corrections or slips of the pen.

After Nephi’s death, the Nephites developed a system of kingly titles for Nephi’s successors:

Jacob 1:11

wherefore the people were desirous to retain in remembrance his name
and whoso should reign in his stead
were called by the people **second Nephi third Nephi** etc.
according to the reigns of the kings
and thus they were called by the people
let them be of whatsoever name they would

This passage implies that if the 1 Nephi preface is referring to Nephi’s own kingly title, it should have read “or in other words / first Nephi wrote this record”. Yet everywhere in the text itself, Oliver Cowdery and the other scribes always wrote *first* as *first*, never as *1st*, *I*, or *1*. In fact, in the text proper the scribes always wrote out every number word for word. No numerals were ever used to write, for instance, the number of years that had passed away or the numbers of those who had died in battle. In particular, the number *one* was always written out. Thus it is very unlikely that *I Nephi* could stand for ‘one Nephi’ or ‘first Nephi’ in the manuscripts.

As noted in the discussion regarding the narrative structure of the Book of Mormon, the chapter specifications themselves are secondary and not a part of the original text. In specifying the chapter numbers, the scribes varied considerably in how they represented those numbers. In the following list, I provide all the extant forms for representing the number for chapter one in the

manuscripts. Nearly all of these are in the hand of Oliver Cowdery. There are two in the hand of scribe 2 of \mathcal{P} , and these are marked as $\S 2\mathcal{P}$ in the list. A dash is used to represent those cases where the original manuscript is not extant.

BOOK	ORIGINAL MANUSCRIPT	PRINTER'S MANUSCRIPT
1 Nephi	—	.1.st
2 Nephi	I	.1.st
Jacob	—	I.
Enos	first .I.	ft I
Jarom	—	first
Omni	—	first
The Words of Mormon	—	I.
Mosiah	—	I
Alma	—	1st ($\S 2\mathcal{P}$)
Helaman	I	I
3 Nephi	—	I
4 Nephi	—	first
Mormon	—	1 ($\S 2\mathcal{P}$)
Ether	—	1
Moroni	—	I

This kind of spelling variation is never found within the text proper.

Elsewhere in the text, John Gilbert (the 1830 typesetter) placed commas around the name *Nephi* when it was preceded by the subject pronoun *I*, as in the punctuation for the very first line of the narrative proper (which in the 1830 edition begins as “I, NEPHI, having been born of goodly parents”). Gilbert may have decided to avoid placing commas around the *Nephi* at the end of the 1 Nephi preface simply because the words right before the *I Nephi* were already heavily punctuated: “This is according to the account of **Nephi; or, in other words**, I Nephi wrote this record.” In any case, punctuation alone does not seem like strong enough evidence to argue that Gilbert actually thought that the capital script *I* in the printer’s manuscript stood for *1* or *1st*. And even if Gilbert thought the *I* was the roman numeral *I*, this does not mean that this interpretation is correct.

One important reason for the last clause in the 1 Nephi preface is to provide a transition to the following narrative. Not only do we get a shift from third person to first person, but we also get a shift from the historical present tense to the past tense. The result is that the last clause in the preface matches the first sentence of the following narrative in both tense and person: “**I Nephi** having been born of goodly parents / therefore I **was** taught somewhat in all the learning of my father”. The shift in tense and person at the end of the 1 Nephi preface intentionally prepares the reader for the following narrative.

Summary: Maintain the reading “I Nephi wrote this record” at the end of the 1 Nephi preface; the capital script *I* of the manuscripts undoubtedly stands for the pronoun *I* rather than the roman numeral *I*; if Joseph Smith had dictated “one Nephi”, the scribe would have written *one Nephi* in \mathcal{O} (and \mathcal{P}); theoretically, the reading “first Nephi” (based on Jacob 1:11) will work, yet if it had been dictated as such, the scribe would have written *first Nephi* in \mathcal{O} (and \mathcal{P}).

1 Nephi 1

■ 1 Nephi 1:1

*I Nephi having been born of goodly parents
therefore I was taught somewhat in all the learning of my father
and [haveing 1 | having ACDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST | have > having B] seen
many afflictions in the course of my days
nevertheless having been highly favored of the Lord in all my days
yea having had a great knowledge of the goodness and the mysteries of God
therefore I make a record of my proceedings in my days*

In this long, complex introductory verse to Nephi’s record, we have two finite clauses (“I was taught” and “I make a record”) and four participial clauses (each with *having* as the nonfinite verb form). The 1837 typesetter initially replaced the second *having* with *have*, thus creating a rather awkward nonparallel conjunct of verb phrases (“I was taught somewhat in all the learning of my father and have seen many afflictions in the course of my days”). While printing this gathering, the 1837 typesetter caught his error and made an in-press correction, thus restoring the correct *having*. As a result, some copies of the 1837 edition have the earlier *have*, but most read *having*. (Out of 18 copies of the first gathering that I have examined, 7 are in the earlier incorrect state and 11 in the later corrected state, so the in-press change seems to have been made about two-fifths of the way through the printing of that first 16-page gathering, designated as signature A.)

Summary: Despite their complexity, the original four participial clauses in 1 Nephi 1:1 should be maintained.

■ 1 Nephi 1:1

*yea having had a great knowledge
of the goodness and [the 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST | Q] mysteries of God*

This minor example demonstrates a very common tendency in the history of the text—namely, the tendency in nominal conjuncts to eliminate the repeated article, either the definite article *the* or the indefinite article *a*. Of course, the repeated article is unexpected in English, thus the tendency to accidentally drop it. Moreover, there is no example in the text where the repeated article has been consciously edited out. Instead, the loss is sporadic and unsystematic and not restricted to any one period in the history of the text. Sometimes a particular loss persists in the textual history. Other times the error is caught, as in this case from the 1911 LDS edition when the lost article was

restored in the following LDS edition (1920). Although the original text does have examples of the nonrepeated article, the original text favors the repeated article and the textual tendency has been to reduce the level of repetition. In fact, the opposite tendency, to add repetition, hardly ever occurs in the text. So one important purpose of a critical text is to restore such repetition whenever the earliest textual sources support it.

Summary: Restore the repeated article *the* or *a* in nominal conjuncts whenever the earliest textual sources support the repetition.

■ 1 Nephi 1:3

and I know that the record which I make

[*to be* >js is 1 | *to be* A | is BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *true*

For the second (1837) edition, Joseph Smith replaced the infinitive phrase “to be” with the indicative form of the *be* verb. The intervening relative clause “which I make” obscures the grammatical mixture of indicative clause and infinitive phrase in “I know that the record . . . to be true”.

A simpler way to have edited the text would have been to have deleted the subordinate conjunction *that*, which would have given “and I know the record which I make to be true”. In fact, this very kind of construction is found later on in the text:

3 Nephi 5:18 and I **know** the record which I make
 to be a just and a true record

One could use this passage to argue for deleting the *that* in 1 Nephi 1:3.

The text has a few other cases of infinitive phrases serving as the complement to the verb *know*:

Jacob 7:14 in the thing which thou **knowest to be** true
Omni 1:25 and **knowing** king Benjamin **to be** a just man
3 Nephi 3:9 and the works thereof I **know to be** good
3 Nephi 8:1 and we **know** our record **to be** true
Mormon 6:6 and **knowing** it **to be** the last struggle of my people

The original text appears to have had another example of a mixed construction that combines the subordinate conjunction *that* with an infinitive phrase. In this case, the text was also edited for the 1837 edition (and also apparently by Joseph Smith), but this time by deleting the *that*:

Moroni 4:1
 wherefore we **know** [*that* 1A | BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
 the manner **to be** true

One might ask whether the earlier mixed constructions in 1 Nephi 1:3 and Moroni 4:1 might be due to accidentally inserting *that* during the writing down of Joseph Smith’s dictation or during the later copying of the original manuscript into the printer’s manuscript. (For both of these passages the original manuscript is not extant.)

There are two arguments that could be used against this hypothesis. First, the resulting text in Moroni 4:1 is sufficiently awkward that one wonders why it was ever accepted in the first place

if it were simply due to miscopying. Its very awkwardness argues that this construction was intended. (The text in 1 Nephi 1:3 is not as difficult grammatically because the infinitive phrase “to be” is delayed by the intervening relative clause “which I make”.)

A second argument is that there are no examples in the manuscripts of the scribes accidentally adding the subordinate conjunction after the verb *know*. The few examples that are found show only a scribal tendency to delete the *that*:

1 Nephi 4:11 (unknown scribe 2 of \mathcal{O})

and I also knew [*he* > *that* 0 | *that* 1 ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
he had sought to take away mine own life

1 Nephi 17:19 (Oliver Cowdery in \mathcal{O})

we knew [NULL > *the* > *that* 0 | *that* 1 ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
ye could not construct a ship

Mosiah 27:18 (unknown scribe 2 of \mathcal{P})

and they knew [NULL > *that* 1 | *that* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
there was nothing save the power of God that could shake the earth

Alma 30:26 (Oliver Cowdery in \mathcal{O})

ye do not know [*there* > *that* > NULL 0 | 1 ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
that there shall be a Christ

Mormon 5:23 (unknown scribe 2 of \mathcal{P})

know ye not [\S 2 NULL >+ \S 1 *that* 1 | *that* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
he hath all power

[Here Oliver Cowdery corrected scribe 2 of \mathcal{P} ; for this part of the text, the 1830 edition was set from \mathcal{O} ; Oliver Cowdery’s correction agrees with the probable reading of \mathcal{O} .]

From a statistical point of view, this evidence must be used with caution. There are only a relatively few cases in the text where the verb *know* is followed by a full indicative (or subjunctive) clause for which the subordinate conjunction *that* is missing. We have the following statistics based on the earliest textual sources (not on the current text, for which there has been a continuing overall but minor tendency to drop the *that* after the verb *know*):

	EARLIEST TEXT	MANUSCRIPT SLIPS
clause with <i>that</i>	307	5
clause without <i>that</i>	12	0

Since there are so few cases where the *that* would have been missing in the first place, it would therefore be difficult to find cases where it could have been accidentally added!

Summary: The original text in 1 Nephi 1:3 probably read according to the earliest textual sources (“I know that the record which I make to be true”) because a similar yet even more awkward construction originally occurred in Moroni 4:1 (“we know that the manner to be true”); if 1 Nephi 1:3 is to be revised, the *that* should be deleted in order to agree with the usage in 3 Nephi 5:18 (“I know the record which I make to be a just and a true record”).

■ 1 Nephi 1:4

*for it came to pass in the commencement
of the [NULL > first year of the 1 | first year of the ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] reign
of Zedekiah*

The original manuscript is not extant here. While copying into the printer’s manuscript, Oliver Cowdery initially wrote “in the commencement of the reign of Zedekiah”, but then he corrected the manuscript by supralinearly inserting “first year of the”. There is no change in the level of ink flow, which implies that the correction was immediate and reflects the reading of the original manuscript rather than editing on the part of Oliver. There really would have been no motivation for the scribe to have added this particular information about the year unless these words were in \mathcal{O} .

The shorter expression is found twice in 1 Nephi 5:12–13, both times as “from the beginning even down to the commencement of the reign of Zedekiah”. There is no need in this later passage to refer to “the first year” of his reign. Elsewhere, the text often refers to the commencement of a particular year in the reign of the judges, as in the following example:

Alma 4:20
and thus in the commencement of the ninth year of the reign of the judges
over the people of Nephi . . .

Generally, I will comment in this volume on manuscript corrections that suggest either editing or scribal difficulties. Such difficulties often provide evidence for determining the original text for that passage and elsewhere. If a manuscript correction appears to be immediate and only the result of the scribe’s desire to copy his text correctly, that correction will probably be silently passed over.

Summary: Accept the supralinear insertion “first year of the” in the printer’s manuscript for 1 Nephi 1:4 since apparently the scribe’s only motivation here was to accurately copy the text from \mathcal{O} into \mathcal{P} .

■ 1 Nephi 1:4

*and in that same year there came many prophets
prophesying unto the people that they must repent
or [that > the 1 | the ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] great city Jerusalem must be destroyed*

The Book of Mormon text typically refers to “that great city”, twice in 1 Nephi and eight times elsewhere (in Helaman, 3 Nephi, and 4 Nephi). The two examples in 1 Nephi are:

1 Nephi 2:13 Jerusalem **that** great city
1 Nephi 10:3 yea even **that** great city Jerusalem

But twice in 1 Nephi (and nowhere else) we have “the great city”, here in 1 Nephi 1:4 and also in 1 Nephi 11:13 (“I looked and beheld **the** great city Jerusalem”). Since *that* is highly expected in this phrase, Oliver Cowdery’s correction of *that* to *the* in 1 Nephi 1:4 probably represents his correcting

the printer’s manuscript to agree with the original manuscript (no longer extant here). The level of ink flow is unchanged, so the correction seems to be immediate.

Summary: Oliver Cowdery’s immediate correction of *that* to *the* in “the great city Jerusalem” is most probably a correction to the reading of the original manuscript; either determiner is possible, although *that* clearly dominates in the text.

■ 1 Nephi 1:9

he saw [one 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPS | One T] descending out of the midst of heaven

In a couple of places, twentieth-century LDS editions have capitalized generic nouns that refer to Christ. Here in 1 Nephi 1:9 the 1981 edition capitalized *one* since it refers to Christ coming down upon the earth. A similar example involves Christ’s appearance to the Nephites. In this case, *man* was capitalized in the 1920 edition:

3 Nephi 11:8
 and behold they saw
 [a man 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPS | man a B | a Man RT]
 descending out of heaven

One serious problem, however, with capitalizing *one* and *man* in these two examples is that the observers (Lehi in the first case and the Nephites in the second) do not know at this point in the narrative who this person is. The capitalization reveals the identity of the individual before the narrative itself does.

Another problem is that such capitalization of generic nouns is contrary to the entire publishing history of the text. Consistent with usage in the King James Bible, no edition of the Book of Mormon has ever capitalized pronouns or generic nouns that refer to deity. It is true that in the editions the pronoun *one* is always capitalized when it is used with *holy* or *mighty* (“the Holy One of Israel”, “the Mighty One of Jacob”, and so forth). But in 1 Nephi 10:8 (using the language of John 1:26), the generic *one* is not capitalized (“for there standeth one among you whom ye know not”). And note here that John the Baptist has not yet revealed at this point in the narrative that this “one among you” is the Savior. Similarly, the generic noun *man* has not been capitalized anywhere except in 3 Nephi 11:8. In the following parallel situation, the word *man* has never been capitalized in any edition:

1 Nephi 11:7 (1981 LDS edition)
 And behold this thing shall be given unto thee for a sign, that after thou hast beheld the tree which bore the fruit which thy father tasted, thou shalt also behold **a man** descending out of heaven, and him shall ye witness; and after ye have witnessed him ye shall bear record that it is the Son of God.

Summary: Capitalization of generic nouns such as *one* and *man* should be avoided, especially in passages where the narrative itself has not yet revealed that the individual is deity (as in 1 Nephi 1:9, 1 Nephi 10:8, 1 Nephi 11:7, and 3 Nephi 11:8).

■ 1 Nephi 1:11

*and the first came and stood before my father and gave unto him a book
and bade him that he should [NULL >+ read it >% read 1 | read ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]*

In the printer’s manuscript, Oliver Cowdery first skipped the verb following *should*, then somewhat later corrected the text by supralinearly inserting “read it” with heavier ink flow. However, the *it* was apparently Oliver’s own addition, a mistake he immediately erased. At first glance the manuscript’s *it* looks like it might simply have been inserted with an ink flow weaker than the preceding *read*, but closer examination of the paper shows the abrasion from erasure. Erasure was probably done by scraping with some kind of sharp knife, perhaps a penknife used to sharpen quills or an actual ink-eraser knife. Our modern gum erasers had not yet been invented. For some discussion of these possibilities, see pages 64–66 in Joe Nickell, *Pen, Ink, and Evidence* (New Castle, Delaware: Oak Knoll Press, 2000).

The original manuscript is not extant for this passage but undoubtedly read simply as “and bade him that he should read”. Lehi is reading a passage from the book, not the entire book, so the missing direct object is consistent with other references to Lehi reading from the book:

1 Nephi 1:12–13
and it came to pass that as he **read**
he was filled with the Spirit of the Lord
and he **read** saying . . .

In this passage, no complement is needed for the verb *read*.

Summary: Accept Oliver Cowdery’s final correction (“and bade him that he should read”) without the pronoun *it* since Oliver definitely attempted to erase it.

■ 1 Nephi 1:14

*when my father had read
and [saw 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPS | seen RT] many great and marvelous things*

There are two ways to interpret the earliest text here in 1 Nephi 1:14. One is that “had read and saw” is a conjoining of the past perfect *had read* and the simple past-tense *saw*. The RLDS text has retained the original text here, which presumes that the RLDS editors have interpreted “had read and saw” in this way.

The other possibility is to interpret “had read and saw” as a conjunction of “had read” and “had saw”, with ellipsis of the repeated *had*. Of course, “had saw” is ungrammatical in standard English, yet this kind of construction was actually quite common in the original text:

1 Nephi 3:30
after that the angel
had [*spake* 01 | *spoken* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] unto us

1 Nephi 5:1
after we had [*Came* 0 | *came* 1ABCDG | *come* EFHIJKLMNOPQRST] down
into the wilderness unto our father

For further discussion plus a listing of all the examples, see PAST PARTICIPLE in volume 3.

It would appear that the editors for the 1920 edition corrected the text under this second interpretation, thus making sure that both main verbs were past participles. Such editing is consistent with all other conjuncts of *heard* and *seen* in the original text:

1 Nephi 20:6	thou hast heard and seen all this
Jacob 7:12	for I have heard and seen
Enos 1:8	whom thou hast not heard nor seen
Enos 1:19	the things which I had heard and seen
Mosiah 27:32	the things which they had heard and seen
Helaman 5:50	all the things which they had heard and seen
3 Nephi 2:1	all which they had heard and seen
3 Nephi 15:24	ye have both heard my voice and seen me
3 Nephi 27:1	the things which they had both heard and seen
3 Nephi 28:16	the things which they had heard and seen

None of these passages show any earlier form involving *saw* rather than *seen*. Nonetheless, there is one occurrence of past participial *saw* in the earliest text:

Alma 19:15
 when the servants of the king
 had [*saw* >]s *seen* 1 | *seen* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
 that they had fallen

The 1830 typesetter edited the text to “had seen”, and Joseph Smith also marked the change in his editing of the printer’s manuscript for the 1837 edition. But originally Oliver Cowdery wrote “had saw” in the printer’s manuscript.

Summary: Despite their ungrammaticality in today’s standard English, the original past participial forms of the earliest textual sources belong in the original text, including those forms found in conjuncts of verb phrases.

■ 1 Nephi 1:14

and thy power and goodness and mercy
 [*is* >]s *are* 1 | *is* A | *are* BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
over all the inhabitants of the earth

There are many cases in the original text where agreement between subject and verb is nonstandard, especially when the verb is *be*. Here we have an example where a conjunct of three attributes of God (his power, goodness, and mercy) is assigned the singular *is*. In his editing for the 1837 edition, Joseph Smith changed the verb to the plural *are*. In general, cases involving subject-verb agreement are discussed as a group in volume 3 under SUBJECT-VERB AGREEMENT.

Summary: The critical text will maintain the original examples of nonstandard subject-verb agreement.

■ 1 Nephi 1:14

because [that > thou 1 | thou ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] art merciful

The normal style of the original text is to follow subordinate conjunctions (like *because*) with *that*. For instance, elsewhere in 1 Nephi we have these examples from the original text:

1 Nephi 2:11

for behold they did murmur in many things against their father
because [*that* 01A | BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] he was a visionary man

1 Nephi 16:22

I Nephi did speak much unto my brethren
because [*that* 0A | *that* >js NULL 1 | BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
they had hardened their hearts again

1 Nephi 16:35

and they did murmur against my father
because [*that* 0A | *that* >js NULL 1 | BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
he had brought them out of the land of Jerusalem

Such style is characteristic of the King James Bible:

Genesis 41:57

and all countries came into Egypt to Joseph for to buy *corn*
because that the famine was *so* sore in all lands

Luke 1:7

and they had no child **because that** Elisabeth was barren

In his editing for the 1837 edition, Joseph Smith generally deleted this archaic use of *that* after *because*, although a few examples are still in the current text, such as 2 Nephi 2:26: “and **because that** they are redeemed from the fall they have become free forever”. In the example from 1 Nephi 1:14, Oliver Cowdery had become so familiar with the expression that he started to write *because that* as he copied the text here from \mathcal{G} to \mathcal{P} . This example also shows that the use of the *that* after *because* was variable in the original text, so in each case we follow the earliest textual sources in order to determine the original reading. For a complete discussion of both the edited and unedited examples, as well as ones without the *that*, see SUBORDINATE CONJUNCTIONS in volume 3.

Summary: Follow the earliest textual sources in determining whether subordinate conjunctions like *because* should be followed by the archaic use of *that*.

■ 1 Nephi 1:14

thou [wilt 1ABCDEFGHIJKLNPRST | will MOQ] not suffer
those who come unto thee that they shall perish

The history of the text shows some variation in the endings for the modal verbs *will* and *shall*. When the subject is the second person *thou*, we have for instance cases of both *wilt* and *will*.

In this particular case, the 1905 LDS edition replaced “thou wilt” with “thou will”. This change was followed by the 1907 and 1911 editions, but the original reading was restored in the 1920 edition. The 1905 change was most probably a typo that resulted from the typesetter’s unfamiliarity with biblical usage. In normally spoken and written modern English, the modal verb form *will* is invariant. There is, for instance, no distinct third person singular form (as in the impossible “he **wills** come”). And the archaic form *wilt* (as in “thou wilt”) is restricted to special religious and poetic language. For a complete listing of the textual variation between “thou wilt” and “thou will”, see INFLECTIONAL ENDINGS in volume 3.

Summary: Here in 1 Nephi 1:14, the earliest textual sources support “thou wilt”, the expected biblical usage.

■ 1 Nephi 1:16

*and now I Nephi do not make a full account of the things
which my father [hath 1ABDEFHIJKLMNOPQRST | had CG] written*

The 1840 edition replaced the present perfect “hath written” with the past perfect “had written”. Although Joseph Smith did some editing for the 1840 edition, this particular change appears to be a typo made by the typesetter. There is no motivation for making the change. In fact, the text immediately following continues the use of the present perfect “hath written”:

1 Nephi 1:16
for he **hath written** many things which he saw in visions and in dreams
and he also **hath written** many things which he prophesied
and spake unto his children

The incorrect “had written” was copied into the 1858 Wright edition but then discontinued.

Summary: The first use of “hath written” in 1 Nephi 1:16 is consistent with the rest of the passage and should be maintained.

■ 1 Nephi 1:16

*and he also hath written many things which he prophesied and spake unto his children
[NULL >+ of 1 | of ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] which I shall not make a full account*

The *of* here is supralinearly inserted with heavier ink flow in the printer’s manuscript. The original manuscript is not extant here, so one cannot be sure whether the insertion is correcting to *o* or represents editing on the part of the corrector. In fact, it is difficult to tell who the corrector is. The *of* and its accompanying insert mark do not quite look like Oliver Cowdery’s, so perhaps the 1830 typesetter or someone else corrected the text here. In that case, the correction would seem to be an editorial one.

The first question we ask here in 1 Nephi 1:16 is whether this relative clause needs a preposition (presumably *of*). This issue comes up fairly frequently in the text, and virtually every example

has its own peculiarities. In analyzing this example, we first consider the general phrase “to make an account” and note that when it has a complement, it is always a prepositional phrase headed by *of*. In all there are eight other cases, of which three are nearby:

1 Nephi 1:16–17

and now I Nephi do not make a full account **of** the things
which my father hath written . . .
but I shall make an account **of** my proceedings in my days . . .
then will I make an account **of** mine own life

Thus we expect the preposition *of* in the relative clause in this same passage.

The second question we ask is whether the preposition *of* should come at the beginning or at the end of the relative clause. With other verbs, either position is possible, yet in nearly all cases the clear majority are found at the head of the relative clause. (For a complete discussion regarding prepositional position, see RELATIVE CLAUSES in volume 3.) This strong tendency suggests that the corrected reading in \mathcal{P} is probably the original reading, even if that correction is due to editing and the *of* happened to be missing from \mathcal{C} .

Summary: Retain the corrected text “of which I shall not make a full account” since the preposition *of* is expected in the expression “to make an account” and its placement at the head of the relative clause is the more probable.

■ 1 Nephi 1:17

after [*that* 1A | BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *I have abridged the record of my father*

Here we have an example of the subordinate conjunction *after* being followed by *that*. As in the case of *because that* (see 1 Nephi 1:14), Joseph Smith usually deleted the archaic use of *that* in his editing for the 1837 edition. (One example where he did not delete the *that* is in 3 Nephi 12:1: “and **after that** ye are baptized with water / behold I will baptize you with fire and with the Holy Ghost”.) The critical text will, of course, restore all cases of *after that* whenever the earliest textual sources support the archaic use of the *that*. For a complete discussion of both the edited and unedited examples, as well as ones without the *that*, see SUBORDINATE CONJUNCTIONS in volume 3.

Just like *because that*, we find examples of *after that* in the King James Bible:

Genesis 13:14

and the LORD said unto Abram **after that** Lot was separated from him
lift up now thine eyes and look . . .

Matthew 27:31

and **after that** they had mocked him
they took the robe off from him and put his own raiment on him

Summary: Follow the earliest textual sources in determining whether subordinate conjunctions like *after* should be followed by *that*.

■ 1 Nephi 1:18

after the Lord had shewn so many

[NULL > *marvelous* 1 | *marvellous* ABCDEFGHIKLMNOQ | *marvelous* JPRST]

things unto my father Lehi

When copying from \mathcal{O} into \mathcal{P} , Oliver Cowdery initially wrote “so many things”, then immediately corrected the phrase by supralinearly adding *marvelous* (there is no change in the level of ink flow). Undoubtedly the original manuscript (which is not extant here) read “so many marvelous things”. Otherwise, there would have been no motivation for Oliver to have made this correction since “so many things” would have worked. Elsewhere, the original text has 18 occurrences of *so many* modifying a following noun phrase, of which two others involve an adjective (“so many precious things” in 2 Nephi 5:16 and “so many brave men” in 3 Nephi 3:3). All the evidence argues that in 1 Nephi 1:18 “so many marvelous things” was the reading of the original text.

Summary: Maintain “so many marvelous things” in 1 Nephi 1:18, undoubtedly the original reading even though \mathcal{O} is not extant.

■ 1 Nephi 1:19

and he testified [that 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST | to Q]

the things which he saw and heard

and also the things which he read in the book

manifested plainly of the coming of a Messiah

The typesetter for the 1911 edition accidentally replaced *that* with *to*, undoubtedly because of the fairly high expectation in English of the phrase “testify to”. (It occurs three times in the Book of Mormon text: once in 2 Nephi 27:12 and twice in Alma 18:1–2.) But this 1911 mistake was not continued in subsequent LDS editions, simply because it resulted in a stranded predicate later on in the passage (“manifested plainly of the coming of a Messiah”).

Summary: The 1911 change from *that* to *to* is simply a typo and was due to the commonness of the phrase “testify to”.

■ 1 Nephi 1:19

and also the things which he read in the book

*manifested plainly of the coming of a **Messiah***

Generally the text capitalizes common nouns such as *Messiah* (but not pronouns or generic nouns such as *one* or *man*) that refer to Jesus Christ, even when they could be read as not referring to deity. Here the use of the indefinite article *a* rather than the definite article *the* suggests that the noun *messiah* could be interpreted as common, with the original Hebrew meaning of ‘an anointed one’ (especially a king).

The printed editions (but not the manuscripts) are consistent in using capitalization for such nouns, as in the following two passages:

1 Nephi 10:4

a prophet would the Lord God raise up among the Jews
yea even a [*masiah* 0 | *Messiah* 1 ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
or in other words
a [*saviour* 01 | *Saviour* ADEFILMNQ | *Savior* BCGHJKOPRST] of the world

2 Nephi 25:18

and unto the convincing of them that
they need not look forward any more for a **Messiah** to come

Also note in the first example the capitalization of the noun *savior* in the printed editions. There are also five examples of “a Christ” in the Book of Mormon (Jacob 7:9, Alma 30:13, 15, 26, and Helaman 16:18), and in the printed editions all are set with capitalization. Of course, *Christ* is just the Greek translation of the Hebrew *Messiah*, so it too can be used as a common noun.

This tradition of capitalizing such nouns is found in the King James Bible (as in Luke 2:11: “for unto you is born this day in the city of David a **Savior** which is Christ the Lord”).

Summary: Retain the traditional capitalization of common nouns (such as *Messiah* and *Savior*) when they refer to Jesus Christ.

■ 1 Nephi 1:20

the tender mercies of the Lord

[*is* >js *are* 1 | *is* A | *are* BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]

over all them whom he hath chosen

Here is another case in the original text where agreement between subject and verb is nonstandard. (See 1 Nephi 1:14 for an earlier example.) In this instance, the subject is clearly plural (“the tender mercies”), but the intervening prepositional phrase (“of the Lord”) favors the singular *is* (as if the text simply read “the Lord is”). In his editing for the 1837 edition, Joseph Smith marked in \wp the editorial change to the plural *are*. The critical text will, of course, restore the original subject-verb disagreement. In general, cases of subject-verb agreement will be discussed as a group in volume 3 under SUBJECT-VERB AGREEMENT.

Summary: Retain in 1 Nephi 1:20 the original singular verb form *is*, even though its subject noun phrase has the plural *mercies* as its head.

■ 1 Nephi 1:20

*but behold I Nephi will shew unto you that
the tender mercies of the Lord is over
all [them >js those 1 | them A | those BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] whom he hath chosen*

The original text of the Book of Mormon has numerous examples of the pronoun *them* used as a determiner, as in “all them whom he hath chosen”. In most instances, Joseph Smith edited this dialectal use of *them* to the standard English determiner *those*. See the complete discussion under PRONOMINAL DETERMINERS in volume 3.

Summary: The original text has many examples of the pronoun *them* used as a determiner; these examples have usually been edited to *those*, as here in 1 Nephi 1:20; based on the earliest textual sources, we restore the original reading (“all them whom he hath chosen”).

1 Nephi 2

■ 1 Nephi 2:1

*for behold it came to pass that the Lord spake unto my father
yea even in a dream
and [sayeth >js said 1 | sayeth A | said BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] unto him
blessed art thou Lehi*

In the original text, the Book of Mormon often uses the historical present tense in a narrative. In this first example, the narrative starts out in the past tense (“the Lord spake”) but then switches to the present tense (“and saith unto him”). This pattern mirrors the style of the King James Bible in the New Testament (where the distinction is based on the original Greek), as in the following example:

Luke 24:36
and as they thus **spake**
Jesus himself **stood** in the midst of them
and **saith** unto them
peace *be* unto you

For the 1837 edition, Joseph Smith changed most examples of the historical present to the simple past, as here in 1 Nephi 2:1. Nearly all the cases involve *saith*, but there are a few other verbs as well. See the discussion under HISTORICAL PRESENT in volume 3.

The word *saith* is often spelled *sayeth* in the manuscripts and in the 1830 edition (as here in 1 Nephi 2:1). This spelling supports the idea that Joseph Smith pronounced *saith* as *say+eth* /sei.əθ/ rather than as *seth* /sɛθ/. We follow the standard spelling *saith* in the critical text since for modern readers it too is typically pronounced /sei.əθ/ rather than /sɛθ/. In other words, every time *saith* is found in the text, it should be assumed that it is pronounced /sei.əθ/. For a complete analysis, see SAITH in volume 3.

Summary: Restore the historical present tense whenever the earliest textual sources support it.

■ 1 Nephi 2:4

*and he left his house and the land of his inheritance
and his gold and his silver and his precious things
and took nothing with him save it were his family and provisions and tents
and [he 01APS | BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRT] departed into the wilderness*

This example involves the simplification of a conjoined clause beginning with “and he”. Similar examples of this simplification are found close by in this chapter:

1 Nephi 2:7

and it came to pass that
 he built an altar of stones
 and [*he* 01APS | BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRT] made an offering unto the Lord
 and gave thanks unto the Lord our God

1 Nephi 2:11

for behold they did murmur in many things against their father
 because [*that* 01A | BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] he was a visionary man
 and [*that he* 01A | BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] had led them
 out of the land of Jerusalem

The last example also involves the deletion of *that* after *because*. See 1 Nephi 2:11 for further discussion of this more complicated example.

In each of these three examples, the subject *he* was dropped in the 1837 edition. This editing was never carried out for the rest of the text. Joseph Smith, in his early editing for the 1837 edition, apparently decided to delete these repetitive *he*'s, but the vast majority in the rest of the text were left unchanged. Consider, for instance, the following two examples from about two-thirds of the way through the text. Here the initial phrase “and he” is successively repeated, yet there has never been any tendency to remove this repetition:

Alma 63:2 (speaking of Shiblon)

and he was a just man
and he did walk uprightly before God
and he did observe to do good continually

Helaman 1:15 (speaking of Coriantumr)

and he was a descendant of Zarahemla
and he was a dissenter from among the Nephites
and he was a large and a mighty man

Besides these later examples of repetition, Joseph Smith also left examples unchanged in the very next chapter of 1 Nephi:

1 Nephi 3:11–12

and Laman went in unto the house of Laban
and he talked with him as he sat in his house
and he desired of Laban the records

1 Nephi 3:13

and behold it came to pass that **Laban** was angry
and thrust him out from his presence
and he would not that he should have the records

This last example also shows that variation can occur: sometimes the *he* is omitted and other times it is there. Thus there is really nothing wrong with the mixture found in the original text

for 1 Nephi 2:4 (“and he left . . . and took nothing . . . and he departed”). In fact, for this instance and the one in 1 Nephi 2:7, the RLDS text has restored the subject pronoun *he* (beginning with the 1908 edition, which is based on the printer’s manuscript).

Summary: Based on the earliest textual sources, the repetitive subject pronoun in conjoined clauses (as in 1 Nephi 2:4 and 1 Nephi 2:7) should be restored.

■ 1 Nephi 2:5

and he came down

by the [borders >+ border >+ borders 0 | borders 1 ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]

near the [shores >+ shore 0 | shore 1 ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] of the Red Sea

Here we have some confusion in the original manuscript over the number for *border* and *shore*. Both were initially written in the plural (“by the borders near the shores of the Red Sea”), then Oliver Cowdery corrected both to the singular (“by the border near the shore of the Red Sea”), although in the case of *border(s)*, Oliver may have attempted to restore the plural *s* after having crossed it out. The plural *s* in *shores* is crossed out with only somewhat heavier ink flow and probably represents a correction made when Oliver read the text back to Joseph Smith. But the plural *s* in *borders* seems to be crossed out with excessively heavier ink flow. In fact, the crossout is shaped such that it could be interpreted as Oliver’s attempt to put the *s* back in, with the result that the crossout looks much larger than a regular crossout. In other words, the final intended text could well have been “by the borders near the shore of the Red Sea”.

Later, when he copied from \mathcal{O} into \mathcal{P} , Oliver Cowdery wrote *borders* rather than *border*. Perhaps he was able to figure out that his ultimate correction of *border(s)* was supposed to be the plural *borders*. Or perhaps he simply expected the plural *borders*. In any event, the printer’s manuscript reads “by the borders near the shore of the Red Sea”. And this use of plural *borders* and singular *shore* has continued throughout the printed editions.

Elsewhere the text consistently uses the plural *borders* (75 times), although in a couple of cases in the printer’s manuscript, the scribe initially wrote the singular *border*:

Alma 5:3 (scribe 2 of \mathcal{P} ; correction with heavier ink flow)

[Border >+ Borders 1 | borders ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]

Alma 50:14 (Oliver Cowdery in \mathcal{P} ; correction without any change in ink flow)

[border > borders 1 | borders ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]

Thus we see a scribal tendency to accidentally write the singular *border* instead of the correct *borders*. In any case, the plural *borders* seems to be the consistent usage in the Book of Mormon.

Determining the expected number for *shore* is more complex. There are three occurrences of *shore(s)*, excluding cases of *seashore*: namely, the one here in 1 Nephi 2:5 plus two others right next to each other in the book of Ether:

Ether 6:12 (based on \mathcal{P} ; \mathcal{C} is not extant here)
 and they did land upon the **shore** of the promised land
 and when they had set their feet upon the **shores** of the promised land
 they bowed themselves down upon the face of the land

The first occurrence is in the singular, the second in the plural, yet in both instances we have exactly the same phraseology: “upon the shore(s) of the promised land”. The scribal correction in 1 Nephi 2:5 of *shores* to *shore* implies a tendency on Oliver Cowdery’s part to write *shores* instead of *shore*. One possibility then is that in Ether 6:12 Oliver once more accidentally wrote *shores* instead of *shore*, but this time he didn’t catch his error.

One could further argue for the singular *shore* by considering the word *seashore*. This related compound occurs in the text only in the singular (26 times) and without any scribal tendency to miswrite it in the plural. However, evidence from the related *seashore* may be irrelevant to determining the number for *shore(s)*. As David Calabro points out (personal communication), the plural *seashores* seems unacceptable on its own, while both *shore* and *shores* are possible. In addition, there are only three examples of *shore(s)*, so the internal evidence is weak for emending *shores* to *shore* in Ether 6:12. Thus it is probably best to leave the variation between *shore* and *shores* in the Ether passage.

Summary: The intended reading in 1 Nephi 2:5 appears to be “by the borders near the shore of the Red Sea”; this is the reading in \mathcal{P} , and Oliver Cowdery’s corrections in \mathcal{C} can also be read this way; Ether 6:12 may have originally read so that the singular *shore* occurred both times in the phrase “upon the shore of the promised land”, but the evidence for such an emendation is meager.

■ 1 Nephi 2:5

*and he traveled in the wilderness in the borders
 which [was 0A | was >js were 1 | are BCDEFGHIJKLMNOQRT | were PS] nearer the Red Sea*

Here Joseph Smith edited the printer’s manuscript so that the singular *was* was changed to the plural *were* (possibly written as *ware*). Joseph made this change by overwriting the *as* in *was* with *ere* (or possibly *are*). The *w* was not crossed out, so he apparently intended to change only the number of the verb form. The 1837 typesetter misread Joseph Smith’s *were* (or *ware*) as *are*.

Generally the text uses the past tense to describe geography in a past-tense narrative. For instance, all other geographical examples involving the word *borders* are in the past tense, even though in the historian’s time (either Nephi’s or Mormon’s) each of these locations could have been accurately described in the present tense (note, in particular, that the phraseology in the example from 1 Nephi 16:14 parallels 1 Nephi 2:5):

1 Nephi 2:8
 and the valley **was** in the borders near the mouth thereof

1 Nephi 16:14
 the most fertile parts of the wilderness
 which **was** in the borders near the Red Sea

Alma 5:3

the land which **was** in the borders of Nephi

Alma 8:5

throughout all the borders of the land
which **was** by the wilderness side

Alma 21:1

the land which was called by the Lamanites Jerusalem . . .
and it **was** away joining the borders of Mormon

Alma 22:27

and the borders of the wilderness
which **was** on the north by the land of Zarahemla

Alma 50:25

the land of Lehi and the land of Morionton
which joined upon the borders of Lehi
both of which **were** on the borders by the seashore

Alma 51:22

the land of Moroni
which **was** in the borders by the seashore

Mormon 2:6

the land of Joshua
which **was** in the borders west by the seashore

Thus the verb in 1 Nephi 2:5 should be in the past tense rather than the present tense. The critical text will, of course, also restore the original singular verb form *was*. See the discussion under SUBJECT-VERB AGREEMENT in volume 3.

Summary: Restore the past tense as well as the singular in the relative clause “which **was** nearer the Red Sea” in 1 Nephi 2:5.

■ 1 Nephi 2:5

and he traveled in the wilderness in the borders which was

[*nearer* 01ABCGHIJKLMNOPQRST | *near* DE | *near* > *nearer* F] *the Red Sea*

The 1841 LDS edition (the first British edition) replaced the comparative *nearer* with *near*. The second printing of the 1852 edition (the third British edition) restored the comparative form, probably by reference to the 1840 edition.

Interestingly, all other places in the text use *near* rather than *nearer* to refer to locations adjacent to bodies of water (six times):

1 Nephi 2:5	by the borders near the shore of the Red Sea
1 Nephi 2:8	in the borders near the mouth thereof
1 Nephi 16:14	which was in the borders near the Red Sea

Mosiah 18:5 there being **near** the water a thicket of small trees
 Mosiah 18:30 in the forest that was **near** the waters of Mormon
 Alma 43:27 in the valley which was **near** the bank of the river Sidon

So the 1841 change in 1 Nephi 2:5, although probably accidental, is consistent with usage elsewhere in the text. This systematicity suggests that the comparative *nearer* in 1 Nephi 2:5 might actually be an error for *near*. Phonetically, there is hardly any difference between *near* and *nearer*. The two forms are near homophones, so it is quite possible that Oliver Cowdery (the scribe here in \mathcal{C}) misheard Joseph Smith's dictation of *near* as *nearer*.

Semantically, *nearer* will work in 1 Nephi 2:5: the comparative seems to imply that Lehi and his family traveled in regions “more or less near” the Red Sea (that is, they kept nearer the Red Sea more often than further away). It should also be noted that the phrase “borders near” as used here in 1 Nephi 2:5 (and in 1 Nephi 2:8 and 1 Nephi 16:14) means ‘regions bordering upon’; in other words, Lehi and his family traveled in the regions that were nearer the Red Sea rather than along a specific line demarcating the boundary between different regions. (See definition 2a under *border* in the Oxford English Dictionary: ‘the district lying along the edge of a country or territory’.) This interpretation of *borders* is required in 1 Nephi 16:14 since that passage indicates that “the most fertile parts of the wilderness” were “in the borders near the Red Sea”:

1 Nephi 16:14
 and we did go forth again in the wilderness
 following the same direction
 keeping in the most fertile parts of the wilderness
 which was **in the borders** near the Red Sea

The transmission of the text provides a number of examples of accidental switching between the comparative and the base form of an adjective:

Alma 21:3 (1837 change: comparative > base)
 that they should wax
 [*stronger* 1A | *strong* BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] in wickedness

Alma 31:5 (1830 change: comparative > base)
 and now as the preaching of the word had had
 a [*greater* 01PS | *great* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOQRT] tendency
 to lead the people to do that which was just

Alma 32:2 (change in \mathcal{P} : comparative > base)
 they began to have success among
 the [*poorer* 0 | *poor* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST] class of the people

Ether 11:6 (1837 change: base > comparative)
 a [*great* 01ART | *greater* BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPS] curse should come
 upon the land

The last example shows that the base form of the adjective can be accidentally changed to the comparative, so we have some general evidence that *near* could be changed to *nearer*. Nonetheless, we have no explicit manuscript evidence of any confusion between the adjective *near* and its

comparative form *nearer*. And since *nearer* will work here in 1 Nephi 2:5, it is probably safest not to emend the text here to *near*. For a complete discussion, see COMPARISON OF ADJECTIVES in volume 3.

Summary: Maintain the use of *nearer* in 1 Nephi 2:5 since the use of the comparative form in this context can be plausibly interpreted; nonetheless, Oliver Cowdery could have misinterpreted *near* in Joseph Smith's dictation as *nearer*; except for this one case, the text has only *near*.

■ 1 Nephi 2:5

*and he [did travel >+ did traveld 0 | did travel 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST]
in the wilderness with his family*

The original text has many examples of the auxiliary verb *do* immediately followed by the main verb, as in this example of “did travel” in 1 Nephi 2:5. There are two other examples in 1 Nephi 2 involving the use of the auxiliary *do*, although one is not original to the text:

1 Nephi 2:14

wherefore they [*did do* 01A | *did* BCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST]
as he commanded them

1 Nephi 2:16

wherefore I [*cried* 0 | *did cry* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST] unto the Lord

A few of these auxiliary *do*'s have been removed from the text, as in the example from 1 Nephi 2:14. And in some cases, the auxiliary *do* has been accidentally added, as in the example from 1 Nephi 2:16. For a complete listing, see DO AUXILIARY in volume 3.

In the example from 1 Nephi 2:5, Oliver Cowdery later corrected the original manuscript's “he did travel” by adding (with somewhat heavier ink flow) a past-tense *d* to the end of the verb *travel*. However, he did not cross out the auxiliary verb *do*. And when he copied this verb phrase into the printer's manuscript, he retained the original “did travel”. His partial alteration may have been an attempt at editing the text. Perhaps he was trying to make the verb agree with the *traveled* of the preceding sentence (“and he **traveled** in the wilderness in the borders which was nearer the Red Sea”).

The King James Bible has numerous examples of the *do* auxiliary occurring in positive declarative clauses. In the following passage, all the verbs take the simple past-tense form except for one, which has the archaic *did wipe* instead of *wiped*:

Luke 7:37–38

and behold a woman in the city . . .
brought an alabaster box of ointment
and stood at his feet behind *him* weeping
and began to wash his feet with tears
and **did wipe** *them* with the hairs of her head
and kissed his feet
and anointed *them* with the ointment

Although such examples of the auxiliary verb *do* are common in Middle English and Early Modern English, such usage is unacceptable in today's English—unless there is stress or emphasis on the *do* auxiliary (which is definitely not the case in the examples from the Book of Mormon).

Summary: Follow the earliest textual sources in either restoring or removing the auxiliary verb *do*; here in 1 Nephi 2:5, Oliver Cowdery originally wrote *did travel*; his later attempt to emend it to *traveled* appears to be secondary and should therefore be ignored.

■ 1 Nephi 2:5

*and he did travel in the wilderness with his family
which consisted of my mother Sariah
and my elder [Brethren 0 | Brethren >+ Brothres 1 | brothers ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]*

In this example, Oliver Cowdery correctly copied the original manuscript's *Brethren* into the printer's manuscript, but then later (with a sharper quill and a heavier and darker ink flow) he overwrote the *e* with an *o* and the final *n* with an *s*. He undoubtedly intended the resulting *Brothres* to represent the word *brothers*. The 1830 compositor set it as such and subsequent editions have retained *brothers*.

The plural *brethren* is much more frequent in the Book of Mormon than *brothers* (549 to 9 in the earliest text). Semantically, both *brothers* and *brethren* are used to refer to blood brothers:

Mosiah 21:9

and now there was a great mourning and lamentation among the people of Limhi
the widow a mourning for her husband
the son and the daughter a mourning for their father
and the **brothers** for their **brethren**

In fact, *brothers* is used only with respect to blood brothers, but the singular *brother* can also be used to refer to a brother in the faith, as at the beginning of Helaman's epistle to Moroni in Alma 56:2 ("my dearly beloved brother Moroni").

In 1 Nephi we have several examples of the scribes mixing up *brethren* and *brothers*, as well as the singular *brother* with the plural *brothers*. Much of the first mix-up has to do with the pronunciation of the word *brethren*. Besides the instance here in 1 Nephi 2:5, there are three more examples of variation:

1 Nephi 3:28

wherefore Laman and Lemuel did speak many hard words unto us
their younger [*Brother 0 | Brethren >%+ Brothres 1 |*
brothers ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]

1 Nephi 3:29

why do ye smite your younger [*Brother 0 | Brethers >+ Brother 1 |*
brother ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] with a rod
know ye not that the Lord hath chosen him to be a ruler over you

1 Nephi 13:10

and they divided the Gentiles from the seed
of my [*Brethers* > *Brethren* 0 | *Brethren* 1 | *brethren* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]

For these three examples, the original manuscript scribe was the unknown scribe 2, while Oliver Cowdery was the scribe for the printer's manuscript. For 1 Nephi 2:5, Oliver Cowdery was the scribe for both \mathcal{O} and \mathcal{P} . In all four of these cases, we let the earliest textual sources determine the correct reading since either *brothers* or *brethren* is semantically possible.

The spelling *brether(s)*, used by both Oliver Cowdery and scribe 2 of \mathcal{O} , apparently stands for *brother(s)*. Besides the examples listed above, we have three other cases (all in \mathcal{O}) where Oliver wrote *brether(s)* for *brother(s)*:

1 Nephi 3:4

thou and thy [*Brethers* 0 | *Brothers* 1 | *brothers* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
should go unto the house of Laban

1 Nephi 3:5

thy [*Brethers* 0 | *Brother* > *Brothers* 1 | *brothers* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
murmur

Alma 56:45

and now I say unto you my beloved
[*Brether* 0 | *Brother* 1 | *brother* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] Moroni

The standard pronunciation for *brethren* is /brɛðrən/, but under the influence of *brother(s)* /brʌðər(z)/, the first vowel of *brethren* is often pronounced with a centralized /ʌ/ vowel rather than /ɛ/ (as in /brʌðrən/, my own pronunciation). The final *r* in *brethren* may also be vocalized, thus ending up with the pronunciation /brʌðərɪn/. This vocalization is due to the vocalization of the final *r* in *brother(s)*. And finally, it is possible that both the final *r* and *n* may be vocalized, giving the three-syllable pronunciation /brʌðərən/ for *brethren*.

The manuscript misspelling *brether(s)* for *brother(s)* is a reversal in the spelling of *brother(s)*, apparently due to the pronunciation /brʌðərɪn/ for *brethren*. We also find evidence for this interference between *brother(s)* and *brethren* in terms of the vocalization of the final *r* in *brethren*. Consider, for instance, the statistics for these misspellings of *brethren* in the manuscripts and early editions:

bretheren	1 time	Oliver Cowdery in \mathcal{O}
	1 time	scribe 3 of \mathcal{O}
	2 times	scribe 2 of \mathcal{O}
	2 times	Hyrum Smith in \mathcal{P}
	1 time	1849 edition
brethern	3 times	1830 edition (one corrected in-press)
	2 times	1840 edition
	11 times	1841 edition
	1 time	1849 edition

Summary: Each choice between *brothers* and *brethren* in the text should be determined by the reading in the earliest textual sources; based on the original manuscript, 1 Nephi 2:5 should read “and my elder brethren”; the misspelling *brether(s)* always represents the word *brother(s)*, not *brethren*.

■ 1 Nephi 2:6

he pitched his [tent 0ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST | tents > tent 1] in a valley

It is quite clear here that the earliest text (the original manuscript) has the singular *tent*. When copying from \mathcal{C} to \mathcal{P} , Oliver Cowdery initially copied the singular *tent* as the plural *tents*, but then he immediately crossed out the plural *s*.

There is no doubt that the singular *tent* is correct here in 1 Nephi 2:6. There are 16 references to a leader’s tent in the Book of Mormon, including 13 for Lehi (such as “and my father dwelt in a tent” in 1 Nephi 2:15 and “we did again travel on our journey toward the tent of our father” in 1 Nephi 7:21). But when referring to a group of people, the text consistently uses the plural *tents*, such as “we did take our tents and departed into the wilderness” in 1 Nephi 16:12 and “they pitched their tents round about” in Mosiah 2:5.

The only special case of usage occurs when the text uses the name of a general to stand for his entire army. In such cases, we always get “his tents” (four times). Note in the following list that for three cases the preceding sentence has a plural subject that refers to a different army and in each of those cases we have “their tents”:

Alma 46:31 (Moroni and his army march out)
and it came to pass that **he** took his army
and marched out with **his tents** into the wilderness

Alma 51:32 (Amalickiah and his army pitch their tents)
and it came to pass that
Teancum and his men did pitch their tents in the borders of the land Bountiful
and **Amalickiah** did pitch **his tents** in the borders on the beach by the seashore

Ether 14:28 (Coriantumr and his army pitch their tents)
and they pitched their tents in the valley of Corihor
and **Coriantumr** pitched **his tents** in the valley of Shurr

Ether 15:8 (Shiz and his army pitch their tents)
wherefore when they came to these waters they pitched their tents
and **Shiz** also pitched **his tents** near unto them

Of course, Lehi’s party is not an army, so it would be incorrect to say “Lehi pitched his tents”.

Summary: The text consistently refers to a leader’s individual tent, as here in 1 Nephi 2:6 (“he pitched his tent”); we get “his tents” only when a general’s name is used to stand for him and his army.

■ 1 Nephi 2:6

he pitched his tent in a valley

[*beside* 0A | *beside* >js *by the side of* 1 | *by the side of* BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
a river of water

For the 1837 edition, Joseph Smith replaced the preposition *beside* with *by the side of*. Historically, the word *beside* derives from “by side” (Oxford English Dictionary), so the substitution of *by the side of* for *beside* in 1 Nephi 2:6 can be viewed more as a type of stylistic editing than as a change in meaning. There appears to be no grammatical and semantic reason for the change. Such stylistic changes for the 1837 edition appear chiefly in the first book (1 Nephi). It should also be noted that it is the tent that is beside the river of water, not the valley. The substitution of *by the side of* does not clear up this potential ambiguity.

There are no other occurrences in the Book of Mormon text of either *beside* or *by the side of*. In the King James Bible, we have examples of both in describing location by water, although most cases have *beside*:

Numbers 24:6	as cedar trees beside the waters
Judges 7:1	Jerubbaal . . . rose up early and pitched beside the well of Harod
Psalms 23:2	he leadeth me beside the still waters
Isaiah 32:20	blessed <i>are</i> ye that sow beside all waters
Ezekiel 32:13	I will destroy also all the beasts thereof from beside the greater waters
Daniel 10:4	I was by the side of the great river

Note that the one example involving pitching of tents (Judges 7:1) uses *beside*. Other examples involving *by the side* have genitive modifiers (such as “by the river’s side” in Exodus 2:5 and Numbers 24:6).

Summary: The use of the original *beside* in 1 Nephi 2:6 is perfectly acceptable; the use of *beside* is supported by examples from the King James Bible and is not improved by replacing *beside* with the expansive, paraphrastic *by the side of*.

■ 1 Nephi 2:7

and it came to pass that he built an altar of stones

*and [he 01APS | BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRT] made an offering unto the Lord
and gave thanks unto the Lord our God*

This example shows Joseph Smith’s deletion of the repeated subject pronoun *he*. Joseph Smith followed this kind of editing only in the beginning of his editing for the 1837 edition. As discussed under 1 Nephi 2:4, there was no need for such stylistic editing.

Summary: Restore the original repeated pronoun *he* in 1 Nephi 2:7.

■ 1 Nephi 2:9

O that thou mightest be like unto this river continually running into
 [NULL > *the fountain of* 0 | *the fountain of* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST] *all righteousness*

As Oliver Cowdery took down Joseph Smith’s dictation in 1 Nephi 2:9, he accidentally skipped “the fountain of” when he initially wrote “continually running into all righteousness”. Oliver immediately corrected the text by supralinearly inserting “the fountain of” (without any change in ink flow). It would be very difficult to imagine this correction as some kind of emendation on Oliver’s part.

The phraseology “the fountain of all righteousness” is used elsewhere to refer specifically to the Messiah (which gives a Christological interpretation to Lehi’s wish for Laman):

Ether 8:26

but that they may be persuaded to do good continually
 that they may come unto the fountain of all righteousness and be saved

Ether 12:28

and I will shew unto them that faith hope and charity
 bringeth unto me / the fountain of all righteousness

Summary: The supralinear insertion in \mathcal{C} of “the fountain of” in 1 Nephi 2:9 is not an emendation but instead represents the reading of the original text.

■ 1 Nephi 2:10

and he also spake unto Lemuel
 [*saying* 0 | 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST]
O that thou mightest be like unto this valley

Oliver Cowdery accidentally dropped the word *saying* when copying from \mathcal{C} into \mathcal{P} . Elsewhere in the text, virtually every occurrence of “X spake unto Y” is followed by *saying* before a direct quote. A complete discussion is found at 1 Nephi 7:1.

Summary: Restore *saying* in 1 Nephi 2:10 since it occurs in the original manuscript.

■ 1 Nephi 2:11

for behold they did murmur in many things against their father
because [*that* 01A | BCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST] *he was a visionary man*
and [*that he* 01A | BCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST] *had led them out of the land of Jerusalem*

This passage involves the deletion in the 1837 edition of the repeated pronoun *he*. This kind of editing also occurred earlier in this chapter (see 1 Nephi 2:4, 7). But in this example the second subordinate conjunction *that* was also edited out. This editing is consistent with the deletion of the first *that* in this verse. In his editing for the 1837 edition, Joseph Smith fairly consistently removed *that* whenever it was immediately preceded by *because*, so it seemed appropriate to

remove the *that* both times from these conjoined clauses. For further discussion, see SUBORDINATE CONJUNCTIONS in volume 3.

Summary: Based on the earliest textual sources, the repetitive subject pronouns in conjoined clauses should be restored in the critical text; coordinated uses of *that* following another subordinate conjunction (like *because*) should also be restored.

■ 1 Nephi 2:11

*for behold they did murmur in many things against their father
because that he was a visionary [man 0ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST | NULL > man 1]*

The text consistently refers to Lehi as “a visionary man”, never as “a visionary”:

1 Nephi 5:2

and she also had complained against my father
telling him that he was **a visionary man**

1 Nephi 5:4

I know that I am **a visionary man**

When he copied from \mathcal{O} to \mathcal{P} , Oliver Cowdery initially wrote “a visionary”, but he immediately caught his error and supralinearly inserted the word *man* without any change in ink flow. The word *visionary* always acts as a modifier in the Book of Mormon text.

Summary: Maintain the consistent use of “a visionary man” in the text.

■ 1 Nephi 2:11

*and that he had led them out of the land of Jerusalem
to leave the land of their inheritance and their gold and their silver and their precious things
[and 01A | B C D E F G H I J K L M N O P Q R S T] to perish in the wilderness*

There is really no reason to delete the *and* here in this passage. The two infinitive phrases can be connected with the coordinating conjunction *and*. There are many such examples elsewhere in the text. For instance, nearby we have the following example:

1 Nephi 4:3

the Lord is able **to** deliver us even as our fathers
and to destroy Laban even as the Egyptians

It could well be that the 1837 edition accidentally dropped the *and*. This change was not marked by Joseph Smith in the printer’s manuscript.

Summary: Restore the *and* connecting the two infinitive phrases in 1 Nephi 2:11; the 1837 change may well be a typo.

■ 1 Nephi 2:11

*and this they said [that 0 | 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST] he had done
because of the foolish imaginations of his heart*

Oliver Cowdery omitted the subordinate conjunction *that* when copying from \mathcal{O} into \mathcal{P} . This deletion may have been intentional; the original phrase does seem to be somewhat awkward, especially because of the fronting of the direct object *this*. Compare the original sentence with the more normal sentence where the *this* is not fronted: “and they said that he had done **this** because of the foolish imaginations of his heart”. For this nonfronted version, the *that* would have been perfectly acceptable. Such fronting is especially rare in the text when the main verb is *say*. One other example is in Mosiah 18:29: “and this he said unto them / having been commanded of God”. (For additional examples of deleting *that* after the verb *say*, see THAT in volume 3.)

Summary: Restore the subordinate conjunction *that* in 1 Nephi 2:11 (“and this they said **that** he had done because of the foolish imaginations of his heart”).

■ 1 Nephi 2:14

wherefore they [did do 01A | did BCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST] as he commanded them

As noted under 1 Nephi 2:5 (“and he did travel in the wilderness with his family”), some of the archaic uses of the auxiliary *do* have been edited out of the Book of Mormon text. This tendency has been especially strong when the auxiliary verb *do* is immediately followed by the main verb *do*, as in the following two examples:

Helaman 13:24

that ye **do cast** out the prophets
and **do mock** them and cast stones at them
and **do slay** them
and [*do do* 1A | *do* BCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST] all manner of iniquity unto them

Ether 11:14

and it came to pass that Moron **did reign** in his stead
and Moron [*did do* >js *did* 1 | *did do* A | *did* BCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST]
that which was wicked before the Lord

In these two passages, Joseph Smith did not edit out any of the other uses of the *do* auxiliary since they were followed by a main verb different from *do* (“do cast”, “do mock”, “do slay”, and “did reign”). Even so, in most instances, Joseph left most of the original occurrences of “did do” in the text (12 of them). One example like 1 Nephi 2:14 is in 3 Nephi 26:20 (“and it came to pass that they **did do** all things”). For a complete listing, see DO AUXILIARY in volume 3.

Summary: Restore the original *do* auxiliary in 1 Nephi 2:14 (“wherefore they **did do** as he commanded them”); the original text has quite a few examples of the *do* auxiliary followed by the main verb *do*.

■ 1 Nephi 2:16

I Nephi being [exceeding 01 | exceeding ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRS | exceedingly T] young nevertheless being large in stature . . .

The original Book of Mormon text uses *exceeding* as the adverb modifier for adjectives and other adverbs. Beginning with the 1920 edition, LDS editors started to add the suffix *-ly* to these adverb forms (thus *exceedingly*). The process was systematically completed in the 1981 edition. See the discussion under EXCEEDING in volume 3.

This use of *exceeding* in front of adjectives and adverbs is characteristic of Early Modern English and is found throughout the King James Bible. For instance, in Matthew 5:12 Jesus declares: “rejoice and be exceeding glad”. The corresponding Book of Mormon passage also originally had “be exceeding glad”, but was subsequently edited for the 1981 LDS edition:

3 Nephi 12:12
for ye shall have great joy
and be [*exceeding* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPSR | *exceedingly* T] glad

Summary: Wherever supported by the earliest textual sources, restore *exceeding* as the adverb modifier of adjectives and adverbs.

■ 1 Nephi 2:16

and also having great [desires 01ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPSRT | desire G] to know of the mysteries of God wherefore I cried unto the Lord

The earliest text reads “great desires”, although the singular *desire* is possible. The 1858 Wright edition accidentally set the singular, but this reading did not persist. Elsewhere, there is one other example of “great desire(s)”, and it too reads in the plural: “because of their **great desires** which they had for the welfare of this people” (Alma 60:9).

Summary: Based on the earliest textual sources, the plural “great desires” should be maintained in 1 Nephi 2:16.

■ 1 Nephi 2:16

and also having great desires to know of the mysteries [NULL > of God 0 | of God 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPSRT] wherefore I cried unto the Lord

Here Oliver Cowdery initially wrote “the mysteries”, but then he immediately added “of God” supralinearly without any change in level of ink flow. Although this addition could be an emendation, it doesn’t seem likely. The Book of Mormon text rarely refers to the mysteries of God

as simply “the mysteries”. (For one example that could be interpreted this way, see Alma 37:4.) Normally in the text we get “the mysteries of God” (eight times) or “his mysteries” (four times) or “the mysteries of him” (once, in Jacob 4:8). Nephi himself uses only the phrase “the mysteries of God” (in 1 Nephi 1:1 and 1 Nephi 10:19 as well as here in 1 Nephi 2:11).

Summary: Maintain in 1 Nephi 2:16 “the mysteries of God”, the corrected reading in \mathcal{C} ; the Book of Mormon rarely refers to God’s mysteries without specifying that they are indeed his.

■ 1 Nephi 2:16

wherefore I [cried 0 | did cry 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST] unto the Lord

Occasionally, the text has accidentally added the *do* auxiliary. In this instance, when copying from \mathcal{C} into \mathcal{P} , Oliver Cowdery unintentionally replaced the simple past-tense form *cried* with *did cry*. All printed editions have followed this reading. Perhaps Oliver was influenced by the use of the *do* auxiliary in the following sentence: “and behold he **did** visit me and **did** soften my heart that I **did** believe” (1 Nephi 2:16). There are two other examples where the *do* auxiliary was accidentally added in 1 Nephi:

1 Nephi 17:1

and our women [*bare* 01 | *did bear* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST] children
in the wilderness

1 Nephi 18:11

nevertheless the Lord [*suffered* 0 | *did suffer* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST] it
that he might shew forth his power

See 1 Nephi 2:5 and 1 Nephi 2:14 for additional discussion. For a complete analysis of this archaic usage, see DO AUXILIARY in volume 3.

Summary: Restore the original reading in 1 Nephi 2:16, which lacks the *do* auxiliary (“wherefore I cried unto the Lord”).

■ 1 Nephi 2:19

blessed art thou

[NULL >- *Nephi* 0 | *Nephi* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST]

Oliver Cowdery’s supralinearly inserted *Nephi* was written with weaker ink flow, which suggests the possibility that this insertion was due to editing—as if Oliver somehow thought that the phrase “blessed art thou” needed to be followed by a name. Of course, the reader already knows that the Lord is speaking to Nephi, so there is no motivation for adding the name except that the original text read this way. The correction may have occurred when Oliver read back the text to Joseph Smith and the ink in the quill was running out or had dried out somewhat.

Elsewhere the text has examples of “blessed art thou” with and without a following name. In all these cases, there is no evidence of a scribe correcting the manuscript by either deleting or adding a name after “blessed art thou”. In four out of ten cases, there is no name:

1 Nephi 2:1	blessed art thou Lehi
1 Nephi 11:6	and blessed art thou Nephi
2 Nephi 3:25	and now blessed art thou Joseph
2 Nephi 4:11 (to Sam)	blessed art thou and thy seed
Mosiah 26:15	blessed art thou Alma
Mosiah 26:17 (to Alma)	and blessed art thou
Alma 8:15	blessed art thou Alma
Alma 45:8 (to Helaman)	blessed art thou
Alma 50:20 (to Lehi)	blessed art thou and thy children
Helaman 10:4	blessed art thou Nephi

Excluded from this list of “blessed art thou” are three cases for which no name can be given. In these cases the narrative itself does not provide a name for the person (the servant of the vineyard in Jacob 5:75 and king Lamoni’s queen in Alma 19:10,12).

Summary: The supralinearly inserted *Nephi* in 1 Nephi 2:19 probably represents the reading of the original text since there is no strong motivation for Oliver Cowdery to have added the name after “blessed art thou”.

■ 1 Nephi 2:20

*and inasmuch as ye shall keep my commandments
ye shall prosper and shall be led to a land of promise
yea even a land which I have prepared for you
[0 | yea 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST] a land which is choice above all other lands*

When copying from \mathcal{O} into \mathcal{P} , Oliver Cowdery added a second *yea* in this verse. The second phrase acts as an appositive to the first phrase; thus the *yea* is not necessary, even though it is possible.

Other examples of such appositive use of “a land” show that sometimes *yea* occurs, sometimes not:

- 2 Nephi 1:5 (no use of *yea* for either occurrence)
 - we have obtained a land of promise
 - a land** which is choice above all other lands
 - a land** which the Lord God hath covenanted with me
 - should be a land for the inheritance of my seed
- Mosiah 21:26 (use of *yea* for both occurrences)
 - they did find a land which had been peopled
 - yea a land** which was covered with dry bones
 - yea a land** which had been peopled and which had been destroyed

1 Nephi 2

Mosiah 23:4 (use of *yea* only for the first occurrence)

and they came to a land
yea even a very beautiful and pleasant **land**
a land of pure water

Helaman 16:20 (no use of *yea*; only one appositive use of “a land”)

to cause us that we should believe in some great and marvelous thing
which should come to pass
but not among us but in a land which is far distant
a land which we know not

Summary: Remove the unnecessary second *yea* in 1 Nephi 2:20; Oliver Cowdery added it in his copying from \mathcal{C} into \mathcal{D} , perhaps accidentally.

1 Nephi 3

■ 1 Nephi 3:2

behold I have dreamed a dream

[*in the which* 01ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST | *in which* G]

the Lord hath commanded me that thou and thy brethren shall return to Jerusalem

At the beginning of relative clauses, the original Book of Mormon text preferred the archaic phraseology “in the which” over “in which”, as here in 1 Nephi 3:2. In this particular example, the 1858 Wright edition accidentally dropped the *the*, but all other editions have kept it.

The earliest textual sources indicate that the original text had 56 occurrences of “in the which” but only 5 of “in which”. In his editing for the 1837 edition, Joseph Smith removed exactly half of the 56 occurrences of “in the which” (but left the other 28 unchanged). The majority of these changes (21 of them) are found in the book of Ether. In most cases of this editing, Joseph just deleted the *the*, but in one case he deleted *in the* (Alma 61:8), in two cases he replaced “in the which” with *and* (Ether 7:22 and Ether 7:23), and in five cases he deleted the *the* and replaced the *in* with a different preposition (*by* in Ether 10:10, Ether 10:15, and Ether 11:10; *with* in Ether 10:26; and *during* in Ether 10:32). In the last example, he also added the word *time* after the *which* (thus producing “during which time”).

This particular editing of Joseph Smith’s is quite unusual. Normally, Joseph stopped most of his stylistic editing after 1 Nephi. In this instance, however, he had worked through nearly 90 percent of the Book of Mormon before he apparently decided (in Mormon 2) that the phrase “in the which” should be edited out.

Elsewhere in the text, a few examples of “in the which” have been occasionally replaced by “in which” but never systematically. The current LDS and RLDS texts thus retain a mixed character with respect to the original “in the which”. The critical text will, of course, restore the original archaic usage whenever it is supported by the earliest textual sources. For a complete discussion, see IN THE WHICH in volume 3.

This archaic “in the which” occurs relatively frequently in the King James Bible (14 times), as in these examples:

Genesis 19:29

God remembered Abraham and sent Lot out of the midst of the overthrow
when he overthrew the cities **in the which** Lot dwelt

Acts 17:31

because he hath appointed a day
in the which he will judge the world in righteousness

Summary: Restore the archaic phraseology “in the which” whenever it is supported by the earliest textual sources.

■ 1 Nephi 3:3

*for behold Laban hath the record of the Jews
and also a genealogy of [my 0ACGHKT | my >]s thy 1 | thy BDEFIJLMNOPQRS] forefathers*

In this passage, Lehi is speaking to his son Nephi. Lehi refers to the genealogy of his (Lehi’s) forefathers. In his editing for the 1837 edition, Joseph Smith decided to edit *my* to *thy* in this verse; the correction is in Joseph’s hand in the printer’s manuscript. One possibility, suggested by David Calabro (personal communication), is that Joseph interpreted the words in verse 3 as a direct quote of the Lord’s commandment to Lehi, referred to first in verse 2 and then once more in verse 4:

1 Nephi 3:2–4

behold I have dreamed a dream
in the which the Lord hath commanded me
that thou and thy brethren shall return to Jerusalem

<beginning of direct quote>

for behold Laban hath the record of the Jews
and a genealogy of **thy** forefathers
and they are engraven upon plates of brass

<end of direct quote>

wherefore the Lord hath commanded me
that thou and thy brothers should go unto the house of Laban
and seek the records and bring them down hither into the wilderness

One difficulty with this interpretation, however, is that the connecting *for* (at the beginning of verse 3) does not seem appropriate in introducing a direct quote. Instead, this conjunction acts as a narrative connector between verses 2 and 3 and suggests that verse 3 continues Lehi’s explanation to Nephi of the Lord’s commandment.

Another possible explanation for the change of *my* to *thy* in verse 3 is that Joseph Smith simply allowed himself to be influenced by the use of *thou* and *thy* at the end of verse 2. In any event, the original *my* was restored in the 1840 edition (apparently by Joseph Smith) but not in the LDS text until the 1981 edition. For the 1908 RLDS edition, the editors reverted to *thy*, probably because Joseph had marked the change in the printer’s manuscript.

Since verse 3 is probably not a direct quote of the Lord’s words to Lehi, the original use of *my* is therefore consistent with the fact that elsewhere the text always refers to Lehi’s genealogy as Lehi’s, not Nephi’s:

1 Nephi 3:12

and he desired of Laban the records
which were engraven upon the plates of brass
which contained the genealogy of **my father**

1 Nephi 5:14

my father Lehi also found upon the plates of brass a genealogy of **his fathers**

1 Nephi 5:16

and thus my father Lehi did discover the genealogy of **his fathers**

Summary: Lehi’s reference to his own genealogy, not Nephi’s, is consistent with usage elsewhere in the text; 1 Nephi 3:3 is probably not a direct quote of the Lord’s words to Lehi.

■ 1 Nephi 3:4

*wherefore the Lord hath commanded me
that thou and thy brothers should go unto the house of Laban and seek the records
and bring them down [NULL > hither 0 | hither 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST] into the wilderness*

Oliver Cowdery, the scribe here in \mathcal{O} , initially skipped the archaic motion adverb *hither* as he wrote down Joseph Smith’s dictation. Oliver immediately caught his error, for the word is supra-linearly inserted without any change in the level of ink flow. Since the passage could read just as well without *hither*, the addition of the word is not the result of editing and undoubtedly represents the original reading. The expression “bring hither” occurs fairly frequently elsewhere in the text (seven times).

Summary: Maintain the use of *hither* in 1 Nephi 3:4; Oliver Cowdery accidentally skipped this adverb when he first took down Joseph Smith’s dictation for this verse.

■ 1 Nephi 3:10

*and it came to pass that
when we had [come >% gone 0 | come 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST | gone T] up
to the land of Jerusalem
I and my brethren did consult one with another*

Here the unknown scribe 2 of the original manuscript initially wrote “had come up”, then he erased *come* and corrected it to *gone*. The correction was not clearly done, with the result that Oliver Cowdery copied the word as *come* into the printer’s manuscript. Only in the 1981 LDS edition has the reading “we had gone up” been restored.

The text consistently refers to Nephi and his brothers as “going up to Jerusalem”, never as “coming up to Jerusalem”:

1 Nephi 3:9

and I Nephi and my brethren took our journey in the wilderness with our tents
to **go up** to the land of Jerusalem

1 Nephi 3:29

behold thou shalt **go up** to Jerusalem again

1 Nephi 4:1

let us **go up** again unto Jerusalem

1 Nephi 7:3

I Nephi did again with my brethren go forth into the wilderness
to **go up** to Jerusalem

The use of *go* rather than *come* is appropriate since Nephi and his brothers are going towards Jerusalem—either away from their encampment in the wilderness or away from “the land of their inheritance”, which is outside the city walls.

Summary: Nephi and his brothers always “go up” rather than “come up” to Jerusalem.

■ 1 Nephi 3:11

and we cast lots

[*which* 0A | *which* >js *who* 1 | *who* BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *of us*
should go in unto the house of Laban

Here is one case where the relative pronoun *which* was edited to *who* despite the fact that standard English actually prefers *which* in this kind of construction. Consider, for instance, the following statistics for present-day English from the Internet site <www.google.com> on 7 November 2002:

which of us	26,800
which one of us	18,500
who of us	8,570
which of you	35,600
which one of you	25,600
who of you	6,510
which of them	81,400
which one of them	21,200
who of them	1,620

Note in each case that the expression “which of X” is more frequent than the corresponding “which one of X”, while the expression “who of X” is relatively infrequent.

Joseph Smith’s editing of *which* to *who* in this expression is found only here. Elsewhere he kept the original *which*’s:

2 Nephi 7:1

to which of my creditors have I sold you

3 Nephi 13:27

which of you by taking thought can add one cubit unto his stature

Both these passages are found in quotations from the King James Bible. We should also note that both are *wh*-questions, so there are distinct differences between these two examples and the relative clause example in 1 Nephi 3:11. The King James text always uses *which* rather than *who* in the expression “which of X” (19 times, including the two passages that the Book of Mormon quotes from, Isaiah 50:1 and Matthew 6:27).

In any event, Joseph Smith’s editing here in 1 Nephi 3:11 is unusual and unnecessary. He was probably motivated (especially here in the beginning of his editing for the 1837 edition) to change every *which* that referred to humans to *who*. See WHICH in volume 3 for a complete discussion of the change to *who*.

Summary: The construction “which of X” is preferred in standard English, so the 1837 editing to “who of X” in 1 Nephi 3:11 is unusual; the critical text will restore the original “which of us” in 1 Nephi 3:11.

■ 1 Nephi 3:13

Laban was angry and thrust him out [from 01ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST | of Q] his presence

The 1911 LDS edition accidentally replaced the phrase “out from his presence” with the more normally expected phrase “out of his presence”. The 1920 edition restored the original reading. The Book of Mormon otherwise prefers “out of X’s presence”, but there are only two examples:

1 Nephi 3:14	but Laman fled out of his presence
Alma 18:12	he was about to return out of his presence

Variation is possible in the Book of Mormon text. For this expression we follow the earliest textual sources to determine in each case whether the preposition should be *from* or *of*.

In the King James Bible, the phrase “out from X’s presence” occurs more frequently than “out of X’s presence” (nine versus three occurrences), as in “they were driven out **from** Pharaoh’s presence” (Exodus 10:11) versus “*and cast you out of* my presence” (Jeremiah 23:39).

Summary: Maintain the use of “out from his presence” in 1 Nephi 3:13 rather than the more modern “out of his presence”.

■ 1 Nephi 3:16

*therefore let us go down to the land of our father’s inheritance
for behold he left gold and silver and all manner of riches
and all this he hath done*

*because of the [commandment 0 | commandments 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST]
[§2 NULL >- §1 of the Lord 0 | of the Lord 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST]*

Here the unknown scribe 2 of \mathcal{O} wrote simply “because of the commandment”. Later, Oliver Cowdery emended the reading in \mathcal{O} by supralinearly inserting the postmodifying phrase “of the Lord”. The addition is highly expected. For instance, the entire phrase was used at the beginning of this verse (“let us be faithful in keeping the commandments of the Lord”). Still, the addition is not necessary, nor is there much evidence that scribe 2 of \mathcal{O} tended to accidentally delete whole phrases. When Oliver copied the text from \mathcal{O} into \mathcal{P} , he also changed the singular *commandment* to the plural *commandments*, thus ending up with the current reading “because of the commandments of the Lord”.

Using the earliest textual sources, including the witness statements, we have these statistics for the type of modifier following the phrase “the commandment(s)”:

	<i>the commandment</i>	<i>the commandments</i>
NULL	2	10
of the Lord	5	26
of God	0	70
of <some person>	7	14
<relative clause>	5	7
TOTALS	19	127

The occurrence in 1 Nephi 3:16 of the singular “the commandment” is unusual because there is no postmodifier. The only other example of “the commandment” without a postmodifier works because the actual commandment immediately follows:

3 Nephi 27:20
 now this is the commandment:
 repent all ye ends of the earth and come unto me and be baptized

One possibility for 1 Nephi 3:16 is that the original text read in the plural (“the commandments”) but the unknown scribe 2 of \mathcal{O} mistakenly wrote down the singular “the commandment”. We actually have considerable evidence that this scribe frequently left off the plural s:

- obvious errors by scribe 2 left uncorrected in \mathcal{O}
 - 1 Nephi 3:28 unto us their younger Brother
 - 1 Nephi 13:29 acrofs the many water
- initial errors corrected in \mathcal{O} by scribe 2
 - 1 Nephi 13:29 the many plain & precious thing|s|
 - 1 Nephi 13:30 above all other Nation|s|
- probable errors by scribe 2 left uncorrected in \mathcal{O}
 - 1 Nephi 13:29 it goeth forth unto all the Nation of the gentiles
 - 1 Nephi 14:12 & their dominion upon the face of the earth were small
 - 1 Nephi 15:33 to be Judged of their work

This manuscript evidence clearly suggests that the original singular *commandment* in 1 Nephi 3:16 could be a scribal error for the plural *commandments*.

Yet given the context, Nephi could well be referring to the specific commandment that Lehi “should take his family and depart into the wilderness” (1 Nephi 2:2), the presumption being that the wealth was left behind because it would not be needed. The language in 1 Nephi 3:16 implies a specific commandment for Lehi to leave his wealth behind, or at least the implication that he should only take along necessities for staying alive in the wilderness. This interpretation is supported by the language in 1 Nephi 2:4 (“and he left his house . . . and took nothing with him save it were his family and provisions and tents”).

We also have examples of Oliver Cowdery’s tendency to accidentally add the plural *s* to legitimate occurrences of the singular *commandment*. See the examples discussed under 1 Nephi 4:34 and Jacob 3:5. Such a tendency seems to be responsible for the addition of the *s* in \mathcal{P} for 1 Nephi 3:16.

Summary: The original reading of “the commandment” in 1 Nephi 3:16 could be a mistake for the plural, especially given the tendency for scribe 2 of \mathcal{C} to accidentally drop the plural *s*; nonetheless, the singular will work here since the passage most likely refers to the commandment that Lehi received to leave Jerusalem; Oliver Cowdery’s additions of “of the Lord” (in \mathcal{C} itself) and the plural *s* (in \mathcal{P}) are unnecessary.

■ 1 Nephi 3:17

for he [*knowing* 01ABDEPS | *knew* CGHIJKLMNOQRT | *knowing* > *knew* F]
that Jerusalem must be destroyed

For the 1840 edition, Joseph Smith (presumably) edited the present participle *knowing* to the past-tense *knew*. This change eliminates what appears to be a dependent participial clause. If one accepts this urge to remove the dependency, another possible revision would be to replace *knowing* with the present-tense *knoweth* or *knows* rather than the past-tense *knew* since the immediately surrounding sentences are in the present tense:

1 Nephi 3:16–18 (with revised *knoweth*)
wherefore let us be faithful
in keeping the commandments of the Lord
therefore let us go down to the land of our father’s inheritance
for behold he left gold and silver and all manner of riches
and all this he **hath** done because of the commandment
for he **knoweth** that Jerusalem must be destroyed
because of the wickedness of the people
for behold they **have** rejected the words of the prophets
wherefore if my father should dwell in the land
after that he hath been commanded to flee out of the land
behold he would also perish
wherefore it must needs be that he flee out of the land

This passage is a direct quote of Nephi’s words to Laman and Lemuel. Jerusalem has not yet been destroyed; thus the use of the past-tense *knew* seems strange within the larger quote. Note that Nephi does use the past-tense *left* when he says that his father “left gold and silver and all manner of riches”. Of course, this event has already happened; thus the past-tense *left* is correct, but the past-tense *knew* would be incorrect.

In my earlier work on the text, I suggested that the *knowing* in 1 Nephi 3:17 is a Hebraism in the text and that the reader must rely on the context to determine whether “he knowing” represents ‘he knows’ or ‘he knew’. The Hebraic equivalent is ‘he is knowing’ or ‘he was knowing’, where the *be* verb is unexpressed and the reader must determine whether the participial clause is in the present or past tense. See the discussion on pages 43–44 in Royal Skousen, “Towards a Critical Edition of the Book of Mormon”, *Brigham Young University Studies* 30 (1990): 41–69.

Greg Wright has suggested (personal communication, 8 November 2002) that the problem here is that the larger passage should be punctuated differently. He argues that the clause beginning with “for behold” should be considered parenthetical, so that the following *wherefore*-clause actually serves as the complement to the earlier clause beginning with “for he knowing”:

1 Nephi 3:16–18 (with original *knowing*)
and all this he hath done because of the commandment
for **he knowing** that Jerusalem must be destroyed
because of the wickedness of the people
—for behold they have rejected the words of the prophets—
wherefore if my father should dwell in the land
after that he hath been commanded to flee out of the land
behold **he** would also perish

Elsewhere in the original (and even current) text, there are quite a few examples of this kind of construction. In each case there is first a long participial clause headed by a subject noun phrase, then the complement clause follows, usually beginning with a sentential connector such as *wherefore*, *therefore*, or *behold* followed by a form of the original subject:

Jacob 7:3
and **he knowing** that I Jacob had faith in Christ which should come
wherefore he sought much opportunity that he might come unto me

Enos 1:15
wherefore **I knowing** that the Lord God was able to preserve our records
I cried unto him continually

Alma 16:5
now **Zoram and his two sons knowing** that Alma was high priest
over the church
and having heard that he had the spirit of prophecy
therefore they went unto him

Alma 43:30
and **he** also **knowing** that it was the only desire of the Nephites
to preserve their lands and their liberty and their church
therefore he thought it no sin that he should defend them by stratagem

Alma 62:19
but **the Lamanites knowing** of their exceeding great courage
and beholding the greatness of their numbers
therefore they durst not come out against them

3 Nephi 3:4–5
and **I knowing** of their unconquerable spirit
having proved them in the field of battle
and knowing of their everlasting hatred towards you
because of the many wrongs which ye have done unto them
—therefore if they should come down against you
they would visit you with utter destruction—
therefore I have wrote this epistle

Mormon 5:8–9

but **I knowing** that these things must surely be made known
and that all things which are hid must be revealed upon the housetops
and also that a knowledge of these things must come unto the remnant
of these people
and also unto the Gentiles which the Lord hath said should scatter this people
and this people should be counted as naught among them
therefore I write a small abridgment

Moroni 7:22

for behold **God knowing** all things
being from everlasting to everlasting
behold he sent angels to minister unto the children of men

The example from 3 Nephi 3:4–5 is particularly relevant for 1 Nephi 3:17–18 since it too contains a parenthetical clause just before the complement clause. From Mormon 5:8–9, we also notice that the initial participial clause can be quite long.

There is one example involving *knowing* where the participial clause was disrupted by so many parenthetical clauses that the writer ended up creating a fragment:

Enos 1:1–2

behold it came to pass that
I Enos knowing my father that he was a just man
for he taught me in his language
and also in the nurture and admonition of the Lord
—and blessed be the name of my God for it—
and I will tell you of the wrestle which I had before God . . .

And finally there is one case involving *knowing* where a change in the punctuation might help deal with a long conjoined participial clause plus a long intervening parenthetical clause. Here, however, there is no subject agreement, only a repeated reference to *things* (that is, the content of the plates):

The Words of Mormon 1:4–5

and **the things** which are upon these plates **pleasing** me
because of the prophecies of the coming of Christ
and **my fathers knowing** that many of them have been fulfilled
—yea and I also know that as many things as have been prophesied
concerning us down to this day has been fulfilled
and as many as go beyond this day must surely come to pass—
wherefore I choose **these things** to finish my record upon them

Summary: In 1 Nephi 3:17, restore the original participial clause involving *knowing* since its usage is consistent with other participial clauses in the text; the passage will need to be punctuated so that the participial clause “for behold they have rejected the words of the prophets” is parenthetical; if *knowing* were to be changed to the indicative, the context (involving a direct quote) suggests replacing *knowing* with the present-tense form *knoweth* or *knows* rather than the past-tense form *knew*.

■ 1 Nephi 3:18

wherefore if my father should dwell in the land
 after that he [*hath* 0ABCDEF GHIJKLMNOPQRST | *had* >+ *hath* 1] been commanded
 to flee out of the land
 behold he would also perish

In copying from \mathcal{O} to \mathcal{P} , Oliver Cowdery initially copied the *hath* in “after that he hath been commanded” as *had*. Some time later, perhaps while proofing against \mathcal{O} (the quill is now sharper), Oliver discovered his error and restored the original *hath*. The original manuscript is extant here, so there is no question that *hath* is correct. Probably what led Oliver to make his initial mistake is that he expected the past-tense subjunctive form *had* in the subordinate *after*-clause, especially since the preceding conditional *if*-clause had the subjunctive modal *should*. Of course, the present indicative *hath* can occur, but the subjunctive past-tense *had* is what readers expect.

Summary: The earliest text in 1 Nephi 3:18 supports the present-tense *hath*, not the past-tense *had*.

■ 1 Nephi 3:19

and behold it is wisdom in God that we should obtain these records
 that we [*might* 0A | *might* >js *may* 1 | *may* BCDEF GHIJKLMNOPQRST] preserve
 unto our children the language of our fathers

In his editing for the 1837 edition, Joseph Smith frequently changed the historically past-tense (or subjunctive) modal verbs *might*, *would*, and *should* to their historically present-tense (or indicative) forms *may*, *will*, and *shall*. Joseph’s apparent motivation was to avoid the modern-day tendency to interpret the past-tense modals as conditional, hypothetical, or subjective. Such editing, however, has been sporadically applied. In virtually every case the original past-tense modal will work, or at least there are examples still in the text of its use in similar contexts. For instance, the following passage does not really claim that Christ’s coming is hypothetical (“Christ should come”) or that the effects of his atonement are only a possibility (“the same might receive remission of their sins”):

Mosiah 3:13

and the Lord God hath sent his holy prophets among all the children of men
 to declare these things to every kindred nation and tongue
 that thereby whosoever should believe that Christ **should** come
 the same **might** receive remission of their sins

In this passage, there has been no attempt to edit the text by replacing the two modals that could be misinterpreted.

In general such past-tense modals should be restored. Here in 1 Nephi 3:19 we have the first example where *might* should be restored. For a complete discussion of these historically past-tense modals, see MODAL VERBS in volume 3.

Summary: Restore the original past-tense modal forms *might*, *would*, and *should* whenever the earliest textual sources support their use.

■ 1 Nephi 3:21

*that they might be faithful in keeping
the commandments of [0ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST | the Lord > NULL 1] God*

The Book of Mormon text has examples of both “the commandments of God” and “the commandments of the Lord”. Oliver Cowdery seemed to favor “the commandments of the Lord”. When copying from \mathcal{O} to \mathcal{P} , he accidentally wrote “the commandments of the Lord” here in 1 Nephi 3:21, but then he immediately corrected his error, crossed out *the Lord*, and wrote *God* afterwards inline. A similar tendency can be seen when he consciously added “of the Lord” to *commandment* in 1 Nephi 3:16.

Summary: Maintain the original reading “the commandments of God” in 1 Nephi 3:21.

■ 1 Nephi 3:23

we went up again [unto 01ABCDGHKPRST | to EFIJLMNOQ] the house of Laban

Here the typesetter for the 1849 LDS edition accidentally changed the archaic preposition *unto* to the more expected preposition *to*. The *to* was retained in LDS editions until 1920.

The text usually favors “unto the house of X”, where X is a person’s name. We have five occurrences of “unto the house of Laban” (including this one), plus single occurrences with the names Ishmael (1 Nephi 7:4) and Jared (Ether 8:13). There is, however, one occurrence of “to the house of X”, namely, with the name Seantum (Helaman 9:26). Since both prepositions are possible, we follow the earliest textual sources.

Summary: Based on the reading in \mathcal{O} and usage elsewhere in 1 Nephi 3–4, the original preposition *unto* should be maintained in 1 Nephi 3:23 (“unto the house of Laban”).

■ 1 Nephi 3:25

*and it came to pass that when Laban saw our property
[01 | , ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST]
[01PS | and ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOQRT] that it was exceeding great
[01 | , ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST]
he did lust after it*

The additional *and* introduced by the 1830 typesetter appears to be a typo, although it may have been consciously added. The 1908 RLDS edition removed this intrusive *and*, but the LDS text has maintained it. The parenthetical nature of the *that*-clause could be shown better by surrounding the clause with dashes rather than the commas of the printed editions:

and it came to pass that when Laban saw our property
—that it was exceeding great—
he did lust after it

By avoiding the additional *and*, the text flows better.

Summary: Remove the secondary *and* that the 1830 typesetter added in 1 Nephi 3:25.

■ 1 Nephi 3:28

*and it came to pass that Laman was angry with me
and also with my father*

[01 | ; ABCDGIJLMNOQRT | , EHKPS | , > ; F]
and also [with > NULL 0 | 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST]
[was 0ABCEFGHIJKLMNQRST | with D] Lemuel
for he hearkened unto the words of Laman

This passage has some rather complex syntax. After the clause about Laman’s anger towards Nephi and also Lehi, there is an additional clause, but with ellipsis, that refers to Lemuel’s anger towards Nephi and Lehi. This additional clause is unexpected in English. Such constructions involving ellipsis in clauses and phrases are characteristic of the original biblical languages, Hebrew and Greek, and are found in the King James Bible:

2 Samuel 15:17
and the king went forth and all the people after him

Matthew 2:3
when Herod the king had heard *these things*
he was troubled and all Jerusalem with him

Similar usage is found in the Book of Mormon. Here are some examples with the same kind of delayed conjoined clause (or noun phrase) as in 1 Nephi 3:28:

1 Nephi 4:28
and it came to pass that when Laman saw me
he was exceedingly frightened
and also Lemuel and Sam

Alma 63:2
and he was a just man and he did walk uprightly before God
and he did observe to do good continually
to keep the commandments of the Lord his God
and also did his brother

Helaman 9:38
and he was brought to prove that he himself was the very murderer
insomuch that the five were set at liberty
and also was Nephi

3 Nephi 3:19
therefore this Gidgiddoni was a great prophet among them
and also was the chief judge

Ether 2:16
and it came to pass that the brother of Jared did go to work
and also his brethren

The example in 3 Nephi 3:19 is confusing: one might misinterpret the text as saying that Gidgiddoni was also the chief judge. In actuality, the chief judge was Lachoneus (3 Nephi 1:1). In other words, the text says that Gidgiddoni (the commander of the Nephite armies) and Lachoneus (the chief judge) were both great prophets. Because of its awkwardness and potential for confusion, this passage was edited for the 1920 LDS edition by replacing the *and* with *as*. See the discussion under 3 Nephi 3:19.

In the case of 1 Nephi 3:28, the natural tendency has been to interpret “and also Lemuel” as meaning that Laman was also angry at Lemuel. In the original manuscript, the unknown scribe 2 started to write “and also with Lemuel”, which he immediately corrected by crossing out the *with*. The 1841 LDS edition actually set the type this way. And even today it is difficult to read the syntax correctly, especially in the current RLDS edition, where only a comma separates “and also with my father” and “and also was Lemuel”. The current LDS text, continuing the original 1830 punctuation in this instance, uses a semicolon, which would normally imply the beginning of an independent clause rather than a delayed conjoined clause. Another possible solution would be to place a dash before the conjoined clause:

1 Nephi 3:27 (revised punctuation)
 and it came to pass that Laman was angry with me and also with my father
 —and also was Lemuel
 for he hearkened unto the words of Laman

Summary: Strengthen the correct interpretation of the delayed conjoined clause “and also was Lemuel” by using a dash rather than a comma or a semicolon.

■ 1 Nephi 3:28

wherefore Laman and Lemuel did speak

many hard [words 0ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST | things > words 1] unto us

Here we see an example of the scribe writing the idea (or semantic equivalent) rather than the specific words of his copy. In the Book of Mormon, the text refers to speaking and writing both *words* and *things*, although *words* is considerably more frequent. Here in 1 Nephi 3:28, Oliver Cowdery, as he copied from \mathcal{O} to \mathcal{P} , initially wrote *things*, then immediately corrected it to *words* (supralinearly inserted but without any change in the level of ink flow). Since either *words* or *things* is possible here, we let the earliest textual sources determine the correct reading: in this case, it is *words* (the reading of the original manuscript).

On two other occasions, Oliver Cowdery interchanged these same two words as he copied from \mathcal{O} to \mathcal{P} :

2 Nephi 6:8 (*words* in \mathcal{O})
 and now I Jacob would speak somewhat concerning
 these [*words* 0ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST | *things* > *words* 1]

Alma 45:15 (*things* in \mathcal{O})

and now it came to pass that after Alma had said
 these [*the* >% *things* 0 | *words* > *things* 1 | *things* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
 to Helaman
 he blessed him

As with 1 Nephi 3:28, Oliver immediately corrected these errors in \mathcal{D} .

There is one example where the text has been consciously edited from *things* to *words*, although in this case Joseph Smith initially intended to change the plural *things* to the singular *word*, but the 1837 edition nonetheless ended up with the plural *words*:

2 Nephi 33:4 (\mathcal{O} not extant)

and the [*things* >js *word* 1 | *things* A | *words* BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
 which I have written in weakness
 will he make strong unto them

For discussion of this more complicated change, see 2 Nephi 33:4.

Summary: In choosing between *things* and *words*, we rely on the earliest textual sources; here in 1 Nephi 3:28, we have “many hard words” rather than “many hard things”.

■ 1 Nephi 3:28

wherefore Laman and Lemuel did speak many hard words unto us
 their younger [Brother 0 | Brethren >%+ Brothres 1 | brothers ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]

■ 1 Nephi 3:29

why do ye smite
 your younger [Brother 0 | Brethers >+ Brother 1 | brother ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
 with a rod
 know ye not that the Lord hath chosen him to be a ruler over you

As discussed under 1 Nephi 2:5, the scribes sometimes mixed up *brothers* and *brethren* or sometimes the spelling of *brother(s)* was influenced by *brethren*. For these two examples in 1 Nephi 3, the original text has been maintained despite some difficulties the scribes had in transmitting the text correctly. For one other example, see 1 Nephi 13:10.

In the first example listed here (1 Nephi 3:28), the unknown scribe 2 of the original manuscript incorrectly wrote down the singular *Brother* rather than the plural *Brothers*. The context clearly shows that the plural is correct (“unto us their younger brothers”). In the printer’s manuscript, Oliver Cowdery initially wrote *Brethren*, but then he erased the final *n* and overwrote (with heavier ink flow) the first *e* with an *o* and the erased *n* with an *s*. The resulting *Brothres* stands for *brothers*, which is how the 1830 compositor set the word.

In the second example (1 Nephi 3:29), the unknown scribe 2 in \mathcal{O} correctly wrote the singular *Brother*. Oliver Cowdery copied this into \mathcal{D} as a plural, spelling it as *Brethers*. His choice of the

plural was undoubtedly influenced by the plural of the preceding “their younger brothers” in verse 28. But Oliver caught his error here in verse 29 and overwrote (using a slightly heavier ink flow) the first *e* with an *o* and crossed out the plural *s* at the end, thus ending up with the singular *Brother*. The 1830 compositor correctly set the word as *brother*.

Summary: In 1 Nephi 3:28–29, the context requires the plural “their younger brothers” in verse 28 but the singular “your younger brother” in verse 29.

■ 1 Nephi 3:29

*behold [thou shalt 0A | thou shalt >]s ye shal 1 | ye shall BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] go up
to Jerusalem again
and the Lord will deliver Laban into your hands*

Sometimes the original text uses the historically singular pronoun *thou* in a plural context. In this passage the angel is speaking to both Laman and Lemuel:

1 Nephi 3:29

why do **ye** smite **your** younger brother with a rod
know **ye** not that the Lord hath chosen him to be a ruler over **you**
and this because of **your** iniquities

Then after the single use of *thou* (“behold **thou** shalt go up to Jerusalem again”), the remainder of the verse continues with the historically plural pronoun (“and the Lord will deliver Laban into **your** hands”).

All such examples of *thou* being used in the plural have been systematically edited out of the Book of Mormon. (For another example, see the discussion under 1 Nephi 7:8.) Although mixtures of *ye* and *thou* can occur in passages referring to one person (see for example Alma 37:37), their use within the same clause has been eliminated. For a complete discussion, see THOU in volume 3.

Summary: The original text allows mixed uses of *thou* and *ye* within the same clause; in addition, *thou* occasionally refers to more than one person; both of these infelicitous types of usage have been edited out of the text but will be restored in the critical text.

■ 1 Nephi 3:30

*and after that the angel had [spake 01 | spoken ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] unto us
he departed*

The original text had at least 14 occurrences of *spake* as the past participle rather than the standard *spoken*. For the clear majority of cases, however, the earliest text had the standard *spoken* (70 times). Most of the 14 examples of *spake* as the past participle were edited to the standard *spoken* in either the first or second edition. The critical text will, of course, restore all past participial examples

where the earliest textual evidence supports *spake* rather than *spoken*. For a complete discussion, see PAST PARTICIPLE in volume 3.

Summary: Restore the dialectal use of the simple past-tense form *spake* as the past participial form whenever it is supported by the earliest textual sources (as here in 1 Nephi 3:30).

■ 1 Nephi 3:30–31

*and after that [he > the angel 0 | the angel 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST] had spake unto us
he departed
and after that the angel had departed
Laman and Lemuel again began to murmur*

Oliver Cowdery initially wrote down Joseph Smith’s dictation in \mathcal{O} as “and after that he had spake unto us he departed”, but then Oliver immediately corrected the subject *he* in the *after*-clause by crossing out the *he* and supralinearly writing *the angel* (the level of ink flow is the same). Oliver probably wrote down *he* in the *after*-clause because of the proximity of the *he* in the following main clause (“he departed”).

One could argue that the correction is actually an emendation since it would have sounded very strange to have only the pronoun *he* in the first sentence but then identify the *he* in the second sentence as *the angel*:

and after that **he** had spake unto us **he** departed
and after that **the angel** had departed . . .

Nonetheless, the correction in \mathcal{O} appears to be immediate. And we can readily explain the error as the result of Oliver Cowdery anticipating the *he* of the following main clause (“he departed”).

Summary: Accept Oliver Cowdery’s correction of *he* to *the angel* in 1 Nephi 3:30 as an immediate correction.

1 Nephi 4

■ 1 Nephi 4:1

*for behold he is mightier [then 01 | than ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] all the earth
then why not mightier [then 01 | than ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] Laban and his fifty
yea or even [then 0 | NULL >+ then 1 | than ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] his tens of thousands*

Three of the Book of Mormon scribes (Oliver Cowdery and the two unknown scribes in \mathcal{C}) often spelled the conjunction *than* as *then*, probably because they pronounced *than* like *then*. This reduced pronunciation for *than* has been very common in dialects of English, including American ones. These three Book of Mormon scribes also frequently spelled *than* correctly. Hyrum Smith and the unknown scribe 2 of \mathcal{P} virtually always spelled the conjunction as *than*. Presumably the original text distinguished between the conjunction *than* and the adverb *then*. In the current text, the spelling is correct for every example of *than* and *then*. For a complete discussion, see THAN in volume 3.

Historically, the lexically distinct *than* and *then* derive from the same Old English adverb (see under *than* in the Oxford English Dictionary), and in many Middle English and Early Modern English texts *then* is consistently used for both *than* and *then*. And even in standard English today, both *than* and *then* are identically pronounced with a schwa vowel in unstressed contexts.

Summary: The scribes often spelled the conjunction *than* like the adverbial *then*; the original text apparently distinguished between the two words, so we make the standard distinction between them in the critical text, allowing the context to determine which one is intended.

■ 1 Nephi 4:2

*and the armies of Pharaoh did follow
and were [drownded 0 | drowned 1 ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] in the waters of the Red Sea*

Here scribe 2 of \mathcal{C} wrote *drownded*, the past-tense form for the base verb *drownd* (in place of the standard *drown*, which of course has the past-tense form *drowned*). The base verb *drownd* is well attested in historical documents and even today is prevalent in dialectal and colloquial speech. The process of adding *d* is not unique to this word: in standard English there are a number of words now ending in *nd* that historically did not have the *d* (such as *astound*, *compound*, and *sound*). When Oliver Cowdery copied this passage into \mathcal{P} , he replaced *drownded* with the standard *drowned*.

The question here is whether the dialectal *drowneded* in 1 Nephi 4:2 represents the original text or scribe 2's own pronunciation (or even Joseph Smith's). Elsewhere the manuscripts have only the past-tense form *drowned*. Scribe 3 of \mathcal{C} wrote *drownd* (his spelling for the standard *drowned*):

1 Nephi 8:32 (scribe 3 in \mathcal{C} ; Oliver Cowdery in \mathcal{P})
 many were [*drownd* 0 | *drowned* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST]
 in the depths of the fountain

Oliver Cowdery (in both manuscripts) consistently wrote *drowned* rather than the dialectal *drowneded*. Besides the spelling *drowned* in \mathcal{P} for 1 Nephi 4:2 and 1 Nephi 8:32, there are nine more extant occurrences of Oliver's spelling *drowned* in the manuscripts:

1 Nephi 17:27 (both \mathcal{C} and \mathcal{P})
 1 Nephi 18:13 (both \mathcal{C} and \mathcal{P})
 Alma 63:8 (both \mathcal{C} and \mathcal{P})
 3 Nephi 8:9 (only \mathcal{P})
 3 Nephi 9:4 (only \mathcal{P})
 3 Nephi 10:13 (only \mathcal{P})

In none of these additional cases is there any evidence that Joseph Smith might have been dictating *drowneded* rather than *drowned*. If he had, we might see some examples of the scribe initially writing the dialectal *drowneded*, then correcting it to *drowned*.

So the question here is whether *drowneded* actually occurred in the original text for 1 Nephi 4:2. It is difficult to decide. From a textual point of view, probably the best solution would be to follow the earliest textual sources unless we have clear evidence that the resulting form is an actual scribal error. If the manuscript reading is dialectally possible, then we allow it. Such a procedure would thus permit *drowneded* in 1 Nephi 4:2.

Summary: Accept the one case of *drowneded* in the text (1 Nephi 4:2) since it is dialectally possible, even though it may very well represent the scribe's (or even Joseph Smith's) own form.

■ 1 Nephi 4:4

now when I had spoken these words
they [*was* 0 | *was* >js *were* 1 | *were* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST] *yet wroth*

Here the original manuscript has "they was", an obvious dialectal form. The *was* was copied as such into the printer's manuscript, but the 1830 typesetter changed it (perhaps unintentionally) to the standard "they were". In his editing for the 1837 edition, Joseph Smith marked the grammatical emendation in the printer's manuscript, even though the 1830 edition had already made the change. (Very frequently, Joseph altered the printer's manuscript to agree with the 1830 edition. In a few cases, Joseph's editing actually perpetuated textual mistakes that had been made by the 1830 compositor.)

The question here is whether the original text actually read "they was". As in the case of *drowneded* in verse 2, it is possible that "they was" resulted from the scribe writing down his own

dialectal language rather than what Joseph Smith actually dictated. Or Joseph himself might have accidentally read off his own dialectal form rather than what he actually saw by means of the interpreters or the seer stone.

Elsewhere in the text, we find five other examples (in the earliest textual sources) of *was* being used with a plural subject pronoun. In his editing for the 1837 and 1840 editions, Joseph Smith ended up changing these examples to read *were* in place of the earlier *was*:

1 Nephi 17:6

we [*was* 0 | *was* >js *were* 1 | *were* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
exceedingly rejoiced when we came to the seashore

Mosiah 29:36

telling them that these things ought not to be
that they [*was* >js *were* 1 | *was* A | *were* BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
expressly repugnant to the commandments of God

Alma 7:18

I had much desire that
ye [*was* >js *were* 1 | *was* A | *were* BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
not in the state of dilemma like your brethren

Alma 9:31–32

because I said unto them
that they [*was* 1ABDEP | *were* CFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] a hard-hearted
and a stiff-necked people
and also because I said unto them that they **were** a lost and a fallen people
they [*was* 1A | *were* BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] angry with me

The last passage shows variation, with two examples of the dialectal “they was” and one of the standard “they were”.

This use of *was* instead of *were* is definitely in the minority in the text. For instance, in the current LDS text there are 632 occurrences of “they were”, 36 of “we were”, and 22 of “ye were”. The vast majority of these exhibit *were* in the earliest textual sources; only a handful have *was*. So perhaps each example of *was* could be due to dialectal overlay (so to speak), from either Joseph Smith or his scribes. In support of this possibility, we have a number of similar examples involving *they* in the manuscripts where the scribe initially wrote the dialectal “they was”, but then corrected the text to “they were”. Except for the first of the following examples, where the ink flow is weaker, these scribal corrections seem to be immediate. And the last three of these corrections are found in the original manuscript:

Mosiah 10:14

they [*was* >- *were* 1 | *were* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] also wroth with him
upon the waters

Alma 17:36

they [*was* > *were* 1 | *were* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] angry
because of the slain of their brethren

Alma 36:2

for they [*was* > *were* 0 | *were* >+ *were* 1 | *were* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
in bondage

Alma 48:21

they [*was* > *were* 0 | *were* 1 ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] compelled reluctantly
to contend with their brethren the Lamanites

Alma 48:23

they [*was* > *were* 0 | *were* 1 ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] sorry
to be the means of sending so many of their brethren out of this world

In all of these examples, the scribe is Oliver Cowdery. Obviously, Oliver himself tended to write the dialectal *was* instead of the standard *were*. So there is a distinct possibility that the scribes themselves were responsible for the few examples of “they was”, “we was”, and “ye was” in the earliest textual sources.

In opposition to this argument from scribal errors, we have abundant evidence in the original text that the dialectal *was* frequently had a plural subject in other contexts:

- *subject noun phrase in the plural*

Mosiah 8:19

and these interpreters [*was* >js *were* 1 | *was* A | *were* BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
doubtless prepared for the purpose of unfolding all such mysteries
to the children of men

- *subject noun phrase in the plural postmodified by a prepositional phrase having a singular noun*

1 Nephi 18:15

the judgments of God
[*was* 0A | *was* >js *were* 1 | *were* BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] upon them

- *a subject noun phrase composed of conjoined singular nouns*

Mosiah 18:14

both Alma and Helam [*was* >js *were* 1 | *was* A | *were* BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
buried in the water

- *in relative clauses with a plural antecedent*

1 Nephi 18:15

wherefore they came unto me and loosed the bands
which [*was* 0A | *was* >js *were* 1 | *were* BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
upon my wrists

- *after an existential there, with a delayed plural subject*

Alma 4:9

yea there [*was* >js *were* 1 | *was* A | *were* BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
envyings and strifes and malice and persecutions and pride

- *after a clause-initial adverbial phrase or adjective, with inverted subject-verb order*

1 Nephi 16:10

and within the ball [*was* 01 | *were* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] two spindles

Mosiah 24:10

so great [*was* >js *were* 1 | *was* A | *were* BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]

their afflictions that they began to cry mightily to God

- *in negative contexts, with a delayed plural subject*

Mosiah 29:3

neither [*was* >js *were* 1 | *was* A | *were* BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]

any of the sons of Mosiah willing to take upon them the kingdom

- *in a conjoined predicate with a plural subject*

Mosiah 7:7

and they **were** surrounded by the king's guard

and [*was* 1A | *were* BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] taken

and [*was* 1A | *were* BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] bound

and [*was* >js *were* 1 | *was* A | *were* BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] committed
to prison

Notice in this last example the use of *were* when immediately preceded by the plural pronoun *they* (“they were surrounded”), but the repeated use of *was* at the head of each of the following conjoined predicates.

Finally, we also have evidence in the original manuscript that the scribe sometimes corrected the standard *were* to the dialectal *was*:

Alma 56:28

and also there [*were* > *was* 0 | *was* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQS | *were* RT] sent
two thousand men unto us from the land of Zarahemla

Here Oliver Cowdery initially wrote the standard “there were sent two thousand men”, but immediately corrected the *were* to the dialectal *was* (there is no change in the level of ink flow). This correction suggests that Oliver was correcting to Joseph Smith’s dictation. Here the use of the dialectal *was* appears to be intentional.

In all, there are over two hundred examples of the dialectal *was* being used with a plural subject in the original text. (For a more complete discussion, see SUBJECT-VERB AGREEMENT in volume 3.) Although the occurrence of *was* right after a plural pronoun (*they*, *we*, and *ye*) is fairly rare, these instances are consistent with the many other occurrences of *was* with a plural subject. For this reason, the safest tack to take in determining the original text is to follow the earliest textual sources in determining whether any particular verb form should be the dialectal *was* or the standard *were*. By following such a procedure, we avoid the temptation of trying to assign every dialectal form to transmission error. In the case of “they was”, the number of occurrences is relatively rare, while at the same time there is an obvious tendency for scribes to accidentally write “they was”. But such evidence is not found for any of the other cases of nonstandard use of *was*.

There are just too many other examples of *was* with a plural subject to assume that they are all due to dialectal influence on the transmission of the text. For this reason we should conservatively retain even those few cases of “they was” (and “we was” and “ye was”) that seem so outrageous to our modern standards of English usage.

Summary: Follow the earlier textual sources in order to determine whether the original text read *was* or *were* with plural subjects.

■ 1 Nephi 4:5

*and I caused that they should hide themselves
without the [wall 0 | walls 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST]*

In 1 Nephi 4:5, the original manuscript reads “without the wall”. Besides the example here in verse 5, we have two more later on in this chapter:

1 Nephi 4:24
and I also spake unto him that I should carry the engravings
which were upon the plates of brass
to my elder brethren
which were without the [wall 0 | walls 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST]

1 Nephi 4:27
and he spake unto me many times concerning the elders of the Jews
as I went forth unto my brethren
which were without the [wall 0 | walls 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST]

In the original manuscript, all three of these verses consistently have the singular *wall*. The first one is in the hand of scribe 2, the second and third in the hand of scribe 3. It is of course possible that the singular *wall* is the result of accidentally dropping the plural *s*. For this tendency in scribe 2, see the examples listed under 1 Nephi 3:16. For scribe 3, we have these examples:

1 Nephi 5:18
these [plate 0 | plates 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST] of brass
should go forth unto all nations kindreds tongues and people

1 Nephi 5:19
these [plate 0 | plates 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST] of brass
should never perish

1 Nephi 6:6
they shall not occupy these [plate 0 | plates 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST]
with things which are not of worth unto the children of men

1 Nephi 7:13
for all [thing 0 | things 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST]
which the Lord hath spoken concerning the destruction of Jerusalem
must be fulfilled

In addition, scribe 3's immediate corrections show the same tendency to accidentally omit the plural *s*:

1 Nephi 8:38

and after that he had preached unto them
and also prophesied unto them
of many [*thing* > *things* 0 | *things* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST]
he bade them to keep the commandments of the Lord

1 Nephi 9:4

and the other plates are for the more part of the reigns of the kings
and the [*war* > *wars* 0 | *wars* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST] and contentions
of my people

1 Nephi 10:11

he spake unto my brethren concerning the gospel
which should be preached
among the [*jew* > *jews* 0 | *Jews* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST]

But the question is whether the singular *wall* is an example of this scribal tendency to drop the plural *s*. All three instances of *wall* are used to describe where the brothers of Nephi are hiding (“without the wall”). In each case, there is no *of* prepositional phrase or other modifying phrase after the word *wall*. The only other passages in the Book of Mormon with the phrase “without the wall(s)” have the plural *walls*, but both are followed by a modifying prepositional phrase that begins with *of*:

1 Nephi 4:4

nevertheless they did follow me up
until we came without the **walls of** Jerusalem

Mosiah 21:19

and the king himself did not trust his person without the **walls of** the city

The same singular/plural difference occurs in the phrase “without the gate(s)”. If post-modification occurs, we have the plural; otherwise, we have the singular:

Mosiah 7:10

and now I desire to know the cause
whereby ye were so bold as to come near the **walls of** the city
when I myself was with my guards without the **gate**

Mosiah 21:23

and the king having been without the **gates of** the city with his guard
he discovered Ammon and his brethren

The consistency of the three cases of “without the wall” in the original manuscript is thus supported by the use of “without the gate” in Mosiah 7:10. Only when postmodified by an *of* prepositional phrase do we find the plurals “without the walls” and “without the gates”.

Summary: Restore the three occurrences of the original singular “without the wall” in 1 Nephi 4.

■ 1 Nephi 4:8–9

[& 01 | *And* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *when I came to him*
 [& >+ I 0 | I 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST] *found that it was Laban*
 [& 01 | *And* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
 [0 | I 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST] *beheld his sword*
 [& 01 | *and* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST] *I drew it forth from the sheath thereof*

Scribe 2 of \mathcal{S} originally wrote down “and when I came to him and found that it was Laban and beheld his sword and I drew it forth from the sheath thereof”. One possibility is that scribe 2 actually wrote down the correct text, which we can syntactically configure as a Hebraism:

and **when** I came to him and found that it was Laban and beheld his sword
and I drew it forth from the sheath thereof

Here we have an initial *when*-clause containing three conjoined predicates followed by a main clause but with an intervening conjunction, *and*. The original text of the Book of Mormon has a good number of Hebraistic examples of a subordinate clause followed by a main clause with a very non-English use of *and* intervening between the two clauses. One striking example of such a Hebraism is the *if-and* construction. (See, for instance, 1 Nephi 17:50; or for a complete list, see under HEBRAISMS in volume 3.) Besides the *if-and* examples, there are also examples of *when*-clauses that have the intervening *and* before the main clause. In the following list, the Hebrew-like *and* is marked with an arrow. Unlike the *if-and* examples, only some of the *when-and* examples have been edited out of the text:

Alma 8:13 (1830 editing)

now **when** the people had said this and had withstood all his words
 and reviled him and spit upon him
 and caused that he should be cast out of their city
 → [*and* 1 | ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] he departed thence
 and took his journey towards the city which was called Aaron

Alma 32:38 (Joseph Smith’s editing for the 1837 edition)

and **when** the heat of the sun cometh and scorseth it
 → [& 0 | & >js NULL 1 | *and* A | BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
 because it hath no root it withereth away

Helaman 5:43 (1920 editing)

and it came to pass that **when** they cast their eyes about
 and saw that the cloud of darkness was dispersed from overshadowing them
 → [& 1 | *and* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQS | RT] behold they saw that
 they were encircled about—yea every soul—by a pillar of fire

3 Nephi 8:19 (original *and* retained)

and it came to pass that
when the thunderings and the lightnings and the storm and the tempest
 and the quakings of the earth did cease
 —for behold they did last for about the space of three hours
 and it was said by some that the time was greater

- nevertheless all these great and terrible things were done
in about the space of three hours—
→ **and** then behold there was darkness upon the face of the land
- 3 Nephi 12:1 (original *and* retained)
and it came to pass that
when Jesus had spake these words unto Nephi
and to those which had been called
—now the number of them
which had been called and received power and authority to baptize
were twelve—
→ **and** behold he stretched forth his hand unto the multitude
and cried unto them saying . . .
- 3 Nephi 23:8 (1830 editing; *and* supplied by Oliver Cowdery while proofing \mathcal{P} against \mathcal{O})
and **when** Nephi had brought forth the records and laid them before him
→ [§2 NULL > §1 & 1 | ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
he cast his eyes upon them and saith . . .
- Mormon 6:11 (original *and* retained)
and **when** they had gone through and hewn down all my people
save it were twenty and four of us—among whom was my son Moroni—
→ **and** we having survived the dead of our people did behold on the morrow . . .
- Ether 15:15 (John Gilbert’s editing for the 1830 edition)
and it came to pass that **when** they were all gathered together
every one to the army which he would
with their wives and their children
both men women and children being armed with weapons of war
having shields and breastplates and headplates
and being clothed after the manner of war
→ [& >jg NULL 1 | ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] they did march forth
one against another to battle

In most of these examples, the *when*-clause is long and complex, with several conjoined or par-
enthetical clauses. The proposed example of *when-and* here in 1 Nephi 4:8–9 seems to be fairly
simple: its conjoined predicates are all short, like the examples in Alma 32:38 and 3 Nephi 23:8.

But one serious drawback to this proposed *when*-clause is that it includes completely new
narrative information (namely, “and found that it was Laban and beheld his sword”). When we
look at other narrative *when*-clauses, we find that the significant new information comes in the
main clause, not in the *when*-clause. (See the examples listed above as well as the example in
Alma 47:27 discussed later in this analysis.) These examples suggest that the original text in
1 Nephi 4:8–9 is probably not a Hebraistic *when-and* construction.

So if scribe 2’s original sentence is unacceptable, what about the two manuscript corrections?
The first change occurred when scribe 2 later corrected the initial manuscript reading by over-
writing the ampersand before the verb *found* with the pronoun *I* (“I found that it was Laban”). The
resulting *I*, written with heavier ink flow, is considerably larger than normal and extends into the
margin of the manuscript.

Yet even with this editing by scribe 2, the resulting text is still awkward. So this continuing difficulty led to the second change: when Oliver Cowdery copied the text into \mathcal{P} , he added the pronoun *I* before the verb *beheld* (“and I beheld his sword”). Elsewhere, we have one other case where scribe 2 of \mathcal{C} temporarily omitted the subject pronoun *I*:

1 Nephi 14:28

[& 01 | *And* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] behold
 [NULL >- I 0 | *I* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST] Nephi
 am forbidden that I should write the remainder of the things which I saw

In this instance, scribe 2 caught his error and inserted the *I* supralinearly (but with considerably weaker ink flow).

One final possibility in 1 Nephi 4:8–9 is that scribe 2 actually overwrote the wrong &. Perhaps the intended text was “and when I came to him and found that it was Laban / I beheld his sword and I drew it forth from the sheath thereof”. The only problem with this interpretation is that the resulting syntax implies that the reader already knows that the person lying in the street is Laban. As already noted, using a *when*-clause in this way seems wholly inappropriate to the narrative. Comparable usage elsewhere in the text works because the reader already knows what has happened:

Alma 47:27

and **when** they had come to the spot and **found** the king lying in his gore
 Amalickiah pretended to be wroth and said . . .

In this passage the reader already knows that Amalickiah’s servant has killed the Lamanite king.

Oliver Cowdery’s insertion of the pronoun *I* in \mathcal{P} is probably correct since the earlier text (“I found that it was Laban and beheld his sword”) oddly conjoins *beheld* with *found* rather than with the most recent verb *was*. Elsewhere in the text, whenever we have a sentence with the past-tense form *found* followed by a *that*-clause, the only possible conjoined clause is another *that*-clause:

Mosiah 21:24

but when he **found that** they were not
 but **that** they were his brethren and had come from the land of Zarahemla
 he was filled with exceeding great joy

Alma 31:12

now when they had come into the land
 behold to their astonishment they **found that** the Zoramites had built synagogues
 and **that** they did gather themselves together on one day of the week

Thus the evidence all suggests that the current reading for 1 Nephi 4:8–9 is probably the correct one, despite its contorted textual history.

Summary: Retain the emended syntax in 1 Nephi 4:8–9; the resulting text in the printer’s manuscript seems to be the only reading that works.

■ 1 Nephi 4:10–11

and I shrunk and would that I might not slay him

[§2 NULL >- §1 & 0|& 1|And ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]

the Spirit saith unto me again . . .

Scribe 2 of \mathcal{C} apparently missed the *and* at the beginning of verse 11. Oliver Cowdery emended the text by supralinearly inserting an ampersand. His emendation is probably correct since elsewhere in 1 Nephi, when there is a conversation with either the spirit or the angel of the Lord (here in chapter 4 or in chapters 11–14), we always get “and X saith/said” (30 times), where X refers to the spirit or the angel. In other words, there is always a connecting *and* with the previous discourse. In 1 Nephi, other connectors (such as *for*, *but*, and *now*) are never found preceding “X saith/said”, only *and*.

We also have abundant evidence from scribe 2’s corrections that he tended to drop his *and*’s. In all of the following examples, he caught his error and corrected it in \mathcal{C} . Note in particular the example in 1 Nephi 13:3 of “he saith unto me”, which parallels “and the Spirit saith unto me again” in 1 Nephi 4:11:

1 Nephi 12:11

and I looked and beheld three generations did pass away in righteousness

[NULL >- & 0|& 1|and ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]

their garments were white

1 Nephi 12:12

[NULL > & 0|& 1|And ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]

I Nephi also saw many of the fourth generation

which did pass away in righteousness

1 Nephi 12:19

[NULL > & 0|& 1|And ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]

while the angel spake these words

I beheld and saw that the seed of my brethren did contend against my seed

1 Nephi 13:3

[NULL > & 0|& 1|And ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]

he saith unto me

these are the nations and kingdoms of the Gentiles

1 Nephi 13:13

and it came to pass that I beheld the Spirit of God

that it wrought upon other Gentiles

[NULL > & 0|& 1|and ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]

they went forth out of captivity upon the many waters

Summary: Accept Oliver Cowdery’s insertion in \mathcal{C} of an ampersand before “the Spirit saith unto me again”; elsewhere the text in 1 Nephi always has the conjunction *and* before “X saith/said”; sometimes scribe 2 of \mathcal{C} omitted the *and* when he initially wrote down the text, but generally he caught his error and corrected it.

■ 1 Nephi 4:12

and it came to pass that the Spirit said unto me again

[to me >- NULL 0 | 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST]

Scribe 2 of \mathcal{O} wrote down the redundant “the Spirit said unto me again to me”. The extra “to me” was crossed out with lighter ink flow, so it is possible that the editing was done considerably later. One should therefore consider whether the original text actually read “the Spirit said again to me” and that somehow “unto me” was accidentally inserted when the text of \mathcal{O} was originally dictated. On the face of it, this suggestion seems highly unlikely since “to me” is the normal English expression, while “unto me” is clearly archaic. Generally, we would expect errors towards normal English, not archaic English.

Internal evidence from usage elsewhere in the Book of Mormon argues that “said unto me again” is much more probable. For instance, in 1 Nephi alone there are 21 other occurrences of “said **unto** me”, but none of “said **to** me”. Similarly, there are 17 occurrences of “saith **unto** me”, but none of “saith **to** me”. (All 17 of these have been edited to “said unto me”.) When *again* occurs with “saith/said unto me” (although only two other times, in 1 Nephi 4:11 and 1 Nephi 11:26), we get the *again* after the “unto me”, not before. Thus usage elsewhere argues for the corrected reading in 1 Nephi 4:12 (namely, “the Spirit said unto me again”).

The preposition *to* in “saith/said to X” is possible, but such usage is nonetheless fairly rare in the Book of Mormon text, as in these two examples from the book of Alma: “these are the words which he saith **to** Nephi” (Alma 3:14) and “he saith **to** a man” (Alma 8:19).

Summary: Accept the deletion of the redundant “to me” in 1 Nephi 4:12; usage elsewhere supports “unto me” as well as the placement of the *again* after “unto me”.

■ 1 Nephi 4:19

and after that I had [smote 0 | smote >js smiten 1 | smitten ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST]

off his head with his own sword . . .

In dialects of English, we often find the simple past-tense form used in place of the standard past-participial form. In this instance, the original text has “had smote” rather than the standard “had smitten”. Elsewhere, the original text usually has the standard *smitten* (42 times), but in four cases *smote* is found. These dialectal examples have all been edited out. For a complete discussion of this usage, see under PAST PARTICIPLE in volume 3.

Summary: Whenever supported by the earliest textual sources, the simple past-tense verb form should be restored in place of the standard past participle (thus “I had smote off his head” in 1 Nephi 4:19).

■ 1 Nephi 4:21

*and he [soposing 0 | supposeing >+ supposed 1 | supposed ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] me
to be his master Laban
for he beheld the garments and also the sword girded about my loins
and he spake unto me concerning the elders of the Jews*

Here we have another example of a participial clause that is never completed. For similar examples (involving *knowing*), see the discussion under 1 Nephi 3:17. Here in 1 Nephi 4:21, the author (Nephi) shifted the focus of his narrative when he decided to explain why Zoram mistook him for Laban. One could interpret this unfinished construction as a Hebrew-like participial clause with an unstated *be* verb (“for he **was** supposing me to be his master Laban”).

Oliver Cowdery himself edited this participial clause. After copying \mathcal{O} into \mathcal{P} , he decided to emend the nonfinite verb form *supposing* to the finite *supposed*. This change was done with heavier ink flow, which implies that the grammatical emendation was not immediate. In this instance, \mathcal{O} is extant, so we know that the original text read *supposing* (spelled as *soposing*). And the example in Enos 1:1–2 (discussed under 1 Nephi 3:17) shows that the text allows such stranded participial clauses.

Participial clauses using *supposing* are found elsewhere, but they are all completed, as in this nearby example:

1 Nephi 4:26

and **he supposing** that I spake of the brethren of the church
and that I was truly that Laban whom I had slew
wherefore he did follow me

Summary: Restore the original participial clause in 1 Nephi 4:21 (“and he supposing me to be his master Laban”) since \mathcal{O} reads this way and such unfinished clauses are occasionally found elsewhere in the text.

■ 1 Nephi 4:24

*and I also spake unto him that I should carry the engravings which were upon the plates of brass
to my elder brethren which were without the [wall 0 | walls 1 ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]*

As discussed under 1 Nephi 4:5, the singular *wall* of the original manuscript is correct.

■ 1 Nephi 4:26

*and that I was truly that Laban
whom I had [Slew 0 | slew >+ slain 1 | slain ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]*

Here we have another example where the simple past-tense form of a verb serves as the past participle. This particular one is interesting in that Oliver Cowdery himself edited the printer’s manuscript: the change from *slew* to *slain* is in heavier, darker ink (just like Oliver’s editing in verse 21, where he changed *supposeing* to *supposed*). Elsewhere, in the earliest text, there are two other examples of

slew used as a past participle (in Alma 18:6 and Ether 8:6), but these were not edited to *slain* until the 1837 edition. For a complete discussion, see under PAST PARTICIPLE in volume 3.

Summary: In accord with the earliest textual evidence, we restore the original cases in the text where the simple past-tense form was used as the past participial form.

■ 1 Nephi 4:27

*and he spake unto me many times concerning the elders of the Jews
as I went forth unto my brethren
which were without the [wall 0 | walls 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST]*

As discussed under 1 Nephi 4:5, the singular *wall* of the original manuscript is correct.

■ 1 Nephi 4:31

*and now I Nephi being a man
[large in Stature 0 | of large stature > large in stature 1 |
large in stature ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST] . . .*

When copying from \mathcal{C} to \mathcal{D} , Oliver Cowdery initially replaced “a man large in stature” with “a man of large stature”, but then he immediately caught his error, crossed out “of large stature”, and supralinearly inserted “large in stature”, the reading of the original manuscript. Elsewhere the text has examples of both types:

1 Nephi 2:16	being large in stature
Mormon 2:1	I being young was large in stature
Ether 14:10	Lib was a man of great stature

So either reading in 1 Nephi 4:31 is theoretically possible; the manuscript evidence clearly supports “large in stature”.

Summary: Maintain in 1 Nephi 4:31 the earliest reading (in \mathcal{C}) of “a man large in stature”.

■ 1 Nephi 4:33

*that he should be a free man like unto us
if he would go down **in** the wilderness with us*

Here in 1 Nephi 4:33, the original manuscript (as well as the printer’s manuscript and all printed editions) reads “if he would go down **in** the wilderness with us”. The preposition *in* sounds odd here; although *in* is not impossible, the preposition *into* definitely seems more appropriate.

Shortly after this verse, in verses 34 and 38, scribe 3 of \mathcal{C} initially wrote “in the wilderness”, but in these two instances he almost immediately corrected the phrase to read “into the wilderness”. (Both corrections involve inserting the *to* into the already-written text, but there is no change in the level of ink flow.) And in both cases, like in verse 33, there is a verb of motion:

1 Nephi 4:34

therefore if thou wilt go down
 [In > Into 0 | into 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST] the wilderness to my father
 thou shalt have place with us

1 Nephi 4:38

and it came to pass that
 we took the plates of brass and the servant of Laban
 and departed [in > into 0 | into 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST] the wilderness

Besides these two corrected examples, we have the same use of *into* in verses 35 and 36:

1 Nephi 4:35

and he promised that he would go down **into** the wilderness unto our father

1 Nephi 4:36

that the Jews might not know concerning our flight **into** the wilderness

The two scribal corrections plus the consistent reference in the text to “going **into** the wilderness” in 1 Nephi 4:34–38 suggest that the original text in verse 33 also had the preposition *into* (“if he would go down into the wilderness with us”).

In English the preposition *in* can be used to mean ‘into’ as well as ‘within or inside of’. But the Book of Mormon tends to avoid using *in* for the meaning ‘into’. Excluding the case of 1 Nephi 4:33, we find that the text is completely consistent with respect to the word *wilderness*: whenever someone crosses from inhabited territory into a wilderness, the preposition is *into* (100 times), while if there is motion within a wilderness, the preposition is *in* (36 times). For most verbs and nouns that show motion, we consistently get only one of the two prepositions:

	<i>into the wilderness</i>	<i>in the wilderness</i>
depart	24	0
flee/flight	18	0
carry	6	0
come	5	0
retreat	4	0
send	4	0
drive	3	0
take	3	0
bring	2	0
follow	2	0
return	1	0

travel	0	8
wander	0	5
course	0	2
move	0	1

Thus verbs like *depart* and *flee* (along with its nominal form *flight*) consistently take “into the wilderness”. On the other hand, there are verbs of motion such as *travel* and *wander* that typically

take place only within a wilderness and therefore avoid the preposition *into*. For a few verbs, either preposition is possible. We have the following statistics from the earliest textual sources (excluding once more the case of 1 Nephi 4:33):

	<i>into the wilderness</i>	<i>in the wilderness</i>
journey	8	15
go	12	2
march	5	1
lead	3	2

The motion verb and noun *journey* can take either *in* or *into*, depending on whether one is journeying within a wilderness (15 times) or journeying into a wilderness (8 times). One nice contrastive example is found in 1 Nephi 16–17, where Lehi and his people start their journey “into the wilderness”, then continue their journey “in the wilderness”. The use of *again* in the second case supports this interpretation:

1 Nephi 16:9

and it came to pass that
the voice of the Lord spake unto my father by night
and commanded him that on the morrow
he should take his journey **into** the wilderness

1 Nephi 17:1

and it came to pass that we did **again** take our journey **in** the wilderness

Since 1 Nephi 4:33 involves the verb *go*, we list all 15 examples of “going in(to) the wilderness”:

1 Nephi 4:33	go down [<i>in</i> 01ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST <i>into</i> <emend>] the wilderness
1 Nephi 4:34	go down [<i>In</i> > <i>Into</i> 0 <i>into</i> 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST] the wilderness
1 Nephi 4:35	go down into the wilderness
1 Nephi 7:3	go forth into the wilderness
1 Nephi 16:10	go into the wilderness
1 Nephi 16:14	go forth into the wilderness
1 Nephi 16:14	go forth again in the wilderness
Omni 1:27	went up into the wilderness
Omni 1:28	went up into the wilderness
Mosiah 22:11	went round about the land of Shilom in the wilderness
Alma 16:5	go into the wilderness
Alma 50:7	go forth into the east wilderness
Alma 50:9	go forth into the east wilderness
3 Nephi 3:20	go up upon the mountains and into the wilderness
Ether 2:5	go forth into the wilderness

Notice once more that when Lehi and his party resume their travel (the second example in 1 Nephi 16:14), they “go forth **again in** the wilderness”. And in Mosiah 22:11, the text explains that the people of Limhi went around the land of Shilom by staying **in** the wilderness. (Earlier, Mosiah 22:8 describes Gideon’s plan that “we will depart with our women and our children our flocks and our herds **into** the wilderness and we will travel around the land of Shilom”. By this time in the history of the people of Limhi, the land of Shilom had probably been repossessed by the Lamanites and was therefore to be avoided.)

In one other instance of an original “into the wilderness”, the preposition *into* was accidentally changed to *in* (in this case, by the 1837 typesetter). The motion verb in this example is *march*:

Alma 52:22
and Moroni and his army by night marched
[*into* 01APS | *in* BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRT] the wilderness

For a complete list of all the cases of “march in(to) the wilderness”, of which only one correctly takes *in*, see Alma 52:22.

There have continually been problems with *in* and *into* in the transmission of the text. The following additional cases (none of which involve scribe 3 of Θ) are each discussed separately in their own place:

2 Nephi 26:15
and after that they shall have been brought down low
[*in* 1BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST | *into* A] the dust . . .

Jacob 5:29
come let us go down [*in* 1 | *into* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] the vineyard

Mosiah 2:36
that it may have no place in you to guide you
[*in* 1ABCEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST | *into* D] wisdom’s paths

Mosiah 11:21
behold I will deliver them
[*in* >+ *into* 1 | *into* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] the hands of their enemies

Mosiah 23:26
the brethren of Alma fled from their fields and gathered themselves together
[*into* 1ABCDEGHKPS | *in* FIJLMNOQRT] the city of Helam

Alma 19:1
they were about to take his body and lay it
[*in* > *into* 1 | *in* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] a sepulchre

Alma 28:8
and this is the account of Ammon and his brethren:
their journeyings [*into* 1 | *in* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] the land of Nephi . . .

Alma 47:29
they were frightened again and fled into the wilderness
and came over [*into* 1ART | *in* BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQS] the land of Zarahemla

Alma 60:30

behold I come unto you

even [*into* 1APS | *in* BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRT] the land of Zarahemla

Helaman 3:5

yea and even they did spread forth into all parts of the land

[*in* 0 | *into* >+ *in* 1 | *into* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] whatsoever parts
it had not been rendered desolates

Summary: Emend 1 Nephi 4:33 so that the preposition is *into* (“if he would go down **into** the wilderness with us”); nearby, in verses 34 and 38, scribe 3 of \mathcal{O} initially wrote “in the wilderness” but then immediately corrected the manuscript to read “into the wilderness”; thus we have clear evidence of scribe 3’s tendency to miswrite “into the wilderness” as “in the wilderness”; all other occurrences of *wilderness* suggest that the original text consistently uses *into* whenever people leave an inhabited area and go into a wilderness.

■ 1 Nephi 4:34

surely the Lord hath commanded us to do this thing

and shall we not be diligent in keeping

the [commandment 0 | commandments 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST] of the Lord

Once more we have a case of *commandment* instead of *commandments* in the original text. Here the scribe in \mathcal{O} is the unknown scribe 3. As noted in the discussion of “without the wall” in 1 Nephi 4:5, this scribe frequently drops off the plural *s*, so one could argue that the reading in \mathcal{O} is a scribal mistake. On the other hand, Oliver Cowdery himself sometimes changes *commandment* to *commandments* (see the discussion under 1 Nephi 3:16). Once again the context allows for a singular form, especially since Nephi refers in the preceding clause to the Lord having “commanded us to do this thing”. In other words, Nephi is telling Zoram about the specific commandment to get the plates of brass from Laban. Thus the singular *commandment* is perfectly fine and should be retained.

Summary: Restore the singular *commandment* in 1 Nephi 4:34 since the context implies the singular.

■ 1 Nephi 4:35

*and it came to pass that **Zoram** did take courage at the words which I spake*

When scribe 3 of \mathcal{O} first wrote the name of Laban’s servant, he wrote it distinctly as *Zoram*. But his two subsequent spellings in \mathcal{O} read *Zorum*—that is, with a *u* vowel rather than an *a* vowel. Oliver Cowdery’s spellings of the name in \mathcal{P} can be read as either *Zoram* or *Zorum* (that is, the last vowel is a partially closed *a*). The printed editions consistently have *Zoram*:

1 Nephi 4:35

now [*Zorum* 0 | *Zoram* / *Zorum* 1 | *Zoram* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
was the name of the servant

1 Nephi 4:37

and it came to pass that
 when [*Zorum* 0 | *Zoram* / *Zorum* 1 | *Zoram* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
 had made an oath unto us
 our fears did cease concerning him

Evidence throughout the original manuscript suggests that the scribes took care to spell the first occurrence of a name correctly, as here in 1 Nephi 4, with the understanding that even if subsequent spellings of the name varied, the correct spelling could be recovered from the first occurrence. This point about the spelling of names is discussed thoroughly in volume 3.

The Book of Mormon has three different individuals named *Zoram* and two different peoples referred to as *Zoramites*. In two places in \mathcal{O} , Oliver Cowdery wrote a partially open *a* in *Zoramites* so that the word could theoretically be read as *Zorumites*. But everywhere else, he consistently wrote the vowel as a clear *a*.

Also related to *Zoram* are two compound names: (1) *Cezoram*, found three times in Helaman 5–6, and (2) *Seezoram*, found three times in Helaman 9. The original manuscript is not extant for any of these, but in the printer’s manuscript Oliver Cowdery always spells the names as *Cezoram* and *Seezoram*—that is, both consistently end in *zoram*, with the *a* vowel. Thus the evidence from these two names also supports the spelling *Zoram*.

Summary: Scribe 3’s spelling in \mathcal{O} of the first occurrence of *Zoram* has the *a* vowel, which apparently represents the correct spelling, not the *u* of his two subsequent spellings in \mathcal{O} .

■ 1 Nephi 4:35

and he promised that he would go down into the wilderness
 unto [*our* 0APST | *my* > *our* 1 | *my* BCDEFGHIJKLMNOQR] father

The inclination here has been to introduce the reading “my father”. When copying from \mathcal{O} to \mathcal{P} , Oliver Cowdery initially wrote “my father” but immediately corrected it to “our father”. For the 1837 edition, the typesetter apparently made the same mistake. The original manuscript is extant here and reads “our father”. Both the 1908 RLDS edition and the 1981 LDS edition restored the original reading.

The source for this error comes from the earlier verse where Nephi’s words to Zoram are directly quoted:

1 Nephi 4:34

therefore if thou wilt go down into the wilderness to **my** father
 thou shalt have place with us

Summary: Maintain the original reading “unto our father” in 1 Nephi 4:35, despite the use of “to my father” in the previous verse.

■ 1 Nephi 4:35

[*Yea* 0T | 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPS] *and he also made an oath unto us that he would tarry with us from that time forth*

The original manuscript here reads “yea and”. Oliver Cowdery accidentally dropped the *yea* when he copied from \mathcal{O} into \mathcal{P} . The 1981 LDS edition correctly restored the *yea*, but the RLDS text here continues the reading of the printer’s manuscript.

Elsewhere the text has 300 occurrences of “yea and”, of which three are occurrences of “yea and he also” (1 Nephi 17:17, Alma 31:25, and Alma 31:38). The word *yea* is typically used in the Book of Mormon to comment on, amplify, or revise what has just been stated. Its use here in 1 Nephi 4:35 is wholly appropriate since it adds details to Zoram’s oath: he not only promises to go down with them, but he also promises to stay with them.

Summary: Based on the reading of the original manuscript, the *yea* before the second part of Zoram’s oath should be maintained.

1 Nephi 5

■ 1 Nephi 5:1

*after we had [Came 0 | came 1ABCDG | come EFHIJKLMNOPQRST] down into the wilderness
unto our father
behold he was filled with joy*

■ 1 Nephi 5:4

*and it [had came 01ABCDGIJLMN | came E | came > had came F | had come HKOPQRST] to pass
that my father spake unto her saying . . .*

In both these verses, the original text read “had came”. The dialectal use of the simple past-tense form *came* as the past participle is an important characteristic of the original text. In the first example (in verse 1), *came* was edited to the standard *come* in the 1849 LDS edition and the 1874 RLDS edition. In order to deal with the second example (in verse 4), the 1849 edition deleted the perfect auxiliary *had*, but the corrected 1852 edition (the second printing) restored the original “had came” (probably by reference to the 1840 edition). This second “had came” was edited to the standard “had come” in the 1874 RLDS edition, while the LDS text has conformed to the standard since the 1907 vest-pocket edition. See the discussion in volume 3 under PAST PARTICIPLE.

It is also possible that in verse 4 the deletion of the perfect auxiliary *had* in the 1849 LDS edition was accidental, especially since the phrase “it came to pass” is much more frequent in the Book of Mormon text than “it had came/come to pass” (of which there are only two other occurrences in the text, in Helaman 6:18 and 3 Nephi 1:20). For another possible example of the tendency to delete the perfect auxiliary in “had came”, see the discussion under Helaman 16:1.

Summary: As already noted, we follow the earliest textual sources in determining the form of the past participle; here the original text in 1 Nephi 5:1 and 1 Nephi 5:4 read “had came”.

■ 1 Nephi 5:4–5

*I know that I am a visionary man
for if I had not seen the things of God in a vision
I should not have known the goodness of God
but had tarried at Jerusalem and had perished with my brethren
but behold I have obtained a land of promise
in the which [things 01BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST | thing A] I do rejoice*

In verse 5 the original and printer’s manuscripts read “in the which **things** I do rejoice”. If we include text from the previous verse, one can interpret the passage as telling us that Lehi rejoiced in two things: he has not perished and he has obtained a land of promise. The land is only promised, of course; Lehi hasn’t made it there yet. For a discussion of this kind of language as an example of the “prophetic perfect”, see pages 164–166 in Donald W. Parry, “Hebraisms and Other Ancient Peculiarities in the Book of Mormon”, *Echoes and Evidences of the Book of Mormon*, edited by Donald W. Parry, Daniel C. Peterson, and John W. Welch (Provo, Utah: Foundation for Ancient Research and Mormon Studies, Brigham Young University, 2002), 155–189.

The 1830 edition changed the plural *things* to the singular *thing*, probably because the relative pronoun *which* is readily interpreted as applying to only the most recent clause (namely, that Lehi has obtained a land of promise). Despite the easiness of the 1830 reading, the plural was restored in the 1837 edition, probably by reference to \mathcal{P} .

We have no examples of scribe 3 of \mathcal{C} mistakenly adding the plural *s* (although there are a number of examples where he did drop it). So there is no direct scribal evidence from scribe 3 to suggest that the plural *s* is an error in \mathcal{C} .

Elsewhere in the text there are three examples of “which thing” and two of “which things”:

Jacob 2:7

and also it grieveth me that
I must use so much boldness of speech concerning you
before your wives and your children
many of whose feelings are exceeding tender and chaste and delicate before God
which thing is pleasing unto God

Jacob 2:24

behold David and Solomon truly had many wives and concubines
which thing was abominable before me

Helaman 13:38

and ye have sought for happiness in doing iniquity
which thing is contrary to the nature of that righteousness
which is in our great and eternal head

Mormon 8:1

behold I have **but few things** to write
which things I have been commanded of my father

Ether 13:5–6

and he spake also concerning the house of Israel
and the Jerusalem from whence Lehi should come
after that it should be destroyed
it should be built up again an holy city unto the Lord
wherefore it could not be a new Jerusalem
for it had been in a time of old
but it should be built up again and become a holy city of the Lord
and it should be built up unto the house of Israel
and that a new Jerusalem should be built up
upon this land unto the remnant of the seed of Joseph
for the which things there has been a type

The last example is particularly interesting since it refers to two actions, the rebuilding of the old Jerusalem and the building of the new Jerusalem. Thus the plural “which things” is appropriate there. We also note that both 1 Nephi 5:5 and Ether 13:6 have the same type of archaic prepositional construction (“in the which things” and “for the which things”).

Summary: Retain the plural usage “in the which things I do rejoice”; there is no direct scribal evidence to suggest that *things* is incorrect in 1 Nephi 5:5; the plural reading is supported by the larger passage as well as by the same usage in Ether 13:6.

■ 1 Nephi 5:6

and after this manner [NULL > *of language* 0 | *of language* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST]
did my father Lehi comfort my mother Sariah

Scribe 3 of \mathcal{G} initially wrote “after this manner did my father Lehi comfort my mother Sariah”, but soon corrected “after this manner” by supralinearly inserting “of language” (the level of ink flow is unchanged). Undoubtedly, scribe 3 expected only “after this manner”, which occurs frequently in the Book of Mormon (27 times) as well as in the King James Bible (16 times).

The specific use of the phraseology “after this manner of language” is found only in 1 Nephi and seems to be a peculiarity of Nephi’s speech. In fact, this same expression is used two other times in 1 Nephi 5 (in verses 3 and 8), so the added phrase “of language” in verse 6 is undoubtedly correct:

1 Nephi 3:21	after this manner of language did I persuade my brethren
1 Nephi 5:3	and after this manner of language had my mother complained
1 Nephi 5:6	and after this manner of language did my father Lehi comfort my mother Sariah
1 Nephi 5:8	and after this manner of language did she speak
1 Nephi 10:15	and after this manner of language did my father prophesy
1 Nephi 17:22	and after this manner of language did my brethren murmur

In one case, “after this manner” serves as subject complement to the word *language*:

1 Nephi 1:15	and after this manner was the language of my father
--------------	---

For two cases in 1 Nephi, however, Nephi does not explicitly state that “after this manner” refers to language:

1 Nephi 16:38	and after this manner did my brother Laman stir up their hearts
1 Nephi 19:24	for after this manner hath the prophet written

Summary: Maintain Nephi’s individual expression “after this manner of language” in 1 Nephi 5:6.

■ 1 Nephi 5:8

*now I know of a surety that the Lord hath commanded my husband to flee into the wilderness
yea and* [0 | *I* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST] *also know of a surety
that the Lord hath protected my sons*

Apparently scribe 3 of \mathcal{O} dropped the subject pronoun *I* from this clause beginning with “yea and”. Oliver Cowdery added it when he copied the text into \mathcal{P} . There is evidence that scribe 3 of \mathcal{O} tended to omit the subject pronoun *I*, as in the following two examples:

- 1 Nephi 8:4
 for behold methought
 [NULL > *i* 0 | *I* 1 ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] saw a dark and dreary wilderness
- 1 Nephi 8:9
 after I had prayed unto the Lord
 [NULL >- *i* 0 | NULL >+ *I* 1 | *I* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] beheld
 a large and spacious field

In the first example, scribe 3 of \mathcal{O} caught his error and supralinearly inserted the *I* (characteristically spelled by scribe 3 as a lowercase *i*). In the second example, his supralinearly inserted *i* was so weak that Oliver Cowdery apparently missed it when he initially copied the passage from \mathcal{O} into \mathcal{P} . Later, with heavier ink flow, Oliver supralinearly inserted the *I* in \mathcal{P} .

In similar clauses beginning with “yea and”, the subject pronoun *I* is never missing:

- 1 Nephi 4:11
yea and I also knew that he had sought to take away mine own life
- 1 Nephi 4:15
yea and I also thought that they could not keep the commandments of the Lord
 according to the law of Moses
 save they should have the law
- The Words of Mormon 1:4
yea and I also know that as many things
 as have been prophesied concerning us down to this day
 has been fulfilled
- Alma 29:11
yea and I also remember the captivity of my fathers
- Alma 34:39
yea and I also exhort you my brethren
 that ye be watchful unto prayer continually
- Alma 38:4
yea and I also knew that thou wast stoned for the word’s sake

Thus both scribal and textual evidence support Oliver Cowdery’s emendation of the text in 1 Nephi 5:8.

Summary: Maintain Oliver Cowdery’s addition of the subject pronoun *I* in 1 Nephi 5:8 (“yea and I also know of a surety”).

■ 1 Nephi 5:8

*yea and I also know of a surety that
the Lord hath protected my sons
and delivered them out of the hands of Laban
and [give >% gave 0 | gave 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPS | given RT] them power
whereby they could accomplish the thing which the Lord hath commanded them*

Here the 1920 LDS edition interpreted the original *gave* as a perfect form, under the assumption that the text intended to conjoin three past participial forms: “the Lord hath protected . . . and [hath] delivered . . . and [hath] gave”. Since “hath gave” would be unacceptable in standard English, *gave* was edited to *given* in the 1920 edition. Of course, it is possible to interpret both *delivered* and *gave* as instances of the simple past tense (equivalent to “the Lord hath protected . . . and [he] delivered . . . and [he] gave”). A similar conjunctive example involving the verb form *gave* is found later on in the text:

3 Nephi 18:6

even as I have broken bread and blessed it
and [*gave* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNPS | *gave* > *given* M | *given* OQRT] it unto you

Also see the discussion under 1 Nephi 1:14, where the *saw* of “my father had read and **saw** many great and marvelous things” was replaced by *seen* in the 1920 LDS edition.

Although infrequent, the original text has clear examples of the simple past-tense form *gave* being used as a past participial form:

Alma 47:13 (reading in Ⓞ)

Amalickiah desired him to come down with his army in the nighttime
and surround those men in their camps
over whom the king **had gave** him command

Alma 55:20 (reading in Ⓞ)

for he had armed those prisoners of the Nephites
which were within the walls of the city
and **had gave** them power to gain possession of those parts
which were within the walls

For a complete discussion, see PAST PARTICIPLE in volume 3.

Summary: Restore the original verb form *gave* in 1 Nephi 5:8 since the original text typically allows simple past-tense forms to be used as the past participle.

■ 1 Nephi 5:10

*my father Lehi took the records which were engraven
upon [the 01ABCDEFGHIJLMNOPQRST | κ] plates of brass*

The 1892 RLDS edition accidentally dropped the definite article *the* in the phrase “the plates of brass”. This error did not persist, especially because these plates had already been identified in

the text. The only time “plates of brass” occurs without any determiner is at the very beginning when the text first refers to them:

1 Nephi 3:3
 for behold Laban hath the record of the Jews
 and also a genealogy of my forefathers
 and they are engraven upon **plates of brass**

From that point on, we have either “the plates of brass” (23 times) or “these plates of brass” (3 times), which is what we expect in English.

Summary: The determiner (either *the* or *these*) for “plates of brass” is always appropriate after its initial reference in 1 Nephi 3:3.

■ 1 Nephi 5:18

*that these plates of brass should go forth
 unto all nations kindreds [NULL > & 0] 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST] tongues and people*

Here scribe 3 of \mathcal{O} inserted an additional *and* (written as an ampersand) between *kindreds* and *tongues*. Oliver Cowdery ignored the extra *and* when he copied the text into \mathcal{P} . The question is whether we find multiple uses of *and* within the phrase “nations kindreds tongues and people” elsewhere in the Book of Mormon text. When the specific order is *nation(s)*, *kindred(s)*, *tongue(s)*, and *people*, the Book of Mormon text puts the *and* only before the last conjunct:

all nations kindreds tongues and people	8 times
every nation kindred tongue and people	7 times

(The example from 1 Nephi 5:18 is excluded in this count, but two examples from the witness statements are included.) Finally, we note one example (in Alma 9:20) where *or* is the conjunction: “every other nation kindred tongue or people”.

In 1 Nephi 5:18 the corrected text of the original manuscript is strange because there is still no *and* between *nations* and *kindreds* (that is, the text reads “all nations kindreds and tongues and people”). Given the word order “nations / kindreds / tongues / people”, the Book of Mormon has no examples of *and* occurring between each pair of conjuncts. There is one example with *and*’s between each pair, but the word order is very different:

3 Nephi 26:4
 when all people **and** all kindreds **and** all nations **and** tongues
 shall stand before God

This example is also different in that there is no *all* before *tongues*, in either the original manuscript (which is extant here for the phrase “nations and tongues”) or the two firsthand copies of it (namely, the printer’s manuscript and the 1830 edition).

The King James Bible has examples of *and*’s between each pair of conjuncts, as in the following examples (all from the book of Revelation):

Revelation 5:9

for thou wast slain and hast redeemed us to God
by thy blood out of every kindred **and** tongue **and** people **and** nation

Revelation 7:9

and lo a great multitude which no man could number
of all nations **and** kindreds **and** people **and** tongues
stood before the throne and before the Lamb

Revelation 11:9

and they of the people **and** kindreds **and** tongues **and** nations
shall see their dead bodies three days and an half

Revelation 14:6

and I saw another angel fly in the midst of heaven
having the everlasting gospel to preach unto them that dwell on the earth
and to every nation **and** kindred **and** tongue **and** people

The last example has the same order of the four conjuncts that is typically found in the Book of Mormon, yet with *and*'s between each pair of conjuncts. This example shows how the language style of the Book of Mormon may follow the King James biblical style (by having the expected order of the four conjuncts) and at the same time systematically differ from it (by having only one *and*).

Given all this textual evidence, we should assume that the extra *and* inserted by scribe 3 of \mathcal{O} before *tongues* in 1 Nephi 5:18 is an error, perhaps influenced by the *and* following *tongues*.

Summary: Internal evidence supports Oliver Cowdery's decision in 1 Nephi 5:18 to drop the extra *and* from before *tongues*, thus giving the expected phrase "all nations kindreds tongues and people".

■ 1 Nephi 5:20–21

*and it came to pass that
thus far I and my father had kept the commandments
wherewith the Lord [had 01ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST | has Q] commanded us
and we had obtained the record which the Lord had commanded us*

Here the 1911 LDS edition accidentally replaced the past-tense form *had* with the present-tense *has*. All the surrounding examples are in the past perfect. This 1911 typo was removed in the following LDS edition (1920).

Summary: Maintain the past perfect "had commanded us" in 1 Nephi 5:20.

■ 1 Nephi 5:21

*and we had obtained the [record 01ABCDEGHKPS | records FIJLMNOQRT]
which the Lord had commanded us
and searched them and found that they were desirable
yea even of great worth unto us*

The earliest textual sources have the singular *record*, but the context uses the plural pronouns *they* and *them* to refer to this record. (The plural pronoun is also found in the following verse: “wherefore it was wisdom in the Lord that we should carry **them** with us”). This repeated plural usage suggests that perhaps the singular *record* is a scribal error for the plural *records*. As noted under 1 Nephi 4:5, scribe 3 of \mathcal{O} tended to accidentally drop the plural *s*, so perhaps this is one more example of that tendency. For the 1852 LDS edition, *record* was emended to *records*, and the LDS text has followed this plural reading ever since.

There is specific evidence that the Book of Mormon scribes had problems choosing between *record* and *records*:

Omni 1:9 (Oliver Cowdery, in \mathcal{P})

and after this manner we keep
the [*records* >% *record* 1 | *records* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]

Mosiah 1:6 (Oliver Cowdery, in \mathcal{P})

and behold also the plates of Nephi which contain
the [*record* > *records* 1 | *records* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
and the sayings of our fathers

Alma 18:36 (Oliver Cowdery, in \mathcal{P})

he began . . . and laid before him
the [*record* > *records* 1 | *records* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
and the holy scriptures of the people

Alma 45:2 (Oliver Cowdery, in \mathcal{O})

believest thou the words which I spake unto thee concerning
those [*Reckord* 0 | *reckords* 1 | *records* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
which have been kept

Helaman preface (Oliver Cowdery, in \mathcal{P})

according to
the [*Reckord* 0 | *Records* >% *Record* 1 | *record* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
of Helaman and his sons

Helaman 3:15 (Oliver Cowdery, in \mathcal{O})

but behold there are many books
and many [*Reckord* > *Reckords* 0 | *records* 1 ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
of every kind

3 Nephi 23:7 (scribe 2 of \mathcal{P})

bring forth
the [§2 *Records* > §1 *Record* 1 | *record* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
which ye have kept

4 Nephi 1:49 (scribe 2 of \mathcal{P})

and thus is the end
of the [*records* >% *record* 1 | *record* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] of Ammaron

Mormon 7:8 (scribe 2 of \mathcal{P} , two times)

not only in this [*records* >% *record* 1 | *record* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
 but also in the record which shall come unto the Gentiles from the Jews
 which [*records* >% *record* 1 | *record* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] shall come
 from the Gentiles unto you

We note here that Oliver Cowdery made mistakes in both directions, while scribe 2 of \mathcal{P} tended to write the plural when the singular is intended. For further discussion, see each specific passage.

Despite the evidence for scribal error, there is opposing evidence that the text itself can switch between the singular and plural when referring to “the record(s)”. In particular, the writer may switch to a plural pronoun after referring to “the record” since that record would have been written on plates. (Of course, the text always refers to plates in the plural, never to an individual plate.) In the following examples, one passage uses the singular pronoun *it* to refer to a plural *records*, but the other three passages use the plural pronoun *they* or *them* to refer to a singular record:

1 Nephi 13:23 (referring to the Bible in contrast to the plates of brass)

and it is **a record** like unto the engravings
 which are upon the plates of brass
 —save there are not so many—
 nevertheless **they** contain the covenants of the Lord
 which he hath made unto the house of Israel

Mosiah 12:8 (referring to the Book of Mormon record and its plates)

and it shall come to pass that except they repent
 I will utterly destroy them from off the face of the earth
 yet they shall leave **a record** behind them
 and I will preserve **them** for other nations which shall possess the land
 yea even this will I do
 that I may discover the abominations of this people to other nations

Mosiah 28:17 (referring to the Jaredite plates and the record on it)

now after Mosiah had finished translating **these records**
 behold **it** gave an account of the people which was destroyed

Ether 15:33 (referring to the Jaredite record and its plates)

and he finished **his record**
 —and the hundredth part I have not written—
 and he hid **them** in a manner that the people of Limhi did find **them**

Part of the shifting in usage may also derive from the semantics of the word *record*. Often the singular *record* is used in a collective sense, while the plural *records* is used to refer to physical plates. The text sometimes switches from one to the other within the same passage, as in the instance when Jesus asked Nephi to get the Nephite record(s):

3 Nephi 23:7–8

and it came to pass that he saith unto Nephi
 bring forth **the record** which ye have kept
 and when Nephi had brought forth **the records** and laid **them** before him
 and he cast his eyes upon **them** and saith . . .

This passage involves some textual variation. See the discussion under 3 Nephi 23:7.

Summary: Since it is possible to switch between *record* and *records* within the same passage, it is probably best to follow the earliest textual sources in 1 Nephi 5:21 and restore the original singular (“we had obtained the record”); nonetheless, there is considerable evidence that Book of Mormon scribes had difficulty in choosing between *record* and *records*.

■ 1 Nephi 5:22

as we journeyed in the wilderness

[*toward* 0 | *towards* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST] *the land of promise*

Normally the Book of Mormon text has *towards*, but scribe 3 of \mathcal{C} often has *toward*, here in 1 Nephi 5:22 as well as in two other places:

1 Nephi 7:21

we did again travel on our journey

[*toward* 01ABCPS | *towards* DEFGHIJKLMNOQRT] the tent of our father

1 Nephi 8:17

wherefore I cast mine eyes

[*toward* 0 | *towards* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST] the head of the river

In fact, these three examples are the only extant examples of *toward* in the original manuscript. Despite these examples of *toward*, scribe 3 sometimes wrote *towards*:

1 Nephi 8:27

and they were in the attitude of mocking and pointing their fingers

towards those which had came up and were partaking of the fruit

1 Nephi 8:31

and he also saw other multitudes pressing their way

towards that great and spacious building

On the other hand, Oliver Cowdery favors *towards*—in fact, all of his extant examples in \mathcal{C} read that way.

The Book of Mormon text strongly prefers the form *towards* rather than *toward*. There are a total of 103 occurrences of *toward(s)* in the text, of which 87 show no variation at all. These 87 all have the form *towards*. There are 16 cases with variation; besides the three involving scribe 3 of \mathcal{C} , we have the following:

1 Nephi 17:13 [*towards* 01ABCDEFGHIJLMNOQRT | *toward* KPS]

2 Nephi 17:1 [*towards* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPS | *toward* RT]

2 Nephi 21:14 [*towards* >% *toward* 1 | *toward* ABCGHKPS |
 towards DEFIJLMNOQRT]

2 Nephi 27:25 [*towards* 1ABCDEFGHIJLMNOPQRST | *toward* HK]

Mosiah 10:17 [*towards* 1ABCEFGHIJKLMNQRST | *toward* D]

Mosiah 15:9 [*toward* 1ABCPS | *towards* DEFGHIJKLMNOQRT]

Mosiah 20:20 [*towards* 1ABCDEFGHIJLMNOPQRST | *toward* HK]

Mosiah 29:40 [*towards* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST | *toward* S]

1 Nephi 5

Alma 43:39	[<i>toward</i> > <i>towards</i> 0 <i>towards</i> 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST]
Alma 43:42	[<i>towards</i> 0ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST <i>toward</i> > <i>towards</i> 1]
Alma 48:6	[<i>towards</i> 01ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPS <i>toward</i> QRT]
Alma 60:5	[<i>towards</i> 01ABCDEFGHIJKLMOPQRST <i>toward</i> N]
Alma 62:14	[<i>towards</i> 1ABCDEFGHIJLMNQRST <i>toward</i> HK]

These are discussed individually in this volume; a summary is found under TOWARDS in volume 3.

Overall, the evidence argues that the best procedure in dealing with this case of minor variation is, in each instance, to let the earliest textual sources determine the reading. Thus here in 1 Nephi 5:22 as well as in 1 Nephi 7:21 and 1 Nephi 8:17, the *toward* written by scribe 3 of \mathcal{C} will be restored, even though it is quite possible that the original text read *towards*.

Summary: In each case of *toward* versus *towards*, we follow the earliest textual sources; three times scribe 3 of \mathcal{C} wrote *toward* instead of *towards*; over time these three examples have been replaced by *towards*, but in each instance the critical text will restore the earliest form, *toward*.

1 Nephi 6

■ 1 Nephi 6:1

*and now I Nephi do not give
the genealogy of my [fathers 0ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST | father > fathers 1]
in this part of my record*

As Oliver Cowdery was copying the text from \mathcal{O} into \mathcal{P} , he initially wrote “the genealogy of my father”, thinking perhaps that Nephi was referring to his father’s genealogy rather than his own. It appears that Oliver immediately caught his error; there is no change in the level of ink flow. The original manuscript reads in the plural.

Normally the text prefers the plural (either *fathers* or *forefathers*) when describing someone’s genealogy, with most examples referring to Lehi’s genealogy:

1 Nephi 3:3

for behold Laban hath the record of the Jews
and also a genealogy of my **forefathers**

1 Nephi 5:14

my father Lehi also found upon the plates of brass a genealogy of his **fathers**

1 Nephi 5:16

and thus my father Lehi did discover the genealogy of his **fathers**

1 Nephi 19:2

wherefore the record of my father and the genealogy of his **forefathers**
and the more part of all our proceedings in the wilderness
are engraven upon those first plates of which I have spoken

Omni 1:18

Zarahemla gave a genealogy of his **fathers** according to his memory

Only in one case do we actually have the singular:

1 Nephi 3:12

and he desired of Laban the records
which were engraven upon the plates of brass
which contained the genealogy of my **father**

This unique use of the singular seems appropriate for this verse. Taken as a whole, the context implies that Laman, in requesting the plates from Laban, referred to the fact that the plates of

brass contained the genealogy of his father, Lehi, thus providing a more specific reason why Laman, a son of Lehi, was asking for the plates. In any event, there is no specific evidence that the use of the singular *father* in 1 Nephi 3:12 is a scribal error for *fathers*.

Summary: Maintain the plural *fathers* in 1 Nephi 6:1 (“the genealogy of my fathers”) as well as the singular *father* in 1 Nephi 3:12 (“the genealogy of my father”); the plural (*fore*)*fathers* is normal when referring to one’s genealogy, but in 1 Nephi 3:12 the context supports the singular.

■ 1 Nephi 6:2

*we are [a desendant 0 | a decendant 1 | a descendant ABCDEGIJLMNOPQRS |
descendants > a descendant F | descendants HKT] of Joseph*

The original text here clearly shows a subject complement in the singular (“we are a descendant of Joseph”). The 1852 LDS edition was the first one to emend this to the expected plural reading (“we are descendants of Joseph”). However, in the second printing of that edition, the original reading was restored (probably by reference to the 1840 edition). Similarly, the first two RLDS editions had the plural reading, but then the 1908 RLDS edition restored the original singular reading (undoubtedly because of the singular reading in \mathcal{D}). Finally, the 1981 LDS edition edited the text to the plural.

There are three other passages in the text where we get this kind of singular subject complement:

2 Nephi 30:4

and then shall the remnant of our seed know concerning us
how that we came out from Jerusalem
and that they are [*a decendant >js descendants 1 | a descendant A |
descendants BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST*] of the Jews

Alma 56:3

behold two thousand of the sons of those men
which Ammon brought down out of the land of Nephi
now ye have known that
these were [*a desendant 01 | a descendant ABCDEPS |
descendants FGHIJKLMNOQRT*] of Laman
which was the eldest son of our father Lehi

3 Nephi 10:4

O ye people of these great cities which have fallen
which are [*a decendant >js a descendants 1 | a descendant A |
descendants BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST*] of Jacob

In two of these cases, Joseph Smith edited “a descendant” to the plural, so that the 1837 and all subsequent editions have “descendants” rather than “a descendant”. In the remaining case, the change to the plural was first made in the 1852 LDS edition and has been retained in all subsequent LDS editions. The 1858 Wright edition and the first two RLDS editions also have the plural, but as in 1 Nephi 6:2 the 1908 RLDS edition reverted to the singular “a descendant” (based on the reading in \mathcal{D}). However, in the two cases where Joseph edited the text in \mathcal{D} , the 1908 edition retains the plural.

Elsewhere there are four cases where the earliest textual sources have the expected plural “descendants” as the subject complement:

Mosiah 25:2

now there were not so many of the children of Nephi
or so many of those which were
[*descendants* 1 | *descendants* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] of Nephi
as there were of the people of Zarahemla

Mosiah 25:13

and this because the kingdom had been conferred
upon none but those which were
[*descendants* 1 | *descendants* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] of Nephi

Alma 24:29

but they were actual [*descendants* 1 | *descendants* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
of Laman and Lemuel

Helaman 11:24

and also a certain number which were real
[*descendants* 1 | *descendants* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] of the Lamanites
being stirred up to anger by them or by those dissenters
therefore they commenced a war with their brethren

Thus in the original text either the singular “a descendant” or the plural “descendants” is possible. Of course, when the subject is actually singular, we have only “a descendant”, as in 1 Nephi 5:14 (“he was a descendant of Joseph”) and 24 other places in the text.

It seems quite clear that the four unusual cases of the singular are fully intended. There is no attempt or even tendency prior to Joseph Smith’s editing for the 1837 edition to remove this singular subject complement. Nor is there any question here of being confused by a nearby singular subject and verb form. In each of the four cases the *be* verb is in the plural and agrees with a plural subject or antecedent (“we are”, “they are”, “these were”, and “which are”). The intentionality of the singular “a descendant” is obvious.

For each of these four cases, one could interpret the plural subject as semantically distributed rather than as a unitary collective plural. In other words, the plural subject could be interpreted as a group of distinct individuals, each of which is a descendant of X. Thus 1 Nephi 6:2 could be thought of as meaning something like ‘we are—each of us—a descendant of Joseph’. Another possibility, suggested by David Calabro (personal communication), is that the word *descendant* could be acting as a bare adjective without the expected noun but understood as referring to people. Thus the noun phrase “a descendant of Joseph” could be interpreted as ‘a descendant people of Joseph’—that is, a group of people descending from Joseph.

Summary: Restore the unexpected but fully intended “a descendant” that occurs with plural subjects and verbs in 1 Nephi 6:2, 2 Nephi 30:4, Alma 56:3, and 3 Nephi 10:4.

1 Nephi 7

■ 1 Nephi 7:1

it came to pass that the Lord spake unto him again
[0 | *saying* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST]
that it was not meet for him Lehi
that he should take his family into the wilderness alone

The original manuscript did not have the word *saying* in this verse. Oliver Cowdery added it when he copied from \mathcal{O} into \mathcal{P} . Typically, scribe 3 of \mathcal{O} does not omit words except subject pronouns, so this addition seems to be based on Oliver’s expectation that *saying* belonged here.

When we examine the word *saying* in the text, we discover that after participial clauses headed by *saying*, we almost always have a direct quote rather than an indirect one. In fact, when there is a preceding clause with the past-tense *spake*, we always get a direct quote after *saying*, as in these nearby examples in 1 Nephi (the words set in bold show that the quote is direct):

1 Nephi 5:4 (Lehi speaking to Sariah)
my father spake unto her saying
I know that **I am** a visionary man

1 Nephi 5:8 (Sariah speaking to her family)
and she spake saying
now **I know** of a surety
that the Lord **hath** commanded **my** husband to flee into the wilderness

1 Nephi 7:8 (Nephi speaking to Laman and Lemuel)
therefore I spake unto them saying
—yea even unto Laman and unto Lemuel—
behold thou art mine elder brethren
and how **is** it that **ye are** so hard in **your** hearts

1 Nephi 8:2 (Lehi speaking to his family)
he spake unto us saying
behold I have dreamed a dream
or in other words **I have** seen a vision

When we examine the earliest textual sources for all occurrences of “X spake . . . saying Y”, we find 76 examples—and for every one of them, the quote following *saying* is always a direct quote. (The King James Bible, in fact, follows this same use of the direct quote, with 240 examples.)

Among the 76 Book of Mormon examples, there are five cases where the subordinate conjunction *that* immediately follows *saying*, yet the *that* does not force the quote to be indirect (contrary to our expectations in modern English). Interestingly, all five of these examples refer to the promise that the Lord made to Nephi in 1 Nephi 2:19–24:

1 Nephi 4:14 (Nephi's words)

I remembered the words of the Lord
which he spake unto me in the wilderness
saying that
inasmuch as **thy** seed **shall** keep **my** commandments
they **shall** prosper in the land of promise

2 Nephi 5:20 (Nephi's words)

wherefore the word of the Lord was fulfilled
which he spake unto me
saying that
inasmuch as they **will** not hearken unto **thy** words
they **shall** be cut off from the presence of the Lord

Jarom 1:9 (Jarom's words)

but the word of the Lord was verified
which he spake unto our fathers
saying that
inasmuch as **ye will** keep **my** commandments
ye shall prosper in the land

Omni 1:6 (Amaron's words)

yea he would not suffer that the words should not be verified
which he spake unto our fathers
saying that
inasmuch as **ye will** not keep **my** commandments
ye shall not prosper in the land

Alma 9:13 (Alma's words)

behold do ye not remember the words
which he spake unto Lehi
saying that
inasmuch as **ye shall** keep **my** commandments
ye shall prosper in the land

The structural similarity between these five passages is quite astounding, even down to the same formulaic use of “saying that”:

<calling attention to the word(s) of the Lord>
which he spake unto X
saying that
inasmuch as <obedience or disobedience>
<resulting success or failure>

If we move beyond the cases where the verb in the preceding clause is *spake*, we encounter 151 additional examples involving *saying*. Here we do find a few cases where *saying* is followed by an indirect quote rather than a direct one:

1 Nephi 3:5 (Lehi quoting Nephi's brothers)

and now behold thy brothers murmur saying
it is a hard thing which **I** have required of **them**

Mosiah 11:19 (Mormon's abridgment)

they did boast in their own strength
saying that **their** fifty **could** stand against thousands of the Lamanites

Alma 19:19 (Mormon's abridgment)

and now the people began to murmur among themselves
some saying that it **was** a great evil that **had** come upon **them**
or upon the king and his house
because he **had** suffered that the Nephite **should** remain in the land

In the first example, the indirect quote is actually part of a direct quote (a quote within a quote). In the two other examples, the word *saying* is followed by the subordinate conjunction *that*, which suggests a minor tendency to have "saying that" followed by an indirect quote.

There is one interesting case where the quote in the earliest textual sources first starts out as an indirect quote (through the first verb), then switches to a direct quote (for the second verb and the final pronoun):

Alma 19:26 (Mormon's abridgment)

but others rebuked them all
saying that he **was** a monster
which [*hath* >js *had* 1 | *hath* A | *had* BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] been sent
from the Nephites to torment [*us* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPS | *them* RT]

This passage may well contain an early textual error. In the original text the whole quote may have been direct. The occurrence of "saying that" in this passage may have led the scribe (or Joseph Smith in his dictating) to change a present-tense *is* to the past-tense *was*. For further discussion of this possibility, see Alma 19:26.

Taken all together, the 76 examples with the phraseology "X spake . . . saying Y" imply that Oliver Cowdery's decision to add *saying* in 1 Nephi 7:1 was in error since the quote there is definitely an indirect one:

1 Nephi 7:1

it came to pass that the Lord spake unto him again
that it **was** not meet for **him** Lehi
that **he should** take **his** family into the wilderness alone

In support of this conclusion, consider six additional cases (most of them in 1 Nephi) where the verb *spake* occurs but there is no *saying* before a following subordinate conjunction *that*. In each of these examples, as with 1 Nephi 7:1, the quote is an indirect one:

- 1 Nephi 4:24 (Nephi speaking to Zoram)
and I also spake unto him
that I **should** carry the engravings which **were** upon the plates of brass
to my elder brethren which **were** without the wall
- 1 Nephi 4:32 (Nephi speaking to Zoram)
I spake with him
that if **he would** hearken unto my words as the Lord liveth and as I live
even so that if **he would** hearken unto our words we **would** spare **his** life
- 1 Nephi 4:33 (Nephi speaking to Zoram)
and I spake unto him even with an oath
that **he** need not fear
that **he should** be a free man like unto us
if **he would** go down into the wilderness with us
- 1 Nephi 10:9 (Lehi speaking about John the Baptist)
and he also spake
that he **should** baptize with water
yea even that he **should** baptize the Messiah with water
- 2 Nephi 10:3 (Jacob speaking about Christ)
for in the last night the angel spake unto me
that this **should** be his name
- Jacob 7:18 (Sherem confessing to the people)
and he spake plainly unto them
that **he had** been deceived by the power of the devil

Summary: Since the following quote is indirect, the intrusive word *saying* should be removed from 1 Nephi 7:1; the reading of the original manuscript (without the word *saying*) is consistent with usage elsewhere in the text.

■ 1 Nephi 7:1

*but that his sons should take daughters to wife
that [0 | they 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST] might raise up seed unto the Lord
in the land of promise*

This variant has significant ramifications for the meaning. The reading of the original manuscript seems to limit the “raising up of seed” to the women. Oliver Cowdery added the subject pronoun *they* when he copied the text into \mathcal{D} . This emendation also changed the grammatical category for the *that*, from a relative pronoun (with *daughters* as the antecedent) to a subordinate conjunction (with the meaning ‘in order that’, thus making the *that*-clause adverbial).

Elsewhere in the text, we find a number of passages that refer to the Lord raising up offspring (referred to as seed or a branch):

2 Nephi 3:5

out of the fruit of his loins
the Lord God would **raise up** a righteous branch unto the house of Israel

Jacob 2:25

I have led this people forth out of the land of Jerusalem
by the power of mine arm
that I might **raise up** unto me a righteous branch
from the fruit of the loins of Joseph

Jacob 2:30

for if I will
—saith the Lord of Hosts—
raise up seed unto me
I will command my people

Ether 1:43

and there will I bless thee and thy seed
and **raise up** unto me of thy seed
and the seed of thy brother
and they which shall go with thee
a great nation

Ether 1:43

and there shall be none greater than the nation
which I will **raise up** unto me of thy seed
upon all the face of the earth

Several examples in the King James Bible also refer to the Lord's ability to raise up offspring:

Joshua 5:7

and their children *whom* he **raised up** in their stead
them Joshua circumcised

1 Chronicles 17:11

I will **raise up** thy seed after thee which shall be of thy sons

Matthew 3:9 (identical to Luke 3:8)

for I say unto you
that God is able of these stones to **raise up** children unto Abraham

But the emended text in 1 Nephi 7:1 refers to *they*, not the Lord, as raising up seed. Such usage is not found elsewhere in the Book of Mormon text, but it is found in the King James Bible in reference to a male being required to marry his brother's widow and father children in place of the dead brother:

Genesis 38:8

and Judah said unto Onan
go in unto thy brother's wife and marry her and **raise up** seed to thy brother

Deuteronomy 25:7

my husband's brother refuseth to **raise up** unto his brother a name in Israel
he will not perform the duty of my husband's brother

Ruth 4:5 (similarly, Ruth 4:10)

thou must buy *it* also of Ruth the Moabitess the wife of the dead
to **raise up** the name of the dead upon his inheritance

Matthew 22:24 (similarly, Mark 12:19 and Luke 20:28)

if a man die having no children
his brother shall marry his wife and **raise up** seed unto his brother

In each of these biblical passages, the crucial aspect centers on the male's role in physically producing offspring. Such a focus implies that in 1 Nephi 7:1, the antecedent for the subject pronoun *they* is actually "his sons". Thus if Oliver Cowdery's *they* is accepted, it should probably be interpreted as referring to the sons of Lehi rather than their wives or even all of them together as parents.

From a scribal point of view, we know that scribe 3 of \mathcal{O} tended to drop the subject pronoun *I* (see the discussion under 1 Nephi 5:8). If Oliver Cowdery's emendation here in 1 Nephi 7:1 is correct, then we would also have an example of scribe 3 dropping *they*. Nonetheless, we have no specific evidence elsewhere that this scribe tended to drop the subject pronoun *they*.

Since scribe 3 of \mathcal{O} sometimes dropped the *I*, we should briefly consider the possibility that *I* might have been the missing subject in 1 Nephi 7:1:

that it was not meet for him Lehi
that he should take his family into the wilderness alone
but that his sons should take daughters to wife
that **I** might raise up seed unto the Lord

We have already seen that this passage is an indirect quote (see the previous discussion regarding *saying* for this verse), so obviously any reading with *I* is impossible, no matter whether *I* refers to Lehi or Nephi. Nor will the pronouns *we* and *ye* work here because of the indirect quote. The pronoun *he* might work here if we take *Lehi* as the antecedent. But the emphasis is on getting wives for his sons; thus *they* does seem to be the most plausible subject pronoun, especially in light of the corresponding biblical passages referring to males raising up seed.

There is considerable internal evidence that some subject is missing in \mathcal{O} . Elsewhere in the Book of Mormon text, there are no examples of the relative pronoun *that* directly followed by the modal verb *might*, but there are numerous examples of the subordinate conjunction *that* followed by a pronoun and then *might*:

that I might	44 times
that thou mightest	6 times
that he might	76 times
that she might	1 time
that it might	5 times
that we might	25 times
that ye might	26 times
that they might	184 times
that there might	1 time

There are also 54 examples of nonpronominal subject noun phrases preceded by the subordinate conjunction *that* and followed by the modal verb *might*. Even if we consider the relative pronouns *which* and *who* (alternatives to the relative pronoun *that*), there are no occurrences directly followed by *might*. When compared with *which* and *who*, the relative pronoun *that* is fairly rare in the Book of Mormon, so the use in \mathcal{O} of *that* as a relative pronoun is highly unexpected. The subordinate conjunction *that*, on the other hand, is very common, especially in cases involving the conditional modal *might* (as shown by the statistics just listed).

Summary: Based on evidence from biblical usage, Oliver Cowdery’s emended *they* in 1 Nephi 7:1 should be accepted; usage elsewhere in the Book of Mormon strongly suggests that the reading in \mathcal{O} (“that might raise up seed”) is highly improbable.

■ 1 Nephi 7:2

*the Lord commanded him that I Nephi and my brethren
should again return [into 01 | unto ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] the land of Jerusalem*

Here the 1830 compositor accidentally set the preposition *into* as *unto*. All subsequent editions have continued to follow the 1830 reading.

The scribes occasionally mixed up *into* and *unto*. In the manuscripts, we have quite a few examples where the scribe initially wrote one of the prepositions but then changed the preposition to the other. Errors are found in both directions:

	<i>unto</i> > <i>into</i>	<i>into</i> > <i>unto</i>
ORIGINAL MANUSCRIPT		
Oliver Cowdery	3	2
scribe 3 of \mathcal{O}	1	0
PRINTER’S MANUSCRIPT		
Oliver Cowdery	7	1
scribe 2 of \mathcal{P}	1	6

Scribe 3 of \mathcal{O} wrote the text for 1 Nephi 7:2, and we do have one example of him mixing up the two prepositions:

1 Nephi 10:20 (scribe 3 of \mathcal{O})
 therefore remember O man
 for all thy doings thou shalt be brought
 [*unto* > % *into* 0 | *into* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST] judgment

When we examine the text as a whole, we find that when the discussion involves the movement of people into a land, any of the three prepositions *into*, *unto*, and *to* is possible. We have the following statistics for the earliest text of the Book of Mormon (which are compared with the King James Bible) for “the land of X”, where X is a proper name. We include in these statistics the one case here in 1 Nephi 7:2 of “into the land of Jerusalem”.

1 Nephi 7

	<i>into</i>	<i>unto</i>	<i>to</i>
KING JAMES BIBLE (totals)	39	9	6
BOOK OF MORMON (totals)	34	5	77
X = Ammonihah			1
Antionum	1		
Corihor			1
Cumorah		2	2
Egypt	1		
Gideon	1		2
Helam			1
Ishmael			6
Jashon			1
Jershon	4		1
Jerusalem	1	1	4
Joshua			1
Lehi			1
Lehi-Nephi			2
Manti	3		1
Melek	3		
Middoni	1		6
Midian			1
Moron		2	1
Moroni	3		1
Nephi	4		24
Noah			1
Sidom	1		
Siron	1		
Zarahemla	10		19

In the King James Bible, *into* dominates, while in the Book of Mormon *to* dominates, but in both texts all three prepositions (*into*, *unto*, and *to*) are possible. This multiplicity suggests that in each instance of this type we should let the earliest textual sources determine the appropriate preposition in the Book of Mormon text.

Semantically, the use of *unto* seems to imply a kind of permanent return to a land, while *into* can be temporary, especially with the verb *return*. There are three examples with “return unto”, and each definitely means ‘to return to live permanently’:

1 Nephi 7:7

and it came to pass that in the which rebellion
they were desirous to return **unto** the land of Jerusalem

1 Nephi 7:15
 if ye will return **unto** Jerusalem
 ye shall also perish with them

Helaman 7:3
 and they did reject all his words
 insomuch that he could not stay among them
 but returned again **unto** the land of his nativity

In the first two examples, Nephi refers to his brothers returning to live in Jerusalem; in the third example, a later prophet Nephi returns to reside once more in “the land of his nativity”. In 1 Nephi 7:2, on the other hand, Nephi and his brothers have been commanded to temporarily “return **into** the land of Jerusalem”.

Summary: Follow the earliest textual sources in determining the preposition for 1 Nephi 7:2 (“into the land of Jerusalem”).

■ 1 Nephi 7:5

*the Lord did soften the heart of Ishmael
 and also his [hole > hole hole 0 | household 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST]*

Scribe 3 of \mathcal{O} initially wrote *hole*, then inserted the same word (*hole*) above the line, so that the text reads “and also his hole hole”. When copying into \mathcal{P} , Oliver Cowdery interpreted this “hole hole” as the word *household*, which is one possible emendation.

From a semantic viewpoint, all other Book of Mormon instances of *household* involve a universal quantifier (11 times). There are ten cases in positive clauses where we find either *all* or *whole* as the universal quantifier:

all his household	1 Nephi 5:14, 2 Nephi 4:10, 2 Nephi 4:12, Alma 23:3, Ether 9:3, Ether 10:1, Ether 13:20, Ether 13:21
his whole household	Alma 22:23
all your household	Alma 34:21

In one case, the clause is negative, and there the universal quantifier is implicit:

Ether 13:22
 Coriantumr repented not
 neither his household

In other words, none of Coriantumr’s household repented. If *all* or *whole* were added to the negative construction (for instance, “Coriantumr repented not / neither his whole household”), the resulting scope of negation could imply that part of his household actually repented. So in order to semantically obtain the equivalent of a universal quantifier in Ether 13:22, no universal quantifier should be stated.

The example in Alma 22:23 (“his whole household”) suggests that the original phrase in 1 Nephi 7:5 was “and also his whole household”. The similarity in pronunciation for *whole* and *-hold* would explain the repetition of *hole* in the original manuscript (but not the missing *house*). When Joseph Smith read off the text for 1 Nephi 7:5, the final *d* of *household* may have been left unpronounced, or scribe 3 may simply have misheard it. In any case, scribe 3 ended up writing down *hole* for *-hold*. And the first *hole*, of course, is a homophone for *whole*.

David Calabro has suggested (personal communication) that scribe 3 may have intended to write *house* above the line but instead accidentally wrote *hole* and thus ended up creating a dittography (*hole hole*). Such an argument could be used in support of Oliver Cowdery’s conjecture (*household*). However, such a correction is inconsistent with what we know about all the scribal dittographies in both manuscripts. In the extant portions of \mathcal{O} , we have over 50 examples of dittography (including seven by scribe 3), while in \mathcal{P} there are over 100 examples. Yet all of these dittographies, it turns out, were written inline and never directly in the correction itself. In other words, dittographies tend to occur as a scribe initially writes down the text. But when errors are corrected, dittographies are unlikely simply because the scribe is concentrating on making the correction. Thus there is no independent manuscript evidence to support the proposal that *hole hole* is a dittography based on the *hold* in *household*. Rather, the most reasonable assumption is that scribe 3’s correction was an attempt to provide a second *hole*, in this case the word *whole*. Obviously some conjecture for 1 Nephi 7:5 is required since the phrase “hole hole” is impossible. The emendation “whole household” is consistent with usage elsewhere; it also more readily explains why scribe 3 ended up writing “hole hole” in \mathcal{O} .

Summary: In 1 Nephi 7:5, add *whole* to *household* to give the reading “and also his whole household”, which explains the text in \mathcal{O} and is consistent with the rest of Book of Mormon usage.

■ 1 Nephi 7:6

*behold Laman and Lemuel and two of the daughters of Ishmael
and the two sons of Ishmael and their families
did rebel against us yea against*

[*i o | I 1ABCDEFGHIJLNP | me > I F | me HKOQRST | I > me M*] *Nephi and Sam
and their father Ishmael and his wife and his three other daughters*

The original manuscript reads “against I Nephi”, even though the text just previously reads “against us” (not “against we”, which seems impossible). The nonstandard usage “against I Nephi” was corrected to “against me Nephi” in the first printing of the 1852 edition, but then the text was changed back to “against I Nephi” in the second printing (probably by reference to the 1840 edition). Finally, the standard “against me Nephi” was permanently implemented in the LDS text in the third printing (in 1907) of the 1905 Chicago edition. The RLDS text made this grammatical change in the 1953 edition.

Most likely, the source for the nonstandard “against I Nephi” is the prevalence of “I Nephi” over “me Nephi” in the text. Elsewhere in 1 and 2 Nephi, there are 87 occurrences of “I Nephi”

(all in subject position, of course). There are just so many exemplars of “I Nephi” that “against I Nephi” sounds acceptable, even if immediately preceded by “against us”. The highly expected “I Nephi” also explains why numerous editions were printed before editors permanently replaced the nonstandard phraseology.

Similar results are found for other names. For most other narrators in the Book of Mormon text (Mormon, Enos, Alma, and ten others), we only get the form *I*. Two names, however, show variance in accord with grammatical position:

“I Jacob” (16 times) versus “me Jacob” (3 times)
 “I Moroni” (17 times) versus “me Moroni” (1 time)

The subject forms clearly dominate.

In general, the critical text restores ungrammatical usage; thus the reading of the original manuscript (“against I Nephi”) should be followed here in 1 Nephi 7:6. For a complete listing of such nonstandard pronominal usage, see PRONOUNS in volume 3.

Summary: Restore the nonstandard usage “against I Nephi” in 1 Nephi 7:6.

■ 1 Nephi 7:7

and it came to pass

[*that* 0] 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST] *in the which rebellion*
they were desirous to return unto the land of Jerusalem

In his copying from \mathcal{O} to \mathcal{P} , Oliver Cowdery deleted the subordinate conjunction *that* here in 1 Nephi 7:7. With or without the *that*, the syntax is difficult. Based on its occurrence in the earliest textual source, the *that* should be restored.

There are many passages where either accidentally or through editing the subordinate conjunction *that* has been deleted after the phrase “and it came to pass”. There are also many examples where the *that* has been added. These changes are often idiosyncratic (as here in 1 Nephi 7:7). Particularly difficult cases will be discussed individually, but for a complete list see the general discussion under THAT in volume 3.

The use of “in the which” immediately followed by a noun occurs elsewhere in the text:

1 Nephi 5:5

but behold I have obtained a land of promise
in the which things I do rejoice

Alma 56:10

and I did join my two thousand sons
 —for they are worthy to be called sons—
 to the army of Antipus
in the which strength Antipus did rejoice exceedingly

Alma 61:8 (two times)

and he hath written unto the king of the Lamanites
in the which he hath joined an alliance with him
in the which alliance he hath agreed to maintain the city of Zarahemla
in the which maintenance he supposeth will enable the Lamanites
to conquer the remainder of the land

3 Nephi 4:4

that they might subsist for the space of seven years
in the which time they did hope to destroy the robbers
from off the face of the land

Ether 13:31

and Shared wounded Coriantumr in his thigh
that he did not go to battle again for the space of two years
in the which time all the people upon all the face of the land
were a shedding blood

All of these examples refer to a just-mentioned word or concept. In 1 Nephi 7:7, “in the which rebellion” refers back to the language in verse 6 (namely, “did rebel against us”).

Summary: In each instance of “it came to pass”, we follow the earliest textual sources in determining whether or not the subordinate conjunction *that* should immediately follow; here in 1 Nephi 7:7, the original manuscript has the *that*.

■ 1 Nephi 7:8

therefore I spake unto them saying

yea even unto Laman and [unto 0ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST | NULL > unto 1] Lemuel

The tendency in English is to not repeat identical items in conjuncts. Here the original text repeats the preposition *unto* (“unto Laman and unto Lemuel”). Oliver Cowdery, in copying from \mathcal{O} to \mathcal{P} , accidentally dropped the repeated preposition, but then he caught his error and supralinearly inserted the second *unto*. The text has numerous examples of the repeated preposition, plus considerable evidence of the difficulties in transmitting such repetition.

Prepositional repetition is characteristic of the biblical Hebrew and Greek and is therefore found throughout the King James Bible, a literal translation in this respect:

Exodus 6:3 (English *unto* = Hebrew *’el*)

and I appeared **unto** Abraham **unto** Isaac and **unto** Jacob

Revelation 1:11 (English *unto* = Greek *eis*)

and send *it* **unto** the seven churches which are in Asia
unto Ephesus and **unto** Smyrna and **unto** Pergamos and **unto** Thyatira
and **unto** Sardis and **unto** Philadelphia and **unto** Laodicea

Such multiple repetition of *unto* is characteristic of the Book of Mormon:

Mormon 7:7

to sing ceaseless praises with the choirs above

unto the Father and **unto** the Son and **unto** the Holy Ghost

Summary: Maintain the repetition of prepositions wherever supported by the earliest textual sources; such repetition is a characteristic of the biblical style but not of standard English.

■ 1 Nephi 7:8

therefore I spake unto them saying

—yea even unto Laman and unto Lemuel—

behold [thou art 01ABDE | ye are CGHIJKLMNOPQRST | thou art > ye are F] mine elder brethren

As already noted under 1 Nephi 3:29, there are a few places in the original text where the historically singular second person pronoun *thou* (or *thee*) is used to directly refer to more than one individual (such as “Laman and Lemuel” and “mine elder brethren” here in 1 Nephi 7:8). Such instances have been consistently edited out of the text (in this case, in the 1840 edition, presumably by Joseph Smith).

Such mixtures of singular *thou* and plural nouns within the same clause are not found in the King James Bible. The biblical style deriving from Early Modern English permits the use of the historically plural second person pronoun *ye* and *you* for singular referents, but not *thou* and *thee* for plural referents. In the original Book of Mormon text, this occasional use of the second person singular pronouns for plurals suggests that *thou* (and *thee*, *thine*, and *thy*) can be used for either singular or plural. Its more generalized usage in the Book of Mormon seems to be an indicator of the biblical style. Such examples like “thou art” here in 1 Nephi 7:8 will be restored whenever there is support from the earliest textual sources. See the discussion under THOU in volume 3.

Summary: Restore in 1 Nephi 7:8 the historically singular “thou art” even though it is used with the plurals “Laman and Lemuel” and “mine elder brethren”.

■ 1 Nephi 7:11

yea and how is it that

ye have [forgotten 0ABCDEFGHIJKLMNPOQRST | forgot >+ forgotten 1]

how great things the Lord hath done for us

When copying from \mathcal{O} to \mathcal{P} , Oliver Cowdery initially wrote the past participle *forgotten* as *forgot*, the simple past-tense form of the verb *forget*. In this instance, Oliver is responsible for the change, but he later caught his error and corrected *forgot* to the standard *forgotten*. The correction is supralinear and is written with a sharper quill, and the ink flow is darker. Perhaps Oliver made his correction when he was proofing \mathcal{P} against \mathcal{O} . Or maybe his change represents later editing that just happens to agree with \mathcal{O} . In either case, \mathcal{O} reads *forgotten*.

Usually the text has *forgotten* for the past participle (ten times), but in Alma 60:20 there are three occurrences where the simple past-tense form *forгат* (soon altered to *forgot*) was used as the past participial form instead of the standard *forgotten*. For discussion, see Alma 60:20 as well as PAST PARTICIPLE in volume 3.

Summary: Based on the earliest textual sources, the standard past participle *forgotten* in 1 Nephi 7:11 should be maintained.

■ 1 Nephi 7:11

yea and how is it that ye have forgotten

[*how* 0A | *how* >js *what* 1 | *what* BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *great things*

the Lord hath done for us

In his editing for the 1837 edition, Joseph Smith changed two cases of the archaic “how great things” to “what great things”—here in 1 Nephi 7:11 and in the title page. But six later occurrences in the text have been left unedited. For complete discussion, see under the second paragraph of the title page.

Summary: Maintain the earliest textual reading of “how great things” in 1 Nephi 7:11.

■ 1 Nephi 7:12–13

wherefore let us be faithful [in 0A | in >js to 1 | to BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] him

and if it so be that we are faithful [in 0A | in >js to 1 | to BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] him

we shall obtain the land of promise

Here the original text twice read “faithful in him”, where *him* refers to the Lord. For the 1837 edition, Joseph Smith edited the preposition *in* to *to*, which is what we expect in modern English. Nonetheless, Moroni 9:25 has retained the expression (“be faithful **in** Christ”). The same expression is also found in one of the witness statements:

three-witness statement

and we know that if we are faithful **in** Christ

we shall rid our garments of the blood of all men

Similarly, the King James Bible has an example using the preposition *in* for this expression:

1 Corinthians 4:17

for this cause have I sent unto you Timotheus

who is my beloved son and faithful **in** the Lord

There are no other examples in the Book of Mormon of “faithful **to** the Lord” except for these two edited examples in 1 Nephi 7:12–13. There are, however, examples of *faithful* taking the archaic preposition *unto* rather than the modern *to*:

Alma 44:4

God will support and keep and preserve us
so long as we are **faithful unto** him

Alma 48:7

Moroni on the other hand had been a preparing the minds of the people
to be **faithful unto** the Lord their God

Ether 1:38

let us be **faithful unto** the Lord

Ether 8:13

will ye swear unto me that ye will be **faithful unto** me
in the thing which I shall desire of you

All of these passages refer to one's faithfulness to someone, yet the preposition is either *in* or *unto* but not *to*. Thus the critical text will restore the two uses of *in* in 1 Nephi 7:12–13.

Summary: Restore the phrase “faithful in him” both times in 1 Nephi 7:12–13 since the earliest textual sources read this way; similar (but unedited) examples of “faithful in X” (where X is a person) are found in both the Book of Mormon and the King James Bible.

■ 1 Nephi 7:14

for behold the Spirit of the Lord

[*ceathes* > *ceases* 0 | *ceaseth* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST] *soon to strive with them*

Scribe 3 of \mathcal{O} initially wrote the impossible *ceathes*, then immediately corrected it to *ceases*. But Oliver Cowdery, in copying from \mathcal{O} into \mathcal{P} , wrote *ceaseth*. There is good evidence that Oliver's interpretation is correct, rather than the other possibility, *ceases*. Scribe 3 probably heard the *th* at the end of the word, which resulted in his metathesized spelling *ceathes* instead of *ceaseth*. When he corrected his mixed-up spelling, he overwrote the *th* to *s* (with heavier ink flow) but neglected to change the final *s* to *th*. It is also possible that Joseph Smith found it difficult to dictate “ceaseth soon” to his scribe. This pronunciation difficulty (a real tongue twister) could have contributed to the confusion.

Usage elsewhere in the text supports the choice of *ceaseth*; in fact, there are no examples of *ceases* elsewhere in the text, only *ceaseth*. And the first of these examples expresses the same idea as 1 Nephi 7:14:

2 Nephi 26:11

and when the Spirit **ceaseth** to strive with man then cometh speedy destruction

Alma 42:23

but God **ceaseth** not to be God

Mormon 9:19

and he **ceaseth** not to be God

Mormon 9:20

and the reason why he **ceaseth** to do miracles among the children of men
is because that they dwindle in unbelief

Summary: Even though 1 Nephi 7:14 ultimately reads *ceases* in the original manuscript, it was originally written as *ceathes*, which implies that the intended reading was *ceaseth*; this form is the one used consistently elsewhere in the text.

■ 1 Nephi 7:15

*and now if ye have choice
go up to the land and remember the words which I speak unto you
that if ye go / ye will also perish*

The reader might be confused over the meaning of “if ye have choice”. It doesn’t seem reasonable to interpret the subordinate clause literally. Nephi isn’t really asking whether Laman and Lemuel and the others have a choice. They apparently have their agency and could return if they wanted to. One possible way to interpret the conditional clause would be to replace the *if* with *since* (“and now since ye have choice / go up to the land”). A more plausible equivalence in modern English would be to replace *have choice* with the verb *choose*: “and now if ye choose / go up to the land”. In other words, the meaning is something like ‘and now if you wish / go up to the land’.

Summary: The expression “if ye have choice” is apparently idiomatic and is equivalent to the modern English “if you choose”, meaning ‘if you wish’.

■ 1 Nephi 7:17

*O Lord
according to my faith which is in [§3 me >- §1 thee 0| thee 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST]
wilt thou deliver me from the hands of my brethren*

Scribe 3 of \mathcal{O} wrote “according to my faith which is in me”, an apparent redundancy that Oliver Cowdery emended in the original manuscript by crossing out the *me* and inserting *thee* supralinearly (and with considerably weaker ink flow). Such emendations in \mathcal{O} by another scribe are always secondary, but nonetheless there is the distinct possibility that scribe 3 wrote down the text incorrectly. The phonetic similarity between *thee* and *me*, plus the potential influence of the following *me* (“wilt thou deliver me”), might have caused scribe 3 to write down “which is in me” rather than “which is in thee”.

There are parallel uses elsewhere in the text in support of Oliver Cowdery’s emendation. First consider cases that refer to faith in the Lord:

Mosiah 4:3

and having peace of conscience
because of the exceeding **faith** which they had **in Jesus Christ**

Alma 14:26

O Lord give us strength according to our **faith** which is **in Christ**

Alma 14:28

for the Lord had granted unto them power
according to their **faith** which was **in Christ**

Alma 15:10

O Lord our God have mercy on this man and heal him
according to his **faith** which is **in Christ**

Alma 18:35

and a portion of that Spirit dwelleth in me
which giveth me knowledge and also power
according to my **faith** and desires which is **in God**

In addition to these examples that refer to faith in the Lord, the text can also refer to someone's faith as "the faith which is in someone":

Alma 61:17

and we will go speedily against those dissenters in the strength of our God
according to the **faith** which is **in us**

Notice, however, that this example does not have the redundancy found in the earliest text for 1 Nephi 7:17—that is, the determiner before *faith* is *the*, not *our*. This example suggests another possible emendation for 1 Nephi 7:17—namely, the original text there may have read "**the** faith which is in **me**", but somehow the scribe accidentally replaced the definite article *the* with *my*.

Despite these arguments in favor of emending "my faith which is in me", we do find a few passages in which the Book of Mormon has redundancies similar to the one that scribe 3 of \mathcal{C} originally wrote in 1 Nephi 7:17:

2 Nephi 5:24

and because of **their** cursing which was upon **them**
they did become an idle people

Mormon 6:10

and it came to pass that my men were hewn down
yea or even **my** ten thousand which were with **me**

Ether 2:15

and the brother of Jared repented him of the evil which he had done
and did call upon the name of the Lord for **his** brethren which were with **him**

In all of these examples, we expect the definite article *the* instead of a possessive pronoun like *their*, *my*, or *his*—thus in the first case, "because of **the** cursing which was upon them". In the second case, Mormon has only ten thousand men assigned to him. The following five verses (Mormon 6:11–15) indicate that there were 23 Nephite military leaders at Cumorah, each of which had ten thousand men under his command. Mormon has no additional allotment of ten thousand men. In the third case, the brother of Jared has no other brethren besides those who are with him. Thus the subsequent text refers to these men as simply "his brethren" (that is, without

any relative clause modification): “I will forgive thee and **thy brethren** of their sins” (Ether 2:15) and “the brother of Jared did go to work and also **his brethren**” (Ether 2:16).

From a communicative perspective, the last two examples differ somewhat from the example in 1 Nephi 7:17. In both of these cases, the relative clause could be considered nonrestrictive rather than restrictive, which would mean that the relative clause acts more as an added explanation and could therefore be paraphrased as follows:

Mormon 6:10

and it came to pass that my men were hewn down
yea or even my ten thousand
that is—those which were with me

Ether 2:15

and the brother of Jared repented him of the evil which he had done
and did call upon the name of the Lord for his brethren
that is—those which were with him

The current text also has one further example of this redundancy (“**his** promise which **he** made”), but the original manuscript shows that this reading is actually an error for “**this** promise which he made”:

Alma 51:10

but behold we shall see that
[*this* 0 | *his* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST] promise which he made was rash

In any event, Alma 61:17 shows that we can talk about “the faith which is in someone”. And 2 Nephi 5:24, Mormon 6:10, and Ether 2:15 (but not Alma 51:10) show that redundancies can occur in these kinds of expressions. Since the original reading in 1 Nephi 7:17 is therefore possible, the critical text will restore the earliest text (“**my** faith which is in **me**”), even though the earliest text could well be an error for either “**the** faith which is in **me**” or “**my** faith which is in **thee**”.

Summary: Maintain the earliest textual reading for 1 Nephi 7:17 (“**my** faith which is in **me**”), despite the redundancy of the pronominal forms in this passage; such redundancies do occasionally occur elsewhere in the text; one possible emendation is Oliver Cowdery’s (“**my** faith which is in **thee**”); yet another is “**the** faith which is in **me**” (following the pattern of Alma 61:17).

■ 1 Nephi 7:19

*and it came to pass that they were angry with me again
and sought to lay hands upon me*

Here we have an example of uniqueness in the text: only in 1 Nephi 7:19 do we have the phrase “to lay hands (up)on someone” (with the meaning ‘to grab someone with the intent to harm or control’). Everywhere else the text includes a possessive pronoun before *hands*:

to lay their hands (up)on someone	16 times
to lay your hands (up)on someone	2 times

We are always going to find examples of unique expressions in the text, and we need to resist the temptation to eliminate their uniqueness (unless of course there is something demonstrably wrong with a particular unique expression). Here in 1 Nephi 7:19, it is theoretically possible that the original text itself read “and sought to lay their hands upon me”. One could argue for this emendation since similar usage in the text follows this pattern, including the following examples from 1 Nephi:

1 Nephi 7:16

and it came to pass that they did lay **their** hands upon me

1 Nephi 17:48

and as they came forth to lay **their** hands upon me

I spake unto them saying . . .

1 Nephi 17:48

and whoso shall lay [*their* 01ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPS | *his* RT] hands upon me
shall wither even as a dried reed

1 Nephi 17:52

neither durst they lay **their** hands upon me nor touch me with their fingers

Although “lay hands” occurs only once in the Book of Mormon text, it is common in the King James Bible:

to lay **their** hands (up)on someone 3 times

to lay hands (up)on someone 13 times

In fact, when preceded by the verb *seek* (as here in 1 Nephi 7:19), similar examples in the King James Bible have only “lay hands”:

Matthew 21:46

but when they sought to **lay hands** on him they feared the multitude

Luke 20:19

and the chief priests and the scribes the same hour sought to **lay hands** on him

Of course, the commonness of this expression without the possessive pronoun could have led scribe 3 of \mathcal{C} to accidentally drop the *their* in 1 Nephi 7:19.

There are two similar examples involving the verb *seek* in the Book of Mormon:

Alma 9:32

and also because I said unto them that they were a lost and a fallen people
they was angry with me and **sought** to lay

[NULL > *their* 1 | *their* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST] hands upon me

Helaman 10:15

therefore they did revile against him and did **seek** to lay **their** hands upon him

The first example is interesting because it shows scribe 2 of \mathcal{P} initially writing the text without the *their*, but then immediately inserting it. Undoubtedly the original manuscript for Alma 9:32 had the *their*. One could view the temporary loss of the *their* in \mathcal{P} as evidence of the scribes’ tendency

to drop the *their* in the expression “lay their hands upon someone”. On the other hand, we have no specific evidence that scribe 3 of \mathcal{O} tended to drop possessive pronouns.

Once more we have an example (namely, here in 1 Nephi 7:19) where there may be an early error in the transmission, but we cannot be sure. In order to keep some control over emendation, we generally accept the earliest textual reading as the original reading unless (1) there is something clearly wrong with that reading, and (2) we can reasonably explain that reading as an error in transmission. But there is nothing at all wrong with having 1 Nephi 7:19 read as simply “lay hands”.

Summary: Retain the unique phraseology “lay hands” in the original manuscript for 1 Nephi 7:19 since there is nothing wrong with it, even though it may be a scribal error for “lay their hands”.

■ 1 Nephi 7:20

*insomuch that they did bow down before me and did plead with me
that I would forgive them of the thing
that they [had 01ABCDGHIJKLMNOPQRST | EFI] done against me*

In the 1849 LDS edition, the typesetter accidentally dropped the perfect auxiliary *had*, which created the dialectal past-tense expression “they done”. This nonstandard use of *done* for *did* can be found ten times in the original text (such as “this he done” in Jacob 7:2), and in one of these cases (in Ether 9:29) the nonstandard *done* was retained for some time after Joseph Smith’s editing of the text for the 1837 and 1840 editions. Thus it is not surprising that here in 1 Nephi 7:20 the subsequent 1852 and 1879 LDS editions continued using “they done”. For further discussion of the simple past-tense form *done*, see under PAST TENSE in volume 3.

Summary: Based on the earliest textual sources, the standard “they had done” for 1 Nephi 7:20 should be maintained instead of the dialectal “they done” that was accidentally introduced into the 1849 edition.

■ 1 Nephi 7:20

*insomuch that they did bow down before me and did plead with me
that I would forgive them of the thing
that they had done against [§3 NULL >- §1 me 0 | me 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNORST]*

Here the object of the preposition *against* was originally lacking in \mathcal{O} . Scribe 3 of \mathcal{O} seems to have accidentally omitted the expected *me*, which Oliver Cowdery himself provided in the original manuscript (again with weak ink flow, just like his correction of *me* to *thee* in verse 17). Oliver’s emendation here is probably correct since *against* never occurs in the Book of Mormon text without an object.

But there is one other possibility: perhaps scribe 3 of \mathcal{O} accidentally added the preposition *against*, but then forgot to cross it out. In other words, the original text may have actually read “that I would forgive them of the thing that they had done”. Note especially the language of the very next verse:

1 Nephi 7:21

and it came to pass that I did frankly forgive them all that they had done

More generally, there are no other cases in the text with the phraseology “to do something **against** someone”. Instead, the text uses either the preposition *to* or *unto*:

Mosiah 19:24

and they told Gideon what they **had done to** the king

Mosiah 27:35

and after they had traveled throughout all the land of Zarahemla
and among all the people which was under the reign of king Mosiah
zealously striving to repair all the injuries
which they **had done to** the church . . .

Ether 9:8

and he was angry with his father
because of that which his father **had done unto** his brother

There is also evidence that scribe 3 of \mathcal{C} occasionally neglected to properly cross out extra words. We have the following examples involving dittography:

1 Nephi 7:1 (scribe 3 crossed out *in the land* instead of *in the lord*)

that they might raise up seed unto the Lord
[*in the lord* 0 | 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST]
[*in the land* > NULL 0 | *in the land* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST | *in the Land* c]
of promise

1 Nephi 7:22 (extra verb *offer* not crossed out)

and they did
[*give thanks* >% *offer sacrifice* 0 | *offer sacrifice* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST]
and [*offer* 0 | 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST] burnt offerings unto him

1 Nephi 12:1 (*the land* accidentally repeated)

and I looked and beheld
[*the land* 0 | *the band* > NULL 1 | ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST]
the land of promise

(For the last two examples, see the discussion under those verses.) And we also have one specific example where Oliver Cowdery accidentally wrote *against*, but then corrected it to the right preposition:

2 Nephi 1:17

lest the Lord your God should come out in the fullness of his wrath
[*upon you* 0ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST | *against* > *upon you* 1]

Of course, scribe 3 of \mathcal{C} did not make this error, but it does show there was a scribal tendency to add the semantically expected *against*.

Ultimately, however, it is probably best to assume that scribe 3 of \mathcal{C} forgot to add the *me* rather than to cross out the word *against*. We have already seen that scribe 3 often skipped the subject pronoun *I* (see 1 Nephi 5:8 for a list), so the loss of the object pronoun *me* would be

similar. Even more important is the following scribal error made by scribe 3 of \mathcal{C} . In this example, he momentarily omitted the object pronoun *me* from the prepositional phrase “unto me”:

1 Nephi 11:32
 and it came to pass that the angel spake
 unto [NULL > *me* 0 | *me* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST] again
 saying . . .

Thus we have explicit independent evidence that scribe 3 of \mathcal{C} could make errors like “they had done against”.

Semantically, the use of *against* is also important in emphasizing a clear distinction between verses 20 and 21 in 1 Nephi 7. In verse 20 we have the singular “thing that they had done against me”, but in verse 21 we have the more general “all that they had done”. The rebellious brothers had tied up Nephi and were intending to leave him to die in the wilderness. So in verse 20, they ask Nephi for forgiveness for that one specific act, which was clearly against Nephi alone. But in verse 21, Nephi forgives them of all their rebellious acts (“all that they had done”). Thus the use of “against me” in verse 20 is clearly appropriate.

Summary: Accept Oliver Cowdery’s emended “against me” in 1 Nephi 7:20 since everywhere else in the text *against* is followed by a noun complement; the use of the preposition *against* is clearly appropriate in verse 20, even though there are no other examples in the Book of Mormon of “to do something **against** someone”.

■ 1 Nephi 7:21

we did again travel on our journey
 [toward 01ABCPS | towards DEFGHIJKLMNOQRT] *the tent of our father*

As discussed under 1 Nephi 5:22, scribe 3 of \mathcal{C} frequently writes *toward* instead of the textually more common *towards*. We follow here the reading of the earliest textual source, which has *toward*. For a summary of the evidence, see TOWARDS in volume 3.

■ 1 Nephi 7:22

they did give thanks unto the Lord their God
and they did [give thanks >% offer sacrifice 0 | offer sacrifice 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST]
and [offer 0 | 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST] *burnt offerings unto him*

Scribe 3 of \mathcal{C} initially wrote “and they did give thanks and offer burnt offerings” before realizing that he had repeated part of the previous clause (“they did give thanks unto the Lord their God”) and skipped over part of the text (“sacrifice and”). A tapering off of the ink flow for *offerings* (spelled as *ofrings*) suggests that scribe 3 quit at that point to make a messy correction of his conflated text. He first erased the repeated “give thanks” (with considerable smearing) and then overwrote it with “offer sacrifice”. The problem here is that he apparently neglected to delete the now-repeated verb *offer*. When Oliver Cowdery copied the text into \mathcal{P} , he removed the second *offer*.

Elsewhere the text uses this same conjunctive expression but without repeating the verb *offer*. Each of the following is especially similar to 1 Nephi 7:22:

1 Nephi 5:9

they did rejoice exceedingly
and **did offer sacrifice and burnt offerings** unto the Lord
and they gave thanks unto the God of Israel

Mosiah 2:3–4

and they also took of the firstlings of their flocks
that they **might offer sacrifice and burnt offerings** according to the law of Moses
and also that they might give thanks to the Lord their God

Both examples have the exact same conjunct “offer sacrifice and burnt offerings” after a helping verb (either *did* or *might*). In fact, both also refer to giving thanks to the Lord, although not in the same order as 1 Nephi 7:22.

There is considerable internal evidence that scribe 3’s repeated *offer* in “they did offer sacrifice and offer burnt offerings” is highly unexpected. To be sure, there exist examples of the past-tense auxiliary verb *did* followed by conjoined predicates with direct objects, but the conjoined verbs are never identical:

Mosiah 27:7

and the Lord **did visit** them and **prosper** them

Alma 1:20

yea they **did persecute** them and **afflict** them with all manner of words

Alma 50:35

a battle commenced between them
in the which Teancum **did slay** Morionton and **defeat** his army

Helaman 1:24

and in this manner they **did fall upon** them and **cut** them **down** to the earth

3 Nephi 9:11

I **did send down** fire and **destroy** them

3 Nephi 26:13

and after that he did shew himself unto them oft
and **did break** bread oft and **bless** it and **give** it unto them

4 Nephi 1:5

they **did heal** the sick and **raise** the dead and **cause** the lame to walk

Mormon 2:14

but they **did curse** God and **wish** to die

Mormon 4:15

they **did beat** again the Lamanites and **drive** them **out** of their lands

Ether 2:2

and they **did** also **lay** snares and **catch** fowls of the air

Ether 11:18

he **did overthrow** Moron and **obtain** the kingdom

There are also quite a few examples in the King James Bible of offering sacrifices and burnt offerings. One example has virtually the same wording as the Book of Mormon’s “offer sacrifice and burnt offerings”:

2 Kings 10:24

and when they went in to **offer sacrifices and burnt offerings**

Jehu appointed fourscore men without and said . . .

All other scriptural expressions conjoining *sacrifice(s)* and *burnt offerings* parallel the emended text in 1 Nephi 7:22—that is, without repeating the verb *offer*.

There is only one King James passage in which the verb *offer* is repeated, but in this instance two finite verb forms (each in the simple past tense) are conjoined. Nor does any conjunct use the word *sacrifice*, but instead two different types of offerings are conjoined, with the result that the noun *offerings* is also repeated:

1 Kings 3:15

and he came to Jerusalem

and stood before the ark of the covenant of the LORD

and **offered up** burnt offeringsand **offered** peace offerings

and made a feast to all his servants

Yet the parallelism here is misleading. In the Hebrew, the two verbs for *offered* are completely different words, as are also the two nouns acting as direct objects (*burnt offerings* and *peace offerings*). The second *offered* corresponds to the basic Hebrew verb ‘to make’; thus the Hebrew underlying the King James reading “and offered peace offerings” can be literally translated as “and he made peace offerings”. In other words, in the Hebrew this second *offered* does not parallel the first *offered*, but instead parallels the verb *made* in the final clause (literally translated as “and he made a feast to all his servants”). Finally, we should note that the King James Bible translates this passage as a conjoining of five predicates, but in the Hebrew we have a conjoining of five complete sentences:

1 Kings 3:15 (literally translated from the Hebrew)

and he came to Jerusalem

and he stood before the ark of the covenant of the LORD

and he offered up burnt offerings

and he made peace offerings

and he made a feast to all his servants

Summary: The critical text will maintain Oliver Cowdery’s emendation that removed the repeated nonfinite verb form *offer* in 1 Nephi 7:22; it appears that scribe 3 of \mathcal{O} failed to delete the second *offer* when he tried to correct what he had initially written down; other passages in the Book of Mormon uniformly support the reading in \mathcal{D} (“they did offer sacrifice and burnt offerings unto him”).

1 Nephi 8

■ 1 Nephi 8:1

*we had gathered together all manner of seeds of every kind
both of grain [01ACGHIJKLMNOPQRST | and BDE | and > NULL F] of every kind
and also of the seeds of fruits of every kind*

The 1837 edition accidentally added an extra *and* in this conjunctive phrase headed by *both*. This reading was followed by the first three LDS British editions (1841, 1849, and 1852) until corrected in the second printing of the 1852 edition (probably by reference to the 1840 edition, which had correctly removed the intrusive *and*). Obviously, the people of Lehi took with them both grain and fruit seeds for planting.

Parallelism requires that the modifying phrase “of every kind” be attached to both “grain” and “the seeds of fruits”:

1 Nephi 8:1
both **of** grain **of every kind**
and also **of** the seeds of fruits **of every kind**

Thus the intrusive *and* is wholly inappropriate. Such cases of parallelism occur whenever the conjunctive phrase is of the form “both . . . and also”:

1 Nephi 13:42
both **unto** the Jews
and also **unto** the Gentiles

Helaman 16:15
both **of** the Nephites
and also **of** the Lamanites

Mormon 2:8
both **on the part of** the Nephites
and also **on the part of** the Lamanites

Summary: Maintain the original parallelism in 1 Nephi 8:1 (“both of grain of every kind and also of the seeds of fruits of every kind”).

■ 1 Nephi 8:1

*we had gathered together all manner of seeds of every kind
both of grain of every kind and also of the seeds
of [fruits 01ABDEPS | fruit CGHIJKLMNOQRT | fruits > fruit F] of every kind*

The earliest textual sources here have the plural *fruits*, which is unexpected in standard English. The 1840 edition replaced the plural with the singular *fruit*. Currently, the LDS text has the singular (introduced in the second printing of the 1852 edition, probably by reference to the 1840 edition). In the 1908 edition, the RLDS text restored the original plural by reference to the printer's manuscript.

Elsewhere the Book of Mormon has a number of occurrences of the plural *fruits*, which suggests that the 1840 change in 1 Nephi 8:1 may have been accidental:

1 Nephi 15:36

and also from that tree of life
whose fruit is most precious and most desirable
of all other [*fruits* 01ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST | *fruit* J]

1 Nephi 18:6

we had prepared all things
much **fruits** and meat from the wilderness

Mosiah 9:9

and we began to till the ground
yea even with all manner of seeds
with seeds of corn and of wheat and of barley
and with neas and with sheum
and with seeds of all manner of **fruits**

Thus there is nothing wrong with the original plural *fruits* in 1 Nephi 8:1.

Summary: In 1 Nephi 8:1, the original text had the plural *fruits*; such plural usage occurs elsewhere in the text.

■ 1 Nephi 8:4

for behold

[*me thot >% me thaught 0 | I thought >% me thought 1 | me thought ABC | me-thought D |
methought EFGHIJKLMNQRST*]
[NULL > i 0 | I 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST] *saw a dark and dreary wilderness*

The archaic *methought* initially caused some confusion for Oliver Cowdery as he copied from \mathcal{O} into \mathcal{P} . In place of *methought*, he initially wrote the modern English “I thought”, but he immediately caught his error. All the printed editions have retained the archaic usage. There is one other use of *methought* in the text:

Alma 36:22

yea and **methought** I saw even as our father Lehi saw
God sitting upon his throne
surrounded with numberless concourses of angels
in the attitude of singing and praising their God

These occurrences in 1 Nephi 8:4 and Alma 36:22 involve the same phraseology (“methought I saw”). Elsewhere the Book of Mormon text uses only the normal subject pronoun form *I* with *thought* (or *think*):

1 Nephi 4:15

yea and **I** also **thought** that
they could not keep the commandments of the Lord

Alma 36:15

O **thought I** that I could be banished
and become extinct both soul and body

Alma 36:19

and now behold when **I thought** this
I could remember my pains no more

The archaic words *methinks*, *methinketh*, and *methought* (deriving from Old English) were occasionally still used in the 1800s, although not in normal spoken English:

Alfred, Lord Tennyson (1832)

At last **methought** that I had wander'd far In an old wood.

Nathaniel Hawthorne (1863)

Methinks a person of delicate individuality . . .
could never endure to lie buried near Shakespeare.

This usage was much more prevalent in Early Modern English:

Shakespeare, *Much Ado About Nothing* (1599)

Methinkes you are sadder.

King James Bible, 2 Samuel 18:27 (1611, original accidentals)

Mee thinketh the running of the foremost is
like the running of Ahimaaz the sonne of Zadok.

See the Oxford English Dictionary under *methinks* for additional citations.

Summary: Retain the archaic *methought*, which is found only twice in the Book of Mormon (1 Nephi 8:4 and Alma 36:22).

■ 1 Nephi 8:4

for behold methought I saw

[0A | NULL >js *in my dream* 1 | *in my dream* BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]

a dark and dreary wilderness

In the first part of the text, Joseph Smith’s editing for the 1837 edition often involves clarification, such as here where he added the phrase “in my dream”. Nonetheless, the previous text has already made it very clear that everything Lehi saw was in his dream or vision:

1 Nephi 8:2

behold I have dreamed a dream

or in other words I have seen a vision

Thus there is no overwhelming need to add “in my dream” two verses later.

Summary: Remove the unnecessary textual clarification “in my dream” from 1 Nephi 8:4.

■ 1 Nephi 8:7

and it came to pass that as I followed him

[*and after i had followed him* 0 | & *after I had followed him* >js NULL 1 |

and after I had followed him A | BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]

I beheld myself that I was in a dark and dreary waste

Here the earliest textual sources create a stranded subordinate clause (“as I followed him”). In order to correct the resulting fragment, Joseph Smith (in his editing for the 1837 edition) deleted the following “and after I had followed him”. A more simple revision would have been to delete the subordinate conjunction *as*, thus giving:

and it came to pass that I followed him

and after I had followed him

I beheld myself that I was in a dark and dreary waste

By deleting a single word (*as*), the following *after*-clause works perfectly well. Of course, this revision suggests that perhaps the *as* was not in the original text but instead was mistakenly added by Joseph Smith as he dictated the text or by scribe 3 of \mathcal{O} as he wrote down the text.

In a number of places the original text has an *as*-clause that is either too long or seems incomplete; in these cases the printed editions have typically removed the subordinate conjunction *as*, thus creating an independent clause and eliminating the fragment:

Enos 1:26 (1920 deletion)

and [*as* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPS | RT] I saw

that I must soon go down to my grave

having been wrought upon by the power of God

that I must preach and prophesy unto this people . . .

Mosiah 2:11 (1920 deletion)

yet [*as* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPS | RT] I have been chosen by this people
and was consecrated by my father
and was suffered by the hand of the Lord that I should be a ruler . . .

Mosiah 23:12 (Joseph Smith's editing for the 1837 edition)

and now I say unto you
[*as* >js NULL 1 | As A | BCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST] you have been oppressed
by king Noah
and have been in bondage to him and his priests
and have been brought into iniquity by them
therefore ye were bound with the bands of iniquity

Alma 3:18 (1830 deletion)

nevertheless [*as* 1 | ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST] they had come out
in open rebellion against God
therefore it was expedient that the curse should fall upon them

Alma 5:47 (1852 deletion)

and moreover I say unto you that
[*as* 1ABCDEFGHIKPS | FIJLMNOQRT] it has thus been revealed unto me
that the words which have been spoken by our fathers are true
even so according to the spirit of prophecy which is in me
which is also by the manifestation of the Spirit of God . . .

Alma 62:27 (1830 deletion)

now it came to pass that
[*as* 1 | ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST] many of the Lamanites that were prisoners
were desirous to join the people of Ammon and become a free people . . .

Helaman 7:10–11 (1830 deletion during proofing)

therefore [*as* 1 | ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST] Nephi had bowed himself
upon the tower which was in his garden
which was also near unto the garden gate which led by the highway
and it came to pass that there was certain men passing by and saw Nephi
as he was a pouring out his soul unto God upon the tower

In these examples, the subordinate conjunction *as* has two possible meanings, either 'as a result of' (equivalent to *because* or *since*) or 'at some time or during some time' (equivalent to *when* or *while*). In our original example in 1 Nephi 8:7, the *as* has the meaning of *while*, as do the two uses of *as* in Helaman 7:10–11.

In a couple of places in the manuscripts, Oliver Cowdery himself edited out an extra *as*:

Alma 44:12 (Oliver Cowdery's emendation in both \mathcal{G} and \mathcal{P})

but **as** he raised his sword
behold one of Moroni's soldiers smote it even to the earth
and [*as* >+ NULL 01 | ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST] it brake by the hilt
and he also smote Zerahemnah that he took off his scalp

Alma 57:3 (Oliver Cowdery's emendation in \mathcal{C})

and [*as* >+ NULL 0 | 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST] Ammoron refused
mine epistle
for he would not exchange prisoners
therefore we began to make preparations to go against the city of Antiparah

In the second of these two cases (Alma 57:3), the *as* actually works (with the meaning of the word *since*), and so Oliver Cowdery's deletion was unnecessary. But in the first case (Alma 44:12), the *as* seems completely extraneous. Note in particular that the passage begins with an *as*-clause ("but as he raised his sword"), which may have been the source for accidentally adding a second *as*, yet this second *as* doesn't have the meaning of either *since* or *when*. The awkwardness of this extra *as* was probably the reason Oliver Cowdery deleted it from both manuscripts. (For further discussion, see under Alma 44:12.)

We find considerable evidence that an *as*-clause can follow "it came to pass (that)", as in the following example:

1 Nephi 7:6

and it came to pass that **as** we journeyed in the wilderness
behold Laman and Lemuel . . . did rebel against us

There are 26 other examples of this construction in the original text. In nearly all these cases, the *as* has the meaning of *while* or *when* because "it came to pass" deals with time.

We also have various examples like 1 Nephi 8:7 that immediately restate the previous clause within a subsequent *after*-clause, as in these examples from 1 Nephi:

1 Nephi 7:22

and it came to pass that we did come down unto the tent of our father
and after that I and my brethren and all the house of Ishmael
had come down unto the tent of my father
they did give thanks unto the Lord their God

1 Nephi 11:19

and it came to pass that I beheld that she was carried away in the Spirit
and after that she had been carried away in the Spirit for the space of a time
the angel spake unto me saying . . .

1 Nephi 16:18

and it came to pass that as I Nephi went forth to slay food
behold I did break my bow which was made of fine steel
and after that I did break my bow
behold my brethren were angry with me

1 Nephi 17:11

and it came to pass that I Nephi did make bellowses
wherewith to blow the fire
of the skins of beasts
and after that I had made bellowses
that I might have wherewith to blow the fire
I did smite two stones together that I might make fire

1 Nephi 18:21

and it came to pass that I prayed unto the Lord
and after that I had prayed
 the winds did cease and the storm did cease

All these examples strongly suggest that if the text in 1 Nephi 8:7 is to be emended, the simplest solution would be to remove the extraneous *as*, especially since it is possible that the *as* was accidentally added. But unlike the example in Alma 44:12, the *as* in 1 Nephi 8:7 does refer to time and cannot be explained away as the accidental repetition of a previous *as*. It could well be that the *as* in 1 Nephi 8:7 is a primitive error in Nephi's syntax: perhaps he first intended to write that **as** (or while) Lehi was following the angel, he (Lehi) noticed he was in a wasteland, but then Nephi changed his mind and decided to write that **after** Lehi had followed the angel for some time, he (Lehi) noticed he was in a wasteland. Obviously, the only difference in meaning deals with the question of how long Lehi followed the angel before he noticed the wasteland. Semantically, either Joseph Smith's removal of the *after*-clause or the proposed deletion of the *as* will work. The critical text will assume that the *as* is an error in the early transmission of the text. Without the *as*, the text in 1 Nephi 8:7 reads just like other passages (such as 1 Nephi 7:22).

Summary: Restore the original *after*-clause in 1 Nephi 8:7; in addition, emend the text by removing the extraneous *as* in the previous clause; this *as* was probably added early on in the transmission of the text, although it may actually represent an infelicity in Nephi's original syntax.

■ 1 Nephi 8:9

and it came to pass
 [*that* 0ACG | *that* >js NULL 1 | BDEFHIJKLMNOPQRST]
after I had prayed unto the Lord
I beheld a large and spacious field

Clearly, the earliest textual sources (C, D*, and the 1830 edition) have the subordinate conjunction *that* after "it came to pass" and before the *after*-clause. Joseph Smith deleted the *that* for the 1837 edition, although there is no apparent grammatical motivation for the deletion. In fact, the next edition (1840) restored the *that*, but then the 1874 RLDS edition omitted it once more. Here the critical text will follow the reading of the earliest textual sources, so the *that* will be restored in 1 Nephi 8:9. For general discussion regarding the deletion of *that* after "it came to pass", see THAT in volume 3.

Summary: In accord with the reading of the earliest textual sources, restore the subordinate conjunction *that* after "it came to pass" in 1 Nephi 8:9.

■ 1 Nephi 8:9

*and it came to pass that [I > NULL 0 | 1 ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
 after I had prayed unto the Lord
 [NULL >- i 0 | NULL >+ I 1 | I ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
 beheld a large and spacious field*

Scribe 3 of \mathcal{O} initially wrote the text here so that the *after*-clause intervened between the subject *I* and its predicate, “beheld a large and spacious field”. He then corrected \mathcal{O} so that the *after*-clause precedes the entire independent clause (“after I had prayed unto the Lord / I beheld a large and spacious field”). This correction is wholly consistent with usage elsewhere in the text.

Scribe 3’s supralinearly inserted correction was a very weak lowercase *i*, which Oliver Cowdery apparently missed when he initially copied the text from \mathcal{O} into \mathcal{P} . Later, with heavier ink flow, Oliver supralinearly inserted the capital *I* in \mathcal{P} . It’s quite possible that Oliver’s correction was, for his part, an emendation rather than the result of him noticing that scribe 3 had written in a supralinear *i*.

There are a few examples elsewhere in the text where a pronominal subject is separated from the predicate by a subordinate clause:

Jacob 4:17

how is it possible that these
 —after **having** rejected the sure foundation—
 can ever build upon it

Alma 13:12

now they
 —after **being** sanctified by the Holy Ghost
having their garments made white
being pure and spotless before God—
 could not look upon sin save it were with abhorrence

Alma 22:35

and now I
 —after **having** said this—
 return again to the account of Ammon . . .

However, in these three examples the subordinate clause is a nonfinite one involving a present participle (either *having* or *being*) rather than a finite verb form (such as in “after I had prayed” in 1 Nephi 8:9).

We should also consider the fact that elsewhere in the text there are 78 occurrences of a finite *after*-clause following “it came to pass (that)” and in every instance the subject of the independent clause follows the *after*-clause, as here in the current text for 1 Nephi 8:9. Scribe 3’s corrected text in \mathcal{O} is undoubtedly the original text.

Summary: In 1 Nephi 8:9, maintain “after I had prayed unto the Lord / I beheld a large and spacious field” (the corrected reading in \mathcal{O}).

■ 1 Nephi 8:9

I [*beheld* 0ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST | *behold* > *beheld* 1] *a large and spacious field*

The Book of Mormon manuscripts show a frequent tendency to mix up *behold* and *beheld*. Here in 1 Nephi 8:9, while copying from \mathcal{C} to \mathcal{P} , Oliver Cowdery initially wrote *behold*, then immediately corrected his *behold* to *beheld* (the reading in \mathcal{C}). As discussed in the previous variant, Oliver initially missed the subject pronoun *I* (which had been supralinearly inserted by scribe 3 of \mathcal{C} as a weakly written lowercase *i*); thus Oliver may well have been expecting *behold* rather than *beheld* immediately following the *after*-clause.

Oliver Cowdery created the very same error later on in this chapter:

1 Nephi 8:26

and I also cast my eyes around about
and [*beheld* 0ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST | *behold* 1]
on the other side of the river of water
a great and spacious building

The 1830 typesetter rejected Oliver's *behold* and restored *beheld*, but apparently without reference to \mathcal{C} .

Interestingly, in both of these cases Oliver Cowdery originally created in \mathcal{P} a Hebrew-like *behold*-clause:

1 Nephi 8:9 (initially in \mathcal{P})

behold a large and spacious field

1 Nephi 8:26 (uncorrected in \mathcal{P})

and behold . . . a great and spacious building

In these examples, *behold* is followed by noun phrase, not a clause (although an existential clause seems to be implied: "behold there was a large and spacious field").

In the King James Bible, we can find examples of this Hebraistic literalism:

Genesis 15:17

and it came to pass that
when the sun went down and it was dark
behold a smoking furnace
and a burning lamp that passed between those pieces

But the original text of the Book of Mormon does not actually have any examples of this kind of Hebraism, although Oliver Cowdery does seem to have momentarily created a couple of them.

For other examples of where *behold* and *beheld* have been mixed up, see Alma 34:6, 3 Nephi 1:15, and 3 Nephi 17:5.

Summary: Maintain the simple past-tense form *beheld* in 1 Nephi 8:9 and 1 Nephi 8:26.

■ 1 Nephi 8:11

and it came to pass that I did go forth and
 [*partook* 0 | *partook* >js *partake* 1 | *partake* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *of the fruit thereof*

The question here is which form should the conjoined verb take when the preceding verb has the paraphrastic auxiliary verb *do*. The current reading implies that two infinitives are conjoined (equivalent to “I did go forth and I did partake”). But the original reading conjoins two finite verbs (equivalent to “I did go forth and I partook”). Later in 1 Nephi 8, there are two more examples of the tendency to replace conjoined finite verbs with conjoined infinitives:

1 Nephi 8:22

and it came to pass that they did come forth
 and [*commensed* 0 | *commence* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST] in the path
 which led to the tree

1 Nephi 8:24

even until they did come forth
 and [*partook* 0 | *partake* >+ *partook* 1 | *partake* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
 of the fruit of the tree

Oliver Cowdery and the 1830 typesetter are responsible for these changes. And Joseph Smith, in his editing of 1 Nephi 8:11 for the 1837 edition, made the printer’s manuscript agree with the reading of the 1830 edition.

We find that elsewhere the text allows three patterns for the conjoined verb phrase when the first verb has the auxiliary *do*. In the following list, I give an example of each pattern. In each case, I have selected an example where the first predicate is of the form “did go forth”:

(A) *the conjoined verb phrase also uses the auxiliary do:*

Helaman 5:50

and it came to pass that they did go forth
 and **did minister** unto the people

(B) *the conjoined verb phrase has the infinitive verb form:*

Alma 31:20

for behold every man did go forth
 and **offer** up these same prayers

(C) *the conjoined verb phrase is in the simple past tense:*

Alma 32:1

and it came to pass that they did go forth
 and **began** to preach the word of God unto the people

These examples show that all three patterns (A, B, and C) are possible. There has been no consistent editing out of the C type.

Summary: Follow the earliest textual sources in 1 Nephi 8:11, 22, 24 and restore the conjoined simple past-tense verb form in the context of a preceding past-tense verb phrase that uses the auxiliary *do*.

■ 1 Nephi 8:11

*and it came to pass that I did go forth
and partook of the fruit thereof*

[01 | ; ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]

and [0 | I 1 ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] beheld that it was most sweet

Here scribe 3 of \mathcal{O} may have omitted the subject pronoun *I*, which Oliver Cowdery supplied when he copied the text from \mathcal{O} into \mathcal{P} . We have already observed several cases where scribe 3 omitted—or may have omitted—the pronoun *I* (see the discussion under 1 Nephi 5:8).

But it is possible to read the text here in 1 Nephi 8:11 without the subject. Perhaps Oliver Cowdery felt that there was just too much distance (namely, four intervening words) between the preceding verb *partook* and the conjoined “and beheld”, so he added the *I*. He may have also been influenced by the example two verses earlier where the subject pronoun *I* had been supralinearly inserted (see 1 Nephi 8:9). The 1830 typesetter further isolated the last clause from the former clauses here in verse 11 by punctuating the break with a semicolon rather than with a comma.

Typically, there are no intervening words when *beheld* is conjoined with a preceding predicate, as in the 14 cases of “looked and beheld”, of which 13 are found in 1 Nephi 11–14. (The 14th is in Jacob 5:17.) Nonetheless, it should be noted that there are three cases of “I looked and I beheld” (in verses 24, 30, and 31 of 1 Nephi 11), which shows that we can get variation regarding the repeated subject even when the verbs are near each other.

Besides the example in 1 Nephi 8:11, we have two other examples where there is an intervening direct object before a conjoined subjectless clause beginning with *beheld*:

1 Nephi 8:26

and I also cast **my eyes around about**

and beheld on the other side of the river of water a great and spacious building

Helaman 5:30

when they heard **this voice**

and beheld that it was not a voice of thunder . . .

The first of these two examples is also in 1 Nephi 8, which means that we have the same scribe as in verse 11 (namely, scribe 3 of \mathcal{O}). Thus one could speculate that the subject pronoun *I* might also be missing in verse 26. Nevertheless, none of these three examples seem incorrect, not even especially awkward, which means that we have no strong reason to reject “and beheld” in 1 Nephi 8:11, 1 Nephi 8:26, and Helaman 5:30.

Summary: Restore the reading of the original manuscript in 1 Nephi 8:11 (“I did go forth and partook of the fruit thereof and beheld that it was most sweet”); the semicolon after *thereof* will also need to be removed; the lack of the repeated subject is also found in similar constructions elsewhere in the text (such as 1 Nephi 8:26 and Helaman 5:30).

■ 1 Nephi 8:11

*I did go forth and partook of the fruit thereof
and beheld that it was most sweet above all that
I ever [had 0A | had >js NULL 1 | BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] before tasted*

For the 1837 edition, Joseph Smith deleted the perfect auxiliary *had* in order to remove a very awkward construction. The original problem seems to have been the use of two separated adverbial elements (*ever* and *before*) with the verb phrase “had tasted”.

Elsewhere in the text there are examples like this one. First of all, the adverb *ever* can appear before the perfect auxiliary *have*:

2 Nephi 6:3

yea mine anxiety is great for you
and ye yourselves know that it **ever has been**

2 Nephi 27:11

and all things shall be revealed unto the children of men
which **ever hath been** among the children of men

Alma 53:12

and for this cause they were brought down into the land of Zarahemla
and they **ever had been protected** by the Nephites

Mormon 5:15

for this people shall be scattered
and shall become a dark a filthy and a loathsome people
beyond the description of that which **ever hath been** amongst us

There are also examples with the adverb *before* between the *have* auxiliary and the past participle of the main verb:

Alma 8:1

having established the order of the church
according as he **had before done** in the land of Zarahemla

Helaman 3:5

because of the many inhabitants which **had before inherited** the land

Helaman 3:6

but because of the greatness of the destruction of the people
which **had before inhabited** the land
it was called desolates

But even of more significance are two examples from 1 Nephi 11:1 that not only have *before* between *had* and the past participle, but also have *never*, the negative form of *ever*, right before the *had*:

1 Nephi 11:1

I was caught away in the Spirit of the Lord
 yea into an exceeding high mountain
 a mountain which I **never had before seen**
 and upon which I **never had before sat** my foot

In fact, in the first of these two cases in 1 Nephi 11:1, scribe 3 of \mathcal{O} initially wrote “which I never before” but then crossed out the *before* and wrote inline “had before seen”. This error thus shows the natural tendency to put the two adverbs *never* and *before* together; it also shows that the awkward word order “never had before seen” is definitely intended.

All of this evidence argues that the original “I ever had before tasted” in 1 Nephi 8:11 is clearly intended and should be restored, despite its awkwardness in modern English.

Summary: Restore the original reading in 1 Nephi 8:11, with its two adverbs separated by the perfect auxiliary *had* (“ever had before tasted”); although awkward, such syntax occurs fairly often in the text.

■ 1 Nephi 8:12

wherefore I began to be **desirous** that my family should partake of it also
 for I knew that it was

[*desirus* 0 | *desireous* >]s *desireable* 1 | *desirous* A | *desirable* BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]

above all other fruit

The earliest text reads *desirous* both times here in 1 Nephi 8:12. Normally in English, “X is desirous of Y” refers to a human X that desires Y. On the other hand, if Y is desired, the expected word is *desirable* rather than *desirous* (“Y is desired”, not “Y is desirous”). For this reason, Joseph Smith edited the text for the 1837 edition by replacing the word *desirous* with *desirable*.

It is very possible that the original text actually read “it was desirable” and that during the dictation process the word *desirable* was replaced by *desirous*. One motivation for such an error would be that the word *desirous* had just occurred in the text (“I began to be desirous”). There is additional evidence in the book of Mosiah that *desirable* and *desirous* can be mixed up, although in this case the original reading in \mathcal{O} is obviously unacceptable and was immediately corrected:

Mosiah 8:12

for I am [*desireable* > *desireous* 1 | *desirous* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
 that these records should be translated into our language

Except for these two cases (in 1 Nephi 8:12 and Mosiah 8:12), the text consistently uses *desirous* when speaking of people’s desires (62 times) and *desirable* when referring to what they desire (6 times). Of those six other occurrences of *desirable*, four refer to fruit (1 Nephi 8:10, 1 Nephi 8:15, 1 Nephi 15:36, and Alma 32:39). So internal evidence argues that Joseph Smith’s correction in 1 Nephi 8:12 may indeed be the original text.

On the other hand, there is historical evidence for *desirous* having the meaning ‘desirable’. The Oxford English Dictionary (under definition 5) includes citations with this meaning from 1430 through 1796, including this example from John Gay’s *The Beggar’s Opera*, first performed in 1728:

Wine inspires us, And fires us . . .
 Women and Wine should Life employ.
 Is there ought else on Earth **desirous**?

Thus *desirous* can have the meaning ‘desirable’. Its use in 1 Nephi 8:12 does not seem that unacceptable (unlike the initial scribal error in Mosiah 8:12).

Since the earliest textual sources support *desirous* both times in 1 Nephi 8:12, and the second example had the meaning ‘desirable’ for the time period close to the Book of Mormon translation, the critical text will maintain *desirous* in “it was desirous above all other fruit”, even though this word could well be an error on the part of scribe 3 of \mathcal{C} (or even on the part of Joseph Smith when he dictated the text).

Summary: Maintain both occurrences of scribe 3’s *desirous* in 1 Nephi 8:12, even in the second case when it means ‘desirable’; such a meaning for *desirous* was current in the century just before the Book of Mormon translation; even so, this use of *desirous* could be an error based on the immediately preceding occurrence of *desirous*.

■ 1 Nephi 8:13

and as I cast my eyes

[*around* 0 | *round* 1 ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *about* . . .

Scribe 3 of \mathcal{C} here in 1 Nephi 8:13 wrote “around about”. Later on in the chapter, we have the same expression:

1 Nephi 8:26

and I also cast my eyes

[*around* 0N | *round* 1 ABCDEFGHIJKLMOPQRST] *about*

When copying these passages into \mathcal{P} , Oliver Cowdery changed “around about” to “round about”. In the current Book of Mormon text, there are 87 occurrences of “round about” and none of “around about”. Although the current text has only “round about”, there are many examples in the original manuscript of Oliver Cowdery initially writing “around about” and then correcting it to “round about”. Out of 30 other extant occurrences in the original manuscript, all in Oliver’s hand, he initially wrote “around about” 9 times but then in each case corrected the text to “round about”. And for six of these (interspersed from Alma 48:8 through Alma 53:4), he corrected *around* by erasing the initial *a*, thus showing that most of his corrections were immediate. For the three other corrections, we have the following in the transcript of \mathcal{C} :

Alma 43:24 (no change in ink flow)

<[a]>ro()
 UND ABOUT

Helaman 1:26 (no change in ink flow)

{a(-) | r}ound {a}bout

Ether 9:35 (with heavier ink flow)

r(o)
 UND
 <aro(u)[n]^(d>)
 ABOUT

The last example appears to be a later correction; not only is the correction in heavier ink flow, but Oliver also supralinearly rewrote the entire word.

In the printer's manuscript, Oliver Cowdery wrote "round about" 82 times and every time without any correction. (Scribe 2 of \mathcal{P} copied the phrase 5 times—and also without any correction.) Not once in \mathcal{P} did Oliver accidentally write "around about". This highly significant difference between the two manuscripts suggests that Oliver Cowdery himself strongly preferred "round about" over "around about". And in \mathcal{P} (here in 1 Nephi 8) he also emended scribe 3 of \mathcal{O} 's two occurrences of "around about" to "round about". His correction in \mathcal{O} of Ether 9:35 appears to be a later emendation because of how it was corrected.

What caused Oliver Cowdery to accidentally write "around about" so many times in \mathcal{O} but not in \mathcal{P} ? The answer is that Joseph Smith must have frequently (and maybe always) dictated the phrase as "around about". Thus scribe 3 of \mathcal{O} wrote down "around about" since he, like Joseph, saw nothing wrong with it. But Oliver kept trying to avoid writing down "around about" in \mathcal{O} , but succeeded without any error only about two-thirds the time (based on the extant occurrences). All of this suggests that Joseph originally dictated "around about" at least part of the time. It is of course possible that Joseph actually saw only "round about" in the interpreters or the seer stone but nonetheless pronounced it as "around about" according to his own speech.

The King James Bible has only "round about" (307 times). Only one of the Book of Mormon examples is a biblical quote (1 Nephi 21:18, quoting Isaiah 49:18). The Oxford English Dictionary explains that both the 1611 Bible and Shakespeare's plays had only "round about" and that before 1600 "around about" was rare. The OED also describes American English as being more prone than British English to replace *round* with *around* in expressions. (Note that in the 1906 LDS large-print edition, printed in Salt Lake City, the typesetter accidentally set "around about" in 1 Nephi 8:26.) The online OED (as of 19 December 2002) lists 445 citations of "round about" (this statistic includes a few cases of repetition) but only two of "around about", one by a famous American writer and the other from a newspaper in Northern Ireland:

Mark Twain, *Century Magazine*, February 1885

There's always cobs **around about** in a shuck tick, and they poke into you.

Belfast Telegraph, 17 January 1977

So **around about** 11 pm . . . I mooched off to bed.

Once more we appear to have a phrase in the Book of Mormon that may involve scribal overlay. There are three possibilities for how the phrase "(a)round about" read in the original text: (1) consistently as "round about", which Joseph Smith tended to read off as "around about"; (2) consistently as "around about", which Oliver Cowdery edited to "round about"; or (3) some variability between the two extremes.

As far as the critical text goes, the least speculative solution is to follow the earliest textual sources for each instance of “(a)round about”. This decision will retain “round about” in nearly all cases. Immediate corrections in \mathcal{O} (such as the six cases involving erasure) will be accepted as the reading of the original text. Only three cases of “around about” will be restored: the two in the hand of scribe 3 of \mathcal{O} (1 Nephi 8:13 and 1 Nephi 8:26) and the one in Ether 9:35 that Oliver Cowdery later corrected with heavier ink flow (by first crossing out the entire *around* and then supralinearly rewriting it as *round*).

Summary: In accord with the earliest textual sources, restore “around about” in 1 Nephi 8:13 and 1 Nephi 8:26 as well as in Ether 9:35.

■ 1 Nephi 8:13

*and as I cast my eyes around about
that perhaps I might discover my family also*
[*And* 0 | & >+ NULL 1 | ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
I beheld a river of water

This is an example of a Hebrew-like syntactic construction that was soon removed from the text. In the original text of the Book of Mormon, there are a number of examples where the conjunction *and* occurs between a preceding subordinate clause and its following independent clause. Such constructions are characteristic of Hebrew but not English. Over time these extra *and*'s have been eliminated from the text. Here in 1 Nephi 8:13, we have such an *and* (following a sentence-initial *as*-clause) which Oliver Cowdery deleted in the printer's manuscript. He initially wrote an ampersand in agreement with the original manuscript's *And*, but then he deleted the ampersand to make the text conform to English. Perhaps he thought the *and* in \mathcal{O} was some kind of scribal error. (The *and* in \mathcal{O} is capitalized because scribe 3 of \mathcal{O} often capitalized the first word in a handwritten line irrespective of its position in the sentence.)

The critical text will restore this Hebrew-like use of *and* after an initial subordinate clause. For further discussion of this type of construction, see HEBRAISMS in volume 3.

Summary: Restore the original Hebraistic *and*'s following initial subordinate clauses.

■ 1 Nephi 8:17

wherefore I cast mine eyes
[*toward* 0 | *towards* 1 ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *the head of the river*

As discussed under 1 Nephi 5:22, scribe 3 of \mathcal{O} often wrote *toward* rather than *towards*. The critical text here will follow the reading of the original manuscript (namely, *toward*). See the complete discussion under TOWARDS in volume 3.

■ 1 Nephi 8:18

and it came to pass that I saw them

but they would not come unto me

[*and partake of the fruit* 0CGHKPRST | 1ABDEFIJLMNOQ]

Here is an example of how Joseph Smith, in his editing for the 1840 edition, used the original manuscript to restore phrases that had been accidentally dropped during the earlier transmission of the text. In this case, Oliver Cowdery omitted the conjoined predicate “and partake of the fruit” when copying from \mathcal{O} into \mathcal{P} . This predicate was restored in the 1840 edition and has been followed throughout the RLDS textual tradition. The LDS text restored it in the 1920 edition, undoubtedly by reference to the 1840 edition. Although the original manuscript for most of 1 Nephi has been in the possession of the LDS Church since the 1880s, there is no evidence that it was ever examined for textual variants until the 1970s.

This conjoining of the verb *come* with *partake* is consistent with six other occurrences here in 1 Nephi 8, which recounts Lehi’s dream of the tree of life:

1 Nephi 8:15	that they should come unto me and partake of the fruit
1 Nephi 8:16	they did come unto me and partake of the fruit also
1 Nephi 8:17	that Laman and Lemuel should come and partake of the fruit also
1 Nephi 8:24	they did come forth and partook of the fruit of the tree
1 Nephi 8:27	towards those which had came up and were partaking of the fruit
1 Nephi 8:30	they came forth and fell down and partook of the fruit of the tree

Summary: Continue to maintain the reading of \mathcal{O} in 1 Nephi 8:18 (“and partake of the fruit”); this predicate was accidentally omitted when \mathcal{O} was copied into \mathcal{P} .

■ 1 Nephi 8:20

and I also beheld

a [Strait 0 | strait 1T | straight ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRS] and narrow path

The two homophones *strait* and *straight* derive from two different words: *strait* is a loanword that comes from Old French *estreit* (and ultimately from Latin *strictus*); *straight* is from Middle English *strehte*, the past participle of the modern verb *stretch*. There is also a clear difference in meaning: *strait* means ‘narrow or tight’, while *straight* means ‘not crooked’. For numerous examples, see the Oxford English Dictionary.

There are 27 occurrences of *strait* and *straight* in the Book of Mormon. Except in one case, the scribes spelled both *straight* ‘not crooked’ and *strait* ‘narrow’ identically as *strait*. The only example with the spelling *straight* is in the original manuscript for Alma 50:8. On the other hand, the 1830 edition consistently spelled all 27 as *straight*. Thus the earliest textual sources provide no evidence as to which word is intended. The decision must be made on the basis of context.

Since in most instances the 1830 spelling *straight* is correct, editing has been restricted to determining which ones should actually read *strait*. And the only editions that have introduced this spelling are twentieth-century ones. For instance, the 1981 LDS edition systematically emended

“straight and narrow” to “strait and narrow”: namely, here in 1 Nephi 8:20 and also in 2 Nephi 31:18, 2 Nephi 31:19, and Helaman 3:29. The LDS textual history has the following numbers of changes replacing the earlier *straight* with *strait*: 1906 large-print edition, 2 cases; 1907 vest-pocket edition, 4 cases; 1920 edition, 2 cases; and 1981 edition, 6 cases. The 1953 RLDS edition changed 4 cases of *straight* to *strait*. The individual examples are discussed throughout this volume, but a complete list of the variation for all 27 cases of *strait* and *straight* can be found under STRAIT in volume 3.

Six of the occurrences of *strait* and *straight* are relatively noncontroversial. In these instances, there is little difficulty in determining which word is intended:

- (1) an arrow needs to be straight so it can fly straight

1 Nephi 16:23

I Nephi did make out of wood a bow
and out of a **straight** stick an arrow

- (2) the verb *straiten* with its meaning ‘to subject to privation, hardship, or distress’

(see definition 7 under *straiten* in the OED)

1 Nephi 17:41 (two times)

and he did **straiten** them in the wilderness with his rod . . .
and the Lord **straitened** them because of their iniquity

- (3) a direct quote from Isaiah 49:20 with the meaning ‘narrow’

1 Nephi 21:20

the place is too **strait** for me

- (4) the adverb *straightway* with its meaning ‘immediately’

(see definition 2 under *straightway* in the OED)

Alma 14:28 (two times)

and they **straightway** came forth out of the prison . . .
and they **straightway** came forth into the city

On the other hand, there are 21 occurrences that involve the words *path*, *course*, *way*, and *gate*. In every instance, a gate is always strait or narrow, never straight. A way is always narrow, never straight. (Even though *strait* means ‘narrow’, the word *strait* is never used with *way*.) The difficulty arises with *path* and *course*. As we shall see, there is evidence that paths and courses can be both straight and narrow, but not redundantly “strait and narrow”. The 21 occurrences can be divided into six cases:

- (1') *a straight and narrow path* (or *course*)

Here *straight* and *narrow* are conjoined and refer to either a path (three times) or a course (once). It seems very doubtful that the completely redundant “strait and narrow” is intended:

1 Nephi 8:20

and I also beheld a **straight and narrow path**
which came along by the rod of iron

2 Nephi 31:18

and then are ye in this **straight and narrow path** which leads to eternal life
yea ye have entered in by the gate

2 Nephi 31:19

after that ye have got into this **straight and narrow path**
I would ask if all is done

Helaman 3:29

and lead the man of Christ in a **straight and narrow course**
across that everlasting gulf of misery

The OED lists the phrase as “straight and narrow” (with citations under definition 3a of *straight*), although the OED argues that the etymological source for *straight* in “straight and narrow” is *strait* rather than *straight*. This claim is based on the language of Matthew 7:14: “strait *is* the gate and narrow *is* the way”. Nonetheless, the phrase “straight and narrow” does not perfectly match Matthew 7:14 since the biblical expression does not directly conjoin *strait* and *narrow* as “strait and narrow”; instead, we have “the gate is strait” (that is, ‘narrow’) and “the way is narrow”, so there is no redundancy.

One potential argument here is that the redundant “strait and narrow” is permissible because the Book of Mormon allows synonymous conjuncts. However, the examples of adjectival conjunctivity in the Book of Mormon are never definitionally synonymous like “strait and narrow” would be. Here are some typical examples as they appear in the current LDS text:

1 Nephi 8:9	a large and spacious field
1 Nephi 8:26	a great and spacious building
Omni 1:28	a strong and mighty man
Alma 13:12	pure and spotless before God
Mormon 8:2	the great and tremendous battle at Cumorah

In each of these cases, the shorter and more frequent and general adjective comes first, followed by the longer, less frequent, and more specific adjective. With the putative example of “strait and narrow”, the syllabically longer *narrow* is the more general and frequent word and yet it comes second rather than first in the conjunctive construction. This incongruity suggests that “strait and narrow” is inappropriate as an example of synonymous adjectival conjunctivity in the Book of Mormon. Of course, no such problem arises with the nonsynonymous “straight and narrow”.

(2') *a narrow way and a straight course*

In the following example, we have clear evidence that a way can be both narrow and straight:

2 Nephi 9:41

behold the **way** for man is **narrow**
but it lieth in a **straight course** before him

The use of the *but* clearly indicates that *straight* cannot be replaced by *strait* (with its meaning ‘narrow’). The conjunction *but* involves a reversal or contradiction in meaning and could not be used here since the meaning would then be ‘the way for man is narrow but it lieth in a narrow course’.

One could reverse this evidence in favor of “straight and narrow” by proposing that the conjunction *but* is an error for *and* (which could then allow for this passage to be reinterpreted as “the way for man is narrow **and** it lieth in a strait course before him”). Throughout the history of the text, there have been a number of cases where *but* has been changed to *and* (and vice versa, from *and* to *but*). For further discussion, see each of the following passages:

2 Nephi 15:7 (*and* > *but* by Oliver Cowdery in \mathcal{P} ;

Isaiah 5:7 in the King James Bible has *but*)

[& > *but* 1 | *but* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] behold a cry

2 Nephi 27:27 (*but* > *and* by Oliver Cowdery in \mathcal{P} ;

Isaiah 29:15 in the King James Bible has no conjunction here)

[*but* >+ & 1 | *And* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] woe unto them
that seek deep to hide their counsel from the Lord

Mosiah 12:33 (*and* > *but* by Oliver Cowdery in \mathcal{P})

[& >+ *but now* 1 | *But now* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]

Abinadi saith unto them . . .

Alma 4:2 (*and* > *but*, Joseph Smith’s editing for the 1837 edition)

[& >js *but* 1 | *and* A | *but* BCDEFGHK | *But* IJLMNOPQRST]

the people being afflicted . . .

Alma 14:18 (*and* > *but* by Oliver Cowdery in \mathcal{P})

[& > *but* 1 | *but* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] they answered them nothing

Alma 42:30 (*but* > *and*, 1920 editing)

[*but* 01ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPS | *and* RT]

let it bring you down to the dust in humility

Alma 43:20 (*but* > *and*, 1920 editing)

[*but* 01ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPS | *and* RT] they were naked

save it were a skin which was girded about their loins

Alma 44:8 (*and* > *but*, 1920 editing)

[& 01 | *and* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPS | *but* RT] we will not suffer ourselves

to take an oath unto you

Alma 52:29 (*but* > *and* by Oliver Cowdery in \mathcal{C})

[*but* > NULL 0 | 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPS]

[& 01 | *and* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPS] all they feared was Lehi and his men

Alma 57:13 (*and* > *but* by Oliver Cowdery in \mathcal{C} and \mathcal{P})

[& >% *but* 0 | & > *but* 1 | *But* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPS] it came to pass

that our prisoners were so numerous that . . .

3 Nephi 4:16 (*but* > *and*, 1830 in-press change)

[*but* 1 | *but* > *and* A | *and* BCDEFGHK | *And* IJLMNOPQRST]

in the twenty and first year they did not come up to battle

3 Nephi 12:22 (possibly *but* > *and* by Oliver Cowdery in \mathfrak{C} [no longer extant here];
Matthew 5:22 in the King James Bible has *but*)

[& 1 | *and* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] whosoever shall say thou fool
shall be in danger of hell fire

3 Nephi 19:6 (*and* > *but* by Oliver Cowdery in going from \mathfrak{C} to \mathfrak{D} ,
or *but* > *and* by the 1830 typesetter)

[*but* 1 | *and* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] behold they did cause
that the multitude should kneel down upon the face of the earth

Ether 6:23 (*but* > *and*, 1920 editing)

[*but* 01 | *But* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQS | *And* RT]
the brother of Jared said unto them . . .

Despite these many examples, it should be remembered that there are over 17,000 examples of *and* and *but* in the text that have been transmitted without any variation and without any subsequent attempt to edit. Thus the chances that one particular example of *but* (in 2 Nephi 9:41) is in error is minuscule. Even then, the only motivation for changing the *but* to *and* would be to salvage a dubious attempt to preserve the reading “strait and narrow” elsewhere in the text. The current text in 2 Nephi 9:41 should be maintained since there is no specific evidence that anything is inappropriate about the conjunction *but* in this passage.

(3') *a straight course*

There are four additional examples with the phraseology of “a straight course”:

Alma 37:44 (two times)

for behold it is as easy to give heed to the word of Christ
which will point to you a **straight course** to eternal bliss
as it was for our fathers to give heed to this compass
which would point unto them a **straight course** to the promised land

Alma 50:8

and the land of Nephi did run in a **straight course** from the east sea to the west

Alma 56:37

they did not turn to the right nor to the left
but pursued their march in a **straight course** after us

(4') *a strait gate and a narrow way*

There are three passages that have this usage. They can be derived from Jesus’s language in the Sermon on the Mount:

Matthew 7:13–14

enter ye in at the **strait gate**
for wide *is* the gate
and broad *is* the way
that leadeth to destruction
and many there be which go in thereat

because **strait** *is* the **gate**
and **narrow** *is* the **way**
which leadeth unto life
and few there be that find it

This biblical passage has two occurrences that refer to “the strait gate” and one to “the narrow way”. The passage is directly quoted twice in the Book of Mormon, although in the second case the order is altered and there is some paraphrase:

3 Nephi 14:13–14

enter ye in at the **strait gate**
for wide is the gate
and broad is the way
that leadeth to destruction
and many there be which go in thereat
because **strait** *is* the **gate**
and **narrow** *is* the **way**
which leadeth unto life
and few there be that find it

3 Nephi 27:33

enter ye in at the **strait gate**
for **strait** *is* the **gate**
and **narrow** *is* the **way**
that leads to life
and few there be that find it
but wide is the gate
and broad the way
which leads to death
and many there be that traveleth therein

This same basic language is also used by Jacob, the brother of Nephi. In this instance, the first clause directly quotes the language of Matthew 7 (and 3 Nephi 14) while the second clause is different yet still refers to “the narrow way”:

Jacob 6:11

repent ye
and enter ye in at the **strait gate**
and continue in the **way** which is **narrow**
until ye shall obtain eternal life

(5') *a straight path*

The original source for the phrase “a straight path” in the Book of Mormon can be traced to the Septuagint translation of Isaiah:

Isaiah 40:3 (literal translation of the Greek)

prepare ye the way of the Lord
make **straight** the **paths** of our God

But the specific phraseology in the Book of Mormon is virtually identical to the language of the synoptic Gospels, which typically quote from the Septuagint:

Matthew 3:3, Mark 1:3, and Luke 3:4
prepare ye the way of the Lord
make his **paths straight**

In 1 Nephi 10:7–10, Lehi uses language found in the Gospels to describe John the Baptist’s words. Thus Lehi quotes, for instance, the above passage from the synoptic Gospels as follows:

1 Nephi 10:8
prepare ye the way of the Lord
and make his **paths straight**

This same language is paraphrased elsewhere in the text. Note the occasional use of the same vocabulary, especially the verbs *prepare* and *make* as well as the noun *way*:

2 Nephi 4:33
O Lord wilt thou make a way for mine escape before mine enemies
wilt thou **make** my **path straight** before me

Alma 7:9
repent ye repent ye
and **prepare** the **way** of the Lord
and walk in his **paths** which are **straight**

Alma 7:19–20
for I perceive that ye are in the paths of righteousness
I perceive that ye are in the path which leads to the kingdom of God
yea I perceive that ye are **making** his **paths straight**
I perceive that it hath been made known unto you by the testimony of his word
that he cannot walk in crooked paths
neither doth he vary from that which he hath said
neither hath he a shadow of turning from the right to the left

Alma 37:12
and his **paths** are **straight**
and his course is one eternal round

Notice, in particular, the references in Alma 7:20 to “crooked paths” and “turning from the right to the left”, in direct contrast to straight paths.

(6') *a narrow gate and a strait path (or a straight path)*

There are two passages near the end of 2 Nephi where a narrow gate occurs with either a strait path or a straight path:

2 Nephi 31:9
and again it sheweth unto the children of men
the [*straitness* 1T | *straightness* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRS] of the **path**
and the **narrowness** of the **gate** by which they should enter

2 Nephi 33:9

but behold for none of these I cannot hope
 except they shall be reconciled unto Christ
 and enter into the **narrow gate**
 and walk in the [*strait* 1T | *straight* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRS] **path**
 which leads to life
 and continue in the path until the end of the day of probation

Both passages have a separate clause that refers to “entering through the narrow gate”. And the second passage refers to the path “which leads to life”. These expressions directly relate to the language of the Sermon on the Mount. Consider especially the parallelism of the Matthew text and the second passage:

<i>Matthew 7:13–14</i> (<i>3 Nephi 14:13–14</i>)	<i>2 Nephi 33:9</i>
enter ye in at the strait gate . . .	and enter into the narrow gate
and narrow <i>is</i> the way	and walk in the strait path
which leadeth unto life	which leads to life

On the other hand, 2 Nephi 33:9 uses the language of Alma 7:9 (“and walk in his paths which are straight”), which shows the influence of Isaiah 40:3. One other example, also cited earlier, has the phraseology “which leads to eternal life”, but in this instance the text allows for the path to be both “straight and narrow”:

2 Nephi 31:18
 and then are ye in this **straight and narrow path**
 which leads to eternal life
 yea ye have entered in by the gate

Thus it appears that either reading (*strait* or *straight*) is possible in 2 Nephi 31:9 and 2 Nephi 33:9. Nonetheless, we have to choose one, and it is not easy to decide. Consistent with the more extensive parallelism with Matthew 7:13–14, it seems more reasonable to choose *strait* for these two ambiguous passages, although we have to recognize that *straight* will also work.

Summary: Maintain the current distinctions between *strait* and *straight* as they are found in the 1981 LDS edition except for the four cases of “strait and narrow”, which should be restored to “straight and narrow” (1 Nephi 8:20, 2 Nephi 31:18, 2 Nephi 31:19, and Helaman 3:29); supported by 2 Nephi 9:41, these four examples explicitly state that paths and courses can be both straight and narrow; the examples in 2 Nephi 31:9 and 2 Nephi 33:9 parallel Matthew 7:13–14, thus the path in those verses should probably be considered strait rather than straight, although either will work.

■ 1 Nephi 8:21

*and I saw numberless concourses of people
many of [home >- whome 0 | whom 1 ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
[are 0 | were 1 ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] pressing forward*

Scribe 3 of \mathcal{O} originally wrote “many of home are pres[s]ing forward”. Quite obviously, the present-tense *are* is a mistake for *were*. Scribe 3 nearly always wrote *ware* for *were*. The *are* here is probably a scribal slip for his intended *ware*. Interestingly, he did correct the spelling *home* to *whome* by inserting (with weaker ink flow) a *w* in the margin right in front of the word *home*. Perhaps he also thought to correct the *are* to *ware* (by adding a *w*) but neglected to do so.

In any event, Oliver Cowdery emended the *are* to *were* when he copied the text from \mathcal{O} into \mathcal{P} . Nephi’s entire description of his father’s dream is in the past tense (and without variation), so Oliver’s emendation is undoubtedly correct.

Summary: Scribe 3’s *are* in 1 Nephi 8:21 is an obvious scribal slip for *ware* ‘were’; Oliver Cowdery correctly emended the text to *were*.

■ 1 Nephi 8:22

*and it came to pass that they did come forth
and [commensed 0 | commence 1 ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] in the path which led to the tree*

The original text here conjoins two finite verb forms. In his copying from \mathcal{O} to \mathcal{P} , Oliver Cowdery ended up dropping the final *d* from *commenced*, thus conjoining two infinitive verb forms. The critical text will restore the earliest textual reading. For discussion, see 1 Nephi 8:11.

■ 1 Nephi 8:24

*and they did press forward
through the [mists 0 | mist > mists 1 | mist ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] of darkness*

The original manuscript has the plural *mists*. In copying from \mathcal{O} to \mathcal{P} , Oliver Cowdery initially wrote the singular *mist*, but then immediately added the plural *s*. The 1830 compositor set the singular, and all subsequent editions have continued with *mist* rather than the original *mists*.

Elsewhere the Book of Mormon text consistently uses the plural *mists* whenever this word is preceded by the definite article *the*:

1 Nephi 12:17	the mists of darkness
3 Nephi 8:22	the mists of darkness

Of course, whenever we have a preceding indefinite article (*a/an*), the text has the singular *mist*:

1 Nephi 8:23	a mist of darkness
1 Nephi 8:23	an exceeding great mist of darkness
1 Nephi 12:4	a mist of darkness

The probable cause for replacing *mists* with *mist* in 1 Nephi 8:24 is the singular *mist* that occurred twice in the preceding verse:

1 Nephi 8:23

and it came to pass that there arose a **mist** of darkness
yea even **an** exceeding great **mist** of darkness

Summary: Restore the plural *mists* in 1 Nephi 8:24 since it is the reading of the earliest textual source (the original manuscript); elsewhere we consistently have “the mists”, never “the mist”.

■ 1 Nephi 8:24

even until they did come forth

and [partook 0 | partake >+ partook 1 | partake ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] of the fruit of the tree

The original text here conjoins two finite verb forms. In his copying from \mathcal{O} to \mathcal{P} , Oliver Cowdery initially wrote *partake* instead of the original *partook*, thus conjoining two infinitive verb forms. Some time later, with a sharper quill and perhaps darker ink, Oliver corrected \mathcal{P} to agree with \mathcal{O} . But the 1830 compositor nonetheless typeset *partake*. The critical text will restore the earliest textual reading. For discussion, see 1 Nephi 8:11.

■ 1 Nephi 8:25

and after that they had

*[partook 0 | partook >js partook 1 | partaken ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] of the fruit of the tree
they did cast their eyes about as if they were ashamed*

Here the original text has the simple past-tense form *partook* for the past participle. In his editing for the 1837 edition, Joseph Smith corrected the reading in \mathcal{P} by adding *en* to the verb, but he probably intended *partaken* rather than what he actually wrote, *partook 1*.

In one other place, an original “had partook” has been edited to “had partaken”:

Alma 42:5

for behold if Adam had put forth his hand immediately
and [*partook* 01ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPS | *partaken* RT] of the tree of life
he would have lived forever

Elsewhere the text has only the standard past participial form *partaken* (three times). For complete discussion, see under PAST PARTICIPLE in volume 3.

Summary: Restore the original simple past-tense form in the verb phrase “had partook” in 1 Nephi 8:25.

■ 1 Nephi 8:26

and I also cast my eyes
 [around 0N | round 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMOPQRST] *about*

The earliest textual source has “around about”, which seems to reflect Joseph Smith’s way of expressing this phrase. The critical text will maintain “around about” here. For discussion, see 1 Nephi 8:13.

■ 1 Nephi 8:26

and I also cast my eyes around about
 and [beheld 0ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST | behold 1]
on the other side of the river of water
a great and spacious building

In his copying from \mathcal{O} to \mathcal{P} , Oliver Cowdery replaced *beheld* with *behold*, which the 1830 type-setter corrected. For discussion of this error, see 1 Nephi 8:9.

■ 1 Nephi 8:27

and they were in the attitude of mocking
and pointing their fingers towards those
which had came [up 0 | at 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST]
and were partaking of the fruit

The original manuscript definitely reads *up* rather than *at*. The *u* was partially overwritten, which permitted it to be interpreted as an *a*. The *p* occurs at the end of the line and is somewhat distorted, but nonetheless the descender of the *p* is clearly visible.

The preposition *up* works much better than *at*. We expect some kind of object to directly follow the preposition *at*, but there is none here. On the other hand, the adverbial *up* needs no complement. Elsewhere there are 44 occurrences in the Book of Mormon of the phrasal verb “to come up”, but none of the hypothetical phrasal verb “to come at”. Moreover, Lehi’s dream continually refers to people coming and partaking of the fruit of the tree of life:

1 Nephi 8:11	I did go forth and partook of the fruit thereof
1 Nephi 8:15	that they should come unto me and partake of the fruit
1 Nephi 8:16	they did come unto me and partake of the fruit also
1 Nephi 8:17	that Laman and Lemuel should come and partake of the fruit also
1 Nephi 8:18	they would not come unto me and partake of the fruit
1 Nephi 8:24	they did come forth and partook of the fruit of the tree
1 Nephi 8:27	towards those which had came up and were partaking of the fruit
1 Nephi 8:30	they came forth and fell down and partook of the fruit of the tree

There are five examples of the phrasal verb “to come at” in the King James Bible; but in each case the meaning is ‘to approach’ and the *at* always takes a noun-phrase complement (such as “come not at *your wives*” in Exodus 19:15 and “and could not come at him for the press” in Luke 8:19).

Summary: Restore the original *up* in 1 Nephi 8:27 (“those which had came up and were partaking of the fruit”); the phrasal verb “to come at” does not occur in the Book of Mormon.

■ 1 Nephi 8:27

*and they were in the attitude of mocking
and pointing their fingers towards those which had came up
and were [partaking 0ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST | partakeing 1 | partakers κ] of the fruit*

The 1892 RLDS edition accidentally replaced *partaking* with *partakers*. Although such a use is found elsewhere (“that ye also may be partakers of the fruit of the tree of life” in Alma 5:62), *partaking* is the correct form here in verse 27, especially in light of its use a few verses later:

1 Nephi 8:33
and after that they did enter into that building
they did point the finger of scorn at me
and those that were **partaking** of the fruit also

For this second passage, the 1892 RLDS edition did not replace *partaking* with *partakers*, so it appears that the 1892 change in verse 27 is a typo.

Summary: Maintain *partaking* in 1 Nephi 8:27, especially given its parallel use in verse 33.

■ 1 Nephi 8:28

*they were ashamed because of those
that were [A 0 | a 1 | ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST] scoffing at them*

The original text frequently has the prepositional *a* before the present participle in a verb phrase. Historically, the *a* derives from the preposition *on* (with the meaning ‘in’) and precedes a gerundive nominal, so that “they were a scoffing at them” meant something like ‘they were in [the process of] scoffing at them’. Such uses are now considered either archaic or dialectal. Examples can be found in the King James Bible, such as Peter’s declaration “I go a fishing” (John 21:3). Such uses of *a* have all been removed from the Book of Mormon text, usually as a result of explicit editing. In this example from 1 Nephi 8:28, the *a* was deleted by the 1830 compositor. Most of the time, the original text does not use the prepositional *a*, and one could view its occasional appearance as a dialectal overlay. Nonetheless, the critical text will restore these *a*’s whenever there is support from the earliest textual sources. For a complete listing and analysis, see PREPOSITIONAL A in volume 3.

Summary: Restore the prepositional *a* in 1 Nephi 8:28 (“those that were a scoffing at them”) since the *a* is found in the manuscripts.

■ 1 Nephi 8:30

behold he saw other multitudes pressing

[§3 forwards >+ §2 forward 0 | forward 1 ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]

The correction in the original manuscript of scribe 3's *forwards* to standard *forward* was not done by scribe 3 (who uses long thin lines to cross out text). Scribe 2 of \mathcal{O} made a couple of editorial corrections on this page (namely, in 1 Nephi 8:34 and 1 Nephi 9:1), both of which involve heavy ink crossouts like the crossing out here of the *s* in *forwards*. Thus it is apparently scribe 2 of \mathcal{O} who crossed out the final *s* in *forwards*. Since the crossout is not scribe 3's, this change was not an immediate one.

Elsewhere scribe 3 of \mathcal{O} wrote only *forward*, including the four other places here in 1 Nephi 8 that refer to "pressing forward":

1 Nephi 8:21	many of whom were pressing forward
1 Nephi 8:24	I beheld others pressing forward
1 Nephi 8:24	and they did press forward
1 Nephi 8:30	and they did press their way forward

But this is not to say that the variant *forwards* cannot occur in the text.

The ultimate question is whether Joseph Smith said *forwards* or *forward*. Quite easily, scribe 3 might have simply heard *forward* but wrote a dialectal *forwards*. In any event, *forwards* does not occur elsewhere in the Book of Mormon text, only *forward*. In two other instances, the scribe initially wrote *forwards* but then immediately corrected it to *forward*:

Alma 13:1 (scribe 2 of \mathcal{P})

[forward 0 ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST | forwards >% forward 1]

Alma 47:5 (Oliver Cowdery in \mathcal{O})

[forwards >% forward 0 | forward 1 ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]

In other words, we have evidence of two other scribes accidentally writing *forwards*. This suggests a marginal tendency for the scribes to use *forwards*. Joseph Smith may have also occasionally pronounced *forward* as *forwards*. Either form is possible, but only here in 1 Nephi 8:30 does the earliest textual source (namely, the original hand of \mathcal{O}) support *forwards* as the reading in the original text. Since *forwards* will work, we accept it here as the reading in the critical text, even though it could very well be a scribal or dictation error.

Summary: In accord with the earliest textual source (the original hand in the original manuscript), the critical text will accept scribe 3's *forwards* rather than scribe 2's emended *forward*, even though the text otherwise has *forward*.

■ 1 Nephi 8:31

*and he also saw other multitudes
[prfsing 0 | feeling 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST] their way
towards that great and spacious building*

There are no scriptural uses of “feeling one’s way”. Here scribe 3 of \mathcal{C} wrote *prfsing* (where *f* stands for an elongated *s*). Scribe 3’s initial *p* looks like an *f*, so when Oliver Cowdery copied the text, he misread *pressing* as *feeling*.

Similar descriptions in Lehi’s dream always use *press* rather than *feel* when referring to the movement of people:

- 1 Nephi 8:21
and I saw numberless concourses of people
many of whom were **pressing** forward
- 1 Nephi 8:24 (two times)
I beheld others **pressing** forward . . .
and they did **press** forward through the mists of darkness
- 1 Nephi 8:30 (two times)
behold he saw other multitudes **pressing** forwards . . .
and they did **press** their way forward

Other examples of “pressing forward” are found in 2 Nephi 31:20 (two times) and Ether 14:12.

Summary: Restore *pressing* in 1 Nephi 8:31 since this is what scribe 3 of \mathcal{C} intended to write down; the text consistently uses the verb *press* rather than *feel* in this semantic context.

■ 1 Nephi 8:32

*and it came to pass that many were drowned
in the [deph 0 | debths 1 | depths ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST] of the fountain*

When copying from \mathcal{C} to \mathcal{P} , Oliver Cowdery interpreted the original manuscript’s *deph* (in the hand of scribe 3) as the plural *depths*, although one could also interpret *deph* as representing the singular *depth*. Thus the question is whether *deph* stands for *depth* or *depths*.

Possible evidence that *deph* stands for *depths* can be found in Nephi’s version of Lehi’s dream, where the plural is used to refer to this same fountain of water:

- 1 Nephi 12:16
behold the **fountain** of filthy water which thy father saw
yea even the river of which he spake
and the **depths** thereof are the **depths** of hell

Generally speaking, we have the plural *depths* in the Book of Mormon text: “depths of the sea” (14 times), “depths of the earth” (4 times), “depths of sorrow” (1 Nephi 16:25), and “depths of the mysteries of him” (Jacob 4:8). When actually measuring physical depth, the singular is of course used (“the depth of the ditch” in Alma 49:18).

The only other place in the text where we get singular/plural variation for *depth(s)* is in the phrase “depth(s) of humility”. In the current text there are five occurrences in the plural but one in the singular (Alma 62:41). Yet even for this one case, the original manuscript initially read *depths*. But in correcting the following word, Oliver Cowdery accidentally erased the final *s* of *depths*, thus leading to an incorrect “depth of humility”. For more discussion, see Alma 62:41.

Thus the text is consistent. Unless the actual measurement of depth is meant, the plural *depths* is used. Given this consistency, plus the clearly corrupt spelling *deph* in \mathcal{O} for 1 Nephi 8:32, Oliver Cowdery’s emendation to *depths* is most probably correct.

Summary: Continue to follow Oliver Cowdery’s interpretation of the scribal slip *deph* in \mathcal{O} as the plural *depths*.

■ 1 Nephi 8:32

and many were lost from [My view > NULL 0 | 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST] his view

Here in 1 Nephi 8:32, scribe 3 of \mathcal{O} accidentally reverted to the first person (as if Nephi were directly quoting Lehi) but then immediately caught his error, crossed out “my view”, and wrote inline “his view”. Earlier, Nephi had been directly quoting his father’s words (1 Nephi 8:2–28), but beginning with verse 29, Nephi had switched to summarizing Lehi’s account (“and now I Nephi do not speak all the words of my father”). The scribal error in verse 32 suggests that the few cases in the text of mixing direct and indirect quotes within a sentence may possibly be due to scribal error (see the discussion for 1 Nephi 7:1 and Alma 19:26). On the other hand, see Alma 56:52–53 for an example of a longer intervening indirect quote that seems to be intentional.

Summary: Maintain the third person usage in 1 Nephi 8:32 (“and many were lost from **his** view”).

■ 1 Nephi 8:33

*but we [0ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST | beheld > headed > NULL 1]
[heded 0 | headed 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST] them not*

Here we have an example of Oliver Cowdery’s occasional difficulty in reading the original manuscript. Scribe 3 of \mathcal{O} spelled *headed* as *heded*, which Oliver initially misread as *beheld*. After initially writing “but we beheld them not” in \mathcal{P} , Oliver immediately caught his error, crossed out *beheld*, and supralinearly wrote *headed*. But then Oliver suddenly recalled the correct spelling, crossed out the supralinear correction, and wrote *headed* inline. In this instance, Oliver Cowdery caught his misspelling; for an example where his misspelling of *heed* as *head* led to a textual misinterpretation and subsequent change in the text, see Alma 51:15.

Summary: Maintain the reading of the original manuscript in 1 Nephi 8:33 (“but we heeded them not”), obviously the correct interpretation of scribe 3’s “but we heded them not”.

■ 1 Nephi 8:34

[§3 *thus is* >+ §2 *thus are* 0 | *these are* 1 | *These are* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
the words of my father
 [01 | : ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
for as many as heeded them had fallen away

Here scribe 3 of \mathcal{O} originally wrote *thus is*, but later scribe 2 of \mathcal{O} corrected the grammar of the text, from “thus **is** the words” to “thus **are** the words”. Later, in his copying from \mathcal{O} to \mathcal{P} , Oliver Cowdery misread scribe 3’s *thus* as *these*, with the result that the editions have consistently read “these are”.

Let us consider the grammatical change first. As already noted, nonstandard subject-verb agreement occurs in the original text. A similar example (but left unedited in the first two editions) is found near the end of 1 Nephi:

1 Nephi 22:6
 for thus [*is the covenants* 01ABDE | *are the covenants* CGHKPRST |
is the covenant FIJLMNOQ] of the Lord with our fathers

Here the 1840 edition changed the singular *is* to *are* (just as scribe 2 of \mathcal{O} emended scribe 3’s *is* to *are* in 1 Nephi 8:34). The 1852 LDS edition solved the problem in subject-verb agreement by changing the logical subject *covenants* to the singular *covenant*. The critical text will retain the original “thus is” in both 1 Nephi 8:34 and 1 Nephi 22:6. See further discussion under SUBJECT-VERB AGREEMENT in volume 3.

Now let us turn to the replacement of *thus* with *these*. This kind of mistake in transmission is found elsewhere in the text, as in the following example where the 1830 compositor misread *thus* as *these*:

Helaman 16:11
 and [*thus* 1 | *these* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] were the conditions
 also in the eighty and eighth year of the reign of the judges

There are quite a few examples where *thus* is used in this way, as in the example listed above of 1 Nephi 22:6 (“for **thus is** the covenants of the Lord with our fathers”). For further discussion of the use of *thus* in summarizing, see Helaman 16:8–11.

The word *thus* in 1 Nephi 8:34 refers to Lehi’s actual words in the previous verse, which are in the first person:

1 Nephi 8:33
 and after that they did enter into that building
 they did point the finger of scorn at **me**
 and those that were partaking of the fruit also
 but **we** heeded them not

The words in the second half of verse 34 (after the summarizing *thus*-clause) are in the third person and represent an explanation by Nephi (as evidenced by the use of the conjunction *for*):

1 Nephi 8:34

thus is the words of my father
for as many as heeded them had fallen away

Even with the reading *these*, the reference is still the preceding quote in verse 33. Therefore, there is no need for the colon after *father* in verse 34; a comma would be more appropriate.

Summary: Restore the nonstandard “thus is the words of my father” in 1 Nephi 8:34; the *thus* refers the reader back to the words of Lehi directly quoted in the previous verse; as a result, a comma, not a colon, should precede the following *for*-clause (“for as many as heeded them had fallen away”).

■ 1 Nephi 8:37

*and he did exhort them then with all the feeling of a tender parent
 that they would hearken to his words*

[*in* 01A | BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *that perhaps the Lord would be merciful to them
 and not cast them off*

This deletion of *in* first appeared in the 1837 edition and was not marked by Joseph Smith in the printer’s manuscript. There is nothing wrong with the syntax of “in that perhaps the Lord would be merciful to them”. The dropping of the preposition *in* could in fact be a typo in the 1837 edition. There is no reason for not restoring the earliest reading here.

The use of “in that” (where *that* is a conjunction) is found nowhere else in the Book of Mormon text. On the other hand, there are many examples of “insomuch that”. One possibility is that “in that” in 1 Nephi 8:37 is an error for “insomuch that”. In the original text, there are 176 examples of “insomuch that”, but none of these are followed by *perhaps*—which suggests that “insomuch that” is determinative and does not permit mere possibility (as here in 1 Nephi 8:37). Moreover, there are no examples of the text switching from *insomuch* to *in* or vice versa. The phrase “that perhaps” occurs 26 times in the original text, but “that perhaps” is never preceded by *insomuch*—or *in*. Even though it appears that the expression “in that perhaps” is unique here in 1 Nephi 8:37, it should nonetheless be restored to the text.

A similar case where *in* has been lost before a subordinate clause is found later on in the text:

3 Nephi 3:11

he was exceedingly astonished because of the boldness of Giddianhi
 [*in* 1PS | ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] demanding the possession
 of the land of the Nephites

In this case, the appended clause is participial and thus differs from the *that*-clause in 1 Nephi 8:37. And in the example from 3 Nephi 3:11, unlike the one here in 1 Nephi 8:37, the *in* seems necessary. For discussion, see 3 Nephi 3:11.

Summary: Restore the reading of the manuscripts for 1 Nephi 8:37 (“in that perhaps the Lord would be merciful to them”).

1 Nephi 9

■ 1 Nephi 9:3–4

*nevertheless I have received a commandment of the Lord
that I should make these plates for the special purpose
that there should be an account engraven of the ministry of my people*

*[and 0|& 1| ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] upon the other plates
should be engraven an account of the reigns of the kings
and the wars and contentions of my people*

The 1830 compositor accidentally omitted the conjunction *and* at the beginning of verse 4. There appears to be no motivation for deleting the *and*; its use here is perfectly consistent with the highly connective nature of the Book of Mormon text. Note the use of the conjunction *and* later on in this passage, where we have a continuing parallel comparison of the two sets of plates:

1 Nephi 9:4

wherefore these plates are for the more part of the ministry
and the other plates are for the more part of the reigns of the kings
and the wars and contentions of my people

Summary: Restore the connective *and* at the beginning of 1 Nephi 9:4; this was accidentally omitted when setting the type for the 1830 edition.

■ 1 Nephi 9:4

*and upon the other plates should be engraven an account
of the [reings 0|reign 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST] of the kings
and the wars and contentions of my people . . .*

*and the other plates are for the more part
of the [Reigns 0|reign 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST] of the kings
and the wars and contentions of my people*

Scribe 3 of \mathcal{O} does not tend to add superfluous *s*'s. Each king has his own reign, so the plural is perfectly acceptable here. Nonetheless, this usage was strange for Oliver Cowdery, so for both occurrences of *reigns* in \mathcal{O} (miswritten once as *reings*), he changed the plural to the singular *reign* when he copied this passage from \mathcal{O} into \mathcal{P} . This same original plural usage occurs elsewhere in the small plates (four times), and in these cases the plural forms have been retained:

the reigns of the kings	Jacob 1:9, Jacob 1:11, Jacob 1:14
the reigns of their kings	Jacob 3:13

With one exception, the singular *reign* occurs only when the text describes the rule of a single king (21 times). The exception is found at the very end of the book of Mosiah, where Mormon is describing the replacement of the hereditary system of kings with elected judges:

Mosiah 29:47
and thus ended the **reign** of the kings over the people of Nephi

This expression parallels the common Book of Mormon expression “the reign of the judges” (which occurs 102 times in the original text, from Mosiah 29 through Helaman 16). The plural use of *reigns* is, in fact, never found when referring to the judges. The first two examples of “the reign of the judges” are near Mosiah 29:47:

Mosiah 29:44 (three verses earlier)
and thus commenced the **reign** of the judges
throughout all the land of Zarahemla

Alma preface (one verse later)
an account of the **reign** of the judges
and the wars and contentions among the people

It is possible that the singular *reign* in Mosiah 29:47 (namely, “the reign of the kings”) is a mistake due to the nearby influence of these two examples of “the reign of the judges”. But a more plausible explanation is that the word *reign* in Mosiah 29, unlike its usage in the small plates of Nephi, specifically refers to the system of rule (either under hereditary monarchs or under elected judges) rather than the particular rule of a king or judge. Under this interpretation, the singular *reign* is wholly appropriate for kings as well as judges. Thus there is no strong motivation to emend *reign* in Mosiah 29:47 to read in the plural.

Summary: Restore the plural *reigns* both times in 1 Nephi 9:4; the small plates of Nephi always refer to “the reigns of the(ir) kings”; in Mosiah 29:47, the singular *reign* in “the reign of the kings” should be retained because it parallels “the reign of the judges” found throughout much of Mormon’s abridgment of the large plates of Nephi; in these later expressions, the word *reign* refers to the system of governance, never to the specific rule of a particular king or chief judge.

■ 1 Nephi 9:4

*and upon the other plates should be engraven
an account of the reigns of **the** kings
and the wars and contentions of my people . . .*

*and the other plates are for the more part
of the reigns of [the 01ABCDEFGHIJKLNOPST | MQR] kings
and the wars and contentions of my people*

The typesetter for the 1905 LDS Chicago edition accidentally dropped the definite article *the* before the second occurrence of *kings*, probably because “the reigns of kings” seems more natural than “the reigns of the kings”. This reading (without the definite article before *kings*) continued in the LDS text until the *the* was restored in the 1981 edition. The 1905 omission was clearly a typo and not due to any kind of editing. Otherwise, we would expect the *the* to have been deleted from the first occurrence of this same expression found at the beginning of the verse (“an account of the reigns of **the** kings”).

Summary: Maintain the definite article *the* before *kings* in 1 Nephi 9:4 (both times).

1 Nephi 10

■ 1 Nephi 10:2–3

he spake unto them concerning the Jews

[*how* 0 | *how* >js NULL 1 | *How* A | BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *that after they were destroyed*

—yea even that great city Jerusalem—

and that many were carried away captive into Babylon

that according to the own due time of the Lord they should return again

The larger passage here consists of several different types of editing, all initiated by Joseph Smith in an attempt to smooth out the text. This editing represents Joseph’s early attempts to clarify the text, but this kind of editing soon ceased since it was probably time-consuming and not really necessary.

We first consider Joseph Smith’s editing of the subordinate conjunctive phrase “how that”. His editing here seems to be motivated by an attempt to deal with the complexity of the subordinate clause (“after they were destroyed”) that follows right after the “how that”. Later on in the book of Ether, Joseph edited out a similar example of *how*; in this case, the following clause (“after the waters had receded from off the face of this land”) is also subordinate:

Ether 13:2

for he truly told them of all things from the beginning of man

and [*how* >js NULL 1 | *how* A | BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *that*

after the waters had receded from off the face of this land

it became a choice land above all other lands

But in five cases, the phrase “how that” has been retained; in each of these cases there is no following subordinate clause after the “how that”:

2 Nephi 30:4

and then shall the remnant of our seed know concerning us

how that we came out from Jerusalem

Jacob 2:5

I can tell you concerning your thoughts

how that ye are beginning to labor in sin

Jacob 3:10

wherefore ye shall remember your children

how that ye have grieved their hearts

Helaman 2:8

and it came to pass that
when the servant of Helaman had known all the heart of Kishcumen
and **how that** it was his object to murder . . .

Helaman 5:6

and when ye remember their works ye may know
how that it is said and also written that they were good

In any event, there is no crucial need to delete the *how* from 1 Nephi 10:3 and Ether 13:2, despite the increased complexity of having an *after*-clause immediately follow “how that”.

Summary: Restore the original connective “how that” in 1 Nephi 10:3 and Ether 13:2.

■ 1 Nephi 10:2–3

he spake unto them concerning the Jews

- (1) *how that after they [ware 0 | were >js should be 1 | were A | should be BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] destroyed
—yea even that great city Jerusalem—*
- (2) *and that many [ware 0 | were >js be 1 | were A | be BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] carried away
captive into Babylon*
- (3) *that according to the own due time of the Lord they **should** return again*
- (4) *yea even [0ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST | NULL >js should 1] be brought back out of captivity*
- (5) *and after that they [are 0A | are >js should be 1 | should be BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] brought back
out of captivity*
- (6) *[to 0A | to >js they should 1 | they should BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] possess again
their land of inheritance . . .*

In this indirect quote from Lehi, Joseph Smith’s editing for the 1837 edition increased the use of *should*. Originally, the verse had only one occurrence of *should* (in 3). One of Joseph’s *should*’s (in 4) was not implemented into the 1837 or any subsequent edition; the original phraseology (“yea even be brought back out of captivity”) has been maintained instead of Joseph’s emended phraseology (“yea even **should** be brought back out of captivity”). It is possible that this lack of change in the text was influenced by the edited text in 2, for which no *should* was inserted (“that many be carried away captive”). In fact, it is possible that Joseph actually intended the clause in 2 to read “that many should be carried away captive”, but he ended up inserting only the *be*. Finally, at the end of this indirect quote (in 6), the original infinitive clause was converted to a finite clause by adding the subject *they* and by again inserting the modal verb *should*.

The original text here in 1 Nephi 10:3 starts out with the past-tense verb form *were*, which seems strange because Lehi is prophesying of the future. Yet such examples of tense shifting are common in English discourse (as in the sentence “he **told** me that he **was** coming **tomorrow**”). Here in 1 Nephi 10:3, the tensed verb forms *were* and *are* occur in the two *after*-clauses (in 2 and 5), while *should* occurs in the main clause in 3 (“they should return again”). Generally speaking, this kind of construction has been left unedited elsewhere in the Book of Mormon text. Consider, for instance, the indirect quote later on in 1 Nephi 15:20. In this instance, Nephi is referring to a

prophecy of Isaiah's about the future of the house of Israel. As in 1 Nephi 10:3, the *were* is found in the *after*-clause, while *should* is found in the following main clause:

1 Nephi 15:20

and I did rehearse unto them the words of Isaiah
which spake concerning the restoration of the Jews or of the house of Israel
and after that they **were** restored
they **should** no more be confounded neither **should** they be scattered again

The last editing change in 1 Nephi 10:3 (in 6) fulfills several purposes. With the addition of the subject *they*, the second *after*-clause is now followed by a main clause, which conforms with the previous *after*-clause. And by adding the *should*, we now have a modal verb in two main clauses, which conforms with the use of *should* in the main clause of 1 Nephi 15:20. A third purpose of the editing has been to remove the nonstandard use of the infinitive clause (“to possess again their land of inheritance”). Nonetheless, the original infinitive clause is readily understood.

The critical text will, of course, follow the earliest reading for 1 Nephi 10:3, including the non-standard use of the infinitive clause at the end of the indirect quote.

Summary: Restore the original verb forms in 1 Nephi 10:3 since the edited changes favoring *should* were unnecessary.

■ 1 Nephi 10:2–3

*he spake unto them concerning the Jews
how that after they were destroyed
—yea even that great city Jerusalem—*

- (1) *and [that 0A | that >js NULL 1 | BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
many were carried away captive into Babylon*
- (2) *[that 0A | that >js NULL 1 | BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
according to the own due time of the Lord
they should return again
yea even be brought back out of captivity*
- (3) *and after [that 0 | 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] they are brought back out of captivity
to possess again their land of inheritance*

In this same passage, three occurrences of the subordinate conjunction *that* have been eliminated, the first two by Joseph Smith in his editing for the 1837 edition, the third accidentally as Oliver Cowdery copied the text from \mathcal{G} into \mathcal{P} . Usually Oliver correctly copied examples of “after that”, so the omission here is exceptional.

The first example of deleted *that* headed a clause that was conjoined with the preceding clause (the one immediately following the subordinate conjunction *after*). This construction conjoins two clauses: “they were destroyed” and “many were carried away captive into Babylon”. Thus the original use of the *that* with the second clause is equivalent to using the archaic “after that”. Joseph Smith typically deleted *that* after a subordinate conjunction, including cases involving clausal conjuncts. For instance, in 1 Nephi 2:11, both *that*'s are deleted. Because the clauses are conjoined, the second deletion is equivalent to removing a *that* after *because*:

1 Nephi 2:11

for behold they did murmur in many things against their father
 because [*that* 01A | BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] he was a visionary man
 and [*that he* 01A | BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] had led them
 out of the land of Jerusalem

In the example from 1 Nephi 10:3, the first *that* did not occur immediately following *after* because *after* was immediately preceded by a *that* (“how **that after** they were destroyed”). The original text tended to avoid the sequence “that after that”, with only one occurrence in the earliest text:

1 Nephi 11:9

and it came to pass **that after that** I had seen the tree
 I said unto the Spirit . . .

So it is not surprising that this awkward construction is not found in 1 Nephi 10:3. Nonetheless, the *that* which originally followed the *and* was an equivalent case of “after that” and was therefore subject to Joseph Smith’s editing. Such an analysis depends on interpreting the *after*-clause as containing a conjunction of clauses. The original use of the tensed verb form *were* in both clauses argues for this interpretation. As already noted, the *should* originally occurred only in the following main clause in 1 Nephi 10:3 (“they should return again”). For additional discussion, see SUBORDINATE CONJUNCTIONS in volume 3.

We now turn to the second *that* which Joseph Smith deleted from 1 Nephi 10:3. Here we have a case of the repeated *that*, which occurs frequently in spoken English (as in the sentence “he said **that** after he came home **that** he would clean his room”). The repeated *that* helps the reader remember that the quotation has not yet ended. Very often in the original Book of Mormon text (and in fact still in the current text), the *that* is repeated when there is an intervening subordinate clause, as in the following examples, the second of which has had the repeated *that* edited out:

1 Nephi 13:28

wherefore thou seest **that**
after the book hath gone forth through the hands
 of the great and abominable church
that there are many plain and most precious things taken away from the book

Alma 24:19

and thus we see **that**
when these Lamanites were brought to believe and to know the truth
 [*that* 0A | *that* >js NULL 1 | BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
 they were firm and would suffer even unto death rather than to commit sin

David Calabro points out (personal communication) an additional advantage of having the repeated *that* in 1 Nephi 10:3: it forces the reader to correctly assign the phrase “according to the own due time of the Lord” to the following clause (“they should return again”) and not to the preceding clause (“many were carried away captive into Babylon”). From 1837 on, the printed text has used only commas to set off the phrase “according to the own due time of the Lord”. Thus the current punctuation does not solve the syntactic ambiguity that resulted from deleting the repeated *that*.

The critical text will restore all examples of the repeated *that*, providing they are supported by the earliest textual sources. For a complete discussion of the repeated *that*, see THAT in volume 3.

Summary: Restore the two *that*'s which Joseph Smith deleted in 1 Nephi 10:2–3; the first represents the equivalent of the archaic “after that”, the second is a repeated *that* which helps the reader remember that the material is being quoted; also restore the third *that* (also an example of “after that”) which Oliver Cowdery accidentally omitted when copying from \mathcal{O} into \mathcal{P} .

■ 1 Nephi 10:3

how that after they were destroyed

[*yea* 0 | *yea* >js NULL 1 | *yea* A | BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *even that great city Jerusalem*

In 1 Nephi 10, Joseph Smith removed *yea* from three examples of “yea even”. In addition to the example here in verse 3, we have these two instances:

1 Nephi 10:4

a prophet would the Lord God raise up among the Jews

[*yea* 0A | *yea* >js NULL 1 | BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *even a Messiah*

1 Nephi 10:9

and he also spake that he should baptize with water

[*yea* 0A | *yea* >js NULL 1 | BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *even that he should baptize the Messiah with water*

This conscious editing by Joseph is found only here in 1 Nephi 10. Elsewhere, he left all other examples of “yea even” unchanged. The original text had 190 examples of “yea even”; besides these three edited examples, there are three accidental copying errors for which *yea* was lost from the phrase “yea even”. (Each of these three accidental losses involved a preceding *you* that appears to have interfered with transmitting the following *yea*. For discussion of these instances, see Alma 42:31, Alma 54:9, and 3 Nephi 3:8.)

The original *yea* is very characteristic of the Book of Mormon text and is used to clarify the immediately preceding text. Thus the *yea* should be restored in these three examples in 1 Nephi 10.

Summary: Restore the three cases of “yea even” in 1 Nephi 10:3, 4, 9; the deletion of the *yea* in this chapter represents stylistic editing on the part of Joseph Smith.

■ 1 Nephi 10:3

to possess again [their land of 0 | the land of their 1 ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] inheritance

The original manuscript reads “their land of inheritance”, which is very unusual when compared with the rest of the text. Elsewhere, the word *inheritance* is always preceded by some kind of determiner or modifier (58 times), as shown by the following statistics:

their inheritance	26
their first inheritance	3
our inheritance	8
our first inheritance	2
your inheritance	5
his inheritance	3
thine inheritance	2
an inheritance	4
the inheritance of my seed	1
the inheritance of thy seed	1
our father's inheritance	1
our fathers' first inheritance	1
their fathers' first inheritance	1

In particular, Lehi's family inheritance is otherwise always referred to as "the land of X's inheritance":

1 Nephi 2:4	and he left his house and the land of his inheritance
1 Nephi 2:11	to leave the land of their inheritance
1 Nephi 3:16	let us go down to the land of our father's inheritance
1 Nephi 3:22	we went down to the land of our inheritance
1 Nephi 5:2	thou hast led us forth from the land of our inheritance
1 Nephi 17:21	we might have enjoyed our possessions and the land of our inheritance

Thus the one occurrence of "their land of inheritance" (in 1 Nephi 10:3) could well be an error in the original manuscript.

We can find manuscript evidence showing that Oliver Cowdery tended to move a possessive pronoun forward in a construction of the form "the X of <possessive pronoun> Y":

Alma 23:7 (∅ is not extant)
 they did lay down
 [*their* > *the* 1 | *the* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] weapons of **their** rebellion

Alma 51:6 (∅ is extant)
 for the freemen had sworn or covenanted to maintain
 their rights and [*the* 0ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST | *their* > *the* 1] privileges
 of **their** religion

Both of these errors are in the printer's manuscript, not the original manuscript; and the scribe is Oliver Cowdery, not scribe 3 of ∅. Moreover, in both cases, Oliver caught his error and corrected it in ℘. For one possible example in 3 Nephi, the error might not have been caught until much later. In this case, both the printer's manuscript and the 1830 edition are firsthand copies of the original manuscript, and they both read the same, so apparently the original manuscript also read "and their privileges of their church":

3 Nephi 2:12 (⊘ is not extant)

yea and also to maintain their rights
and [*their* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPS | *the* RT] privileges of **their** church
and of their worship and their freedom and their liberty

It is possible that the 1920 LDS emendation, “and **the** privileges of their church”, is how the original text actually read. So if there is an error in 3 Nephi 2:12, it probably occurred as Oliver Cowdery wrote down Joseph Smith’s dictation. If so, this would be a third example of *the* being replaced by *their* in anticipation of a following *their*.

One difference between these three examples and the one in 1 Nephi 10:3 is that the following *their* was not deleted in any of the three other examples—that is, these three examples suggest that if the original text in 1 Nephi 10:3 had been “the land of their inheritance”, then the mistake should have been “their land of their inheritance”. Instead, scribe 3 of ⊘ wrote “their land of inheritance”. So there isn’t a perfect match between these three examples of scribal error and the earliest text in 1 Nephi 10:3.

Furthermore, there are a number of scribal and printing errors that show a strong tendency to produce errors favoring the expected phraseology of “the land(s) of their inheritance”:

1 Nephi 13:15 (the 1830 edition replaced *for* with *of*)

the land [*for* 01BCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST | *of* A] their inheritance

1 Nephi 22:12 (Oliver Cowdery omitted the word *first* in Ⓟ)

the lands of their [*first* 0 | 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST] inheritance

2 Nephi 1:11 (in Ⓟ, Oliver Cowdery accidentally replaced *possessions* with *inheritance*, then immediately corrected his error)

the lands of their [*possessions* 0ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST |
inheritance > *possessions* 1]

Clearly, Oliver Cowdery expected the phraseology “the land(s) of their inheritance”.

Ultimately, we have to recognize that the earliest textual reading for 1 Nephi 10:3 is completely understandable. Even though a scribal error may be involved, it is probably safest to retain this unique reading, since it does occur in the earliest textual source, the original manuscript.

Summary: Restore the unique reading “their land of inheritance” in 1 Nephi 10:3, even though it may be an error for “the land of their inheritance” (the reading in Ⓟ).

■ 1 Nephi 10:4

a prophet would the Lord God raise up among the Jews

[*yea* 0A | *yea* >js NULL 1 | BCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST] *even a Messiah*

As discussed under 1 Nephi 10:3, the original *yea* that Joseph Smith deleted here should be restored.

■ 1 Nephi 10:6

*wherefore all mankind [was 0A | was >js were 1 | were BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
in a lost and in a fallen state
and ever would be save **they** should rely on this Redeemer*

Here Joseph Smith edited “all mankind was” to “all mankind were”. The singular works as long as mankind is considered a collective whole, but the use later on in the verse of the plural pronoun *they* suggests that “all mankind” should be treated as a plurality of separate individuals (“save **they** should rely on this Redeemer”).

Elsewhere the text has consistently preferred the plural *were* with “all mankind”:

Mosiah 16:4

thus all mankind **were** lost
and behold **they** would have been endlessly lost
were it not that God redeemed his people from their lost and fallen state

Alma 42:14

and thus we see that all mankind **were** fallen
and **they** were in the grasp of justice

Nonetheless, the critical text will restore the singular *was* in 1 Nephi 10:6 since its use there appears to be intentional. For complete discussion, see SUBJECT-VERB AGREEMENT in volume 3.

Summary: Restore the singular *was* in “all mankind was in a lost and in a fallen state” (1 Nephi 10:6).

■ 1 Nephi 10:8

*yea even he should go forth and cry in the wilderness
prepare ye the way of the Lord
and make his paths [strait 01 | straight ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]*

In 1 Nephi 10:8, Lehi’s language parallels that of the synoptic Gospels (Matthew 3:3, Mark 1:3, and Luke 3:4), which derives from the Septuagint version of Isaiah 40:3. As a result, the printed editions have consistently had the correct *straight* rather than the *strait* of the manuscripts. For other passages, the issue regarding *strait* versus *straight* is often more complex. For a complete discussion, see under 1 Nephi 8:20; for a complete listing of the textual variation, see STRAIT in volume 3.

Summary: The phraseology in 1 Nephi 10:8 of “make his paths straight” follows the language of the synoptic Gospels in describing John the Baptist’s mission; thus *straight* is the correct reading.

■ 1 Nephi 10:9

and my father

[*saith* 0A | *saith* >js *said* 1 | *said* BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]

[*that* 0A | *that* >js NULL 1 | BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]

he should baptize in Bethabara beyond Jordan

and he also [*spake* 0A | *spake* >js *said* 1 | *said* BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]

[*that* 0A | *that* >js NULL 1 | BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]

he should baptize with water

The first part of verse 9 indirectly quotes Lehi’s words as “my father saith that he should baptize in Bethabara beyond Jordan”. Joseph Smith edited the historical present *saith* to *said* and deleted the *that*. Later on in the verse, he edited the verb *spake* to *said* in addition to again deleting the *that*. All of this editing is of a secondary nature. Joseph probably changed the verb from *spake* to *said* because of the adverb *also*, thus increasing the parallelism between the two indirect quotes (that is, “and my father **said** . . . and he also **said**”). For discussion of the change from *saith* to *said* and the deletion of the *that*, see HISTORICAL PRESENT and THAT in volume 3.

As far as the change from the verb *spake* to *say* is concerned, this is the only place where Joseph Smith made such an editorial change. His editing here is characteristic of his early attempts to smooth out the text. There is nothing grammatically wrong with “and he also spake that he should baptize with water”. Other examples of this usage have not been removed from the text. In the following passage, we have an earlier example of an indirect quote where the verb is *spake* rather than *say*:

1 Nephi 4:24

and I also **spake** unto him **that** I should carry the engravings
which were upon the plates of brass
to my elder brethren which were without the wall

In this example, however, the previous verse (1 Nephi 4:23) uses the verb *spake* (“and I spake unto him as if it had been Laban”), so there was no need here to change *spake* to *said*.

Summary: In 1 Nephi 10:9, restore the original *spake* that Joseph Smith edited to *said*; Joseph’s editing here is an attempt to increase the parallelism of the text.

■ 1 Nephi 10:9

and my father saith that he should baptize in

[*bethebara* 0 | *Bethebara* 1 | *Bethabara* APRST | *Bethabary* BCDEFGHIJKLMNOQ] *beyond Jordan*

The passage here agrees with the corresponding reading in the King James Bible:

John 1:28

these things were done in **Bethabara** beyond Jordan
where John was baptizing

The Book of Mormon manuscripts have the spelling *Bethebara* (and with a lowercase initial *b* in \mathcal{O} since scribe 3 of \mathcal{O} typically spells proper nouns without capitalization). The equivalent Greek spelling *Bethebara* is actually found in John 1:28 for a couple of manuscripts dating from the 12th and 13th centuries CE. The earliest extant Greek manuscripts support the reading *Bethany*, but Origen (writing in 253–254 CE) apparently found a few manuscripts with the reading *Bethabara*. For discussion, see page 171 of Bruce M. Metzger, *A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament*, second edition (Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1994); for the specific variation and the manuscripts, see Barbara Aland, Kurt Aland, Johannes Karavidopoulos, Carlo M. Martini, and Bruce M. Metzger, *The Greek New Testament*, fourth revised edition (Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft and United Bible Societies, 1993).

Although textual critics have favored the *Bethany* of the early manuscripts, it is quite possible that early on in the textual history of the Gospel of John, the strange name *Bethabara* was accidentally replaced by the more familiar *Bethany*. The Book of Mormon text agrees with the reading *Bethabara* rather than *Bethany*. The manuscript spelling *Bethebara* appears to be just a misspelling of *Bethabara*: the schwa pronunciation of the second vowel led the scribe to write *e* instead of *a*. Ultimately, the question is whether Joseph Smith spelled out this place-name to the scribe. We find abundant evidence in the original manuscript that Joseph often spelled out Book of Mormon names, especially the first time they occurred. But with most biblical names, he apparently assumed that the scribe could spell them correctly or, if not, that the typesetter would. There is no evidence in the original manuscript for the spellings of recognizable biblical names ever being corrected in this way. (For a list of examples, see the discussion under 1 Nephi 11:13.) Consequently, we should assume that the manuscript spelling *Bethebara* is simply a misspelling for *Bethabara*.

The incorrect spelling *Bethabary* showed up first in the 1837 edition and continued in all editions until the 1908 RLDS edition and the 1920 LDS edition. In his editing for the 1837 edition, Joseph Smith did not mark this spelling change in \mathcal{P} . *Bethabary* is undoubtedly a typesetter's error, probably influenced by the place-name *Barbary*, which was prominent in American foreign policy issues in the early 1800s.

Summary: The manuscript spelling *Bethebara* is most probably a scribal error for *Bethabara*, the place-name mentioned in John 1:28 in the King James Bible; the 1837 reading *Bethabary* is no doubt a typo.

■ 1 Nephi 10:9

and he also spake that he should baptize with water
 [yea 0A | yea >js NULL 1 | BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *even that*
he should baptize the Messiah with water

As discussed under 1 Nephi 10:3, the original *yea* that Joseph Smith deleted here should be restored.

■ 1 Nephi 10:10

*and after that he had baptized the Messiah with water
he should behold and bear record that
he had baptized the Lamb of God which should take away the
[sin 0 | sin >+ sins 1 | sins ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] of the world*

Here the original manuscript reads *sin* (that is, in the singular). When copying from \mathcal{O} into \mathcal{P} , Oliver Cowdery initially wrote *sin*, then consciously inserted the plural *s* (the ink flow is heavier). The problem here is whether the singular *sin* in \mathcal{O} is one of scribe 3's typical errors—namely, of accidentally dropping the plural *s*. In this instance, the plural use is clearly expected, but the singular *sin* will work.

When we compare this text to its biblical parallel, we find the following wording in the King James Bible:

John 1:29
the next day John seeth Jesus coming unto him and saith
behold the Lamb of God which taketh away the **sin** of the world

Based on this parallel, the singular *sin* in the original manuscript of the Book of Mormon should be considered correct.

In fact, this same accidental change from singular to plural occurred in one other place in the text:

2 Nephi 31:4
wherefore I would that ye should remember that I have spoken unto you
concerning that prophet which the Lord shewed unto me
that should baptize the Lamb of God which should take away
the [*Sin* 1 | *sins* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOQRT | *sin* PS] of the world

In this second case, the 1908 RLDS text restored the singular *sin*, the reading of the printer's manuscript. Here in 2 Nephi 31:4 (unlike the case in 1 Nephi 10:10), Oliver Cowdery did not emend the singular to the plural.

Elsewhere the Book of Mormon text has only the plural *sins* (not *sin*) in the phrase “the sin(s) of the world”. Yet in all 15 of these other instances, there is no reference to the role of John the Baptist as there is in 1 Nephi 10:10 and 2 Nephi 31:4:

1 Nephi 11:33
and I Nephi saw that he was lifted up upon the cross
and slain for the **sins** of the world

Mosiah 26:23
for it is I that taketh upon me the **sins** of the world

Alma 5:48
and behold it is he that cometh to take away the **sins** of the world

Alma 7:14
that ye may have faith on the Lamb of God
which taketh away the **sins** of the world

Alma 30:26

and ye say also that he shall be slain for the **sins** of the world

Alma 34:8

and that he shall atone for the **sins** of the world

Alma 34:12

therefore there can be nothing which is short of an infinite atonement
which will suffice for the **sins** of the world

Alma 36:17

behold I remembered also to have heard my father prophesy unto the people
concerning the coming of one Jesus Christ a Son of God
to atone for the **sins** of the world

Alma 39:15

it is him that surely shall come to take away the **sins** of the world

Alma 42:15

therefore God himself atoneth for the **sins** of the world

3 Nephi 11:11

and have glorified the Father in taking upon me the **sins** of the world

3 Nephi 11:14

I am the God of Israel and the God of the whole earth
and have been slain for the **sins** of the world

3 Nephi 28:9

and again ye shall not have pain while ye shall dwell in the flesh
neither sorrow save it be for the **sins** of the world

3 Nephi 28:38

there was a change wrought upon their bodies
that they might not suffer pain nor sorrow save it were for the **sins** of the world

4 Nephi 1:44

and from this time the disciples began to sorrow for the **sins** of the world

In three cases (Alma 5:48, Alma 7:14, and Alma 39:15), the text uses language nearly identical to John the Baptist's (as in John 1:29), yet without mentioning him in any way. Thus the earliest text for 1 Nephi 10:10 and 2 Nephi 31:4 is perfectly consistent; only when a passage refers directly to John the Baptist baptizing the Lamb of God does the Book of Mormon text uses the singular *sin*, precisely like the language in John 1:29.

Summary: Both 1 Nephi 10:10 and 2 Nephi 31:4 specifically refer to John's baptism of Jesus and have the singular usage "the sin of the world", as found in John 1:29; all other instances of this phrase in the Book of Mormon take the plural ("the sins of the world").

■ 1 Nephi 10:13

*wherefore he said it must needs be that we should be led with one accord
into the [land of promise 0ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST | promised land > land of promise 1]*

When copying from \mathcal{C} to \mathcal{P} , Oliver Cowdery initially wrote “promised land” instead of “land of promise”, but he immediately caught his error, crossed out the word *land* as well as the *d* of *promised*, then supralinearly inserted *land of* before *promise* (and all of this without any change in the level of ink flow).

Elsewhere the text is evenly divided in its use of “land of promise” versus “promised land” (21 to 21), so either reading is possible here in 1 Nephi 10:13. Of course, \mathcal{C} is extant and Oliver Cowdery corrected \mathcal{P} to agree with \mathcal{C} .

Summary: Follow the earliest textual sources in choosing between “land of promise” and “promised land”; here in 1 Nephi 10:13, the earliest reading is “land of promise”.

■ 1 Nephi 10:13–14

*it must needs be that we should be led with one accord into the land of promise
unto the fulfilling of the word of the Lord
that we should be scattered upon all the face of the earth
and after **that** the house of Israel should be scattered
they should be gathered together again
or in fine [that 0A | that >js NULL 1 | B C D E F G H I J K L M N O P Q R S T]
after the Gentiles had received the fullness of the gospel
the natural branches of the olive tree or the remnants of the house of Israel
should be grafted in or come to the knowledge of the true Messiah*

Here Joseph Smith deleted the repeated subordinate conjunction *that* in his editing for the 1837 edition. The repeated *that* specifically refers the reader back to the earlier “unto the fulfilling of the word of the Lord”. The previous *after*-clause (which begins verse 14) did not have a *that* before it since, as already noted under 1 Nephi 10:2–3, the text tends to avoid the sequence “that after that”. For additional discussion, see **THAT** in volume 3.

Summary: Restore the deleted subordinate conjunction *that* following “or in fine” in 1 Nephi 10:14; the *that* is used to help connect the text to the earlier reference in verse 13 (“the fulfilling of the word of the Lord”).

■ 1 Nephi 10:16

*and all these things
[of 0ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST | of >js NULL >js of 1] which
I have spoken [0ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST | NULL >js of >js NULL 1]
was done as my father dwelt in a tent in the valley of Lemuel*

In his editing for the 1837 edition, Joseph Smith first thought to move the preposition *of* from the head of the relative clause to the end, but then he changed his mind. Elsewhere, when the verb of the relative clause is *speak*, the text overwhelmingly prefers having the *of* at the head of the relative clause: out of 52 clear cases without any textual variation, 46 have *of* at the head, 6 at the end. For a complete list of the examples involving *speak* (including four unclear cases with variation), see RELATIVE CLAUSE in volume 3.

Summary: Usage elsewhere strongly supports the placement of the preposition *of* at the head of the relative clause, especially when the verb is *speak*.

■ 1 Nephi 10:17

*and it came to pass that after I Nephi
having heard all the words of my father
concerning the things which he saw in a vision
and also the things which he spake by the power of the Holy Ghost
which power he received by faith on the Son of God
—and the Son of God was the Messiah which should come—
[and it came to pass that 0 | & it came to pass that >]s NULL 1 |
And it came to pass that A | BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
I Nephi was desirous also that I might see and hear and know of these things*

In his editing for the 1837 edition, Joseph Smith deleted 48 examples of the phrase “it came to pass”, of which 42 were marked for deletion in the printer’s manuscript. One of these (in Alma 14:1) was never implemented, but the other 41 were. Of course, Joseph Smith left unchanged the vast majority of nearly 1,500 original examples of “come to pass”. (This count includes variants like “it had come to pass” and “it shall come to pass” in addition to the very frequent “it came to pass”.) In most instances, the deleted examples are extraneous occurrences of this very frequent clause. For most cases of deletion, there were two or more examples of “it came to pass” in close proximity; in some cases, nothing new had “come to pass”; in other cases, there was a syntactic repetition of “it came to pass”.

In this example from 1 Nephi 10:17, the second “it came to pass” was removed because of redundancy: the original sentence began with “it came to pass” (at the beginning of verse 17) and then repeated “it came to pass” following a long *after*-clause and an intervening parenthetical clause. The purpose of the repeated “it came to pass” was to bring the reader back to the original topic.

Despite the seeming overuse of “it came to pass”, the critical text will restore every one of the 47 examples that were deleted in the 1837 edition. Examples of this same kind of overuse can actually be found in the original Hebrew of the book of Genesis, but not in the English of the King James Bible (where unnecessary examples of “it came to pass” were ignored in the translation). For further discussion, see pages 35–37 of Royal Skousen, “The Original Language of the Book of Mormon: Upstate New York Dialect, King James English, or Hebrew?” *Journal of Book of Mormon Studies* 3/1 (1994): 28–38. For a complete analysis of all 48 of the deleted examples of “it came to pass”, see COME TO PASS in volume 3.

Summary: Restore all the examples of “it came to pass” that were deleted for the 1837 edition.

■ 1 Nephi 10:18

for he is the same

[§3 yesterday and >+ §2 yesterto 0 | yesterday 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST]

today and forever

Scribe 3 of \mathcal{O} wrote “yesterday and today and forever”. In an apparent attempt to delete the first *and*, scribe 2 of \mathcal{O} crossed out the *day* of *yesterday* as well as the following *and*, but in correcting for the deleted *day*, scribe 2 supralinearly inserted *to*, probably under the influence of the following *today*. Of course, the resulting text is garbled (“yesterto today and forever”). Oliver Cowdery, when copying into \mathcal{P} , interpreted the text to read “yesterday today and forever”, which is probably what scribe 2 of \mathcal{O} intended.

Such editing is consistent with usage elsewhere in the text. There are six other occurrences of “yesterday today and forever”, but none of “yesterday and today and forever”:

2 Nephi 2:4

for the Spirit is the same yesterday today and forever

2 Nephi 27:23

and I will shew unto the world
that I am the same yesterday today and forever

2 Nephi 29:9

and I do this that I may prove unto many
that I am the same yesterday today and forever

Alma 31:17

but thou art the same yesterday today and forever

Mormon 9:9

for do we not read that God is the same yesterday today and forever

Moroni 10:19

and I would exhort you my beloved brethren
that ye remember that he is the same yesterday today and forever

Interestingly, the corresponding phrase in the King James Bible is indeed “yesterday and today and forever”:

Hebrews 13:8

Jesus Christ the same yesterday **and** today **and** forever

There is another passage in the Book of Mormon text where *and* is repeated, although this example involves *tomorrow* rather than *yesterday*:

Moroni 10:7

for he worketh by power according to the faith of the children of men
the same today **and** tomorrow **and** forever

So *and* can be used to separate all three conjuncts of time. Thus the original hand in \mathcal{O} for 1 Nephi 10:18 (scribe 3's "yesterday and today and forever") is perfectly acceptable, even if it is unique for the Book of Mormon.

Summary: Restore the deleted *and* in 1 Nephi 10:18 ("yesterday and today and forever"); although unique, this reading is supported by the use of "today and tomorrow and forever" in Moroni 10:7.

■ 1 Nephi 10:18

and the way is prepared

[*for all men* 0CGHIJKLMNOQRT | 1ABDEPS | NULL > *for all men* F]
from the foundation of the world

Here is the second clear example of Joseph Smith using the original manuscript to restore a phrase ("for all men") that had been accidentally skipped when Oliver Cowdery copied from \mathcal{O} into \mathcal{P} . Joseph used \mathcal{O} to correct the text for only the 1840 edition. The 1841 British edition was set from the 1837 edition; thus the 1841 edition and the subsequent 1849 British edition are missing the phrase. The first printing of the 1852 British edition also lacks the phrase, but for the second printing of that edition, the 1840 edition was consulted (at least for this part of the text) and the phrase was thus restored to the LDS text. The more recent RLDS text does not have the phrase since the 1908 edition was based on the printer's manuscript.

The loss of the phrase "for all men" is quite natural. Elsewhere the text does not explicitly state that the way is prepared for all; the universal applicability of the way is either assumed or otherwise explained:

2 Nephi 2:4

and the way is prepared from the fall of man and salvation is free

Alma 37:46

even so it is with us
 the way is prepared
 and if we will look we may live forever

Alma 41:8

therefore the way is prepared
 that whosoever will may walk therein and be saved

Summary: Maintain in 1 Nephi 10:18 the phrase "for all men" since it is found in \mathcal{O} ; this short phrase was accidentally lost when Oliver Cowdery copied from \mathcal{O} into \mathcal{P} .

■ 1 Nephi 10:18–19

*and the way is prepared for all men from the foundation of the world
if it so be that they repent and come unto him
for **he** that diligently seeketh shall find
and the mysteries of God shall be unfolded
to [them 0ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST | him >+ them 1]*

In 1 Nephi 10:19, the original manuscript switches from the singular *he* (at the beginning of the verse) to the plural *them* (at the end of the second clause). Although such a shift is possible (notice the use of the plural *all men* and *they* in the previous verse), another possibility is that Joseph Smith read off a stressless *him* as /əm/, which scribe 3 of \mathfrak{C} then misinterpreted as *them*, which is pronounced identically as /əm/ in colloquially spoken English. In other words, Joseph dictated “shall be unfolded to /əm/” and the scribe interpreted the /əm/ as *them*. Oliver Cowdery, when copying from \mathfrak{C} into \mathfrak{D} , initially wrote the expected *him* but shortly thereafter corrected it with slightly heavier ink flow to *them*. This possible emendation of *them* to *him* in 1 Nephi 10:19 was first proposed by Richard Tripp II, a student in my fall 1997 Book of Mormon textual criticism class.

There is considerable evidence in the original manuscript for the scribes misinterpreting *them* as *him* (and vice versa) and then correcting the error. Consider the following two immediate corrections in \mathfrak{C} :

Alma 55:8

& they hailed him but he sayeth unto <him> them

Ether 8:17

leading {<%him%>|them} away by fair promises

In these two cases, Oliver Cowdery initially wrote *him*, then immediately corrected the pronoun to *them*. In the first instance, Oliver crossed out the *him* and then wrote the *them* inline immediately after. In the second case, Oliver erased his initial *him* and overwrote it with *them*.

Of course, in both of these examples, it is obvious what the correct pronoun should be. But in 1 Nephi 10:19, we are dealing with *he* as a generic pronoun, which semantically implies plurality; thus the following *them* is not impossible. If it were impossible, it would have surely been edited to *him* at some time during its publishing history, but this has never happened.

Elsewhere in the original text, we find examples involving generic pronouns that switch from singular to plural (or vice versa), even within the same sentence. Here I give two examples of complex sentences involving a switch in number in going from one clause to the next. In each case, the earliest text is apparently the original text; the switch in number seems intended since the subject pronouns *he* and *they* (unlike the object pronouns *him* and *them*) wouldn't have been aurally confused since there is not much similarity in pronunciation between *he* and *they*:

Mosiah 29:28

and now if ye have judges and **they** do not judge you
according to the law which has been given
ye can cause that
[*he* >jg *thhey* 1 | *they* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST] may be judged
of a higher judge

Alma 5:25

ye cannot suppose that
 such [*an one* >js NULL 1 | *an one* A | BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
 can have place in the kingdom of heaven
 but [*they* >js *he* 1 | *they* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] shall be cast out
 for **they** are the children of the kingdom of the devil

In the first example, John Gilbert (the 1830 typesetter) edited the printer's manuscript by replacing the singular *he* with the plural *they*. In the second example, Joseph Smith edited the printer's manuscript by removing the singular references: he crossed out *an one* and replaced the first *they* with *he*. But when the 1837 edition was actually typeset, the second change was ignored, probably because the plural usage in the following clause ("they are the children of the kingdom of the devil") could not be readily edited to the singular.

These examples show that we have to be very cautious about emending *him* and *them*. It could well be that the original text for 1 Nephi 10:19 read "be unfolded to him" and that the *them* in the original manuscript is the result of scribe 3 misinterpreting /əm/ as *them*. Nonetheless, there are clear examples where a switch from singular to plural is actually intended, providing the pronoun is generic. In such cases, we will rely on the earliest textual sources to determine the reading. In cases where the pronoun refers to a specific individual or group of people, then we may have good cause to emend the earliest reading if *him* and *them* seem to have been mixed up as the scribes were taking down Joseph Smith's dictation.

Summary: Retain the generic pronoun *them* in 1 Nephi 10:19 since the original manuscript reads this way; although this instance of *them* may be a scribal error for *him*, there is considerable independent evidence for switching the number when the pronoun is generic; in such cases, we rely on the earliest textual sources to determine whether the object pronoun is *him* or *them*.

■ 1 Nephi 10:19

and the mysteries of God shall be unfolded [to 0 | unto 1 ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] them

Elsewhere in the Book of Mormon text, the verb *unfold* is always followed by *unto* when the object of the preposition is a pronoun:

Jacob 4:18

I will unfold this mystery **unto you**

Mosiah 29:33

and many more things did king Mosiah write unto them
 unfolding **unto them** all the trials and troubles of a righteous king

Mosiah 29:35

and he also unfolded **unto them**
 all the disadvantages they labored under
 by having an unrighteous king to rule over them

Alma 40:3
 now I unfold **unto you** a mystery

Ether 4:7
 then will I manifest unto them the things which the brother of Jared saw
 even to the unfolding **unto them** all my revelations

When the object of the preposition is not a pronoun, we have two occurrences with the preposition *to* but none with *unto*:

Mosiah 2:9
 that the mysteries of God may be unfolded **to** your view

Mosiah 8:19
 and these interpreters was doubtless prepared
 for the purpose of unfolding all such mysteries **to** the children of men

In the history of the text, there are numerous examples where scribes have mixed up the prepositions *unto* and *to*. We have examples of changes occurring in both directions; for a couple of examples, see 1 Nephi 15:33 and 2 Nephi 6:6. Such variation implies that we should consider each case on its own merits. With respect to 1 Nephi 10:19, both *to* and *unto* can occur with the verb *unfold*, so there is no reason to reject the *to* found in the earliest textual source for that passage.

Summary: Restore the preposition *to* in 1 Nephi 10:19 (the reading of the original manuscript) since either *to* or *unto* can complement the verb *unfold*.

■ 1 Nephi 10:19

and the mysteries of God shall be unfolded to them by the power of the Holy Ghost as well in [this time 01PS | these times ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRT] as in times of old and as well in times of old as in times to come

When referring to the present, the Book of Mormon text has 61 occurrences of “this time” but never “these times”. When referring to nonpresent time, we have “times of old” (five times) or “times to come” (only once, in this passage). There is one past-time occurrence that has the singular: “in a time of old” (Ether 13:5). In any event, the present is always viewed in the Book of Mormon as a single point in time, whereas the past and future are usually considered as a sequence of points in time. Here in 1 Nephi 10:19, the plural reference to present time was introduced by the 1830 typesetter and was undoubtedly due to the plural usage for past and future time found in this passage. The RLDS text restored the singular “this time” in the 1908 edition since that edition restored many readings found in the printer’s manuscript.

Summary: Restore the singular “this time” in 1 Nephi 10:19; the text consistently uses the singular “this time” (rather than “these times”) to refer to present time.

1 Nephi 11

■ 1 Nephi 11:1

*for it came to pass that after I had desired to know the things that my father had seen
and believing that the Lord was able to make them known unto me*

[*wherefor* 0 | *wherefore* >js NULL 1 | *wherefore* A | BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]

[*as* 0 ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRT | *as* >js NULL >js *as* 1 | *As* PS] *I sat pondering in mine heart
I was caught away in the Spirit of the Lord*

For this complex passage, Joseph Smith deleted the word *wherefore* in his editing for the 1837 edition. He also experimented with deleting the following *as*, but he ended up restoring it. Elsewhere, the text typically retains the *wherefore* since it is used to make the reader understand that the following main clause is resultive (that is, a direct result of conditions just stated). In a few other cases, when the initial dependent clause or phrase was complex, Joseph deleted the *wherefore*:

1 Nephi 19:23

and I did read many things unto them which were in the books of Moses
but that I might more fully persuade them to believe in the Lord their Redeemer
[*wherefore* 0A | *wherefore* >js NULL 1 | BDEFIJLMNOPQRST | *Wherefore* CGHK]
I did read unto them that which was written by the prophet Isaiah

2 Nephi 6:11

wherefore after they are driven to and fro
for thus saith the angel
many shall be afflicted in the flesh
and shall not be suffered to perish because of the prayers of the faithful
[*wherefore* 0A | *wherefore* >js NULL 1 | BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
they shall be scattered and smitten and hated

Jacob 7:3

and he knowing that I Jacob had faith in Christ which should come
[*wherefore* 0A | *wherefore* >js NULL 1 | BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
he sought much opportunity that he might come unto me

The Words of Mormon 1:18

wherefore with the help of these
king Benjamin
by laboring with all the might of his body and the faculty of his whole soul
and also the prophets
[*wherefore* >js NULL 1 | *wherefore* A | BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
[*they* >js NULL 1 | *they* A | BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] did once more
establish peace in the land

In two of these examples, part of the motivation for the deletion seems to have been the repetition of the *wherefore*. In any case, all of these examples of editing are found in the small plates of Nephi. (I count the Words of Mormon as textually part of the small plates, although they may have been physically written on other plates.) For further analysis, see the discussion under these passages.

Yet there are cases where the resultive *wherefore* has been retained in complex passages. Here are two that start out with “it came to pass” (just as in 1 Nephi 11:1):

1 Nephi 2:16

and it came to pass that I Nephi
being exceeding young
nevertheless being large in stature
and also having great desires to know of the mysteries of God
[*wherefore* 01ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOQRT | *Wherefore* PS] I cried unto the Lord

Ether 10:1

and it came to pass that Shez which was a descendant of Heth
for Heth had perished by the famine and all his household save it were Shez
[*wherefore* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST | *wherfore* E]
Shez began to build up again a broken people

Note also that in these two examples the repeated subject (occurring after *wherefore*) is not deleted, as it was in the Words of Mormon 1:18.

Joseph Smith’s editing in 1 Nephi 11:1 appears to be one more example of his attempts at clarifying the text; as noted before, this type of editing occurred chiefly in the first part of the Book of Mormon. The critical text will restore the *wherefore* in all these cases.

Summary: Restore the resultive *wherefore* in 1 Nephi 11:1; its removal from the text was not necessary from a grammatical point of view.

■ 1 Nephi 11:1

*wherefore as I sat pondering in mine heart
I was caught away in the Spirit of the Lord
yea into an exceeding high mountain
[a mountain 0 | 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST] which I never had before seen*

The appositive use of “a mountain” is not an error in the original manuscript. Oliver Cowdery omitted “a mountain” when he copied the text from \mathcal{C} into \mathcal{P} . Perhaps his eye skipped from the first to the second *mountain* as he copied. Another possibility is that he thought the appositive usage was either unnecessary or a scribal error.

There are numerous other uses of appositives in the Book of Mormon text, such as the following example where the appositive repeats “the land”:

3 Nephi 5:12

and behold I am called Mormon
being called after **the land** of Mormon
the land in the which Alma did establish the church among this people

Note here that the appositive “the land” could have been deleted without causing problems in interpreting the sentence. The appositive usage in the original manuscript for 1 Nephi 11:1 is probably not a case of dittography since there is no exact repetition (“an exceeding high mountain” is sufficiently different from “a mountain”). Thus the earliest reading with the appositive usage should be restored.

Summary: Restore the appositive “a mountain” in 1 Nephi 11:1 since this usage doesn’t appear to be a dittography; this kind of appositive is supported by other examples in the text.

■ 1 Nephi 11:1

*wherefore as I sat pondering in mine heart
I was caught away in the Spirit of the Lord
yea into an exceeding high mountain
a mountain which I never had before seen
and upon which I never had before [sat 01ABCD | set EFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] my foot*

In the 19th century, the two verbs *sit* and *set* were frequently mixed up in their forms. Even today some speakers have difficulty with these verbs. Historically, *sit* is intransitive and takes *sat* as the simple past and past participle, while *set* is transitive and takes the identical *set* as the simple past and past participle. (See the discussion under *set, sit* in Merriam-Webster’s Dictionary of English Usage.)

Here in 1 Nephi 11:1, the earliest editions retained the *sat* of the original manuscript. The change to the standard *set* was first made in the 1849 LDS edition and then independently in the 1858 Wright edition; the standard *set* has been followed in all subsequent editions.

It is possible here that the original manuscript’s *sat* is an accident. The previous use of *sat* earlier on in the verse (“as I sat pondering”) may have influenced the choice of *sat* near the end of the verse. Nonetheless, the tendency to mix up the two verbs *sit* and *set* is found throughout the Book of Mormon text. Out of a total of 105 cases, the earliest textual sources show 10 examples of nonstandard usage. (For a complete list, see SIT in volume 3.) Since the frequency of this usage was very high in the 19th century, we will assume that the occasional mix-up in the text is intended. Thus for 1 Nephi 11:1, we follow the earliest textual sources that support *sat*, even if this particular occurrence could be due to scribal error.

Summary: Based on the earliest textual sources, the dialectal *sat* (in 1 Nephi 11:1) will be restored in the critical text; mix-ups between the intransitive *sit* and the transitive *set* occur about 10 percent of the time in the text.

■ 1 Nephi 11:2

*and the Spirit saith unto me
behold what [desireth >% desirest 0 | desirest 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST] thou*

This variant brings up the issue of subject-verb agreement for the second person subject pronoun *thou*. Initially, scribe 3 of \mathcal{C} added the *-eth* ending to the verb *desire* rather than the standard *-est* ending. In two other places in this chapter, the same extended use of *-eth* shows up:

1 Nephi 11:4 (scribe 3 of \mathcal{O})

and the Spirit **saith** unto me

[*believeth* >% *believest* 0 | *believest* 1BCDEFGH | *Believest* AIJKLmnopqrst]

thou that thy father saw the tree

1 Nephi 11:10 (scribe 3 of \mathcal{O})

and he **saith** unto me

what [*desireth* 0 | *desirest* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNopqrst] thou

We see that in verses 2 and 4, scribe 3 immediately caught his error, erased the word-final *h*, and inserted an *s* between the stem-final *e* and the now-final *t*. On the other hand, in the third case (somewhat later, in verse 10), scribe 3 wrote the grammatically incorrect *-eth* ending in \mathcal{O} but without ever correcting it. Oliver Cowdery made the correction for this third case when he copied the text from \mathcal{O} into \mathcal{P} . We should also note that in all three cases we have a preceding *saith*, which could be the reason scribe 3 accidentally added the *-eth* ending instead of the correct *-est* to the following verb.

The first two examples clearly show the tendency of scribe 3 to incorrectly use the third person singular *-eth* in place of the second person singular *-est*. So the question is whether we should interpret the example in 1 Nephi 11:10 as a third example of this scribal tendency. (In all three cases, it is also possible that Joseph Smith himself accidentally dictated the *-eth* ending.) There is considerable evidence in the text that the inflectional ending *-eth* (or *-th*) acts more as an indicator of the biblical style than strictly as an ending for the third person singular present. For instance, this ending is frequently used in the third person plural present (see the discussion under INFLECTIONAL ENDINGS in volume 3). And as noted in the following discussion (under 1 Nephi 11:3), the *-eth* ending shows up in the expression “I saith” (rather than the correct historical-present form “I say”). In dealing with such complex cases, we should consider the specific evidence for scribal error. For instance, in the case of *-eth* in the third person plural and “I saith”, there is very little (if any) evidence of scribal correction. Thus the manuscript evidence supports the conclusion that some specific uses, although nonstandard, are intentional and should be maintained in the critical text.

On the other hand, the evidence regarding the confusion between the biblical inflectional endings *-eth* and *-est* strongly suggests that scribal error is involved. Let us consider first the cases in the manuscripts where we get *-eth* instead of *-est*. Besides the three cases produced by scribe 3 of \mathcal{O} here in 1 Nephi 11, we have five more examples from three other scribes:

1 Nephi 12:9 (scribe 2 of \mathcal{O})

and he saith unto me

thou [*remembereth* 01ABCDGHKPS | *rememberest* EFIJLMNOQRT]

the twelve apostles of the Lamb

1 Nephi 13:28 (scribe 2 of \mathcal{O})

thou [$\mathfrak{S}2$ *seethest* > $\mathfrak{S}1$ *seest* 0 | *seest* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNopqrst]

that after the book hath gone forth . . .

[Scribe 2 of \mathcal{O} initially wrote *seeth*, then he immediately corrected his error by adding the correct *-est* inline, but he neglected to delete the *-eth*; Oliver Cowdery later made the proper emendation in \mathcal{O} by crossing out scribe 2's *seethest* and supralinearly inserting *seest*.]

Mosiah 27:13 (scribe 2 of \mathcal{P})

for why [*persecutith* > % *persecuteth* 1 | *persecuteth* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQS |
persecutest NRT] thou the church of God

[It is possible that \mathcal{O} may have read *persecuteth*, but it is not extant here.]

Alma 11:23 (scribe 2 of \mathcal{P})

[$\mathcal{S}2$ *knoweth* > $\mathcal{S}1$ *knowest* 1 | *Kowest* A | *Knowest* BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] thou
that the righteous yieldeth to no such temptations

[\mathcal{O} is not extant here; Oliver Cowdery corrected \mathcal{P} to the standard *-est*,
perhaps by emendation or by reference to \mathcal{O} .]

3 Nephi 13:17 (Oliver Cowdery in \mathcal{P})

but thou when thou [*fasteth* 1 | *fastest* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
anoint thy head and wash thy face

[Matthew 6:17 in the King James Bible has *fastest*; \mathcal{O} probably had *-est*;
here the 1830 edition was set from \mathcal{O} .]

In all, we have eight cases where the earliest textual sources have the nonstandard *-eth* rather than the standard *-est*. And in five of these cases, we have some evidence that the *-eth* is a scribal error (1 Nephi 11:2, 1 Nephi 11:4, 1 Nephi 13:28, Alma 11:23, and 3 Nephi 13:17). On the other hand, in three cases, the earliest textual source has the nonstandard *-eth* without any variation (1 Nephi 11:10, 1 Nephi 12:9, and Mosiah 27:13). The high error rate suggests that these three other cases are also scribal errors. This conclusion is particularly strong for 1 Nephi 11:10 since just before, in verses 2 and 4, scribe 3 of \mathcal{O} initially wrote the *-eth* ending but then immediately corrected it to *-est*.

David Calabro has also pointed out (personal communication) that in nearly all of these examples, the verb ending in *-eth* is immediately followed by a *th*-initial word (usually *thou*, but also *that* and *the*). In other words, the tendency to say, hear, or write the *-eth* ending may have been facilitated by the following *th* sound (a voiced interdental fricative /ð/ in all these cases). Such a phonetic effect would further argue that the tendency to replace the *-est* ending with *-eth* was largely due to difficulties in writing down Joseph Smith's dictation rather than being an accurate reflection of the original text.

In discussing this variation, we should also consider three cases in the manuscripts where the third person singular *-eth* ending was momentarily replaced by *-est*:

1 Nephi 12:17 (scribe 2 of \mathcal{O})

which blindeth the eyes
and [*hardenest* > *hardeneth* 0 | *hardeneth* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST]
the hearts of the children of men
and leadeth them away into broad roads

[Scribe 2 of \mathcal{O} corrects his own error.]

Alma 32:19 (Oliver Cowdery in \mathcal{O})

than he that only [*believest* > *believeth* 0 | *believeth* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST]

[Oliver Cowdery corrects his own error.]

3 Nephi 11:34 (Oliver Cowdery in \mathcal{P})

and whoso [*believest* > *believeth* 1 | *believeth* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
not in me and is not baptized shall be damned

[Oliver Cowdery corrects his own error in \mathcal{P} ; apparently \mathcal{O} had *-eth*;
here the 1830 edition, which has *-eth*, was set from \mathcal{O}]

In these three cases, we have clear evidence that the scribe was responsible for substituting the *-est* ending (since he caught his error and immediately corrected it). Such mix-ups of *-eth* and *-est* are not restricted to the manuscripts. We have a couple of cases where typesetters incorrectly set the wrong ending:

Alma 26:21 (typo in the 1840 edition)

what natural man is there that
[*Knoweth* 0 | *knoweth* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST | *knowest* C] these things

Ether 3:11 (typo in the 1841 edition)

[*Believest* 1AHIJKLMNOPQRST | *believest* BCEFG | *believeth* D]
thou the words which I shall speak

Finally, it should also be noted that in two cases (1 Nephi 12:9 and Mosiah 27:13), the text has long maintained the nonstandard *-eth* ending. In fact, the RLDS text continues to maintain the *-eth* ending for both examples (“thou remembereth” and “why persecuteth thou”). This perseverance of the *-eth* ending provides strong evidence that it has been difficult for scribes, editors, and typesetters of the Book of Mormon to control these unfamiliar biblical inflectional endings. For a complete discussion, see INFLECTIONAL ENDINGS in volume 3.

Summary: The high incidence of scribal corrections involving mix-ups between the biblical inflectional endings *-eth* and *-est* strongly suggests that the original text used the standard ending, even when the earliest textual source reads otherwise; thus the *-est* ending is probably correct for 1 Nephi 11:10, 1 Nephi 12:9, Mosiah 27:13, and 3 Nephi 13:17; corrections in the manuscripts support the *-est* ending for 1 Nephi 11:2, 1 Nephi 11:4, 1 Nephi 13:28, and Alma 11:23, on the one hand, and the *-eth* ending for 1 Nephi 12:17, Alma 32:19, and 3 Nephi 11:34, on the other hand.

■ 1 Nephi 11:3

and I [*saith* 0A | *saith* >js *said* 1 | *said* BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] . . .

There are 12 places in the small plates of Nephi where the original text has “I saith” (sometimes *saith* is spelled *sayeth*). In each case, the *saith* (or *sayeth*) represents the historical present. (For a complete discussion of this usage, see HISTORICAL PRESENT in volume 3.) The other 11 examples of “I saith” are as follows:

1 Nephi 11:15

and I [*saith* 0A | *saith* >js *said* 1 | *said* BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] unto him

1 Nephi 13:22

and I [*saith* 0A | *saith* >js *said* 1 | *said* BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]

1 Nephi 14:8

I [*saith* >js *said* 1 | *saith* A | *said* BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] unto him

1 Nephi 17:9

and I [*sayeth* 0 | *sayeth* >js *said* 1 | *saith* A | *said* BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]

1 Nephi 17:49

I Nephi [*sayeth* 0 | *sayeth* >js *said* 1 | *saith* A | *said* BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
unto them

1 Nephi 17:50

and I [*sayeth* 0 | *sayeth* >js *said* 1 | *saith* A | *said* BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
unto them

1 Nephi 22:2

and I Nephi [*sayeth* 0A | *sayeth* >js *said* 1 | *said* BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
unto them

Jacob 7:9

and I [*sayeth* >js *said* 1 | *sayeth* A | *said* BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] unto him

Jacob 7:10

and I [*sayeth* >js *said* 1 | *sayeth* A | *said* BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] unto him

Jacob 7:11

and I [*sayeth* >js *said* 1 | *sayeth* A | *said* BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] unto him

Enos 1:7

and I [*sayeth* >js *said* 1 | *sayeth* A | *said* BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]

In the original text, there are many more examples of *saith* being used in narrative discourse (most of them involving a third person singular subject). In his editing for the 1837 edition, Joseph Smith consistently changed these present-tense uses of *saith* to the past-tense *said*, including the 12 cases of “I saith” here in the small plates of Nephi.

There is one case outside of the small plates of Nephi where the scribe (Oliver Cowdery) initially wrote “I saith” but immediately corrected it to “I say”:

Alma 37:9

yea I [*sayeth* >% NULL 0 | 1ABCDEFHIJKLMNOPQRST] say unto you

But this is not an example of the historical present, so the use of “I saith” here would be inconsistent with its usage elsewhere—namely, in the small plates of Nephi. The small plates are, of course, written in the first person, so the first-person historical present is expected. On the other hand, Mormon abridged the large plates of Nephi, with the result that when Mormon abridges a narrative, it is always someone else’s narrative and not Mormon’s, and therefore no first-person historical present ever shows up in Mormon’s abridgment.

Interestingly, in these narratives there are no examples of the standard “I say” for the first-person historical present. Since the occurrence of “I saith” is so frequent in the small plates, we have to accept it there as being genuine. This does not mean however that there are no occurrences in these same narratives of the corresponding past-tense “I said”. When cases of “I saith”

occur, we normally find about an equal number of cases of “I said” intermingled within each narrative, as indicated by the following statistical comparison for various discourse narratives in the small plates:

NARRATIVE	<i>I saith</i>	<i>I said</i>
1 Nephi 11–14	4	5
1 Nephi 16–19	3	2
1 Nephi 21	1	0
Jacob 7	3	1
Enos 1	1	0
TOTALS	12	8

Summary: Restore in the small plates of Nephi the 12 examples of the historical present “I saith”; the earliest textual sources support its frequent occurrence in first-person narratives.

■ 1 Nephi 11:4

and the Spirit saith unto me

[*believeth* >% *believest* 0 | *believest* 1BCDEFGH | *Believest* AIJKLMNQRST] *thou*
that thy father saw the tree

As discussed under 1 Nephi 11:2, scribe 3 of Θ accidentally used the *-eth* ending here rather than the correct *-est*, perhaps under the influence of the preceding *saith*. In this instance, he caught his error.

■ 1 Nephi 11:6

and blessed art thou Nephi

because thou believest in the Son of the Most High

[§3 NULL >+ §1 *God* 0 | *God* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST]

The original scribe (scribe 3 of Θ) wrote “the son of the most high”, which Oliver Cowdery (scribe 1) later corrected by supralinearly inserting *God* with slightly heavier ink flow, so that the text then read “the son of the most high God”. Close by, nearer the beginning of this verse, the text reads “Hosanna to the Lord the most high God”, which was probably the source for Oliver’s emendation.

Generally the Book of Mormon text has “most high God” (five times), but “Most High” occurs once in 2 Nephi 24:14 (which quotes Isaiah 14:14). Although the Book of Mormon text strongly favors “most high God”, both “Most High” and “most high God” are found in the text of the King James Bible, with “Most High” occurring more frequently (32 times, versus 11 times for “most high God”). When the phrase is preceded by “Son of”, we have only one occurrence, namely in Mark 5:7, for which the reading is “Jesus *thou* Son of the most high God”. In any event, the Book of Mormon reading “the Son of the Most High” in 1 Nephi 11:6 works perfectly well, and Oliver Cowdery’s emendation was unnecessary.

Summary: Restore near the end of 1 Nephi 11:6 the original reading “the Son of the Most High”; although unique for the Book of Mormon, this expression is perfectly acceptable.

■ 1 Nephi 11:7

and behold this thing shall be given unto thee for a sign
 that after thou hast beheld the tree
 which [*bare / bore* o | *bore* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST] the fruit . . .

Scribe 3 of \mathcal{O} wrote *bare* for the present-tense *bear* and the past-tense *bare* (both are pronounced as /bɛr/ in modern English). Often, however, scribe 3's *a* looks like an *o*, as here with *bare*, with the result that Oliver Cowdery copied the verb as *bore* into \mathcal{P} . The simple past-tense form *bore* is, of course, what we expect in modern English, while *bare* is the archaic simple past-tense form. In the King James Bible, only *bare* is found for the simple past-tense form of the verb *bear*.

Evidence that scribe 3's *a* can look like an *o* is abundant. In the transcript of \mathcal{O} (see line 17 on page 16 of \mathcal{O}), the word is transcribed as *b[a|o]re*. On the very next line (line 18), the word *tasted* is found, yet in the actual manuscript the *a* is written more like an *o*, but *tasted* was not transcribed as *tosted* since clearly that was not what scribe 3 intended. In the same manner, scribe 3's *o*'s often look like *a*'s. See, for instance, the *o* in the *thou* that immediately follows *tasted* (also on line 18): the word looks more like *thau* than *thou*.

Except for the case of *bare* here in 1 Nephi 11:7, scribe 3's other occurrences of *bare* (standing for either *bear* or *bare*) are clearly written with an *a* vowel and are therefore transcribed as simply *bare*:

- 1 Nephi 10:10 (line 44 on page 14 of \mathcal{O})
 he should behold and [*bare* o | *bear* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST] record
- 1 Nephi 11:7 (line 21 on page 16 of \mathcal{O})
 ye shall [*bare* o | *bear* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST] record
- 1 Nephi 11:32 (line 2 on page 18 of \mathcal{O})
 I saw and [*bare* o | *bear* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST] record
- 1 Nephi 11:36 (line 15 on page 18 of \mathcal{O})
 I saw and [*bare* oF | *bear* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST] record
- 1 Nephi 12:7 (line 50 on page 18 of \mathcal{O})
 I also saw and [*bare* o | *bear* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST] record

There are three other occurrences of *bore* in the current LDS edition (although in the RLDS text, the first of these maintains the earlier *bare*):

- Mosiah 14:12 (Isaiah 53:12 in the King James Bible has *bare*)
 and he [*bear* 11JO | *bare* ABCDEFGHKLMNPQS | *bore* RT] the sins of many
 and made intercession for the transgressors
- Alma 1:25 (\mathcal{O} is not extant here, but may have read *bare*)
 and they **bore** with patience the persecution
 which was heaped upon them

Alma 53:13 (the correction in \mathcal{P} suggests \mathcal{C} read *bear*)
 but it came to pass that when they saw the danger
 and the many afflictions and tribulations
 which the Nephites [*did* > *bore* 1 | *bore* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] for them
 they were moved with compassion

In all other cases where the simple past-tense form is expected, the textual evidence firmly supports *bare* rather than *bore*. First, there are four clear cases where the verb of the original text must be interpreted as the past-tense form *bare*:

- 1 Nephi 17:1
 and our women [*bare* 01 | *did bear* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
 children in the wilderness
- 2 Nephi 8:2 (Isaiah 51:2 in the King James Bible has *bare*)
 look unto Abraham your father and unto Sarah
 she that [*bear* 1ILMN | *bare* ABCDEFGHJKOPQRST] you
- 2 Nephi 18:3 (Isaiah 8:3 in the King James Bible has *bare*)
 and I went unto the prophetess and she conceived
 and [*bear* 1ABCDEIJLMNOQ | *bare* FGHKPRST] a son
- Mosiah 14:12 (Isaiah 53:12 in the King James Bible has *bare*)
 and he [*bear* 1IJO | *bare* ABCDEFGHKLMPQS | *bore* RT] the sins of many
 and made intercession for the transgressors

Second, there are 11 other cases where the context requires a past-tense interpretation, and in each of these cases the scribal evidence argues once more for *bare* rather than *bore*. (These specific examples are discussed in this volume under the following: the three-witness statement, 1 Nephi 11:32, 1 Nephi 13:24, 1 Nephi 14:29, Enos 1:20, 3 Nephi 17:21, and 3 Nephi 18:37.) In all, there are 15 cases in favor of *bare*. This predominance of evidence argues that the unclear *b[a|o]re* here in 1 Nephi 11:7 should be interpreted as *bare* (“the tree which **bare** the fruit”).

For further discussion, see each of the three other cases of *bore* (Mosiah 14:12, Alma 1:25, and Alma 53:13) as well as the complete discussion of *bare* versus *bore* under PAST TENSE in volume 3. Also see BEAR in volume 3 regarding this question as well as the problem of how to interpret the tense for the spellings *bear* and *bare*.

Summary: The most probable reading for scribe 3’s *b[a|o]re* in 1 Nephi 11:7 is the archaic past-tense form *bare*, although the modern form *bore* is also possible.

■ 1 Nephi 11:7

after thou hast beheld the tree which bare the fruit
 [*of* 0 | 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST] *which thy father tasted*
thou shalt also behold a man descending out of heaven

Elsewhere the Book of Mormon text has at least ten examples of “to taste of”, including two dealing with fruit:

1 Nephi 8:28
and after that they had tasted **of** the fruit
they were ashamed

Jacob 5:31
the Lord of the vineyard did taste **of** the fruit

There is also one more passage that has “of which” at the head of a relative clause as well as a second example of “to taste of”:

Alma 36:24
that I might bring them to taste **of** the exceeding joy
of which I did taste

There appears to be a partitive sense when the preposition *of* is used with *taste*.

Summary: Restore in 1 Nephi 11:7 the original preposition *of* at the head of the relative clause “of which thy father tasted”, especially since the partitive usage in “to taste of fruit” is the normal phraseology in the Book of Mormon.

■ 1 Nephi 11:7

*and after that ye [Shal 0 | 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST] have witnessed him
ye shall bear record that it is the Son of God*

Oliver Cowdery here seems to have accidentally deleted the modal *shall* when copying from \mathcal{O} into \mathcal{P} . Elsewhere, in subordinate clauses headed by *after*, *when*, or *until* (that is, when the subordinate clause refers to the future) there are nine additional passages with the future perfect “shall have <done something>”:

1 Nephi 15:13
in the latter days **when** our seed **shall have** dwindled in unbelief . . .

2 Nephi 9:15
and it shall come to pass that
when all men **shall have** passed from this first death unto life . . .

2 Nephi 14:4 (quoting Isaiah 4:4 of the King James Bible)
when the Lord **shall have** washed away the filth of the daughters of Zion
and **shall have** purged the blood of Jerusalem . . .

2 Nephi 26:1
and **after** that Christ **shall have** risen from the dead
he shall shew himself unto you

2 Nephi 26:9
and they shall have peace with him
until three generations **shall have** passed away
and many of the fourth generation **shall have** passed away in righteousness

2 Nephi 26:10

and **when** these things

[NULL >+ *shall* 1 | *shall* APS | BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRT] **have** passed away
a speedy destruction cometh unto my people

2 Nephi 26:15

after that my seed and the seed of my brethren

[NULL > *shall* 1 | *shall* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] **have** dwindled in unbelief

and **shall have** been smitten by the Gentiles

yea **after** that the Lord God **shall have** camped against them round about

and **shall have** laid siege against them with a mount and raised forts against them

and after that they **shall have** been brought down low in the dust . . .

3 Nephi 20:28

nevertheless **when** they **shall have** received the fullness of my gospel . . .

3 Nephi 26:9

and **when** they **shall have** received this

which is expedient that they should have first to try their faith . . .

Note in particular the examples in 2 Nephi 26:10, 15 where Oliver Cowdery initially dropped the modal *shall* when he copied the text from \mathcal{O} into \mathcal{P} . In these two cases, he caught his error and supralinearly inserted the *shall*. Thus we see a tendency on Oliver's part to accidentally delete the *shall* in future perfect constructions. Consequently, his omission of the *shall* in 1 Nephi 11:7 should also be considered accidental and unmotivated.

Summary: Based on the original manuscript, the modal *shall* should be restored in 1 Nephi 11:7 (“after that ye shall have witnessed him”); there are a good many other passages that support the future perfect in subordinate clauses involving the future.

■ 1 Nephi 11:8

and I looked and beheld a tree

and it was like unto the tree which my father had seen

and the beauty thereof was far beyond

yea exceeding [of 01ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST | NULL > of F] all beauty

In the first printing of the 1852 LDS edition, the preposition *of* was deleted here, probably accidentally since it was restored in the second printing of that edition. Nonetheless, the *of* does seem intrusive. Of course, the “yea exceeding” itself is interruptive, breaking up the clause “the beauty thereof was far beyond all beauty”, in which no *of* would have occurred. In this instance, the word *exceeding* is verbal and the *of* makes it a gerund, so there is really nothing wrong with this construction, even though its usage is unique within the Book of Mormon text. The *of* was obviously intended.

A similar example of such an interruption involving *beyond* uses the conjunction *or*:

Alma 12:1

he opened his mouth and began to speak unto him
 and to establish the words of Amulek
 and to explain things **beyond**
or to unfold the scriptures
beyond that which Amulek had done

In this instance, the *beyond* is necessarily repeated.

Summary: Maintain the preposition *of* in 1 Nephi 11:8 (“exceeding of all beauty”).

■ 1 Nephi 11:9

*I behold thou hast [shew 0 | shewn 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMPS | shown JNOQRT]
 unto me the tree which is most precious above all*

Scribe 3 of \mathcal{O} wrote “thou hast shew” in the original manuscript. When Oliver Cowdery copied the text from \mathcal{O} into \mathcal{P} , he corrected the *shew* to *shewn*. We have evidence that scribe 3 of \mathcal{O} occasionally omitted the final *n* of a past participle:

1 Nephi 6:1 (final *n* of *been* omitted by scribe 3 of \mathcal{O})
 for it is given in the record which has bee kept by my father

1 Nephi 11:9 (final *n* of *seen* initially omitted by scribe 3 of \mathcal{O})
 after that i had see|n| the tree i said unto the spirit

Another possibility is that the *shew* in \mathcal{O} actually stood for *shewed*. And there is also evidence that scribe 3 of \mathcal{O} occasionally dropped the regular inflectional ending *-(e)d* for the past participle:

1 Nephi 10:12 (scribe 3’s error in \mathcal{O} corrected by scribe 2 of \mathcal{O})
 whose branches should be broken of and should be scatter^{s2 ed}^

1 Nephi 11:22 (scribe 3 of \mathcal{O} corrects his own error)
 and I answer|d| him saying yea it is the love of god

Thus scribal evidence equally supports both *shewn* and *shewed* as emendations in 1 Nephi 11:9.

Elsewhere in the text, there are 37 examples of the past participle for the verb *shew* (and its variant *show*). Based on the earliest textual sources, we have the following variants: *shewn* (29 times), *shewed* (6 times), and *shown* (2 times). Thus the *-n* ending is favored most of the time (31 versus 6 times). Within the small plates themselves, there are 11 occurrences of the *-n* ending but only one of *shewed* (in 1 Nephi 20:6). Yet this one exception is a citation from the King James Bible, and there (in Isaiah 48:6) the form is *shewed*. In other words, the actual Book of Mormon language in the small plates consistently supports the use of *shewn* (or *shown*) rather than *shewed*. Internal evidence thus supports Oliver Cowdery’s decision to interpret the *shew* as a scribal error for *shewn*. (For the later LDS editing of *shew* to *show*, see SHEW in volume 3.)

Summary: Maintain in 1 Nephi 11:9 Oliver Cowdery’s interpretation of *shew* in \mathcal{O} as a scribal error for *shewn* rather than *shewed*.

■ 1 Nephi 11:9

*I behold thou hast shewn unto me the tree
which is [most 0 | 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST] precious above all*

Here we have another example where Oliver Cowdery omitted a word in his copying from \mathcal{O} to \mathcal{P} . In this instance, he accidentally deleted the *most* that was right before *precious*. Elsewhere in the text, there are five other occurrences of “most precious” used predicatively in a relative clause, so there is obviously nothing wrong with its use here in 1 Nephi 11:9. In fact, two of these (like 1 Nephi 11:9) involve fruit:

Jacob 5:74

and the Lord of the vineyard had preserved unto himself the natural fruit
which was **most precious** unto him from the beginning

Alma 32:42

ye shall pluck the fruit thereof which is **most precious**
which is sweet above all that is sweet
and which is white above all that is white

For discussion of “most precious” in conjoined phrases, especially those involving the adjective *plain*, see 1 Nephi 13:28.

Summary: Restore the example of “most precious” in 1 Nephi 11:9; Oliver Cowdery accidentally dropped *most* when he copied from \mathcal{O} into \mathcal{P} .

■ 1 Nephi 11:10

*and he saith unto me
what [desireth 0 | desirest 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST] thou*

Scribe 3 of \mathcal{O} wrote down “desireth thou” rather than the grammatically correct “desirest thou”. It is possible that the reading with the *-eth* ending was actually intended, although it is more probable that the scribe himself accidentally created this reading, perhaps under the influence of the preceding *saith*. For a complete discussion, see under 1 Nephi 11:2.

■ 1 Nephi 11:11

*and he spake unto me as a man speaketh
[with 0ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST | unto > with 1] another*

When Oliver Cowdery was copying from \mathcal{O} into \mathcal{P} , he initially wrote “speaketh unto another”, probably because he had just written “spake unto me”. He soon corrected his error (with no change in ink flow) by crossing out the *unto* and supralinearly inserting *with*. Although the text overwhelmingly prefers “to speak **unto** someone” (256 times), there are six occurrences elsewhere of “to speak **with** someone”. The preposition *to* also occurs with *speak*; “to speak to someone” is also comparatively infrequent, occurring 18 times.

Summary: Maintain in 1 Nephi 11:11 the preposition *with* in “as a man speaketh with another”; although “to speak **unto** someone” is more prevalent, “to speak **with** someone” also occurs in the text.

■ 1 Nephi 11:13

and it came to pass that I looked and beheld the great city

[01A | of BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *Jerusalem*

There is no *of* for 1 Nephi 11:13 in the two manuscripts or in the 1830 edition. The *of* was added in the 1837 edition, probably accidentally since the addition was not marked by Joseph Smith in Ø. When used with *great*, the word *city* is otherwise immediately followed by *Jerusalem* (that is, without the *of*):

1 Nephi 1:4	the great city Jerusalem
1 Nephi 10:3	that great city Jerusalem

In other places in the text, there is usually no *of* when the name of a city directly follows “great city”:

Helaman 1:18	that great city Zarahemla
Helaman 13:12	this great city of Zarahemla
3 Nephi 8:24	that great city Zarahemla
3 Nephi 8:25	that great city Moronihah
3 Nephi 9:3	that great city Zarahemla
3 Nephi 9:4	that great city Moroni
3 Nephi 9:5	that great city Moronihah
3 Nephi 9:9	that great city Jacob-Ugath
4 Nephi 1:8	that great city Zarahemla

Only in Helaman 13:12 do we get the *of*.

On the other hand, when *great* is not used, we typically have the *of* when the city is Jerusalem:

1 Nephi 4:30	the city of Jerusalem
Alma 21:4	the city of Jerusalem
3 Nephi 9:7	the city of Jerusalem

The last two examples refer to a Nephite city named (one would presume) after the Jewish capital.

In the history of the Book of Mormon text, there has been a good deal of fluctuation over whether *of* should occur between the word *city* and the following name of the city (such as “the city Cumeni” versus “the city of Cumeni”). When variation occurs, the evidence suggests that in each case the earliest textual sources should be followed. Therefore, here in 1 Nephi 11:13, the intrusive *of* should be removed since the earliest textual sources (as well as usage elsewhere in the text) support the reading without the *of*.

Summary: Remove the intrusive *of* in 1 Nephi 11:13 so that the text reads according to the earliest textual sources (as “the great city Jerusalem”); in all cases but one, the *of* does not occur between “great city” and the following name of a city.

■ 1 Nephi 11:13

and I beheld the city of [nathareth 0 | Nazareth 1 ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
and in the city of [nathareth 0 | Nazareth 1 ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] I beheld a virgin

The city Nazareth is twice spelled *nathareth* by scribe 3 in the original manuscript (this scribe typically leaves proper nouns uncapitalized). One possibility is that this spelling actually represents the original pronunciation of the name—or at least the pronunciation of the name in Nephi’s time. The *th* could stand for the proto-Semitic voiced interdental fricative /ð/, which ultimately became /z/ in Hebrew. Some scholars have argued that the actual name for Nazareth had, instead of the /z/, a Hebrew emphatic *s* (represented phonetically as /s̥/). For instance, the modern Hebrew name for Nazareth derives from this alternative. Historically, the emphatic *s* could have derived from an emphatic interdental fricative, either a voiced or a voiceless one (that is, from either /ð/ or /θ/). Thus the intervocalic *th* spelling of the Book of Mormon spelling *nathareth* could represent an original proto-Semitic interdental fricative, either /ð/, /ð̥/, or /θ/. Of course, this interpretation presumes that the place actually existed at about 600 BCE. (For the historical development of Semitic consonants, see pages 18–20 of Angel Sáenz-Badillos, *A History of the Hebrew Language*, translated by John Elwolde [Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993]. For discussion regarding the pronunciation of the second consonant of Nazareth, see J. C. O’Neill, “Jesus of Nazareth”, *The Journal of Theological Studies* 50/1 [April 1999]: 135–142.)

There are two problems with this proposal. First, biblical names in the Book of Mormon typically follow the standard spellings found in the King James Bible. (The name *Sariah* is simply not the same as *Sarah* and is not a biblical name per se.) There appears to be no evidence in the Book of Mormon manuscripts of any conscious attempt to spell a biblical name like its Hebrew or Greek original. Second, we have other evidence for scribe 3 of 3 having difficulty with interdental and alveolar fricatives. For instance, in his attempt to write down *ceaseth* in 1 Nephi 7:14, scribe 3 anticipated the final *th* sound and placed it earlier in the word (thus his initial spelling of *ceaseth* as *ceathes*). In the same way, the first *th* in scribe 3’s *nathareth* may have resulted from scribe 3 anticipating the final *th* by placing it earlier in the name, although here he did get the correct *th* at the end of the name.

On the other hand, one could argue that the spelling *nathareth* seems to be intentional because it was written twice that way in 1 Nephi 11:13. Perhaps scribe 3 actually mispronounced the name as *Nathareth*. A good example of such a mispronunciation is the name *Melchizedek*, which is typically pronounced as /mɛlkeˈzədɪk/ rather than /mɛlkɪˈzədək/ (with metathesis of the second and fourth vowels). The name is consistently misspelled in the printer’s manuscript (the original manuscript is not extant for any of its five spellings). Although the misspellings in scribe 2’s hand (either *Melchezidek* or *Melchesidek*) involve a metathesis of the second and third vowels, they do seem to be based on the typical mispronunciation of *Melchizedek*:

Alma 13:14–15 (two times)

[*Melchezidek* 1 | *Melchizedek* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOQRT | *Melchisedec* PS]

Alma 13:17–18 (three times)

[*Melchesidek* 1 | *Melchizedek* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOQRT | *Melchisedec* PS]

It seems doubtful that we would want to argue that *Melchezidek* actually represents the original spelling of Melchizedek's name, especially given its etymological Hebrew meaning of 'my king is righteous' (*malkī + šedeq*). Note in particular that the first vowel in the Hebrew form of the name is *a* rather than *e*. The *e* derives from the Greek transliteration of the name (as *Melchisedek*), which ends up being spelled in the King James Bible as *Melchizedek* (in the Old Testament) and *Melchisedec* (in the New Testament). There has been no attempt in the Book of Mormon text (or the King James Bible) to spell *Melchizedek* like the Hebrew *Malchisedek*.

As further evidence that there was little or no attempt to control for the spelling of biblical names in the manuscripts, consider the following list of biblical names from 2 Nephi 12–24 (quoting Isaiah 2–14) that were misspelled and left uncorrected by Oliver Cowdery in the printer's manuscript (the original manuscript is not extant for any of these examples):

- 2 Nephi 18:2 (Isaiah 8:2 has *Jeberechiah*)
the son of [*Jerebechiah* 1 | *Jeberechiah* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
- 2 Nephi 18:6 (Isaiah 8:6 has *Rezin*)
and rejoice in [*Razin* 1 | *Rezin* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
- 2 Nephi 19:1 (Isaiah 9:1 has *Zebulun*)
the land of [*Zebulon* 1 | *Zebulun* ABCDEFGHIJKMNOPQRST | *Zebulum* L]
- 2 Nephi 19:1 (Isaiah 9:1 has *Jordan*)
beyond [*Jordon* 1 | *Jordan* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
- 2 Nephi 19:1 (Isaiah 9:1 has *Galilee*)
in [*Gallilee* 1 | *Galilee* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
- 2 Nephi 19:21 (Isaiah 9:21 has *Manasseh* both times)
[*Mannassah* >jg *Mannasseh* 1 | *Manasseh* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
[*Mannassah* 1 | *Manasseh* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
- 2 Nephi 20:26 (Isaiah 10:26 has *Midian*)
the slaughter of [*Mideon* 1 | *Midian* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
- 2 Nephi 20:28 (Isaiah 10:28 has *Michmash*)
at [*Mishmash* 1 | *Michmash* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
- 2 Nephi 20:29 (Isaiah 10:29 has *Ramah*)
[*Ramath* 1 ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] is afraid

For most of these examples, the 1830 typesetter seems to have consulted his King James Bible in order to make sure the unfamiliar names were spelled correctly. (For discussion concerning the only example that the typesetter did not revise, *Ramath*, see under 2 Nephi 20:29.)

Returning to the name *Nazareth*, it seems that the more plausible solution is that scribe 3's *nathareth* is simply an error for *Nazareth*, perhaps based on a mispronunciation. Oliver Cowdery, in copying the name from \mathfrak{C} into \mathfrak{P} , apparently thought it was a scribal error and thus adjusted the spelling.

Summary: Maintain the biblical spelling *Nazareth* for the name of Mary’s city; scribe 3 of Ɔ’s spelling *nathareth* (even though repeated) is probably a scribal error, perhaps due to this scribe’s tendency to anticipate the final *th* or maybe his mispronunciation of the name; in general, biblical names in the Book of Mormon agree with their traditional spellings in the King James Bible.

■ 1 Nephi 11:18

*behold the virgin which thou seest is the mother
of [0A | NULL >js the son of 1 | the Son of BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] God*

■ 1 Nephi 11:21

*behold the Lamb of God
yea even [01A | the Son of BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] the Eternal Father*

There are four passages in the text where Joseph Smith inserted “the Son of”, thus modifying references to God so that these passages could not be misinterpreted as references to God the Father instead of his Son, Jesus Christ. Besides the two listed here, there are two more later on in this section of 1 Nephi:

1 Nephi 11:32
and I looked and beheld the Lamb of God / that he was taken by the people
yea [01A | the Son of BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] the everlasting God
was judged of the world

1 Nephi 13:40
the Lamb of God is
the [NULL >js son of the 1 | A | Son of the BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRT |
son of the s] Eternal Father and the Savior of the world

These changes, characteristic of Joseph’s editing for the first part of the text, should be considered as clarifications, not as doctrinal reinterpretations. Earlier in this section of the text, Jesus is clearly identified as the Son of God:

1 Nephi 10:17
and also the things which he spake by the power of the Holy Ghost
which power he received by faith on **the Son of God**
and the Son of God was the Messiah which should come

1 Nephi 11:7
and behold this thing shall be given unto thee for a sign
that after thou hast beheld the tree
which bare the fruit of which thy father tasted
thou shalt also behold a man descending out of heaven and him shall ye witness
and after that ye shall have witnessed him
ye shall bear record that it is **the Son of God**

There is no real confusion about also referring to Jesus later on in this section as God, the Eternal Father, and the everlasting God. In fact, these characterizations of Jesus recall Isaiah’s description

of the promised son as “Wonderful, Counselor, the Mighty God, the Everlasting Father, the Prince of Peace” (see Isaiah 9:6 and 2 Nephi 19:6).

Furthermore, in other places later on in the text, Joseph Smith left unchanged all the references that describe Jesus Christ as the Father and as God:

2 Nephi 25:12

and when the day cometh that the Only Begotten of the Father
—yea even **the Father** of heaven and of earth—
shall manifest himself unto them in the flesh
behold they will reject him

Mosiah 3:8

and he shall be called Jesus Christ the Son of God
the Father of heaven and of earth
the creator of all things from the beginning

Mosiah 7:27

and because he saith unto them
that Christ was **the God the Father** of all things
and saith that he should take upon him the image of man
and it should be the image after which man was created in the beginning
or in other words he said
that man was created after the image of **God**
and that **God** should come down among the children of men
and take upon him flesh and blood
and go forth upon the face of the earth . . .

Mosiah 15:1–3

I would that ye should understand
that **God** himself shall come down among the children of men
and shall redeem his people
and because he dwelleth in flesh
he shall be called the Son of God
and having subjected the flesh to the will of the Father
being **the Father** and the Son
the Father because he was conceived by the power of God
and the Son because of the flesh
thus becoming **the Father** and Son

Mosiah 16:15

teach them that redemption cometh through Christ the Lord
which is **the very Eternal Father**

Alma 11:38–39

now Zeezrom saith again unto him
is the Son of God **the very Eternal Father**
and Amulek saith unto him
yea he is **the very Eternal Father** of heaven and earth
and all things which in them is

Helaman 14:12

and also that ye might know of the coming of Jesus Christ the Son of God
the Father of heaven and of earth
the creator of all things from the beginning

Helaman 16:18

if so and he be the Son of God
the Father of heaven and of earth . . .

Mormon 9:12

and because of the fall of man came Jesus Christ
even **the Father** and the Son

Ether 3:14

behold I am Jesus Christ
I am **the Father** and the Son

Ether 4:7

even to the unfolding unto them all my revelations
saith Jesus Christ the Son of God
the Father of the heavens and of the earth and all things that in them is

Ether 4:12

and he that will not believe me will not believe the Father which sent me
for behold I am **the Father**
I am the light and the life and the truth of the world

In virtually all other instances, the text clearly distinguishes between the Father and the Son. One example will suffice:

2 Nephi 31:12

and also the voice of the Son came unto me saying
he that is baptized in my name
to him will the Father give the Holy Ghost like unto me

The only other instance where the text seems to confound the Trinity is in the ubiquitous statement that the Father and the Son and the Holy Ghost are one (found in the three-witness statement, 2 Nephi 31:21, 3 Nephi 11:27, 3 Nephi 11:36, and Mormon 7:7). In any event, Jesus Christ is God, and the four verses in 1 Nephi 11–13 where he is characterized as the Father and as God are consistent with usage elsewhere in the text.

Perhaps the original motivation for adding the first “the son of” (in 1 Nephi 11:18) resulted from complaints by Alexander Campbell about the use in the Book of Mormon of the seemingly Catholic phraseology “the mother of God”:

The name of Jesus Christ, was declared to Nephi, 545 years before it was announced to Mary, and she in true Roman phraseology, is called ‘*the mother of God.*’

There is clear evidence that the Latter Day Saints were aware of this issue since they quoted Campbell in an early issue (volume 1, number 3; April 1835) of the *Latter Day Saints’ Messenger and Advocate* (see page 105 in the article “Trouble in the West”).

Hugh Nibley, on page 6 of *Since Cumorah* (Salt Lake City, Utah: Deseret Book, 1967), suggests putting *the Son of* in italics to show its secondary nature. In the critical text, of course, these additional words will be relegated to the apparatus.

Summary: Restore the original passages in 1 Nephi 11:18, 1 Nephi 11:21, 1 Nephi 11:32, and 1 Nephi 13:40 that refer directly to Jesus Christ as the Father and as God; Joseph Smith inserted “the Son of” in these four verses in order to clarify that the text was referring to Jesus Christ rather than to his Father; Joseph Smith did not clarify such usage later on in the text, nor was it actually necessary here in 1 Nephi 11–13.

■ 1 Nephi 11:27

I beheld the heavens open

*and the Holy Ghost [came / come o | come 1ABCDEFGHJKLMNPQRST | came o] down out of heaven
and [abode 01ABCDEFGHJKLMNOPS | abide RT] upon him in the form of a dove*

In the original manuscript for 1 Nephi 11:27, the past tense was used for each verb in the two clauses after the initial clause. Scribe 3’s *came* could also be read as *come* (the *a* looks somewhat like an *o*), which probably led Oliver Cowdery to accidentally replace the past-tense form *came* with the infinitive form *come* when he copied from \mathfrak{C} into \mathfrak{P} . It is also possible that Oliver expected “the Holy Ghost come down out of heaven” to be conjoined with the preceding complement clause (“the heavens open”). In other words, his change reconstructs the implicit structure of the sentence:

I beheld the heavens open
and [I also beheld] the Holy Ghost come down out of heaven

The bracketed text fills in the intended ellipsis of words.

This change was of course inconsistent with the following “and abode upon him”. In the 1907 LDS vest-pocket edition, the contradiction in tense was removed by restoring *came*. On the other hand, the 1920 LDS edition eliminated the inconsistency by changing *abode* to *abide*, so that now all three clauses are treated as conjoined complements of the verb *behold*:

I beheld the heavens open
and [I also beheld] the Holy Ghost come down out of heaven
and [I also beheld the Holy Ghost] abide upon him

The text does not typically conjoin clause complements after the past-tense verb form *beheld*. Instead, in every instance (four more of them) a separate independent clause follows:

1 Nephi 11:30

and I looked and I **beheld** the heavens open again
and I **saw angels** descending upon the children of men

1 Nephi 12:3

and it came to pass that
I **beheld** many generations pass away
after the manner of wars and contentions in the land
and I **beheld many cities**
yea even that I did not number them

1 Nephi 12:11

and I looked and **beheld** three generations did pass away in righteousness
and **their garments were white**

Alma 19:18

and to their astonishment
they **beheld** the king and the queen and their servants prostrate upon the earth
and **they all lay there** as though they were dead

Thus there is nothing incorrect or unusual about the original text in 1 Nephi 11:27. (For discussion regarding one other case, which turns out not to be an example of this construction, see 3 Nephi 17:5.)

Summary: Follow the past-tense readings of the original manuscript in 1 Nephi 11:27 (“and the Holy Ghost **came** down out of heaven and **abode** upon him”).

■ 1 Nephi 11:29

*and it came to pass that
they were carried away in the Spirit from before my face
[that 01A | and BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] I saw them not*

The original text reads as a resultive clause. The change to *and* first appeared in the 1837 edition and was not marked by Joseph Smith in the printer’s manuscript, so this change may simply be a typo. The resultive *that* more accurately represents the semantic connection between the two clauses.

There has been a tendency to replace the resultive *that* elsewhere in the text. Typically we expect *so that* rather than *that*, with the result that when only *that* occurs, there is a tendency to substitute *and*. For other examples of this change, see under 1 Nephi 13:15, 1 Nephi 15:34, Jacob 4:11, Alma 32:5, 3 Nephi 3:26, Ether 8:11, Ether 12:14, and Ether 14:30.

Summary: Restore the resultive *that* in 1 Nephi 11:29 (“that I saw them not”).

■ 1 Nephi 11:30

*and it came to pass that the angel spake unto me
[0 | again 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST]
saying . . .*

Three times in 1 Nephi 11, Oliver Cowdery felt he should insert *again* as he copied from \mathcal{C} into \mathcal{D} . Besides the example listed above, we have these two nearby examples:

1 Nephi 11:35
 and the angel of the Lord spake unto me
 [0 | *again* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST]
 saying . . .

1 Nephi 11:36
 and the angel of the Lord spake unto me
 [0 | *again* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST]
 saying . . .

Of course, in each case the angel had already spoken to Nephi, so it is quite obvious that by adding *again*, nothing false is stated.

In the entire account of Nephi’s vision of the tree of life, when reference is made to the next thing the angel says, *again* is used only three times in the original text:

1 Nephi 11:26
 and the angel said unto me **again** . . .

1 Nephi 11:31
 and he spake unto me **again** saying . . .

1 Nephi 11:32
 and it came to pass that the angel spake unto me **again** saying . . .

Oliver Cowdery’s extra *again*’s are found in the same chapter (in verses 30, 35, and 36). Elsewhere in Nephi’s account of what the angel said to him (1 Nephi 11–14), the text never uses *again*, nor does Oliver add any more *again*’s either. Excluding the very first reference to what the angel said (in 1 Nephi 11:14, where *again* would be impossible), there are a total of 39 places where *again* could have theoretically been used. The original text had three cases of *again*, Oliver Cowdery added three more, but for the other 33 cases, there has never been any use of *again* (even accidentally in the transmission of the text). Especially striking is the lack of *again* in all 27 references to what the angel said in the rest of this account (1 Nephi 12–14). Thus Oliver’s brief inclination to add *again* near the end of chapter 11 should be ignored. Of course, those occasional cases of its actual use in the original text should be maintained.

Summary: Remove the three intrusive occurrences of *again* that Oliver Cowdery inserted in 1 Nephi 11:30, 35, 36; there are three legitimate occurrences of *again* in the same part of the text (1 Nephi 11:26, 31, 32).

■ 1 Nephi 11:31

*and I beheld multitudes of people
 which were sick and which were afflicted
 [of 0A | of >js with 1 | with BCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST] all manner of diseases
 and with devils and unclean spirits*

Here Joseph Smith edited the original preposition *of* to *with*, thus making the two conjuncts begin with the same preposition (“afflicted **with** all manner of diseases and **with** devils and

unclean spirits”). Elsewhere, the past participle *afflicted*, when complemented by a prepositional phrase, is usually followed by the preposition *with*:

1 Nephi 16:21

now it came to pass that I Nephi
having been afflicted **with** my brethren
because of the loss of my bow . . .

Mosiah 17:16

and it will come to pass that ye shall be afflicted
with all manner of diseases because of your iniquities

Alma 3:22

now Alma himself
being afflicted **with** a wound
did not go up to battle at this time against the Lamanites

Alma 37:42

therefore they tarried in the wilderness
or did not travel a direct course
and were afflicted **with** hunger and thirst because of their transgression

The example from Mosiah 17:16 uses the same phraseology as Joseph Smith’s editing of 1 Nephi 11:31 (“afflicted with all manner of diseases”). It should, however, be noted that for each of these four examples, the preposition could have also been *by*. In fact, in the example from 1 Nephi 16:21, the preposition *by* is the expected one in modern English since a human agent is involved (that is, we expect “having been afflicted **by** my brethren because of the loss of my bow”). There is one example with the preposition *by*, and here a human agent is also involved:

Mosiah 11:21

and they shall be afflicted **by** the hand of their enemies

In archaic English, the preposition *of* is used as the agentive preposition (instead of the modern English *by*). For instance, in *As You Like It*, Shakespeare has “I have been told so **of** many” (meaning, of course, “I have been told so *by* many”). Consider, for instance, the following example in the Book of Mormon where the archaic *of* was accidentally replaced with *by* in the 1841 British edition:

Mormon 8:1

behold I have but few things to write
which things I have been commanded
[*of* 1ABCGHKPS | *by* DEFIJLMNOQRT] my father

One can therefore argue that the original use of the preposition *of* in 1 Nephi 11:31 is intended to be equivalent to the preposition *by* (that is, “afflicted **by** all manner of diseases”). Like the archaic usage originally in Mormon 8:1, there is no need from a textual point of view to emend the original *of* in 1 Nephi 11:31 to either *by* or *with*.

Summary: Based on the earliest textual sources, restore the original preposition *of* in 1 Nephi 11:31, where it serves as the archaic agentive preposition (in place of *by*, the modern one).

■ 1 Nephi 11:32

*and I looked and beheld the Lamb of God
that he was taken by the people
yea [01A | the Son of BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
the everlasting God was judged of the world*

As discussed under 1 Nephi 11:18, Joseph Smith added “the Son of” in four different verses. Such additions help clarify the meaning but are unnecessary from a textual point of view.

■ 1 Nephi 11:32

*yea the everlasting God was judged of the world
and I saw and [bare 0 | bear 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST] record*

Besides this example of the ambiguity involving *bear* and *bare* (the present-tense and past-tense forms of the verb *bear*), there are three similar examples in this part of 1 Nephi:

1 Nephi 11:36

and it came to pass that
I saw and [bare 0F | bear 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST] record
that the great and spacious building was the pride of the world

1 Nephi 12:7

and I also saw and [bare 0 | bear 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST] record
that the Holy Ghost fell upon twelve others

1 Nephi 14:27

and I Nephi heard
and [bare/bore 0 | bear 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST] record
that the name of the apostle of the Lamb was John

Scribes 2 and 3 of \mathcal{G} tended to favor the spelling *bare* for *bear*, so the spellings here in \mathcal{G} give no clear information as to whether the present or past tense is intended. On the other hand, Oliver Cowdery tended to spell both *bear* and *bare* as *bear*, so neither can his spellings be used to distinguish between the tenses for this verb.

In each of these cases, as with one example in the three-witness statement, the apparent intended form is the past-tense *bare* since all of them parallel the usage in John 1:34 of the King James Bible. And here the specific parallelism with John’s language is very striking; there is only an occasional word difference:

John 1:34	and I saw and bare record
1 Nephi 11:32	and I saw and bare record
1 Nephi 11:36	that I saw and bare record
1 Nephi 12:7	and I also saw and bare record
1 Nephi 14:27	and I Nephi heard and bare record

Furthermore, in each of these cases the associated clause describing what Nephi was bearing record of is always in the past tense, which further supports the past-tense form *bare* in the conjoined clause:

1 Nephi 11:32	yea the everlasting God was judged of the world
1 Nephi 11:36	that the great and spacious building was the pride of the world
1 Nephi 12:7	that the Holy Ghost fell upon twelve others
1 Nephi 14:27	that the name of the apostle of the Lamb was John

For the complete discussion regarding this difficulty in determining the tense of *bear/bare*, plus a listing of the spelling variation, see BEAR in volume 3.

Summary: Four times in 1 Nephi 11–14, Nephi uses the expression “I saw/heard and bare record”, which closely parallels John’s usage in the King James Bible (“I saw and bare record”); the surrounding text is in the past tense, so the word *bear* should be emended to *bare* in 1 Nephi 11:32, 1 Nephi 11:36, 1 Nephi 12:7, and 1 Nephi 14:27.

■ 1 Nephi 11:35

and I beheld that they were

in a large and [0ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST | a 1] spacious building

In the Book of Mormon text, the indefinite article is often repeated when attributive adjectives are conjoined (as originally in Omni 1:28: “**a** strong and **a** mighty man”). But in this instance from 1 Nephi 11:35, Oliver Cowdery accidentally added the repeated *a* when he copied the text from \mathcal{O} into \mathcal{P} . Nonetheless, the 1830 compositor omitted the repeated *a* even though he apparently had no access here to the reading in \mathcal{O} .

Elsewhere in the text, no initial determiner or other premodifier is ever repeated when an adjective is conjoined with the word *spacious*:

1 Nephi 8:9	a large and spacious field
1 Nephi 8:20	a large and spacious field
1 Nephi 8:26	a great and spacious building
1 Nephi 8:31	that great and spacious building
1 Nephi 11:36	the great and spacious building
1 Nephi 12:18	the large and spacious building
Mosiah 11:8	many elegant and spacious buildings

For examples involving other adjectives, see CONJUNCTIVE REPETITION in volume 3.

Summary: Maintain the original reading in 1 Nephi 11:35 without the repeated indefinite article *a* (“a large and spacious building”).

■ 1 Nephi 11:35

and the angel of the Lord spake unto me
 [0 | *again* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST]
saying . . .

As discussed under 1 Nephi 11:30, Oliver Cowdery's insertion of *again* was unnecessary.

■ 1 Nephi 11:36

and it came to pass that I saw
and [bare 0F | bear 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST] record
that the great and spacious building was the pride of the world

As discussed under 1 Nephi 11:32, the past-tense form *bare* is probably the intended reading here in 1 Nephi 11:36.

■ 1 Nephi 11:36

and it came to pass that I saw and bare record that
the great and spacious building was the pride of the world
 [§3 NULL >+ §1 & it fell 0 | & it fell 1 | *and it fell* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOQRT | *And it fell* PS]
and the fall thereof was exceeding great

The original text did not have the clause “and it fell”. Scribe 3 of \mathcal{C} never wrote it into the text as he took down Joseph Smith's dictation. But at some later period, Oliver Cowdery supralinearly inserted this clause in \mathcal{C} . This extra clause was copied into \mathcal{P} and has been included in every printed edition. Undoubtedly, the linguistic source for the clause is from the Sermon on the Mount where Jesus refers to the fall of the house built by the foolish man:

Matthew 7:27

and the rain descended and the floods came
 and the winds blew and beat upon that house
and it fell and great was the fall of it

The similarity of the Book of Mormon's “and the fall thereof was exceeding great” with the King James Bible's “and great was the fall of it” seems to have triggered Oliver's desire to add the explanatory (but unnecessary) “and it fell”.

In two other passages, the text refers to the fall of the great and abominable church. In these instances, the preceding language refers to this church tumbling down, which we readily interpret as its fall:

1 Nephi 22:14

yea that great and abominable church shall tumble to the dust
 and great shall be the fall of it

2 Nephi 28:18

but behold that great and abominable church
the whore of all the earth
must tumble to the earth
and great must be the fall thereof

In both examples, the last clause parallels the King James Bible’s “and great was the fall of it”, yet in both cases there is no directly parallel clause “and it fell”.

We should note that the last clause in 1 Nephi 11:36 (“and the fall thereof was exceeding great”) is not as close to the biblical parallel as the two other Book of Mormon passages are (1 Nephi 22:14 and 2 Nephi 28:18). Further, since “the fall thereof” in 1 Nephi 11:36 comes at the beginning of the clause, this noun phrase can be considered a new topic for which no preceding explanation is necessary. In the Matthew passage and the two other Book of Mormon passages, the predicate adjective *great* occurs first and the subject noun phrase *the fall* comes later in the clause (after the verb). Such an inverted word order is acceptable because the fall has already been referred to (directly in Matthew 7:27 and indirectly in 1 Nephi 22:14 and 2 Nephi 28:18). There is no need in 1 Nephi 11:36 for Oliver Cowdery’s explanatory “and it fell”, and it should therefore be removed.

Summary: Restore the original text for 1 Nephi 11:36 (that is, without the clause “and it fell”); this textual addition apparently represents a borrowing from Matthew 7:27, yet the word order in 1 Nephi 11:36 implies that this added clause is unnecessary.

■ 1 Nephi 11:36

and the angel of the Lord spake unto me
[0 | *again* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST]
saying . . .

Here Oliver Cowdery unnecessarily inserted the word *again*. For discussion, see under 1 Nephi 11:30.

1 Nephi 12

■ 1 Nephi 12:1

*and I looked and beheld [the land 0 | the band > NULL 1 | ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
the land of promise*

Here in 1 Nephi 12:1, the original manuscript appears to have a dittography. The first occurrence of “the land” is found at the end of the line, then “the land” is repeated at the beginning of the next line:

1 Nephi 12:1 (lines 23–24, page 18 of \mathcal{O})

seed of thy brethren & i lookt and beheld the land
the land of promise and i beheld multitudes of ...

This particular scribe (scribe 3 of \mathcal{O}) produced two other examples of dittography as he moved from the end of one line to the beginning of the next line. In both these cases, he caught his error and crossed out the initial occurrence (the one at the end of the line):

1 Nephi 7:19 (lines 7–8, page 11 of \mathcal{O})

And it came to pass that they ^{ware} ^ angry with me again <and>
and sought to lay hands upon me but behold one of the

1 Nephi 10:13–14 (lines 8–9, page 15 of \mathcal{O})

lord that we should be scattered upon all the face <of>
of the earth and after that the house of israel ...

For 1 Nephi 12:1, Oliver Cowdery initially copied the dittography into \mathcal{P} , then deleted the first one. Apparently, he wrote *land* as *band*, but he undoubtedly intended *land*. In any event, Oliver interpreted “the land the land” in \mathcal{O} as a dittography that scribe 3 had neglected to correct.

The chances are slight that the repetition in “the land the land of promise” is genuine. Besides the two other cases involving the end of the line (listed above), scribe 3 of \mathcal{O} often created dittographies, although in all other cases he caught his error:

1 Nephi 4:26 (line 14, page 7 of \mathcal{O})

I had <had> Slew where fore he did follow me and

1 Nephi 7:6 (lines 12–13, page 10 of \mathcal{O})

i nephi and sam and their father ishmael and his
wife <and> <his Wife> and his three other daughters and it came

1 Nephi 8:26 (lines 48–49, page 12 of ☉)

and beheld on the other side of the river of water <of>
<water of water> a great and spesious bilding and it

1 Nephi 11:36 (line 17, page 18 of ☉)

fall there of <there of> was exceding great and the ...

These examples are all alike: in each case, the same precise words are repeated.

Elsewhere in the text there are no examples of “the land the land”, but there are quite a few cases where *land* is repeated in an appositive, yet the repetition always includes some difference:

1 Nephi 2:20

ye shall prosper and shall be led to **a land** of promise
yea even **a land** which I have prepared for you
a land which is choice above all other lands

2 Nephi 1:5

we have obtained **a land** of promise
a land which is choice above all other lands
a land which the Lord God hath covenanted with me
should be a land for the inheritance of my seed

Mosiah 21:26

nevertheless they did find **a land** which had been peopled
yea **a land** which was covered with dry bones
yea **a land** which had been peopled and which had been destroyed

Mosiah 23:4

and they came to **a land**
yea even **a** very beautiful and pleasant **land**
a land of pure water

Alma 17:19

and Ammon went to **the land** of Ishmael
the land being called after the sons of Ishmael

Alma 45:16

cursed shall be **the land**
yea **this land**
unto every nation kindred tongue and people ...

Alma 50:11

the Nephites possessing all **the land** northward
yea even all **the land** which was northward of the land Bountiful

Alma 54:13

yea and we will seek **our lands**
the lands of our first inheritance

Helaman 16:20

but not among us
but in **a land** which is far distant
a land which we know not

3 Nephi 5:12

and behold I am called Mormon
being called after **the land** of Mormon
the land in the which Alma did establish the church among this people

These examples strongly suggest that the unmodified repetition “the land the land” in 1 Nephi 12:1 of \mathcal{C} is a dittography and that Oliver Cowdery was right to delete the repetition in the printer’s manuscript.

Summary: Accept Oliver Cowdery’s emendation in 1 Nephi 12:1; the extra “the land” is most probably an uncorrected dittography created by scribe 3 of \mathcal{C} , especially since he sometimes created dittographies like this one when ending one line and beginning the next.

■ 1 Nephi 12:3

*and it came to pass that I beheld many generations pass away
after the [manner 01ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST | manners Q] of wars
and contentions in the land*

Here in 1 Nephi 12:3, the 1911 LDS edition accidentally added a plural *s* to *manner*, probably because of its partial visual similarity to the following plural *wars*. Of course, “after the manners of wars” is clearly contrary to usage (in English as well as in the Book of Mormon), and thus this error was removed in the following LDS edition (1920). Of course, the text is consistent in its use of “manner of X” rather than “manners of X”, with 170 occurrences of the singular and none of the plural.

Summary: Maintain the singular number for *manner* throughout the text; there are no occurrences of *manners* in the Book of Mormon.

■ 1 Nephi 12:4

*I saw a mist of darkness
on the face of the land of promise*

Here we have an instance where the preposition is *on* rather than the much more frequent *upon*. There is one other example:

Alma 16:16

for the Lord did pour out his Spirit
on all the face of the land

Elsewhere in the text, when *upon* or *on* precedes “the face of”, we get *upon* 111 times but *on* only twice. This disparity in frequency suggests the possibility that here we have two cases where *upon* was accidentally written as *on*. The original manuscript is not extant for the second case, but the *on* is extant in the original manuscript for the first example. In one of the 111 examples with *upon*, the 1906 LDS edition replaced *upon* with *on* (Helaman 3:9, quoted below), but in all other cases there has been no variation between *upon* and *on* for this expression involving “the face of”.

More generally, there are nine cases where *upon* has been replaced by *on* in the textual history:

Mosiah 28:11 (change in the 1837 edition)

therefore he took the records which were engraven

[*upon* 1A | *on* BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] the plates of brass

Alma 3:14 (change in the 1837 edition)

and I will set a mark [*upon* 1APS | *on* BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRT] them

Alma 22:30 (change in the 1840 edition)

and it bordered [*upon* 1ABDEFIJLMNOPQRST | *on* CGHK] the land
which they called Desolation

Alma 51:20 (change in the 1874 RLDS edition)

and the remainder of those dissenters . . .

were compelled to hoist the title of liberty

[*upon* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST | *on* HK] their towers

Helaman 3:9 (change in the 1906 LDS large-print edition)

and they did suffer whatsoever tree should spring up

[*upon* 01ABCDEFGHIJKLMOPQRST | *on* N] the face of the land
that it should grow up

3 Nephi 20:2 (error by scribe 2 of \varnothing , immediately corrected)

and they arose up

and stood [*on* > *upon* 1 | *upon* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] their feet

Mormon 1:4 (change in the 1837 edition)

and ye shall engrave

[*upon* 1APS | *on* BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRT] the plates of Nephi
all the things that ye have observed concerning this people

Mormon 5:2 (change in the 1874 RLDS edition)

for they repented not of their iniquities

but did struggle for their lives

without calling [*upon* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST | *on* HK] that being
who had created them

Ether 2:9 (change in the 1874 RLDS edition)

and the fullness of his wrath cometh

[*upon* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST | *on* HK] them
when they are ripened in iniquity

On the other hand, there are three cases where the opposite has occurred (an original *on* being replaced by *upon*):

- Alma 16:2 (change in the 1837 edition)
for behold the armies of the Lamanites had come in
[*on* 1A | *upon* BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] the wilderness side
- Alma 19:29 (change in the 1874 RLDS edition)
O blessed God
have mercy [*on* 1ABCDEFGHIJLMNOQRT | *upon* HKPS] this people
- Helaman 5:26 (error by Oliver Cowdery in \mathcal{P} , immediately corrected)
that ye cannot lay your hands
[*upon* > *on* 1 | *on* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] us to slay us

The 1837 edition and 1874 RLDS edition are responsible for the large majority of these prepositional switches. For further discussion, see under each of these 12 passages. Obviously, confusion between the two prepositions *on* and *upon* is fairly frequent.

But in 1 Nephi 12:4 and Alma 16:16, there is no textual variation in any of the (extant) textual sources. Thus it is probably best to keep the preposition *on* in these two examples, even though *upon* is much more frequent in the phrase “(up)on the face of”.

Summary: Retain in 1 Nephi 12:4 and Alma 16:16 the preposition *on* in the phrase “on the face of the land” since it is found in the earliest textual sources for these two passages; the preposition *on*, although infrequent when compared with *upon*, is possible.

■ 1 Nephi 12:4

*and I saw lightnings
and I heard thunders and earthquakes and all manner of tumultuous noises
and I saw the earth*

- (1) [$\mathcal{S}3$ *that it* > NULL >+ $\mathcal{S}1$ NULL 0 | 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
[$\mathcal{S}3$ *rent* >+ $\mathcal{S}1$ NULL 0 | 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
[$\mathcal{S}3$ NULL >+ $\mathcal{S}1$ & 0 | & 1 | *and* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *the rocks*
[$\mathcal{S}3$ NULL >+ $\mathcal{S}1$ *that they rent* 0 | *that they rent* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] . . .

and I saw many

- (2) *that* [*they* 01ABCDEFGHIJLMNOPQRST | GHK] *were burnt with fire*

and I saw many

- (3) *that* [*they* 0A | *they* >js NULL 1 | BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *did tumble to the earth
because of the quaking thereof*

In this passage there are three examples (numbered as 1, 2, and 3) that involve either removing or reinterpreting the subordinate conjunction *that*. In the first example, scribe 3 of \mathcal{C} originally deleted “that it”. (The initial crossout of the two words “that it” is identical to two other crossouts made by scribe 3 on the same manuscript page.) Scribe 3 thus changed the text from “I saw the

earth **that it** rent the rocks” to simply “I saw the earth rent the rocks”, although one might have expected the base form of the verb *rend* (that is, “I saw the earth rend the rocks”); compare, for instance, “I saw many **fall** down at his feet and **worship** him” in 1 Nephi 11:24. The unacceptability of “I saw the earth rent the rocks” may thus be a further indication that scribe 3’s deletion was secondary and does not represent the original text. (Oliver Cowdery later made some additional changes to this reading, which are discussed below.)

In the second example, the pronoun *they* was removed in the 1858 Wright edition; this deletion was followed by the first two RLDS editions. This change made the resultive subordinate conjunction *that* into a subject relative pronoun (“and I saw many that were burnt with fire”). This reading, however, has not been maintained in the RLDS text.

In the third example, Joseph Smith himself deleted the *they* for the 1837 edition, thus making the *that* into a subject relative pronoun (“and I saw many that did tumble to the earth”). This reading continues in both the LDS and RLDS texts.

The reinterpretation of the resultive subordinate conjunction *that* as a subject relative pronoun has been inconsistent since in the same verse there are two other examples where the resultive subordinate conjunction *that* has been maintained throughout the textual history:

and I saw the plains of the earth
 that they were broken up
 and I saw many cities
 that they were sunk

So the original text for this verse has a sequence of five resultive *that*’s, each of which should be retained:

and I saw the earth
 that it rent the rocks . . .
 and I saw the plains of the earth
 that they were broken up
 and I saw many cities
 that they were sunk
 and I saw many
 that they were burnt with fire
 and I saw many
 that they did tumble to the earth because of the quaking thereof

In the last two examples, the word *cities* is implied. This interpretation is supported by the text in 3 Nephi where the record of this destruction is actually given. There the text specifies that the Nephite cities were sunk, burned, or shaken till their buildings collapsed:

3 Nephi 8:14
 and **many** great and notable **cities** were sunk
 and **many** were burned
 and **many** were shook till the buildings thereof had fallen to the earth

As in 1 Nephi 12:4, the word *many* is again twice repeated and without repeating the head noun *cities*. In fact, the same sequencing of types of destruction is given (sinking, burning, and collapsing).

We now return to the first example listed here in 1 Nephi 12:4. As already noted, the text originally read “and I saw the earth that it rent the rocks”, which was edited by scribe 3 of \mathcal{O} to “and I saw the earth rent the rocks”. Later, in heavier ink, Oliver Cowdery overwrote scribe 3’s crossout of “that it” with his own crossout and then further emended the text to read “and I saw the earth and the rocks that they rent”. Oliver was apparently dissatisfied with the earth rending the rocks, so he changed the verb *rend* from transitive to intransitive. His emendation does restore the resultive subordinate conjunction *that* to this passage (“that they rent”), but the resulting construction is ambiguous: the resultive clause definitely applies to the preceding noun phrase “the rocks” (that is, the rocks rent), but one cannot be sure if the clause also applies to the earlier noun phrase “the earth” (that is, the earth rent). In other words, the text could be interpreted as either (1) Nephi saw the earth and [he saw] the rocks that they [the rocks] rent, or (2) Nephi saw the earth and the rocks that they [both the earth and the rocks] rent. Oliver Cowdery’s emendation has therefore introduced some indeterminacy as to how the resultive clause should be interpreted.

Despite its difficulty, the original reading (“and I saw the earth that it rent the rocks”) is understandable. Since the same resultive construction is used four more times in this passage, we should assume that its initial use is fully intended and represents the original text.

Summary: Restore in 1 Nephi 12:4 the original transitive use of *rend* (“I saw the earth that it rent the rocks”); all five of the original resultive clauses in this verse should be maintained.

■ 1 Nephi 12:4

*and I saw many
that they were [burnt 0 | burned 1 ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] with fire*

The original manuscript has *burnt*, an alternative past participle form for *burned*. When Oliver Cowdery copied the text from \mathcal{O} into \mathcal{P} , he replaced *burnt* with the more common *burned*. Since either verb form will work, we follow the earliest textual source (the original manuscript) and restore *burnt*.

Elsewhere in the text, there are five occurrences of *burnt offerings*, which is of course what we expect when the past participle is used as an adjective. Otherwise, when the text uses the verb *burn* either in the simple past or as a verbal past participle, we have *burned*. Only here in 1 Nephi 12:4 do we get *burnt* as a verbal past participle. It is quite possible that this form represents a dialectal intrusion on the part of either Joseph Smith or scribe 3 of \mathcal{O} .

Summary: In 1 Nephi 12:4, maintain the past participle *burnt* (the reading of \mathcal{O}), even though it is quite possible that *burnt* is an error for *burned*.

■ 1 Nephi 12:5

*and it came to pass that after I saw these things
I saw the vapor of darkness
that it passed from off the face of the earth
[NULL >+ & 0 | & 1 | and ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRT | And PS] behold
I saw the multitudes which had not fallen*

Scribe 3 of \mathcal{O} first started this sentence without the sentence-initial *and*, but somewhat later he inserted it inline (as an ampersand) and with somewhat heavier ink flow. Without the *and*, the sentence-initial *behold* sounds quite abrupt. It is possible that the inserted *and* is not original, but unlike the case with scribe 2 of \mathcal{O} , there is no independent evidence that scribe 3 frequently omitted *and*'s. Without additional evidence, it is more reasonable to assume that the *and* is original to the text and that it was discovered missing when scribe 3 read these words back to Joseph Smith (as part of the dictation process), which would explain why the correction was done with somewhat heavier ink flow.

Summary: Maintain the sentence-initial *and* before “behold I saw the multitudes which had not fallen”.

■ 1 Nephi 12:5

*and behold I saw [the 0 | 1 ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] multitudes
which had [not 0T | 1 ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRS] fallen
because of the great and terrible judgments of the Lord*

While copying from \mathcal{O} to \mathcal{P} , Oliver Cowdery omitted two small words: the definite article *the* before *multitudes* and the *not* before *fallen*. The *not* is obviously necessary since in the next verse the narrative refers to Jesus Christ's later visit to those who survived the terrible destruction at the time of his death (but definitely not to those who were killed by the destruction):

1 Nephi 12:6
and I saw the heavens open
and the Lamb of God descending out of heaven
and he came down and he shewed himself unto **them**

The 1981 LDS edition restored the *not*, but the RLDS text has maintained the reading in \mathcal{P} (which lacks the *not*).

Another example where Oliver Cowdery accidentally dropped the *not* is found in the description of this event later in 3 Nephi; that is, in 3 Nephi 8:20 we have the actual occurrence of the event prophesied in 1 Nephi 12:5, and the later text uses the very same language when it refers to the people “which had not fallen”:

3 Nephi 8:20
and it came to pass that
there was thick darkness upon the face of all the land
insomuch that the inhabitants thereof
which had [NULL >+ not 1 | not ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] fallen
could feel the vapor of darkness

In this instance, Oliver caught his error but not immediately. Later, probably when he was proofing \mathcal{P} against \mathcal{O} , Oliver supralinearly inserted the *not* with somewhat heavier ink flow and a duller quill (a sure sign that the correction was not immediate). The 1830 edition (a firsthand copy of \mathcal{O} here in 3 Nephi) has the *not*, so we can be confident that \mathcal{O} (which is not extant here) read “which had not fallen”.

There are two other cases where *not* was accidentally omitted during manuscript transmission (see the discussion for 3 Nephi 20:45 and Ether 3:9). In both of these cases, it appears that Oliver Cowdery is responsible for dropping the *not*.

The definite article *the* should also be restored in 1 Nephi 12:5 (“I saw **the** multitudes which had not fallen”) since Nephi saw all those who survived the destruction. Of course, the *the* is found in the original manuscript and actually prepares the reader for the subsequent verse that uses only the pronoun *them* to refer to the survivors (“and he came down and he shewed himself unto **them**”).

Summary: In the RLDS text, the *not* before *fallen* needs to be restored since otherwise the following text makes no sense; and in both the LDS and RLDS texts, the definite article *the* before *multitudes* should be restored; both *the* and *not* are found in the original manuscript.

■ 1 Nephi 12:6

and I saw the heavens open

and the Lamb of God descending out of [01ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST | the L] heaven

Here the 1902 LDS edition accidentally added the definite article *the*, giving “descending out of **the** heaven” rather than the original “descending out of heaven”. The Book of Mormon uniformly has *heaven* without the definite article *the* whenever the text refers to beings coming down from heaven or going up to heaven (30 times, counting this one in 1 Nephi 12:6). We have, for instance, these examples with the phraseology “out of heaven”, of which four are preceded by the present participle *descending*:

1 Nephi 11:7	thou shalt also behold a man descending out of heaven
1 Nephi 11:27	and the Holy Ghost came down out of heaven
1 Nephi 12:6	and I saw . . . the Lamb of God descending out of heaven
Helaman 5:48	and angels came down out of heaven
3 Nephi 11:8	and behold they saw a man descending out of heaven
3 Nephi 17:24	and they saw angels descending out of heaven
3 Nephi 19:14	and angels did come down out of heaven

There are a few cases where the textual history has “the heaven”. One case involves an example of scribal error that was immediately corrected:

Mosiah 2:41

and if they hold out faithful to the end

they are received into [*the* > NULL 1 | ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST] heaven

Another case has the reading “in **the** heaven above” in the earliest textual sources:

Mosiah 12:36

thou shalt not make unto thee any graven image
or any likeness of any thing
in [*the* 1A | BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] heaven above
or things which is in the earth beneath

But this passage is one of the Ten Commandments (found in Exodus 20:4), which reads “in heaven above” in the King James Bible. When Mosiah 13:12 also quotes this commandment, it reads like the biblical source (“in heaven above”). Thus “in **the** heaven above” in Mosiah 12:36 may very well be an error.

There is one case where the original manuscript apparently read “in the heaven”:

Mormon 9:17

who shall say that it was not a miracle that by his word
the [*Havens* >% *Haven* 1 | *heaven* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
and the earth should be

Here \mathcal{P} and the 1830 edition are each a firsthand copy of \mathcal{O} , and both read the same. The language of this passage suggests the phraseology of Genesis 1:1 (“in the beginning God created **the** heaven and the earth”). Thus the use of “the heaven and the earth” is probably correct in Mormon 9:17.

For a complete discussion, see each of these three passages (Mosiah 2:41, Mosiah 12:36, and Mormon 9:17). Here in 1 Nephi 12:6, it is quite clear that the earliest reading is the correct one.

Summary: Maintain the phraseology “out of heaven” in 1 Nephi 12:6; this reading is supported by the earliest textual sources as well as by usage elsewhere in the text.

■ 1 Nephi 12:6

and he came down

and [*he* 0 | 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST] *shewed himself unto them*

The second *and* joins two sentences rather than two predicates. Elsewhere in the Book of Mormon, there are 20 occurrences of the verb *come* followed by a one-word adverbial (namely, *down*, *forth*, *up*, or *forward*) that is then conjoined by the conjunction *and* to a following clause or full predicate. And in each of these other instances, we have only the predicate following the *and*; that is, elsewhere a pronominal form of the subject is never repeated when the verb is *come* (thus “an angel came down and stood before me” in 1 Nephi 11:14). Consequently, the original wording in 1 Nephi 12:6 (where two sentences are joined rather than two predicates) seems out of place and may explain why Oliver Cowdery omitted the second *he* when he copied from \mathcal{O} into \mathcal{P} .

When we consider other verbs besides *come*, we discover that there are a good many cases of a short sentence conjoined to a following sentence where the pronominal form of the subject occurs in both sentences, just as in the original manuscript for 1 Nephi 12:6. Here are some examples involving the subject pronouns *he* and *they*:

Alma 19:7	and he saw the king and he knew that he was not dead
Alma 25:12	and they were hunted and they were smitten
Alma 63:2	and he was a just man and he did walk uprightly before God
Helaman 8:1	and they were angry and they cried out against him saying . . .
3 Nephi 18:9	and they did drink and they were filled
Ether 2:16	and they were small and they were light upon the water

All of these examples have the conjunction *and* at the beginning of the initial sentence, just as in 1 Nephi 12:6. So the reading of the original manuscript in 1 Nephi 12:6 (“and he came down and **he** shewed himself unto them”) is quite acceptable.

Summary: Restore the subject pronoun *he* in the second conjoined sentence in “and he came down and **he** shewed himself unto them”.

■ 1 Nephi 12:7

*and I also saw
and [bare 0 | bear 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST] record
that the Holy Ghost fell upon twelve others*

The parallel language from John 1:34 argues that the correct tense for the verb *bear* should be the past-tense *bare*. For discussion, see 1 Nephi 11:32.

■ 1 Nephi 12:8

*and the angel spake unto me saying
behold the twelve disciples of the Lamb
which [are 0ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST | are >js ware 1] chosen
to minister unto thy seed*

In his editing of *Ø* for the 1837 edition, Joseph Smith changed the present-tense *are* to *were* (spelled as *ware*). This change was either missed or rejected in typesetting the 1837 edition. Joseph’s probable intention was to have this reference to the twelve disciples agree in tense with the reference to them in the previous verse:

1 Nephi 12:7
and I also saw and bare record that
the Holy Ghost **fell** upon twelve others
and they **were** ordained of God and chosen

The problem here is that this previous reference in verse 7 reflects Nephi’s past-tense retelling of what he saw (“and I also saw and bare record that . . .”), whereas in verse 8, Nephi is directly quoting the angel (“and the angel spake unto me saying . . .”). Therefore the reference to the yet-to-be chosen twelve apostles should be in the present tense in verse 8.

Summary: Maintain the present-tense reading of both the original and the current text in 1 Nephi 12:8 since here we have a direct quote of the angel’s words to Nephi: “behold the twelve disciples of the Lamb which **are** chosen to minister unto thy seed”.

■ 1 Nephi 12:9

and he saith unto me

thou [remembereth 01ABCDG HKPS | rememberest EFIJLMNOQRT]

the twelve apostles of the Lamb

There is a strong tendency in the transmission of the Book of Mormon text for the third person singular ending *-eth* to be extended to other persons and numbers. In this example from 1 Nephi 12:9, scribe 2 of \mathcal{C} wrote “thou remembereth”. (Starting with 1 Nephi 12:9, scribe 2 took over for scribe 3.) It is possible that this use of *-eth* represents the actual original text, but it is more probable that this extension of the *-eth* ending was influenced by the preceding use of *saith*. For discussion, see 1 Nephi 11:2 as well as INFLECTIONAL ENDINGS in volume 3.

■ 1 Nephi 12:11

and I looked and beheld three generations

[did 0A | did >js NULL 1 | BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] pass away in righteousness

In this verse, the auxiliary *did* in “did pass” was removed by Joseph Smith in his editing for the 1837 edition. He apparently rejected the past-tense form in favor of the base form of the verb in the clausal complement of the verb *beheld*; that is, he changed “X beheld something happened” to the more expected “X beheld something happen”. Normally, in English we expect the base form of the verb, as in the following three examples involving *beheld*:

1 Nephi 11:27	I beheld the heavens open
1 Nephi 11:30	and I beheld the heavens open again
1 Nephi 12:3	I beheld many generations pass away

The original past-tense usage in 1 Nephi 12:11 may more appropriately be considered as a case where the subordinate conjunction *that* is missing. Elsewhere in the Book of Mormon, we have 40 occurrences of “X beheld **that** something happened or something was” (such as “I beheld **that** the rod of iron . . . was the word of God” in 1 Nephi 11:25). Thus the earliest reading in 1 Nephi 12:11 (“and I looked and beheld three generations did pass away”) may be equivalent to “and I looked and beheld **that** three generations did pass away”. This example turns out to be the only case involving the past-tense *beheld* where the *that* preceding a finite clause is missing. So it is possible that the original text had the *that* and somehow it was accidentally omitted when scribe 2 of \mathcal{C} wrote down Joseph Smith’s dictation. More generally, the text usually has *that* following verbs of quotation or perception, but occasionally the original text is missing the *that*. On the other hand, there is also evidence that in transmitting the text, scribes and typesetters have occasionally deleted the *that*. In general, the best solution here is to follow the earliest textual sources in each

case (unless there is something definitely wrong with the earliest reading). Thus in 1 Nephi 12:11, the critical text will accept the reading of the original manuscript—that is, without the *that*. (For a complete analysis, see THAT in volume 3.)

Nonetheless, there is some internal evidence in support of Joseph Smith’s emendation. By deleting the finite verb *did*, Joseph made all 16 examples of “I looked and (I) beheld” conform, with each example having a nonfinite complement: in ten instances, the complement is simply a noun phrase; in four cases, the complement is a noun phrase followed by a participial phrase; and in one case, we have the base form of the verb (that is, the bare infinitive):

1 Nephi 11:30

and I looked and I beheld the heavens **open** again

Thus Joseph Smith’s editing in 1 Nephi 12:11 removed the only example where “I looked and (I) beheld” is followed by a finite clause. In other words, his editing to “I looked and beheld three generations **pass** away in righteousness” made 1 Nephi 12:11 conform to 1 Nephi 11:30. We should also keep in mind that Joseph’s emendation could be the original text and that somehow the *did* was accidentally added during the initial transmission of the text (as Joseph was dictating the text to scribe 2).

There are two other possible emendations for 1 Nephi 12:11 that should be mentioned here. First, it is possible that the original text read “and I looked and **behold** three generations did pass away in righteousness”. This Hebraistic construction is frequently found in the King James Bible, occurring 29 times (such as “and he looked and behold the bush burned with fire” in Exodus 3:2). In the Book of Mormon text, there is considerable evidence that *behold* and *beheld* were frequently mixed up by the scribes while transmitting the text. However, in this construction, “I looked and (I) beheld”, there are no examples whatsoever of scribal difficulty. Only the past-tense verb form *beheld* is ever found in this context—16 times and without any variation. (For a complete discussion of the mix-ups between *behold* and *beheld*, see under BEHOLD in volume 3. The discussion there also includes a complete list of the places where *behold* and *beheld* have been mixed up by either scribes or typesetters.)

Another possible emendation for 1 Nephi 12:11 proposes that in the original text the subject pronoun *I* was actually repeated but was somehow skipped—that is, 1 Nephi 12:11 originally read “and I looked and **I** beheld three generations did pass away in righteousness”. Actually, the odds are against this emendation. In Nephi’s account of his vision of the tree of life, the clause “I looked and beheld” occurs a total of 13 times (including this one in 1 Nephi 12:11), while “I looked and **I** beheld” occurs 3 times (1 Nephi 11:24, 30, 31). In all 16 cases, there is no scribal variance: for each instance, the original manuscript itself shows no deletion or addition of the *I*. Since either reading is theoretically possible, in the case of 1 Nephi 12:11 we follow the earliest textual sources (here the original manuscript).

Summary: Restore in 1 Nephi 12:11 the reading of the original manuscript (“and I looked and beheld three generations **did** pass away in righteousness”), even though the subordinate conjunction *that* may have been accidentally omitted in the early transmission of the text.

■ 1 Nephi 12:11

and I looked and beheld three generations did pass away in righteousness
 [NULL >- & 0|& 1| *and* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *their garments were white*
even like unto the Lamb of God

[& inserted inline, slightly raised, with a weaker level of ink flow]

■ 1 Nephi 12:11–12

and the angel said unto me
these are made white in the blood of the Lamb because of their faith in him
 [NULL > & 0|& 1| *And* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
I Nephi also saw many of the fourth generation which did pass away in righteousness

[& inserted in the margin, at the beginning of the line, with the same level of ink flow]

Here we have two examples where scribe 2 of \mathcal{O} momentarily skipped the *and*. Throughout this part of 1 Nephi, there are five other examples of this tendency on his part:

1 Nephi 12:18–19

... and Jesus Christ which is the Lamb of God
 of whom the Holy Ghost beareth record
 from the beginning of the world until this time
 and from this time henceforth and forever
 [NULL > & 0|& 1| *And* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]

while the angel spake these words
 I beheld and saw that the seed of my brethren did contend against my seed

[& inserted supralinearly, with no insert mark, with the same level of ink flow]

1 Nephi 13:2–3

and I said I behold many nations and kingdoms
 [NULL > & 0|& 1| *And* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] he saith unto me
 these are the nations and kingdoms of the Gentiles

[& inserted in the margin, at the beginning of the line, with the same level of ink flow]

1 Nephi 13:13

and it came to pass that I beheld the Spirit of God
 that it wrought upon other Gentiles
 [NULL > & 0|& 1| *and* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
 they went forth out of captivity upon the many waters

[& inserted supralinearly, with an insert mark, with the same level of ink flow]

1 Nephi 13:20

and I beheld a book
 [*it* >% & 0|& 1| *and* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
 it was carried forth among them

[& initially skipped, then the subject pronoun *it* was erased and over-written with the &]

1 Nephi 15:28

and I said unto them that it was an awful gulf
 which separateth the wicked from the tree of life
 [§2 NULL > §1 & 0 | & 1 | *and* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
 also from the saints of God

[& skipped by scribe 2, but supralinearly inserted later by Oliver
 Cowdery with a sharper quill; no insert mark for the &]

Except for the last case, scribe 2 caught his error; in the last instance, Oliver Cowdery supplied the *and*, which seems required. Of the corrections made by scribe 2 himself, only the first case (here in 1 Nephi 12:11) has a different level of ink flow. In the last of scribe 2's own corrections (the one in 1 Nephi 13:20), there is an erasure, which indicates an immediate correction. The preceding five corrections were probably done when scribe 2 read back the text to Joseph Smith, since in each case the placement of the ampersand indicates that the basic text had already been written. The first one ended up with a weaker level of ink flow, but the ink flow for each of the next four is unchanged, which suggests that these corrections were not due to later editing on the part of scribe 2.

The biblical style (based on the Hebrew) uses *and*'s between sentences to create a continuously connected narrative. In each of these cases, the abruptness without the *and* definitely seems inappropriate.

Summary: Scribe 2 of \mathcal{C} tended to accidentally drop the connective *and* when initially writing down Joseph Smith's dictation; nonetheless, when checking the text, probably by reading it back to Joseph, he was in most instances able to restore the missing *and*.

■ 1 Nephi 12:12

*and I Nephi also saw many of the fourth generation
 which [did pass 0 | did pass >js passed 1 | did pass A | passed BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] away
 in righteousness*

Here Joseph Smith removed the *do* auxiliary in his editing for the 1837 edition. Nonetheless, ten examples of "did pass" are retained in the text, including one very similar example in Helaman 6:13 ("and thus the sixty and fourth year **did pass** away in peace"). The critical text will, of course, restore such usage (which is characteristic of the biblical language style from Early Modern English). See the discussion under 1 Nephi 2:5 and, more generally, under DO AUXILIARY in volume 3.

Summary: Restore the biblical sounding "did pass" here in 1 Nephi 12:12 since this is how the earliest textual sources read.

■ 1 Nephi 12:17

*and the mists of darkness are the temptations of the devil
which blindeth the eyes
and [hardenest > hardeneth 0 | hardeneth 1 ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
the hearts of the children of men
and leadeth them away into broad roads*

The inflected form of the verb *harden* shows the scribal tendency to replace the biblical inflectional *-eth* ending with the second person singular ending *-est*. In this instance, scribe 2 of \mathcal{C} immediately caught his error and corrected it by overwriting the *st* with *th* (there is no change in the level of ink flow). Notice the correct use of the *-eth* ending for the nearby verbs *blindeth* and *leadeth*. For discussion, see 1 Nephi 11:2 as well as INFLECTIONAL ENDINGS in volume 3.

■ 1 Nephi 12:17

*and the mists of darkness are the temptations of the devil
which blindeth the eyes
and hardeneth the hearts of the children of men
and leadeth them away into broad roads
that they [0FIJLMNOQRT | may 1ABCDEFGHIKPS] perish and are lost*

When copying from \mathcal{C} to \mathcal{P} , Oliver Cowdery accidentally added the modal verb *may* before *perish*. The 1852 LDS edition restored the reading of the original text by removing the *may*, although this change was not done by reference to the original manuscript (which at the time was still lying in the cornerstone of the Nauvoo House). The 1852 editors probably deleted the *may* because they recognized the possible contradiction between “may perish” and “are lost”: the modal expression “may perish” implies that these deceived people might not actually perish, but the following predicate “are lost” definitely implies that they are indeed lost. One could argue that a lost soul can be found, but that if one has perished, there is no hope of recovery. A similar passage in Alma, however, indicates that being lost and perishing are essentially the same from a spiritual point of view:

Alma 34:9

for it is expedient that an atonement should be made
for according to the great plans of the eternal God
there must be an atonement made
or else all mankind must unavoidably perish
yea all are hardened
yea all are fallen and **are lost** and **must perish**
except it be through the atonement
which it is expedient should be made

The use of the modal *must* here in Alma 34:9 clearly points out that there is no other option. The intrusive *may* in 1 Nephi 12:17 is definitely inappropriate, and thus the 1852 LDS editors were justified in removing it. Of course, we now know that their emendation is in fact the original reading. The RLDS text has, however, continued with the intrusive *may*.

Summary: Maintain the reading of the original manuscript in 1 Nephi 12:17 (“that they perish and are lost”); the 1852 edition restored the original reading, probably because the editors noticed the inconsistency of “they may perish and are lost”.

■ 1 Nephi 12:18

and a great and [a 01ABCDEFGHIJLMOPQRST | GHKN] terrible gulf divideth them

There has been a strong tendency in the history of the text to accidentally omit a repeated indefinite article when conjoining adjectives. As noted under 1 Nephi 11:35, many conjoined adjectives in the Book of Mormon text have a repeated indefinite article. Here in 1 Nephi 12:18, the original text read “a great and a terrible gulf”. The 1858 Wright edition accidentally dropped the repeated *a*, as did the 1906 LDS large-print edition. (The 1874 and 1892 RLDS editions followed the 1858 Wright text.) We shall see many examples of this tendency to lose the repeated *a* in the history of the text, mainly because speakers of modern English do not expect such repetition. For a list of examples, see CONJUNCTIVE REPETITION in volume 3.

The original text, however, is not particularly systematic about whether the *a* should be repeated or not, even for specific adjectives. For instance, when *great* and *terrible* are combined, the *a* is not repeated except in 1 Nephi 12:18:

1 Nephi 12:18	a great and a terrible gulf
1 Nephi 18:13	a great and terrible tempest
3 Nephi 8:6	a great and terrible tempest
3 Nephi 8:11	a great and terrible destruction
3 Nephi 8:12	a more great and terrible destruction

In each case, we follow the earliest textual sources, which means that in 1 Nephi 12:18, the *a* is repeated.

Summary: Maintain the repeated *a* in 1 Nephi 12:18 since this is the reading in \mathcal{O} ; such repetition occurs fairly often in the text.

■ 1 Nephi 12:18

and a great and a terrible gulf divideth them
yea even the [sword 0 | word 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
of [NULL >+ the 0 | the 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] justice of the eternal God

Scribe 2’s initial *s* in the original manuscript looks like an undotted *i*, so that *sword* looks like it begins with a four-stroke *w* (rather than the expected three-stroke *w*). Yet nearby examples of *s*-initial words clearly show that we have *sword* in the original manuscript and not *word*. (See, for instance, *saw* and *seed* on line 38 of page 19 in \mathcal{O} , five lines below *sword*.) When Oliver Cowdery copied from \mathcal{O} into \mathcal{P} , he misread the strange looking *sw* as simply a *w*, thus leading to the current reading, *word*.

There are no other examples of “the word of justice” in the Book of Mormon text, but there are seven other examples of “the sword of justice”:

Alma 26:19	the sword of his justice
Alma 60:29	the sword of justice
Helaman 13:5	the sword of justice (two times)
3 Nephi 20:20	the sword of my justice
3 Nephi 29:4	the sword of his justice
Ether 8:23	the sword of the justice of the eternal God

The last example has precisely the same phraseology as the original reading in 1 Nephi 12:18 (“yea even the sword of the justice of the eternal God”).

This parallel from Ether also supports the definite article *the* before *justice*. Originally in \mathcal{O} , scribe 2 wrote “the sword of justice”, but then he supralinearly inserted the *the*. The level of ink flow for the *the* is somewhat heavier, but it is the same as the ink flow for the following phrase (“of the Eternal God”), which means that scribe 2 dipped his quill after writing the word *justice*, then inserted the *the* and continued writing the text.

Summary: Replace *word* with *sword* in 1 Nephi 12:18; \mathcal{O} actually reads this way, and elsewhere the text refers to “the sword of justice”, never to “the word of justice”.

■ 1 Nephi 12:18

and a great and a terrible gulf divideth them
yea even the sword of the justice of the eternal God
and [Jesus Christ 0A | Jesus Christ >js Mosiah 1 | the Messiah BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
which is the Lamb of God

This passage contains the first occurrence of the name *Jesus Christ* in the Book of Mormon text (excluding the title page, which was written by Moroni about a thousand years later). This entire passage from verses 16–18 in 1 Nephi 12 is a direct quote of the angel’s words to Nephi (verse 16 begins “and the angel spake unto me saying”, and verse 19 follows the quote with “and while the angel spake these words”). The next time the text uses the name *Jesus Christ* is much later, after Nephi has finished quoting Isaiah 2–14 in 2 Nephi 12–24:

2 Nephi 25:19
 for according to the words of the prophets
 the Messiah cometh in six hundred years
 from the time that my father left Jerusalem
 and according to the words of the prophets
 and also the word of the angel of God
 his name should be **Jesus Christ** the son of God

Here Nephi specifically refers to the fact that the angel of God revealed the name of the Messiah and that his name would be “Jesus Christ the Son of God”. And *Jesus Christ* is precisely what the

angel in 1 Nephi 12:18 gives as the name of the Lamb of God. Also later on in the text, Nephi's brother Jacob indicated that an angel had told him that the name of the Savior would be *Christ*:

2 Nephi 10:3

wherefore as I said unto you
it must needs be expedient that **Christ**
—for in the last night the angel spake unto me that this should be his name—
that he should come among the Jews

We note here that Jacob did not get the name from Nephi himself—Jacob had not yet even been born when Nephi had his vision of the tree of life. Apparently Nephi hadn't told the name to Jacob. Like Nephi, Jacob got the name *Christ* (the Greek form of Messiah) from an angel. Note, however, that Jacob does not mention Christ's personal name, *Jesus*.

These distinctions are important in evaluating Joseph Smith's editing of 1 Nephi 12:18 for the 1837 edition. When he got to this passage in the printer's manuscript, Joseph crossed out *Jesus Christ* and supralinearly inserted *Mosiah*, his spelling for *Messiah*. The *s* in the name *Mosiah* can be pronounced as an /s/ or a /z/. (Both pronunciations are listed, for instance, in the pronouncing guide at the end of the 1981 LDS edition; in the 1920 LDS edition, only the /s/ pronunciation is given.) Joseph Smith apparently pronounced *Mosiah* with the /s/, along with a reduced schwa vowel /ə/ for the first vowel; thus for him *Mosiah* and *Messiah* were homophonous (both pronounced as /məsaɪ.ə/. In any event, Joseph intended *Messiah*, which is what was set in the 1837 edition (plus the addition of the expected definite article *the*).

But this editing causes a real difficulty—namely, the first reference to the full name *Jesus Christ* (that is, with the personal name *Jesus*) is now in 2 Nephi 25:19! The only other possible source for his name must now come from when the angel told Jacob that the Messiah's name would be *Christ*, which is not the same as *Jesus Christ*. Thus we see that the original use of *Jesus Christ* in 1 Nephi 12:18 is crucial to understanding the later reference in 2 Nephi 25:19. The critical text will, of course, restore the name *Jesus Christ* in 1 Nephi 12:18, not only because it is the earliest reading but also because it is necessary.

One possible reason behind Joseph Smith's editing in 1 Nephi 12:18 is that prior to that point *Messiah* was the name the text had used to refer to Christ (besides descriptive expressions like the Son of God, the Lamb of God, the Redeemer, and the Savior). The designation *Messiah* was used right at the beginning of 1 Nephi by Lehi (in 1 Nephi 1:19) and then eight times in 1 Nephi 10). Perhaps the sudden appearance of the complete name *Jesus Christ* in 1 Nephi 12:18 seemed odd, so Joseph replaced it with *Messiah*.

The same basic points, although from a different viewpoint, are discussed by Brent Metcalfe on pages 427–433 of his article “The Priority of Mosiah”, *New Approaches to the Book of Mormon: Explorations in Critical Methodology*, edited by Brent Lee Metcalfe (Salt Lake City, Utah: Signature Books, 1993), pages 395–444.

Summary: Restore the name *Jesus Christ* in 1 Nephi 12:18; the later use in 2 Nephi 25:19 of *Jesus Christ* as the name given by the angel of God depends upon the original reading in 1 Nephi 12:18 (and not upon Jacob's statement in 2 Nephi 10:3).

■ 1 Nephi 12:18–19

... and Jesus Christ which is the Lamb of God
of whom the Holy Ghost beareth record from the beginning of the world until this time
and from this time henceforth and forever
[NULL > & 0 | & 1 | And ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
while the angel spake these words
I beheld and saw that the seed of my brethren did contend against my seed

Here scribe 2 of \mathcal{C} accidentally omitted the *and* but soon supplied it, perhaps when he read the text back to Joseph Smith. The use of *and* as a narrative connector is very prominent in the Book of Mormon and should be maintained here. For discussion, see 1 Nephi 12:11.

■ 1 Nephi 12:19

and while the angel
[spake 0BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST | spoke >js spake 1 | spoke A] these words . . .

Throughout the history of the Book of Mormon text, there has been a minor tendency for the modern English simple past-tense *spoke* to replace the biblical past-tense *spake*, but in no case has this tendency towards modernization persisted in the text. In this example, Oliver Cowdery accidentally replaced *spake* with *spoke* when he copied from \mathcal{C} into \mathcal{P} ; the 1830 typesetter copied the *spoke*, but Joseph Smith restored the original, archaic *spake* in his editing for the 1837 edition.

Elsewhere, there have been a couple of manuscript examples where the scribe's *spake* could have been interpreted as *spoke* (since the scribe's *a* looked like an *o*), yet in both of these cases the verb was correctly copied as *spake*:

1 Nephi 13:8 (scribe 2 of \mathcal{C})
the angel [*spake* / *spoke* 0 | *spake* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST] unto me
Alma 33:15 (Oliver Cowdery in \mathcal{C})
for it is not written that Zenos alone
[*spake* / *spoke* 0 | *spake* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST] of these things

In one instance, Oliver Cowdery initially wrote *spoke* in \mathcal{P} , but then he immediately corrected it to *spake*:

Mosiah 2:35
and behold also they [*spoke* > *spake* 1 | *spake* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST]
that which was commanded them of the Lord

And in one final case, the 1906 LDS large-print edition set *spoke* accidentally:

Helaman 16:1
and now it came to pass that there were many
which heard the words of Samuel the Lamanite
which he [*spake* 01ABCDEFGHIJKLMOPQRST | *spoke* N] upon the walls
of the city

Except for these few fleeting occurrences of *spoke*, the Book of Mormon text has only *spake* for the simple past-tense form of the verb *speak* (with 170 examples of *spake* in the original text). For further discussion, see PAST TENSE in volume 3.

Summary: Maintain the use of *spake* everywhere in the text; there are no occurrences of *spoke* in the original text, nor has the occasional intrusion of *spoke* into the text persisted.

■ 1 Nephi 12:23

and it came to pass that I beheld
 [that 0AK | that >js NULL 1 | BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
after they had dwindled in unbelief
they became a dark and loathsome and a filthy people

Elsewhere in the text we almost always have the subordinate conjunction *that* after the past-tense form *beheld* when there is a following past-tense clause. The only exception in the earliest text is in 1 Nephi 12:11, where the original manuscript reads “and I looked and beheld three generations did pass away in righteousness”. Here in 1 Nephi 12:23 is the only occurrence of *beheld that* that Joseph Smith edited to *beheld*. His apparent motivation was to reduce the complexity of having two subordinate *that*’s near each other. Yet the text normally has the *that* when the following clause is in the past tense (see the discussion under 1 Nephi 12:11). In any event, the critical text will restore the *that* here in 1 Nephi 12:23 since it is found in the earliest textual sources and there is no evidence that its occurrence here is an error.

Summary: Based on the earliest textual sources, restore the subordinate conjunction *that* after the past-tense form *beheld* in 1 Nephi 12:23.

■ 1 Nephi 12:23

they became
a dark [a > & 0 | & 1 | and ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] loathsome and a filthy people

In this complex example, we cannot be sure whether the original text repeated the indefinite article *a* before *loathsome*. After writing “a dark”, scribe 2 of \mathcal{C} initially wrote the letter *a*, then overwrote it with an ampersand.

There are two possibilities here. The first is that scribe 2 originally started to write “a loathsome”, but then corrected what he had just written by overwriting the indefinite article *a* with an ampersand. Under this interpretation, we could view the resulting text as a mistake—that is, scribe 2 may have forgotten to restore the *a* that he had just overwritten with an ampersand. As a result, the current text (“a dark and loathsome and a filthy people”) ended up conjoining three adjectives for which the middle one is missing its indefinite article. A nearly parallel example with the same three adjectives would argue that all three uses of *a* are expected:

Mormon 5:15

for this people shall be scattered
and shall become **a dark a filthy and a loathsome people**

This passage from Mormon is in that part of the text where both the 1830 edition and the printer's manuscript are firsthand copies of the original manuscript; thus we can be confident that \mathcal{O} read "a dark a filthy and a loathsome people" — that is, the *a* was repeated for each conjoined adjective. But unlike 1 Nephi 12:23, there is only one *and* conjoining the three adjectives.

When we look at the two other cases in the text where three adjectives are conjoined, we find that the evidence is mixed:

Mosiah 10:12

they were **a wild and ferocious and a blood-thirsty people**

Alma 17:14

for they had undertaken to preach the word of God
to **a wild and** [*a* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST | L] **hardened**
and a ferocious people

In these two cases, the *and* is repeated both times, but the middle *a* is missing in the first example. Further, the second example shows the tendency to lose the middle *a* (in the 1902 LDS edition). Thus both 1 Nephi 12:23 and Mosiah 10:12 may be examples where the scribe accidentally dropped the second of three *a*'s. In other words, Mosiah 10:12 could be a scribal error for "a wild and a ferocious and a blood-thirsty people". The original manuscript is not extant there. The paucity of these examples suggests that we should follow the earliest textual sources when dealing with the problem of the repeated *a* (as well as the repeated *and*).

The second possibility for 1 Nephi 12:23 is that the *a* that scribe 2 of \mathcal{O} initially wrote was simply the beginning of the word *and* (and not the indefinite article *a*). Normally, scribe 2 wrote $\&$ for *and*, but sometimes he wrote out the *and*, especially when he first started taking down Joseph Smith's dictation (at 1 Nephi 3:7). In all, scribe 2 of \mathcal{O} wrote the word *and* 312 times in the extant portions of \mathcal{O} in 1 Nephi. Of these instances, only 15 *and*'s (less than 5 percent) were actually written out as *and*; the rest were written as $\&$. Yet of the first 17 occurrences, scribe 2 wrote the word out eight times (almost half the time). In fact, the first four occurrences were all written out. But as he progressed in his scribal work, scribe 2 only occasionally wrote out the word. He apparently tried hard to write the ampersand since there are two places near the beginning of his work as scribe where he first started to write the initial *a* of the *and*, but then he aborted it and wrote the ampersand instead. These two instances are here listed, along with the other *and*'s and $\&$'s as scribe 2 wrote them (from 1 Nephi 3:7 through 1 Nephi 3:22):

- occurrences 1–6: *and, and, and, and, &, and*
- occurrence 7: *a* erased and overwritten by the $\&$

1 Nephi 3:10

and it came to pass that when we had gone up to the land of Jerusalem
I [*a* >% $\&$ 0 | $\&$ 1 | *and* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST] my brethren
did consult one with another

- occurrences 8–19: *I* >% &, &, &, &, &, *that* >- &, *and*, &, *and*, *and*, &, &
- occurrence 20: *a* written before the &, then erased

1 Nephi 3:15

as the Lord liveth

[*a* >% NULL 0 | 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST]

[& 01 | *and* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST] as we live

we will not go down unto our father in the wilderness

until we have accomplished the thing

which the Lord hath commanded us

- occurrences 21–31: &, &, &, &, &, *and*, &, &, &, &, &

The two corrections occurred, it would seem, as scribe 2 was trying to convert from *and* to &. Nonetheless, it should be pointed out that for the 20th occurrence, one could interpret the erased *a* as the result of scribe 2 accidentally skipping the *and* in anticipation of the following *as*; that is, he started to write the word *as*, but then he caught his error and erased the *a* that he had already written. In addition, the 21st occurrence has an erased *a*, but this *a* immediately follows rather than precedes the ampersand. In this instance, the erased *a* could be a scribal error in anticipation of the word *all* that follows the 22nd occurrence (which is an &):

1 Nephi 3:16 (with the 21st and 22nd occurrences)

for behold he left gold

[& 01 | *and* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST]

[*a* >% NULL 0 | ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST] silver

[& 01 | *and* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST] **all** manner of riches

In any event, the occurrence later on in 1 Nephi 12:23 of *a* corrected to & may be an example of scribe 2 of \mathcal{O} starting out to write *and* instead of & but then correcting himself. We have a case of *and* written out in the following verse (namely, 1 Nephi 13:1), so there is evidence that scribe 2 still occasionally wrote out the *and* and may have still been trying to correct this tendency in 1 Nephi 12:23. In any event, this scribal evidence (however meager) suggests that we should not automatically interpret the *a* that was corrected to & in 1 Nephi 12:23 as a mistake for the indefinite article *a*.

Summary: Maintain the current phraseology of “a dark and loathsome and a filthy people” in 1 Nephi 12:23, which derives from what scribe 2 ended up writing in \mathcal{O} ; the second adjective is not preceded by the indefinite article *a*, unlike the parallel example in Mormon 5:15 (“a dark a filthy and a loathsome people”), but a similar lack of repetition is found in Mosiah 10:12 (“a wild and ferocious and a blood-thirsty people”).

1 Nephi 13

■ 1 Nephi 13:2–3

and I said

I behold many nations and kingdoms

[NULL > & 0 | & 1 | *And* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *he saith unto me*
these are the nations and kingdoms of the Gentiles

Scribe 2 of \mathcal{O} accidentally omitted the *and* here, then later inserted it in the margin at the beginning of the line but with the same level of ink flow. This correction probably took place when scribe 2 read back the text to Joseph Smith (as part of the dictation process). As discussed under 1 Nephi 12:11, the connective *and* is characteristic of the Book of Mormon style and is expected here.

■ 1 Nephi 13:4

and it came to pass that I saw among the nations of the Gentiles

the [formation 0T | foundation 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPS] of a great church

■ 1 Nephi 13:5

behold the [formation 0T | foundation 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPS] of a church
which is most abominable above all other churches

Here we have two cases where the original text uses the noun *formation* to refer to the process of establishing the great and abominable church. Two other examples are found later in this chapter:

1 Nephi 13:26

thou seest the [formation 0T | foundation 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPS]
of that great and abominable church

1 Nephi 13:32

because of the plain and most precious parts of the gospel of the Lamb
which hath been kept back by that abominable church
whose **formation** thou hast seen

When he copied the text from \mathcal{O} into \mathcal{P} , Oliver Cowdery replaced the word *formation* with *foundation*, but for only the first three cases, not the fourth one (in verse 32). It is difficult to determine whether Oliver's three changes are accidental or intentional. If the change had occurred only once, we would readily suspect that Oliver accidentally misread scribe 2's *formation* as *foundation*. On the other hand, since the change occurred three out of four times, it is possible that for some

reason Oliver thought *foundation* was more suitable than *formation*. For instance, he might have been influenced by Paul's reference in Ephesians to the foundation of the Lord's church:

Ephesians 2:19–20 (King James Bible)

now therefore ye are no more strangers and foreigners
but fellow citizens with the saints
and of the household of God
and are built upon **the foundation** of the apostles and prophets
Jesus Christ himself being the chief corner *stone*

Of course, the noun *foundation* does not represent a process of founding or forming. Instead, *foundation* refers to the inert underlying structure of the church rather than its actual founding or forming. The original manuscript consistently has *formation*, and this word makes perfectly good sense. The 1981 LDS text correctly restored the three cases that Oliver changed. The RLDS text continues to follow Oliver's inconsistently applied alteration.

The original text uses the verb *form* to describe the process of organizing churches (as well as secret combinations). We not only have these four examples of *formation* in 1 Nephi 13 but also the following examples with the verb *form*:

Mosiah 21:30

and they also did mourn for the death of Abinadi
and also for the departure of Alma and the people that went with him
who had **formed** a church of God through the strength and power of God

Mosiah 21:34

therefore they did not at that time **form** themselves into a church

Helaman 6:18

those murderers and plunderers were a band
which had been **formed** by Kishcumen and Gaddianton

4 Nephi 1:1

the disciples of Jesus had **formed** a church of Christ
in all the lands round about

Ether 8:18

and it came to pass that they **formed** a secret combination

The verb *found* (as well as the agentive *founder*) can also be used to refer to the process of founding a church (for examples, see the discussion in the next section, under 1 Nephi 13:6).

Summary: The original manuscript consistently refers to the formation, not the foundation, of the great and abominable church; Oliver Cowdery's change of *formation* to *foundation* (whether intentional or not) made a distinct change in meaning but was inconsistently applied.

■ 1 Nephi 13:6

and it came to pass that I beheld this great and abominable church
 and I saw the devil that he was
 the [founder of 0AT | founder of >js foundation of 1 | foundation of BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRS] it

In his editing for the 1837 edition, Joseph Smith emended the agentive *founder* to the specific noun *foundation* in four passages. Besides this one in 1 Nephi 13:6, we have the following three cases:

1 Nephi 14:17

and when the day cometh
 that the wrath of God is poured out upon the mother of harlots
 which is the great and abominable church of all the earth
 whose [founder >js foundation 1 | founder AT |
foundation BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRS] is the devil
 then at that day the work of the Father shall commence

2 Nephi 26:22

and there are also secret combinations even as in times of old
 according to the combinations of the devil
 for he is the [founder >js founderation 1 | founder AT |
foundation BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRS] of all these things

2 Nephi 26:22

yea the [founder >js founderation 1 | founder AT |
foundation BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRS] of murder and works of darkness

For the initial example (in 1 Nephi 13:6), Joseph was probably influenced by Oliver Cowdery's two uses of the word *foundation* just before in 1 Nephi 13:4–5 (see the previous discussion under 1 Nephi 13:4, 5). Besides these four examples of Joseph's replacement of *founder* with *foundation*, there is a fifth example that was introduced into the text by the 1830 typesetter:

1 Nephi 14:9

look and behold that great and abominable church
 which is the mother of abominations
 whose [founder 1PST | foundation ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOQR] is the devil

The 1981 LDS edition correctly restored the original noun *founder* in all five of these cases. The RLDS text has restored *founder* in only one case (1 Nephi 14:9). Beginning with the 1908 edition, the RLDS text has typically followed the printer's manuscript. In 1 Nephi 14:9, Joseph Smith did not mark the change from *founder* to *foundation* in \mathcal{P} because the change had already been made in the 1830 edition; thus the 1908 RLDS edition restored *founder* only there.

There is one example that uses the verb *found* (not the agentive noun *founder*) to refer to the devil as the one who founded the great and abominable church:

1 Nephi 14:3

and that great pit which hath been digged for them
 by that great and abominable church
 which was **founded** by the devil and his children

Here, of course, it would be difficult to emend the verb form *founded* to the noun *foundation* (or the agentive *founder*) without significantly rewriting the text.

In addition to these examples involving the devil as founder of the great and abominable church, there are a couple of references to Alma as the founder of the church among the Nephites:

Mosiah 23:16
and now Alma was their high priest
he being the **founder** of their church

Mosiah 29:47
and thus ended the days of Alma
who was the **founder** of their church

Summary: The original text consistently refers to the devil as the founder, not the foundation, of the great and abominable church; Joseph Smith's editing of *founder* to *foundation* in 1 Nephi 13:6 was probably influenced by Oliver Cowdery's immediately preceding changes of *formation* to *foundation* in 1 Nephi 13:4–5.

■ 1 Nephi 13:10

*and they divided the Gentiles from the seed
of my [Brethers > Brethren 0 | Brethren 1 | brethren ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]*

As discussed under 1 Nephi 2:5 and 1 Nephi 3:28, the scribes sometimes mixed up *brethren* and *brothers*. In this example from 1 Nephi 13:10, the unknown scribe 2 of \mathcal{O} initially wrote the plural form *Brethers* (a fairly frequent misspelling in the manuscripts for *brothers*), but here he immediately caught his error and corrected it to *Brethren*. His corrected form was copied into \mathcal{P} and the 1830 edition. The critical text will maintain the use of *brethren* here in 1 Nephi 13:10.

■ 1 Nephi 13:12

*and I looked and beheld a man among the Gentiles
[which 0A | which >js who 1 | who BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] were separated
from the seed of my brethren by the many waters*

For the second edition of the Book of Mormon (1837), Joseph Smith typically edited the relative pronoun *which* to *who* when it referred to people. (Of course, in modern English, *who* is what we expect.) Here are four other examples from this same chapter where the antecedent for an original *which* was *the Gentiles*:

1 Nephi 13:16
and it came to pass that I Nephi beheld that the Gentiles
[which 0A | which >js who 1 | who BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] had gone forth
out of captivity
did humble themselves before the Lord

1 Nephi 13:19

and I Nephi beheld that the Gentiles
 [which 0A | which >js that 1 | that BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] had gone
 out of captivity
 were delivered by the power of God

1 Nephi 13:29

and after it goeth forth unto all the nations of the Gentiles
 —yea even across the many waters which thou hast seen—
 with the Gentiles **which** have gone forth out of captivity . . .

1 Nephi 13:30

nevertheless thou beholdest that the Gentiles
 [which 0A | which >js who 1 | who BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] have gone forth
 out of captivity . . .

In Early Modern English, the relative pronoun *which* was generally used to refer to humans; such usage occurs throughout the King James Bible (as in Matthew 6:9, “our Father **which** art in heaven”). In the Book of Mormon text, Joseph Smith usually replaced these cases of the archaic *which* with *who* (or *whom*), although occasionally he replaced the *which* with *that*. And in a few cases, he neglected to make the change, leaving the original *which*. These five examples from 1 Nephi 13 show all three of these possibilities. In four of the cases, he replaced the *which* (three times with *who* and once with *that*), but in one case he left the *which* unchanged. The critical text will, of course, restore all the original *which*’s. For a complete discussion of this editing, see WHICH in volume 3.

Summary: Restore the original *which*’s whenever they are found in the earliest textual sources.

■ 1 Nephi 13:12

*and I looked and beheld a man among the Gentiles
 which [where 0 | was >js was 1 | was ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] separated
 from the seed of my brethren by the many waters*

In copying from \mathcal{O} into \mathcal{P} , Oliver Cowdery copied scribe 2’s *where* as *was* rather than *were*. Although scribe 2 of \mathcal{O} usually spelled *were* correctly (24 times without correction), there are six other places where he spelled *were* as *where* (including two nearby examples, one in the very same verse as the one listed above):

1 Nephi 3:12

the records which [where 0 | were 1 ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] engraven
 upon the plates of brass

1 Nephi 3:14

and my brethren
 [where >% were 0 | were 1 ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] about to return
 unto my father in the wilderness

1 Nephi 12:11

and their garments [*where* 0 | *were* 1 ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] white
even like unto the Lamb of God

1 Nephi 13:12

and he went forth upon the many waters
even unto the seed of my brethren
which [*where* 0 | *were* 1 ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] in the promised land

1 Nephi 13:15

and I beheld that they [*where* 0 | *were* 1 ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] white
and exceeding fair and beautiful

1 Nephi 13:29

and after that these plain and precious things
[*where* 0 | *were* 1 ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] taken away
it goeth forth unto all the nations of the Gentiles

In only one case (1 Nephi 3:14) did scribe 2 correct his spelling from *where* to *were*. And except for the one example being discussed here, Oliver Cowdery correctly copied the *where* as *were*. For a complete discussion of how the scribes spelled this form of the *be* verb, see WERE in volume 3.

The semantics of the passage is much improved when the plural *were* is used—namely, Columbus lived “among **the Gentiles** who **were** separated” from the Lamanites by the ocean. The referent for the relative pronoun *which* is the nearest noun phrase—that is, “the Gentiles”, not “a man” (namely, Columbus). The current text seems to imply that Columbus alone was separated from the Lamanites.

Summary: Replace the singular *was* with the plural *were* in 1 Nephi 13:12 (“the Gentiles which were separated from the seed of my brethren”); scribe 2 of Ⓞ frequently misspelled *were* as *where*.

■ 1 Nephi 13:13

*and it came to pass that I beheld the Spirit of God
that it wrought upon other Gentiles
[NULL > & 0 | & 1 | and ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
they went forth out of captivity upon the many waters*

Scribe 2 of Ⓞ accidentally omitted the *and* here in 1 Nephi 13:13, then somewhat later he inserted it supralinearly (and with an insert mark). The level of ink flow is unchanged. This correction probably took place when this scribe read back the text to Joseph Smith (as part of the dictation process). The *and* seems necessary here. For complete discussion, see 1 Nephi 12:11.

■ 1 Nephi 13:14

*and I beheld the wrath of God
that it was upon the seed of my brethren
and they were scattered before the Gentiles
and [they 0A | they >js NULL 1 | BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] were smitten*

In his editing for the 1837 edition, Joseph Smith removed the repeated subject pronoun *they*. Obviously, this kind of editing is unnecessary except from a stylistic point of view. Joseph soon discontinued most of his stylistic editing; consider the following unaltered examples found later on in the text:

Alma 25:12
for **they were** driven by the Lamanites
and **they were** hunted
and **they were** smitten

Ether 2:16
and **they were** small
and **they were** light upon the water

Summary: Restore the repeated subject pronoun *they* in 1 Nephi 13:14; not only is it supported by the earliest textual sources, but the only reason for its removal was a question of style.

■ 1 Nephi 13:15

*and I beheld the Spirit of the Lord that it was upon the Gentiles
[that 01ABDEFIJLMNOPQS | and CGHKRT] they did prosper
and obtain the land for their inheritance*

The 1840 edition introduced the reading *and*, which replaced the original resultive subordinate conjunction *that*. We do not know if this change actually represents Joseph Smith's minor editing for the 1840 edition or whether it is an error made by the typesetter for that edition. By reference to the printer's manuscript, the RLDS text restored the *that* in the 1908 edition. Here the editors for the 1920 LDS edition apparently followed the 1840 edition and thus changed the LDS text.

The resultive *that* implies that the prosperity of the Gentiles is the direct result of the Spirit of the Lord being upon the Gentiles. The *and*, of course, could be interpreted this same way. As already noted under 1 Nephi 11:29, the tendency to replace the resultive *that* with *and* has occurred a number of times in the text.

Summary: Restore the original resultive *that* in 1 Nephi 13:15 ("that they did prosper").

■ 1 Nephi 13:15

they did prosper and obtain the land
 [for 01BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST | of A] *their inheritance*

The 1830 compositor accidentally replaced the preposition *for* with *of*, undoubtedly because “the land **of** one’s inheritance” is considerably more frequent than “the land **for** one’s inheritance” (38 times versus 10 times). The correct *for* was restored in the 1837 edition.

Summary: Maintain the original “for their inheritance” in 1 Nephi 13:15.

■ 1 Nephi 13:15

like unto my people
 before [that 0A | that >js NULL 1 | BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *they were slain*

Here we have the first example of the subordinate conjunction *that* after the conjunction *before*. Such examples of archaic Early Modern English have been edited out of the text. In this particular instance, Joseph Smith marked the deletion in \mathcal{P} . For a complete listing, see SUBORDINATE CONJUNCTIONS in volume 3. See 1 Nephi 1:14 for *because that* and 1 Nephi 1:17 for *after that*.

Summary: Restore the archaic use of *that* after the subordinate conjunction *before* wherever it is supported by the earliest textual sources.

■ 1 Nephi 13:18

and I beheld that the power of God was with them
and also that the wrath of God was upon
 [all 01BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST | A]
 [those 0BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST | them >js those 1 | them A]
that were gathered together against them to battle

The 1830 edition accidentally dropped the *all* here, but it was restored in the 1837 edition (probably by reference to \mathcal{P} , which had retained the *all*). Such examples as “all those that”, “all they that”, and “all them that” are found elsewhere in the original text (13 other times), so the loss of the *all* here is simply a typesetting error.

We also note an interesting grammatical change that Oliver Cowdery introduced when he copied the text from \mathcal{C} into \mathcal{P} —namely, he miscopied “all those that” as “all them that”, a dialectal usage. This example clearly shows that the scribes sometimes introduced their own dialectal forms into the text, but from this example one cannot assume that every dialectal form in the text derives from scribal error. (For an example of this point, see the discussion of “they was” in 1 Nephi 4:4.) In his editing for the 1837 edition, Joseph Smith edited the *them* to *those*, which just happened to be the reading of the original manuscript. He did not have to refer to \mathcal{C} to make this grammatical emendation. For further discussion of this particular grammatical issue, see PRONOMINAL DETERMINERS in volume 3.

Summary: Maintain “all those that” in 1 Nephi 13:18, the reading of the original manuscript.

■ 1 Nephi 13:20

and I beheld a book

[*it* >% & 0|& 1| *and* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *it was carried forth among them*

Scribe 2 of \mathcal{G} accidentally omitted the *and* here in 1 Nephi 13:20. He initially wrote the subject *it* of the following clause, but he immediately caught his error, erased the *it*, and overwrote the erasure with an ampersand. As with many other examples of scribe 2 omitting the *and*, the *and* is obviously necessary here. For a complete discussion, see 1 Nephi 12:11.

■ 1 Nephi 13:22–23

and I saith [0| *unto him* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST]

I know not

and he saith [0ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST| *unto me* > NULL 1]

behold it proceedeth out of the mouth of a Jew

Here we see two examples of Oliver Cowdery’s tendency, when copying from \mathcal{G} to \mathcal{P} , to add an *unto* prepositional phrase after the use of *saith* (now edited to *said*). In the first case, Oliver kept the phrase “unto him”, but in the second case he deleted the extra “unto me”.

In 1 Nephi 11–14, the text begins with the discourse between Nephi and the Spirit of the Lord, followed by the longer discourse between Nephi and the angel of the Lord. For most of this vision of Nephi’s, verbs referring to speaking are followed by the prepositional phrase “unto X”, but not always. In the following statistics, the pronoun *I/me* refers, of course, to Nephi, while *he/him* refers to either the Spirit or the angel; the two instances in 1 Nephi 13:22–23 are counted as examples lacking the *unto* prepositional phrase:

I saith unto him	2	I saith	2
I said unto him	3	I said	2
I spake unto him	0	I spake	0
he saith unto me	16	he saith	1
he said unto me	12	he said	0
he spake unto me	16	he spake	0

So the use of the prepositional phrase (either “unto me” or “unto him”) is considerably more frequent, but there are five cases that lack the prepositional phrase, the two here in 1 Nephi 13:22–23 and the following three examples:

1 Nephi 11:3

and I saith

I desire to behold the things which my father saw

1 Nephi 11:5

and I said yea

thou knowest that I believe all the words of my father

1 Nephi 13:2
 and I said
 I behold many nations and kingdoms

Since these few examples show that the prepositional phrase is not always included, we reject Oliver Cowdery's addition of "unto him" in 1 Nephi 13:22 and accept his correction (removing his own intrusive "unto me") in 1 Nephi 13:23.

Summary: Follow the earliest textual sources (here the original manuscript) for determining whether the prepositional phrase "unto him" or "unto me" should be added to the discourse verbs *say* and *speak* in 1 Nephi 11–14; in particular, the "unto me" added by Oliver Cowdery in 1 Nephi 13:22 should be removed.

■ 1 Nephi 13:23

*the book [which 0A | which >js that 1 | that BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] thou beholdest
 is a record of the Jews*

Here we have an example of Joseph Smith's editing from *which* to *that*. The earlier examples involved *which*'s that referred to human antecedents. Joseph normally edited these cases of *which* to *who* (or *whom*). Sometimes prescriptive grammarians attempt to substitute *that* for *which* in restrictive relative clauses, as here. (For discussion, see Merriam-Webster's Dictionary of English Usage under *that* 1.) Of course, the Book of Mormon text has retained many examples of *which* used as a restrictive relative pronoun, including the following example involving *book*:

1 Nephi 14:23
 wherefore the things **which** he shall write are just and true
 and behold they are written in the book
which thou beheld proceeding out of the mouth of the Jew

Note that this passage has a second example of *which* used as a restrictive relative pronoun ("the things which he shall write"). For a complete discussion of the occasional editing of *which* to *that*, see under WHICH in volume 3.

Summary: Restore the original *which* in 1 Nephi 13:23 ("the book which thou beholdest"), despite the prescriptive injunction against its use as a restrictive relative pronoun.

■ 1 Nephi 13:23

*the book which thou beholdest is a record of the Jews
 which [contain 0 | contains 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST]
 the covenants of the Lord which he hath made unto the house of Israel*

The original manuscript has the third person plural verb form *contain* rather than the third person singular verb form *contains* or *containeth*. It is quite possible that this usage is due to the immediately preceding plural noun *Jews*, which is not the grammatical antecedent of the *which*

but whose immediate proximity leads to the choice of the plural verb form *contain*. The following example shows another case where an immediately preceding plural noun (*the wars*) determines the verb form, even if the actual grammatical antecedent (*the record*) is singular:

Jarom 1:14

ye can go to the other plates of Nephi
for behold upon them the [*record* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPS | *records* RT]
of our **wars are** engraven

In other words, the immediate proximity of the plural *wars* leads to the plural verb form *are* because “wars are” is expected, not “wars is”. For additional examples in the original text of the influence of an intervening prepositional phrase on grammatical number, see SUBJECT-VERB AGREEMENT in volume 3.

Another possible explanation for 1 Nephi 13:23 is that scribe 2 of \mathcal{O} may have accidentally dropped the *s* from *contains*. Dropping the final *s* is a common scribal error for scribe 2, as these examples later on in 1 Nephi 13 show:

1 Nephi 13:29

all the [*Nation* 0 | *Nations* 1 | *nations* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST] of the Gentiles

1 Nephi 13:29

across the many [*water* 0 | *waters* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST]

1 Nephi 13:29

the many plain and precious
[*thing* >- *things* 0 | *things* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST]

1 Nephi 13:30

above all other [*Nation* > *Nations* 01 | *nations* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST]

All of these examples, however, involve the plural *s* and not the third person singular *s*.

When Oliver Cowdery copied the verb *contain* into \mathcal{P} , he added the *s*, although another possibility would have been to add *-eth*. Support for this grammatical emendation comes from the immediately following sentence in this verse:

1 Nephi 13:23 (no textual variance; \mathcal{O} is extant)

and it also **containeth** many of the prophecies of the holy prophets

On the other hand, *contains* does occur in the Book of Mormon:

2 Nephi 29:10 (no textual variance; \mathcal{O} is not extant)

wherefore because that ye have a Bible
ye need not suppose that it **contains** all my words

On balance, all of this evidence suggests that the use of the plural *contain* in 1 Nephi 13:23 was the result of the immediately preceding plural noun *Jews*. The use of *containeth* later on in the verse argues that the third person singular form *contains* was not intended—and that *containeth* might have been a more systematic grammatical emendation for Oliver Cowdery to have made.

The critical text, consistent with the original (but nonstandard) usage in Jarom 1:14 (which is based on proximity), will restore the nonstandard usage in 1 Nephi 13:23.

Summary: Restore the ungrammatical “the book . . . is a record of the Jews which **contain** the covenants of the Lord” since usage elsewhere suggests that nonstandard subject-verb agreement does occur in the earliest text.

■ 1 Nephi 13:24

*and when it proceeded forth from the mouth of a Jew
it contained the [fulnefs 0 | planeness 1 | plainness ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRS | fulness T]
of the gospel of the Lamb*

While copying from \mathfrak{G} to \mathfrak{P} , Oliver Cowdery accidentally misread scribe 2’s *fulnefs* as *planeness*. The 1981 LDS edition restored the original reading. Elsewhere, the text consistently refers to the fullness (never the plainness) of the gospel, even though both are possible:

- 1 Nephi 10:14 the fullness of the gospel
- 1 Nephi 15:13 the fullness of the gospel of the Messiah
- 3 Nephi 16:10 the fullness of my gospel (three times)
- 3 Nephi 16:12 the fullness of my gospel
- 3 Nephi 20:28 the fullness of my gospel
- 3 Nephi 20:30 the fullness of my gospel

Summary: Follow the reading of the original manuscript in 1 Nephi 13:24 (“the fullness of the gospel”); the Book of Mormon consistently refers to the fullness of the gospel, not the plainness.

■ 1 Nephi 13:24

*and when it proceeded forth from the mouth of a Jew
it contained the fullness of the gospel of the [Land 0 | Lord 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST]*

Here the original manuscript reads “the Gospel of the Land”, which is clearly wrong. Orthographically, the *n* of *Land* is definitely not an *r* since scribe 2 of \mathfrak{G} consistently writes his *r*’s differently from his *n*’s. Oliver Cowdery, when copying from \mathfrak{G} to \mathfrak{P} , interpreted the *n* as an *r*, probably because Oliver’s own *n*’s and *r*’s are very similar and are sometimes mixed up. And since scribe 2’s *o*’s and *a*’s are very similar, Oliver Cowdery readily interpreted *Land* as *Lord*.

Yet elsewhere in this passage there are four occurrences of “the gospel of the Lamb” (in verses 26, 29, 32, and 34) but none of “the gospel of the Lord”. In fact, nowhere else in the Book of Mormon do either of these two phrases occur. So this predominance of “the gospel of the Lamb” in 1 Nephi 13 suggests that the occurrence of “the Gospel of the Land” in verse 24 of the original manuscript is a scribal error for “the gospel of the Lamb”.

It is quite easy to see how scribe 2 of \mathfrak{G} might have misinterpreted *lamb* as *land*. When Joseph Smith dictated *lamb*, scribe 2 could well have misheard Joseph’s /læm/ as the phonetically

similar /læn/, a common pronunciation of the word *land*. In normal speech, the final *d* of *land* is usually not pronounced when a pause follows or the following word begins with a consonant. Here Joseph, in his dictation, probably paused after having read off “the gospel of the Lamb”. After mishearing the nasal *m* as a nasal *n*, scribe 2 could then have readily interpreted the resulting /læn/ as the word *land*.

This emendation and explanation was first brought to my attention by Zane Kerby, Merilee Knoll, and Rebecca S. Wilson, three students in my fall 1996 class on textual criticism of the Book of Mormon.

Summary: Emend 1 Nephi 13:24 to read “the gospel of the Lamb”, in accord with the four subsequent occurrences of “the gospel of the Lamb” in 1 Nephi 13; scribe 2’s *Land* is most reasonably a mistake for *Lamb*, not *Lord*; Oliver Cowdery interpreted *Land* as *Lord* when he copied the text from \mathfrak{C} into \mathfrak{D} .

■ 1 Nephi 13:24

*and the angel of the Lord said unto me
thou hast beheld that the book proceeded forth from the mouth of a Jew
and when it proceeded forth from the mouth of a Jew
it contained the fullness of the gospel of the Lamb of whom the twelve apostles
[Bare / Bore o | bear 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST] record
and they [Bare / Bore o | bear 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST] record
according to the truth which is in the Lamb of God*

The original manuscript has *bare* (spelled by scribe 2 with a capital letter *B*), but the *a* can also be interpreted as an *o* since this scribe, like scribe 3 of \mathfrak{C} , does not always clearly distinguish between these two letters. (For instance, the word *abominable* nine lines below actually looks like it is spelled *abominoble*.) Oliver Cowdery, when he copied from \mathfrak{C} into \mathfrak{D} , interpreted both cases of *Bare / Bore* as *bare*, but in accord with his typical spelling, he wrote each one as *bear*. The present-tense form *bear* has been retained throughout the published editions of the Book of Mormon.

This passage describes the Bible as going forth to the Gentiles, with the explanation that it contained not only the fullness of the gospel but also the witness of the twelve apostles that Jesus was the Lamb of God (that is, the Messiah who was the sacrificial lamb for all mankind). Thus the past-tense verb form *bare* works both times in this passage. On the other hand, one could interpret the testimony of the twelve apostles as an eternal one, and thus the present-tense interpretation is also possible. In 3 Nephi we have specific evidence for both interpretations, as discussed under BEAR in volume 3.

Subsequent verses in 1 Nephi 13 repeatedly state that the Bible came to the Gentiles through the twelve apostles. The Bible, in other words, is their record:

1 Nephi 13:25–26 (referring to the Bible)
wherefore **these things** go forth from the Jews in purity unto the Gentiles
according to the truth which is in God
and after that they go forth **by the hand of the twelve apostles of the Lamb**
from the Jews unto the Gentiles . . .

1 Nephi 13:38–39 (referring first to the Bible, then to other scriptures,
and finally back to the Bible)

I beheld the remnant of the seed of my brethren
and also **the book of the Lamb of God**
which had proceeded forth from the mouth of the Jew
and I beheld that it came forth from the Gentiles
unto the remnant of the seed of my brethren
and after it had come forth unto them
I beheld **other books** which came forth by the power of the Lamb
from the Gentiles unto them
unto the convincing of the Gentiles
and the remnant of the seed of my brethren
and also to the Jews which were scattered upon all the face of the earth
that **the records of the prophets and of the twelve apostles of the Lamb** are true

1 Nephi 13:40 (referring first to other scriptures, then to the Bible)
these **last records** which thou hast seen among the Gentiles
shall establish the truth of **the first**
which is of the twelve apostles of the Lamb

1 Nephi 13:41 (referring first to the Book of Mormon, then to the Bible)
and the words of the Lamb shall be made known
in **the records of thy seed** as well as
in **the records of the twelve apostles of the Lamb**

All these additional references to the twelve apostles in 1 Nephi 13 refer to the Bible as their book. By having the past-tense form *bare* both times in verse 24, the Book of Mormon explicitly states that it is in the Bible that the twelve apostles bore record that Jesus was the Lamb of God.

Summary: Interpret both occurrences of scribe 2's *Bare / Bore* in 1 Nephi 13:24 as the past-tense verb form *bare*; the remainder of the chapter supports the idea that the Bible contains the witness of the twelve apostles that Jesus was the Lamb of God.

■ 1 Nephi 13:25–26

*wherefore these things go forth
from the [Jews / Jew 0 | Jews 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST] in purity
unto the [gentiles / gentile 0 | Gentiles 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST]
according to the truth which is in God
and after that they go forth by the hand of the twelve apostles of the Lamb
from the [Jews / Jew 0 | Jews 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST]
unto the [gentiles 0 | Gentiles 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST] . . .*

Here scribe 2 of \mathcal{C} did not clearly write the plural *s* for two occurrences of *Jews* and the first occurrence of *Gentiles*. It seems that in each of these three cases he tried to write the *s*, but it was never clear, so we have to consider the possibility that the singular was intended (*Jew* and *Gentile*).

But the *s* for the second occurrence of *Gentiles* is definitely there. The parallelism here implies that at least both occurrences of *Gentiles* should be interpreted as plural. We do know that scribe 2 of \mathcal{O} frequently dropped his plural *s*'s (for examples, see under 1 Nephi 13:23). In any event, the two occurrences of what may be the singular *Jew* is possible. Nonetheless, Oliver Cowdery, when he copied from \mathcal{O} into \mathcal{P} , interpreted the whole passage in 1 Nephi 13:25–26 as being in the plural (two occurrences of *Jews* and two of *Gentiles*).

If the singular reading *Jew* is what scribe 2 actually wrote, he may have been influenced by the two occurrences of “the mouth of a Jew” in the previous verse (1 Nephi 13:24). Throughout this part of the text, we have seven examples of the singular *Jew*, but in each case the text refers to “the mouth of a Jew” (or “the mouth of the Jew”):

1 Nephi 13:23	out of the mouth of a Jew
1 Nephi 13:24	forth from the mouth of a Jew (two times)
1 Nephi 13:38	forth from the mouth of the Jew
1 Nephi 14:23	out of the mouth of the Jew (three times)

But in 1 Nephi 13:25–26, there is no reference to “the mouth of a/the Jew”.

There are other places in the text where the singular *Jew* occurs. Here I list all other occurrences in the text of either singular *Jew* or singular *Gentile*. In most instances, they are found together:

title page	and also to Jew and Gentile . . . to come forth in due time by the way of Gentile . . . and also to the convincing of the Jew and Gentile
2 Nephi 10:16	he that fighteth against Zion both Jew and Gentile . . . shall perish
2 Nephi 26:33	and all are alike unto God both Jew and Gentile
2 Nephi 33:8–10	I have charity for the Jew I say Jew because I mean them from whence I came I also have charity for the Gentiles . . . and now my beloved brethren and also Jew and all ye ends of the earth hearken unto these words

Only in the last one do we get the singular *Jew* occurring with the plural *Gentiles*. Note that we also get the plural *brethren* as well as the plural “all ye ends of the earth”; thus here in 2 Nephi 33:8–10, this contrast between the singular *Jew* and plural non-Jewish people seems intentional.

Summary: Accept Oliver Cowdery’s transmission of the plural nouns *Jews* and *Gentiles* in 1 Nephi 13:25–26 since parallelism supports the plural in this passage.

■ 1 Nephi 13:26

*and after that they go forth by the hand of the twelve apostles of the Lamb
from the Jews unto the Gentiles*

[Behold 0 | behold >]s NULL 1 | behold A | BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]

[after this 0A | after this >]s NULL 1 | BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]

thou seest the formation of that great and abominable church

In his editing for the 1837 edition, Joseph Smith deleted the redundant “after this”. He also deleted the word *behold*, although that was grammatically unnecessary. Elsewhere the text has 18 examples of *behold* inserted between a subordinate *after*-clause and its following independent clause, including this nearby example:

1 Nephi 13:35

and **after** that thy seed shall be destroyed and dwindle in unbelief
and also the seed of thy brethren
behold these things shall be hid up

Nor is there anything unacceptable about the redundancy of “after this” following the extended *after*-clause. The “after this” lets the reader know that the long subordinate clause is finished. Another example of this kind of construction is found later in Nephi’s record:

2 Nephi 31:14

after that ye have repented of your sins and witnessed unto the Father
that ye are willing to keep my commandments by the baptism of water
and have received the baptism of fire and of the Holy Ghost
and can speak with a new tongue
yea even with the tongue of angels
and after this should deny me
it would have been better for you that ye had not known me

This redundant usage helps the reader keep in mind that the preceding lengthy clause was a subordinate one involving *after*.

Summary: Restore the redundant “behold after this” in 1 Nephi 13:26; this repetition reminds the reader of the subordination used in the preceding clause and therefore clearly marks the end of a fairly long subordinate clause.

■ 1 Nephi 13:26

thou seest the [formation 0T | foundation 1]ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPS
of that great and abominable church

As discussed under 1 Nephi 13:4, the reading of the original manuscript is correct (“the **formation** of that great and abominable church”).

■ 1 Nephi 13:26

*behold after this thou seest the formation
of [that 0T | a 1 ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRS] great and abominable church*

In copying from \mathcal{O} to \mathcal{P} , Oliver Cowdery accidentally replaced the determiner *that* with the indefinite article *a*, even though this “great and abomination church” has already been extensively referred to (in 1 Nephi 13:4–9). The 1981 LDS edition restored the *that*.

Summary: Maintain the definite determiner *that* in 1 Nephi 13:26 (the reading of the original manuscript); the great and abominable church has already been referred to, so the indefinite article *a* that Oliver Cowdery introduced is inappropriate.

■ 1 Nephi 13:26

*behold after this thou seest the formation of that great and abominable church
which is [the 01A | BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] most abominable of all other churches*

The definite article *the* was deleted in the 1837 edition, but that deletion was not marked by Joseph Smith in his editing of the printer’s manuscript. The deletion is probably a typesetting error. There seems to be no particular grammatical or semantic motivation for removing the *the*. Elsewhere the text has only “most abominable”, although “the most abominable” would have been possible:

1 Nephi 13:5
behold the formation of a church
which is **most abominable** above all other churches

Alma 39:5
know ye not my son that these things are an abomination in the sight of the Lord
yea **most abominable** above all sins save it be . . .

(For a third example of “most abominable”, but one that involves textual variation, see Ether 8:18.) The occurrence of “the most abominable” in 1 Nephi 13:26 is unique, but there is no substantive reason for removing the definite article.

Summary: Restore the definite article *the* in 1 Nephi 13:26 (“the most abominable”).

■ 1 Nephi 13:26

*behold after this thou seest the formation of that great and abominable church
which is the most abominable [of 0 | above 1 ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] all other churches*

In nearly all instances, the Book of Mormon text uses *above* when comparing one member of a set to all the other members of that set, thus “most desirable above”, “most abominable above”, “most precious above”, and so on. In two examples, the earliest textual source (the original manuscript) actually reads *of* rather than *above*. Besides the one here in 1 Nephi 13:26, we have this other example later in this section of the text:

1 Nephi 15:36

wherefore the wicked are separated from the righteous
 and also from that tree of life
 whose fruit is most precious and most desirable
 [of 0 | *above* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST] all other fruits

In both of these examples, when copying from \mathcal{O} to \mathcal{P} , Oliver Cowdery replaced the *of* with *above*, perhaps because he perceived a logical contradiction: the one member being compared cannot belong to the set of all **other** members. Such an interpretation assumes that *of* here is being used in its current set-inclusive sense. But another possibility is that *of* here retains some of its original English meaning of ‘from’.

Another possibility is that scribe 2 of \mathcal{O} misheard Joseph Smith’s dictated *above* /əbəv/ as *of* /əv/ (the pronunciation of each word ends with the same /əv/, at least in American English). However, there is no independent evidence that scribe 2 ever made this mistake—that is, there are no scribal corrections or obvious errors that show scribe 2 (or any other scribe in \mathcal{O}) accidentally writing down *of* in place of *above*.

In her December 1997 paper for my class on textual criticism, Claryce Sherwood thoroughly analyzed the variation in the phrase type “most <adjective> above/of all (other) X”. Based on the earliest textual sources, we have examples for all four of the possible types:

(1) most <adjective> **above** all X

1 Nephi 8:11	most sweet above all that I ever had before tasted
1 Nephi 11:9	most precious above all
1 Nephi 11:22	the most desirable above all things
Alma 39:5	most abominable above all sins
Ether 8:18	most abominable and wicked above all
Moroni 9:9	most dear and precious above all things

(2) most <adjective> **above** all **other** X

1 Nephi 11:15	most beautiful and fair above all other virgins
1 Nephi 13:5	most abominable above all other churches
Jacob 5:61	the most precious above all other fruit

(3) most <adjective> **of** all X

Alma 24:11	the most lost of all mankind
------------	-------------------------------------

(4) most <adjective> **of** all **other** X

1 Nephi 13:26	the most abominable of all other churches
1 Nephi 15:36	most precious and most desirable of all other fruits

Sherwood pointed out in her paper that one of the remaining types is also logically inconsistent—namely, the first one listed above: “most <adjective> **above** all X”. (The example in 1 Nephi 8:11

will work because the *all* is restrictively modified.) She also included the following passage as one having the same logical difficulty:

Alma 32:42

behold by and by ye shall pluck the fruit thereof
 which is most precious
 which is sweet **above** all that is sweet
 and which is white **above** all that is white
 yea and pure **above** all that is pure

One may ask with respect to Alma 32:42, how can something be “sweet above all that is sweet”? Except for the case of 1 Nephi 8:11, all the examples listed under 1 above (“most <adjective> **above** all X”) could be edited by adding *other* (as in “most abominable above all **other** sins” for Alma 39:5). Or in the case of Alma 32:42, we could add *else* (thus “sweet above all **else** that is sweet”, “white above all **else** that is white”, and “pure above all **else** that is pure”), even though this would obviously mar the poetic simplicity of the original text.

Of course, no one really has any problem in interpreting the meaning of the two problematic cases (“most <adjective> **above** all X” and “most <adjective> **of** all **other** X”). The most consistent solution would be to follow the original manuscript in 1 Nephi 13:26 and 1 Nephi 15:36 and not worry about the supposed logical inconsistency of these two examples.

Summary: Restore the two original examples of “most <adjective> **of** all **other** X” in 1 Nephi 13:26 and 1 Nephi 15:36; Oliver Cowdery’s editing that changed the *of* to *above* (“most <adjective> above all other X”) was apparently based on what seemed illogical, yet corresponding examples in the text having the phraseology “most <adjective> above all X” (which could also be considered illogical) have never been edited.

■ 1 Nephi 13:28

*wherefore thou [§2 seethest > §1 seest 0 | seest 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST] that
 after the book hath gone forth through the hands of the great and abominable church
 that there are many plain and most precious things taken away from the book*

Here scribe 2 of \mathcal{O} wrote *seethest*, an obvious conflation of an initial *seeth* followed by the correct *-est* ending. Oliver Cowdery corrected this scribal error in the original manuscript itself by crossing out the entire word and supralinearly inserting the correct *seest*. Here we have one more example of the scribal tendency to overextend the biblical ending *-eth*. Undoubtedly the original reading here in 1 Nephi 13:28 is *seest*, not *seeth*. See the discussion under 1 Nephi 11:2 as well as the more general discussion under INFLECTIONAL ENDINGS in volume 3.

Summary: The correct reading in 1 Nephi 13:28 is “thou seest” (which is Oliver Cowdery’s correction of the impossible “thou seethest”).

■ 1 Nephi 13:28

there are many plain
and [most 0 | 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST] precious things taken away from the book

Here Oliver Cowdery omitted the modifier *most* in his copying from \mathcal{O} to \mathcal{P} . We have already seen one other place where he made the same error:

1 Nephi 11:9
 I behold thou hast shewn unto me the tree
 which is [*most* 0 | 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST] precious above all

Close by the example in 1 Nephi 13:28 is another one involving *most*, but this time the problem occurs in \mathcal{O} rather than \mathcal{P} :

1 Nephi 13:34
 because of the most plain
 and [*pre >% most > NULL* 0 | 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST] precious parts
 of the gospel of the Lamb

In this instance, scribe 2 of \mathcal{O} first started to write *precious* after the *and*, but then he caught his error, erased the *pre* that he had already written, and overwrote the erased text with the word *most*. Finally, he crossed out this second *most*. Perhaps he consciously deleted the *most* because of its apparent redundancy with the *most* in front of *plain*, in which case the original text actually read “most plain and most precious”. On the other hand, perhaps he accidentally repeated the *most* and for that reason he deleted it, in which case the original text read “most plain and precious”.

Besides these examples, there are ten occurrences elsewhere in the text of *precious* preceded by *most*, of which the following five are found conjoined with another adjective:

1 Nephi 13:26	plain and most precious
1 Nephi 13:32	the plain and most precious parts
1 Nephi 14:23	plain and pure and most precious
1 Nephi 15:36	most precious and most desirable
Jacob 5:61	good and the most precious

Note in particular the example in 1 Nephi 15:36 where the *most* is repeated. This example shows that there would be nothing wrong with “the **most** plain and **most** precious parts” in 1 Nephi 13:34. Since scribe 2 of \mathcal{O} did not edit the example in 1 Nephi 15:36 of the repeated *most*, the deletion of the repeated *most* in 1 Nephi 13:34 was probably an attempt to make the written text agree with what Joseph Smith had dictated, not what scribe 2 thought sounded better.

In support of this argument, consider examples where a conjoined *precious* is not immediately modified by *most*:

1 Nephi 13:29	these plain and precious things
1 Nephi 13:29	the many plain and precious things
1 Nephi 13:34	plain and precious
1 Nephi 13:35	plain and precious
1 Nephi 13:40	the plain and precious things

1 Nephi 19:3	the more plain and precious parts
Alma 7:10	a precious and chosen vessel
Moroni 9:9	most dear and precious

The example in 1 Nephi 19:3 (“the more plain and precious parts”) shows that the corrected reading in 1 Nephi 13:34 (“the most plain and precious parts”) is possible.

David Calabro points out (personal communication) that scribe 2 of \mathcal{O} might have accidentally crossed out the wrong *most* in 1 Nephi 13:34; after correctly inserting the *most* before *precious*, perhaps scribe 2 should have deleted the earlier *most* (the one before *plain*), but in his confusion he accidentally deleted the one he had just inserted. If so, the original text in verse 34 would be “the plain and most precious parts of the gospel of the Lamb which hath been kept back by that abominable church”, which would have been completely identical with the phraseology two verses before, in 1 Nephi 13:32 (“the plain and most precious parts of the gospel of the Lamb which hath been kept back by that abominable church”).

Obviously, a number of conjectures are possible. Perhaps the best solution in 1 Nephi 13:34 is to accept scribe 2’s final corrected text (without the repeated *most*) since this reading will work. Scribe 2 of \mathcal{O} had just written “the plain and most precious parts” two verses earlier (in 1 Nephi 13:32) and ended up accidentally writing “the most plain and most precious parts” in verse 34. He caught his error and deleted the second *most*.

Summary: Restore the *most* in “many plain and most precious things” (1 Nephi 13:28); Oliver Cowdery accidentally deleted this *most* when he copied the text from \mathcal{O} into \mathcal{P} ; in 1 Nephi 13:34, scribe 2’s final reading in the original manuscript (“the most plain and precious parts”) is probably the original text.

■ 1 Nephi 13:29

*and after it goeth forth unto all the nations of the Gentiles
yea even across the many waters—which thou hast seen—
with the Gentiles which have gone forth out of captivity*

(1) [& 0|& >js NULL 1|and A| BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]

*thou seest **because of** the many plain and precious things
which have been taken out of the book*

*which were plain unto the understanding of the children of men
according to the plainness which is in the Lamb of God*

(2) [& 0|& >js that 1|and A| BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]

because of these things which are taken away out of the gospel of the Lamb

(3) [& 0|& > an 1|an ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *exceeding great many do stumble*

This is an exceedingly complex sentence, connected originally by *and*’s. The resulting text is a long, incomplete, and complex subordinate *after*-clause (with parenthetical phrases and intervening relative clauses) that was twice extended by adding a connective *and* (listed above as 1 and 2). In his editing for the 1837 edition, Joseph Smith attempted to alleviate the difficulty by removing these two *and*’s. In the printer’s manuscript, Joseph actually changed the second *and* to *that*, but the 1837 edition ended up simply deleting the *and* (or alternatively, omitting Joseph Smith’s *that*). Joseph’s *that* might not have made much sense between the two phrases headed by *because of*

since both refer to the removal of many plain and precious things from the gospel. Nonetheless, the *that* could be interpreted as the beginning of the complement for the earlier “thou seest”:

thou seest . . .

that because of these things which are taken away out of the gospel of the Lamb
an exceeding great many do stumble

The use of the first *and* to connect the subordinate *after*-clause and the following main clause (the one beginning with “thou seest”) may be viewed as a Hebraism. See the discussion regarding HEBRAISMS in volume 3 as well as the examples listed under 1 Nephi 4:8–9 and 1 Nephi 17:50.

Examples like the second *and* are often found in the text when a long preceding subordinate clause is summarized by means of a shorter clause or phrase before giving the main clause, as in the following example:

1 Nephi 10:2–3

he spake unto them concerning the Jews
how that **after** they were destroyed
yea even that great city Jerusalem
and that many were carried away captive into Babylon
that according to the own due time of the Lord they should return again
yea even be brought back out of captivity
and after that they are brought back out of captivity
to possess again their land of inheritance

The text in 1 Nephi 13:29 favors some connector such as *and* between the two phrases headed by *because of*, given that the second one summarizes the idea of the first.

Near the end of this complex sentence (listed as 3 above), scribe 2 of \mathcal{C} wrote & at the beginning of the main clause (that is, “**and** exceeding great many do stumble”). This use of “exceeding great many” seems incomplete without an indefinite article *an*. Elsewhere the text always has the indefinite article preceding “great many” (including two examples with *exceeding*):

1 Nephi 9:1	and also a great many more things
Mosiah 21:10	a great many widows
Alma 13:12	an exceeding great many
Helaman 3:3	an exceeding great many
Helaman 8:18	a great many thousand years
Helaman 14:1	a great many more things
3 Nephi 3:24	a great many thousand people

(The indefinite article *an* in the Alma 13:12 example was mistakenly deleted by Oliver Cowdery.) Near the end of verse 29 in 1 Nephi 13, scribe 2 of \mathcal{C} apparently misheard the indefinite article *an* as *and*. His mistake in writing & for *an* provides evidence that the original manuscript was indeed dictated.

Summary: Despite its original complexity, the long sentence in 1 Nephi 13:29 with its two connecting *and*’s will be restored in the critical text; such Hebraistic connectiveness is characteristic of the Book of Mormon text, especially when a subordinate clause is followed by the main clause; on the other hand, the last *and*, written as &, was probably the result of the scribe mishearing *an* as *and*.

■ 1 Nephi 13:29

*and thou seest because of the many plain and precious things
which have been taken out of the book which were plain
unto the [understanding of the 0ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST | NULL >+ understanding of the 1]
children of men*

The original manuscript is extant here and reads “plain unto the understanding of the children of men”. Normally, the noun phrase after “plain unto” refers directly to people, not to their understanding:

2 Nephi 1:26	he hath been plain unto you
2 Nephi 9:47	would I be plain unto you
2 Nephi 25:4	the words of Isaiah are not plain unto you
2 Nephi 25:4	they are plain unto all they that . . .
2 Nephi 26:33	save it be plain unto the children of men

The expected phraseology (“plain unto the children of men”, as in 2 Nephi 26:33) may explain why Oliver Cowdery, while copying from \mathcal{O} to \mathcal{P} , initially wrote “plain unto the children of men”. His supralinear correction in \mathcal{P} was probably done later when he proofed \mathcal{P} against \mathcal{O} (the level of ink flow is somewhat heavier).

Summary: Maintain the reading of the original manuscript in 1 Nephi 13:29 (“plain unto the understanding of the children of men”), despite its uniqueness in the text.

■ 1 Nephi 13:30

*nevertheless thou beholdest
that the Gentiles which have gone forth out of captivity
and have been lifted up by the power of God
above all other nations upon the face of the land*

- (1) **which** is choice above all other lands
- (2) **which** is the land
- (3) [*which* 0A | *which* >js *that* >js NULL 1 | *that* BCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST]
*the Lord God hath covenanted with thy father
that his seed should have for the land of their inheritance . . .*

This passage originally had a sequence of three *which*’s (listed above as 1, 2, and 3). Joseph Smith tried to alleviate, it would seem, this repetition of the same relative pronoun by replacing the third *which* with *that*. This emendation has been followed in all subsequent editions (from 1837 on). However, while editing the printer’s manuscript, Joseph apparently changed his mind, and he actually ended up deleting his *that*. Perhaps he felt it conflicted with the following relative pronoun *that* (namely, “**that** his seed should have for the land of their inheritance”). This second change would have clearly simplified the overall relative-pronoun usage in this passage (“**which** is the land the Lord God hath covenanted with thy father **that** his seed should have”). Unfortunately, Joseph’s crossout of the *that* is not all that clear (yet there is no doubt that he did cross it out).

The 1837 typesetter did not see Joseph Smith's crossout and so printed the *that*, which has been followed by all subsequent editions. Thus the current text has two *which*'s, followed by two *that*'s.

This editing by Joseph Smith is, of course, stylistic. Yet in many instances, he left numerous occurrences of the relative pronoun *which* in close proximity to each other. See, for instance, the previous verse (1 Nephi 13:29), which has six occurrences of *which*.

Summary: Restore the one case of *which* in 1 Nephi 13:30 that was edited to *that*; the frequent repetition of the relative pronoun *which* occurs throughout the Book of Mormon text.

■ 1 Nephi 13:30

*nevertheless thou beholdest that the Gentiles
which have gone forth out of captivity
and have been lifted up by the power of God
above all other nations upon the face of the land
which is choice above all other lands
which is the land which the Lord God
hath covenanted with thy father
that his seed should have
for the land of their inheritance*

□ *wherefore thou seest that* 01*AIJLMNOQRT
the Lord God will not suffer
that the Gentiles will

□ *will not* 1^cBCDEFGHKPS

utterly destroy the mixture of thy seed

Here we have another example where Joseph Smith edited the text (in this case, in the printer's manuscript) in order to remove an initial fragment. In the original text, the sentence begins with "thou beholdest that the Gentiles", followed by a long sequence of relative clauses, but no predicate is ever provided for the original subject ("the Gentiles"). Instead, the original text starts over, so to speak, by referring back to the initial idea of beholding or seeing ("wherefore thou seest that . . ."). As already noted under 1 Nephi 11:1, Joseph sometimes removed these examples of *wherefore*-clauses but not always. In any event, such clauses are perfectly understandable and will be maintained in the critical text.

In this example, the *wherefore*-clause that Joseph Smith deleted introduces new information (namely, the Lord will not allow the Gentiles to completely destroy the surviving descendants of Nephi). Probably because of this added information, Orson Pratt (in his editing for the 1879 edition) decided to restore the original text here in 1 Nephi 13:30, undoubtedly by reference to the 1830 edition (at the time the only available source for the original text). Subsequent LDS editions have followed Orson Pratt's restoration, but the RLDS editions have continued to follow Joseph Smith's shorter text, which he specifically marked in the printer's manuscript.

Summary: Maintain the original *wherefore*-clause in 1 Nephi 13:30, with its partial repetitiveness; Joseph Smith's 1837 editing not only corrected the grammar in this passage, but also removed some of the information found in the original text, which is probably why Orson Pratt restored the original reading in the 1879 LDS edition.

■ 1 Nephi 13:30

*wherefore thou seest that the Lord God will not suffer
that the Gentiles will utterly destroy the mixture of thy seed
[which 0ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST | which >js who 1]
[is 0A | is >js are 1 | are BCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST] among thy brethren*

Here Joseph Smith made two types of changes in his editing for the 1837 edition; the first deals with the relative pronoun *which* and the second with the number of the following *be* verb. Let us first consider the question of the relative pronoun. In this example, Joseph changed the *which* to *who* since the antecedent refers to humans (“the mixture of thy seed”). A similar change was made a few verses later; in this instance, the antecedent for *which* was the word *remnant*:

1 Nephi 13:34
and this remnant
of [*which* 0A | *which* >js *whom* 1 | *whom* BCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST] I speak
is the seed of thy father

Nonetheless, the editing of *which* for these two nouns (*seed* and *remnant*) has been unsystematically applied in the text. In fact, Joseph's first change of *which* to *who* (here in 1 Nephi 13:30) has never been implemented in any printed edition. More generally, the editing of *which* for the antecedents *seed* and *remnant* is uneven. Consider the following additional examples, of which only 7 of 13 examples have been edited to *who*:

1 Nephi 13:12
the seed of my brethren
[*which* 0A | *which* >js *who* 1 | *who* BCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST] were
in the promised land

2 Nephi 21:11 (Isaiah 11:11, King James Bible)
the remnant of his people **which** shall be left

2 Nephi 21:16 (Isaiah 11:16, King James Bible)
the remnant of his people **which** shall be left

2 Nephi 28:2
and especially unto our seed **which** are a remnant of the house of Israel

Mosiah 8:12
a remnant of the people
[*which* >js *who* 1 | *which* A | *who* BCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST]
have been destroyed

Alma 46:25

that part of his seed **which** shall be taken unto God

Alma 46:27

the remnant of the seed of Joseph **which** shall perish as his garment

3 Nephi 5:24

all the remnant of the seed of Jacob

[*which* >js *who* 1 | *which* A | *who* BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]

are scattered abroad

3 Nephi 16:4

the remnant of their seed

[*which* 1A | *who* BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] shall be scattered

3 Nephi 21:5

your seed **which** shall dwindle in unbelief

Mormon 3:19

the remnant of this people

[*which* 1A | *who* BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] shall also be judged

by the twelve whom Jesus chose in this land

Mormon 7:1

the remnant of this people

[*which* >js *who* 1 | *which* A | *who* BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] are spared

Ether 13:10

the remnant of the seed of Joseph

[*which* 1A | *who* BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] were of the house of Israel

For a complete discussion of this grammatical change, see WHICH in volume 3.

We now turn to the second type of editing in 1 Nephi 13:30 — namely, Joseph Smith’s changing of the number of the *be* verb from singular to plural (that is, from *is* to *are*). The form of the nouns *mixture* and *seed* (in “mixture of thy seed”) is singular, but its semantic referent is plural. Once more, however, this editing of subject-verb agreement with the noun *seed* has not been systematic. In the following example, Joseph changed the plural to the singular, the opposite of his change here in 1 Nephi 13:30:

2 Nephi 28:2

especially unto our seed

which [*are* >js *is* 1 | *are* A | *is* BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]

a remnant of the house of Israel

For further discussion of this type of editing, see SUBJECT-VERB AGREEMENT in volume 3.

Summary: Unless there is contrary evidence, we follow the earliest textual sources in determining the relative pronoun and subject-verb agreement in the relative clause; here in 1 Nephi 13:30, we restore the original “the mixture of thy seed **which is** among thy brethren”.

■ 1 Nephi 13:32

neither will the Lord God suffer that the Gentiles shall forever remain
 in that [state of awful 0A | awful state of > state of awful >]s awful state of 1 |
 awful state of BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
 [woundedness 0 | woundedness >]s blindness 1 | woundedness A |
 blindness BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
 which thou beholdest that they are in

This passage involves two changes. The first deals with the word order. The original manuscript reads, “state of awful woundedness”, which Oliver Cowdery initially copied into \mathcal{P} as “awful state of woundedness”, but then he immediately corrected the word order to “state of awful woundedness”, making \mathcal{P} agree with \mathcal{C} . The 1830 edition followed the original reading. But in his editing of \mathcal{P} for the 1837 edition, Joseph Smith restored the initial order found in \mathcal{P} and then replaced the word *woundedness* with *blindness*—that is, “awful state of blindness”. This reading has been retained in all subsequent editions of the Book of Mormon.

Let us first consider the question of word order. Elsewhere in the text there are seven clauses where the adjective *awful* modifies *state*, of which one (Ether 4:15) has the same form as the current text for 1 Nephi 13:32 (except for the word *wickedness*):

2 Nephi 9:27	for awful is his state
Alma 12:13	then will our state be awful
Alma 12:14	in this awful state
Alma 26:17	from our awful sinful and polluted state
Helaman 6:40	they were in an awful state
Ether 4:15	in your awful state of wickedness
Moroni 7:38	and awful is the state of man

Thus the secondary word order in 1 Nephi 13:32 will work; *awful* can modify *state*.

On the other hand, there are four cases with the other word order (the original order in 1 Nephi 13:32), and for three of these the phraseology is “state of awful wickedness”:

Alma 40:14	now this is the state of the souls of the wicked yea in darkness and a state of awful fearful looking for . . .
Helaman 4:25	for they had fallen into a state of unbelief and awful wickedness
Helaman 7:4	and seeing the people in a state of such awful wickedness . . .
3 Nephi 6:17	they were in a state of awful wickedness

Thus the original order “state of awful X” is supported four times in the text, while the secondary order “awful state of X” is supported once (in Ether 4:15).

These examples suggest that 1 Nephi 13:32 may actually be referring to a state of wickedness rather than woundedness. Scribe 2 of \mathcal{O} wrote down *woundedness*, which is visually similar to *wickedness* (both begin with *w* and end with *edness*). But since the error is probably not an auditory one, it is quite possible that Joseph Smith himself misread the word to his scribe (instead of the scribe mishearing it). Elsewhere the Book of Mormon never refers to a “state of woundedness” (in fact, there are no other examples of the word *woundedness* in the text). But the preceding examples show that there are four references to a “state of wickedness” and that in each case the word *awful* occurs with the expression. The only substantive difference with 1 Nephi 13:32 is the word *woundedness*.

Also note that here in 1 Nephi 13:32 the demonstrative *that* (“in that state of awful . . .”) refers the reader back to an already mentioned state of the Gentiles, namely:

1 Nephi 13:29

and because of these things which are taken away out of the gospel of the Lamb
an exceeding great many do stumble
yea insomuch that Satan hath great power over them

The last clause in verse 29 describes a state of wickedness, although it doesn’t explicitly say so. The passage refers to people stumbling, as if in darkness, which might have been the reason Joseph Smith later edited the word *woundedness* to *blindness* in verse 32. The word *woundedness* did not seem right.

Textually there is clear evidence linking spiritual blindness with wickedness. In fact, one of the passages that refer to a “state of wickedness” makes this connection:

Ether 4:15

behold when ye shall rend that veil of unbelief
which doth cause you to remain in your **awful state of wickedness**
and hardness of heart and **blindness of mind** . . .

Thus the earlier reference in 1 Nephi 13:29 can be considered a state of wickedness.

Summary: Emend 1 Nephi 13:32 by replacing the word *woundedness* with the visually similar *wickedness*; Joseph Smith may have accidentally misread *wickedness* as *woundedness*, thus creating a rather implausible reading for this verse; the original word order “state of awful” (which is more frequent in the text) should be restored.

■ 1 Nephi 13:32

*neither will the Lord God suffer that the Gentiles shall forever remain
in that state of awful wickedness
which thou beholdest [that 0AJ | that >js NULL 1 | BCDEFGHIKLMNOPQRST] they are in*

We have already seen a similar example where the subordinate conjunction *that* was removed from the text:

1 Nephi 2:11

and this they said [*that* 0 | 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST] he had done
because of the foolish imaginations of his heart

Such constructions involving a clause embedded within a clause may be awkward, but they are not ungrammatical. For a complete list of verbs that have occasionally lost the subordinate conjunction *that* from the head of the following complement, see THAT in volume 3.

Summary: In accord with the earliest textual sources, restore the subordinate conjunction *that* in 1 Nephi 13:32 (“which thou beholdest that they are in”).

■ 1 Nephi 13:32

*because of the plain and most precious parts of the gospel of the Lamb
which [hath 0A | hath >js have 1 | have BCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST] been kept back
by that abominable church*

Here the antecedent for the relative pronoun *which* is a plural noun phrase (“the plain and most precious parts”), but the intervening prepositional phrase has a singular noun phrase (“the gospel of the Lamb”). This nearer noun phrase may be the reason why the singular form *hath* appears in the relative clause (“the gospel of the Lamb which **hath** been kept back by that abominable church”). An equally possible explanation is that the original text of the Book of Mormon allows the inflection ending *-(e)th* for verbs in the third person plural.

In his editing for the 1837 edition, Joseph Smith edited the *hath* to the standard plural *have*. The critical text will, of course, restore the original *hath*. For a similar example, see 1 Nephi 13:34. For a general discussion, see INFLECTIONAL ENDINGS and SUBJECT-VERB AGREEMENT in volume 3.

Summary: Restore the original *hath* in 1 Nephi 13:32; the biblical *-(e)th* ending commonly occurs as a plural verb form in the original text.

■ 1 Nephi 13:34

*and this remnant
of which I [speak 01ABCDEFGHIJKLMOPQRST | spake N]
is the seed of thy father*

The 1906 LDS large-print edition accidentally replaced the present-tense *speak* with the past-tense *spake*. Perhaps the typesetter was influenced by the preceding clause near the beginning of the verse that reads “the angel of the Lord **spake** unto me”. Theoretically, either tense would work in this passage, but here the earliest textual sources all support the present-tense *speak*.

Summary: Maintain the present-tense *speak* in 1 Nephi 13:34, the reading of the original manuscript.

■ 1 Nephi 13:34

*because of the most plain
and [pre >% most > NULL 0 | 1 ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] precious parts
of the gospel of the Lamb*

As discussed under 1 Nephi 13:28, the corrected reading in \mathfrak{C} (“the most plain and precious parts of the gospel of the Lamb”) is probably the original text.

■ 1 Nephi 13:34

*because of the most plain and precious parts of the gospel of the Lamb
which [hath 0A | hath >js has 1 | has BCDEGHKPS | have FIJLMNOQRT] been kept back
by that abominable church*

The language here is almost identical to the language found two verses earlier:

1 Nephi 13:32

*because of the plain and most precious parts of the gospel of the Lamb
which [hath 0A | hath >js have 1 | have BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
been kept back by that abominable church*

Yet here in verse 34 Joseph Smith edited the original *hath* to *has* rather than the grammatically standard form *have*. The RLDS text has kept the singular *has*, which incorrectly implies that the antecedent for the relative pronoun *which* is “the gospel of the Lamb” rather than “the most plain and precious parts”. Beginning with the 1852 LDS edition, the LDS text has had the grammatically correct *have*. The critical text will restore the original *hath*. See the discussion under 1 Nephi 13:32 as well as the general discussion under INFLECTIONAL ENDINGS and SUBJECT-VERB AGREEMENT in volume 3.

Summary: Restore the original *hath* in 1 Nephi 13:34, just as in 1 Nephi 13:32.

■ 1 Nephi 13:34

- behold saith the Lamb of God
after that I have visited the remnant of the house of Israel
and this remnant of which I speak is the seed of thy father*
- (1) **wherefore** *after that I have visited them in judgment
and smitten them by the hand of the Gentiles
and after that the Gentiles do stumble exceedingly
because of the most plain and precious parts of the gospel of the Lamb
which hath been kept back by that abominable church which is the mother of harlots
saith the Lamb*
- (2) *[where fore 0 | wherefore >js NULL 1 | wherefore A | BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
I will be merciful unto the Gentiles in that day*

Here Joseph Smith removed the second *wherefore*, probably because it adds nothing more to the *wherefore* (listed as 1) that occurs earlier in this complex sentence. Nonetheless, such repetitions

of *wherefore* are helpful in bringing the reader back to the original point and keeping track of the main idea. Here is a similar repetition of *wherefore* that has not been removed from the text:

2 Nephi 2:18

and because that he had fallen from heaven
and had become miserable forever
he sought also the misery of all mankind
wherefore he saith unto Eve
yea even that old serpent
which is the devil
which is the father of all lies
wherefore he saith
partake of the forbidden fruit and ye shall not die

Summary: Restore the repeated *wherefore* in 1 Nephi 13:34, which helps the reader recover from the long preceding subordinate clause.

■ 1 Nephi 13:34–36

and after that the Gentiles do stumble exceedingly . . .

(1) **saith** the Lamb

wherefore I will be merciful unto the Gentiles in that day

(2) [*saith the Lamb* 0A | *saith the Lamb* >js NULL 1 | BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]

*insomuch that I will bring forth unto them in mine own power
much of my gospel which shall be plain and precious*

(3) **saith** the Lamb

for behold

(4) **saith** the Lamb

I will manifest myself unto thy seed . . .

behold these things shall be hid up to come forth unto the Gentiles

by the gift and power of the Lamb

and in them shall be written my gospel

(5) **saith** the Lamb

and my rock and my salvation

In close succession, we get five occurrences of the phrase “saith the Lamb”. We get the longer “saith the Lamb of God” both before and after this passage (see 1 Nephi 13:33, 34 and 1 Nephi 14:3, 7). Joseph Smith, in his editing for the 1837 edition, removed one of the five occurrences of “saith the Lamb” (the second one listed above), perhaps because he felt that “saith the Lamb” was too frequent in this passage. Nonetheless, he kept the third and the fourth occurrences, even though both of these are even closer to each other than the first and second occurrences, so perhaps there was some other motivation for his deletion of the second occurrence. The critical text will, of course, restore the second occurrence.

Summary: Keep all five occurrences of “saith the Lamb” in 1 Nephi 13:34–36; this successive use of the same shortened version of “saith the Lamb of God” is clearly intended.

■ 1 Nephi 13:37

[*yea* 1A | *and* BCDEFGHIJKLMNOQRT | *And* PS] *whoso shall publish peace*
 [that shall publish >js NULL 1 | *that shall publish* A | BCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST]
 [NULL >js *yea* 1 | A | *yea* BCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST] *tidings of great joy*
how beautiful upon the mountains shall they be

In his editing for the 1837 edition, Joseph Smith simplified the complex structure of the original text in 1 Nephi 13:37 (“yea whoso shall publish peace—that shall publish tidings of great joy—how beautiful upon the mountains shall they be”). Although the replacement of *yea* with *and* at the beginning is not marked by Joseph Smith in the printer’s manuscript, this change is clearly related to the other changes (which Joseph Smith did mark in Ø).

This passage is a paraphrase of Isaiah 52:7. In the following collation, the words that are exactly the same are in bold. We should especially note that the word order is not the same:

ORIGINAL BOOK OF MORMON TEXT	KING JAMES BIBLE
1 Nephi 13:37	Isaiah 52:7
	how beautiful
	upon the mountains
	are the feet of him
	that bringeth good tidings
<i>yea</i>	
whoso shall publish peace	that publisheth peace
that shall publish	that bringeth
tidings of great joy	good tidings of good
	that publisheth salvation
how beautiful	
upon the mountains	
shall they be	

The phrase “tidings of great joy” is closer to the language of Luke 2:10 (“behold I bring you good **tidings of great joy** which shall be to all people”) than it is to Isaiah’s “good tidings of good”.

Joseph Smith’s editing does not attempt to bring the text closer to its Isaiah source, but instead it represents his attempt to remove what he apparently felt was the awkwardness resulting from having two different relative pronouns (*whoso* and *that*) in such close proximity and the virtually immediate repetition of the word *publish*. Of course, such repetition is found in the Isaiah source, but there the relative pronoun is always the same (namely, *that*, occurring four times) and the verbs *publisheth* and *bringeth* alternate so that the verbs are not immediately repeated.

The critical text will, of course, restore the original text in 1 Nephi 13:37; with a little parenthetical punctuation (such as the use of dashes), the second relative clause is fully understandable. Once more, Joseph Smith’s editing here represents the stylistic kinds of changes he tended to make in the first part of his editing for the 1837 edition.

Summary: Restore the original text in 1 Nephi 13:37; this paraphrase of Isaiah 52:7 is somewhat awkward, but with appropriate parenthetical punctuation it is fully understandable.

■ 1 Nephi 13:38

*and it came to pass that
I beheld the remnant of the seed of my brethren
 and also the book of the Lamb of God
 which had proceeded forth from the mouth of the Jew
 [& I beheld >js NULL 1 | and I beheld A | BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
 that it came forth from the Gentiles unto the remnant of the seed of my brethren*

Here is another case of Joseph Smith’s stylistic editing for the 1837 edition. In this instance, he removed the repetitiveness of “and I beheld”, although elsewhere such repetition involving *beheld* has been retained:

1 Nephi 8:11

and it came to pass that **I** did go forth
 and partook of the fruit thereof
 and **beheld** that it was most sweet
 above all that I ever had before tasted
yea and I beheld that the fruit thereof was white
 to exceed all the whiteness that I had ever seen

One could remove the repetitive “yea and I beheld” here as well, but of course such stylistic editing is unnecessary. Similarly, the original text in 1 Nephi 13:38 reads perfectly well.

Summary: Restore the original use of the repetitive “and I beheld” in 1 Nephi 13:38; this is one more example of Joseph Smith’s stylistic editing in the first part of the text.

■ 1 Nephi 13:38–39

*and it came to pass that
 I beheld the remnant of the seed of my brethren
 and also the book of the Lamb of God
 which had proceeded forth from the mouth of the Jew
 and I beheld that it came forth from the Gentiles
 unto the remnant of the seed of my brethren

 and after it had come forth unto them
 I beheld other books which came forth by the power of the Lamb
 from the Gentiles **unto** them
 unto the convincing of the Gentiles and the remnant of the seed of my brethren
 —and also [to >js NULL 1 | to A | BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] the Jews
 which were scattered upon all the face of the earth—
 that the records of the prophets and of the twelve apostles of the Lamb are true*

The text here seems to be referring to the other books as going “from the Gentiles **unto** them” — that is, to the descendants of Laman and Lemuel, “the remnant of the seed of my brethren” — and “also **to** the Jews”. Unlike the Bible, these other scriptures would come from the Gentiles themselves

and would go to both the Lamanites and the Jews. In other words, the prepositional phrase “to the Jews” (and its following relative clause “which were scattered upon all the face of the earth”) is conjoined with the preceding “unto them”.

Obviously, this prepositional phrase along with its attached relative clause interrupts the long gerundive clause “unto the convincing of the Gentiles and the remnant of the seed of my brethren . . . that the records of the prophets and of the twelve apostles of the Lamb are true”. Joseph Smith’s solution to this difficulty was to include the Jews as among those who would be convinced by these additional scriptures, which is not what the original text actually says. In his editing for the 1837 edition, Joseph Smith simply deleted the preposition *to* and thus altered the meaning.

There is nothing inappropriate about conjoining the prepositions *unto* and *to* within a conjoined construction, as in the following examples scattered throughout the Book of Mormon:

2 Nephi 1:5	unto me and to my children
Jacob 2:12	unto you and to your seed
Alma 3:17	unto Nephi and to his seed
Alma 18:37	unto the king and to his servants
Alma 60:34	unto me . . . and also to Helaman
3 Nephi 12:1	unto Nephi and to those which had been called
Mormon 5:10	unto their seed and also to the Gentiles
Mormon 9:22	unto his disciples which should tarry yea and also to all his disciples
Ether 9:2	unto Omer and also to his sons and to his daughters

Note that several of these also have “and also to”, just like the text originally in 1 Nephi 13:39.

Given that the emphasis in the extended passage is on scriptural books going from one people to another, the preposition *to* is wholly appropriate in 1 Nephi 13:39 and should therefore be restored, even though it has a more complicated reading.

Summary: Restore the preposition *to* in the earliest text for 1 Nephi 13:39; this passage refers to other scriptures being delivered to the Jews (“and also **to** the Jews”); although this construction is complex, it does make sense.

■ 1 Nephi 13:40

*these last records which thou hast seen among the Gentiles
shall establish the truth of the first*

which [is >js are 1 | is A | are BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] of the twelve apostles of the Lamb

The relative clause originally had the singular verb form *is*. The antecedent for *which* is “the first”, probably meaning “the first records”. The plural is actually found at the end of the previous verse (“the **records** of the prophets and of the twelve apostles of the Lamb”). Nonetheless, there are many instances where the original text interchangeably refers both to “the record” and “the records” (for a list of examples, see 1 Nephi 5:21). So “the first” here could be referring to ‘the record’.

Such shifts in number frequently occur when there is some intervening text between the relative pronoun and its antecedent. Here in 1 Nephi 13:40, the immediately preceding noun phrase is in the singular (“the truth of the first”), which may have been the reason why the verb in the relative clause is in the singular. Similarly, in the following example involving *records*, the singular *Limhi* occurs just before the relative pronoun *which*, thus influencing the choice of the singular *was* in the following relative clause:

Mosiah 28:11

and after having translated and caused to be written the records
 which **were** on the plates of gold
 which had been found by the people of Limhi
 which [*was* >js *were* 1 | *was* A | *were* BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] delivered
 to him by the hand of Limhi . . .

For further discussion of the effects due to proximity, see SUBJECT-VERB AGREEMENT in volume 3.

Summary: In accord with the earliest text for 1 Nephi 13:40, restore the original singular verb form *is* in the relative clause “which is of the twelve apostles of the Lamb”.

■ 1 Nephi 13:40

the Lamb of God is the
 [NULL >js *son of the* 1 | A | *Son of the* BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRT | *son of the* s] *Eternal Father*
and the Savior of the world

As discussed under 1 Nephi 11:18, Joseph Smith added “the Son of” in four different places in the text. Such additions help clarify the meaning but are not crucial from a textual point of view.

■ 1 Nephi 13:41

wherefore they [*both* 1BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST | A] *shall be established in one*

The 1830 edition accidentally dropped *both* here, but it was restored in the 1837 edition, undoubtedly by reference to the printer’s manuscript. Although \mathcal{O} was fully extant when Joseph Smith did his editing for the 1837 edition, there is no evidence that he ever referred to \mathcal{O} at that time. Currently, the original manuscript is not extant for this part of the text (for about three manuscript pages in 1 Nephi 13–15), including this part of the text.

Summary: Maintain *both* in “they both shall be established in one” since this is how the printer’s manuscript reads (here the earliest textual source).

■ 1 Nephi 13:42

and after that he [hath >js has 1 | hath A | has BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] manifested himself unto the Jews and also unto the Gentiles . . .

In his editing for the 1837 edition, Joseph Smith sometimes replaced the biblical *-(e)th* ending with the expected third person singular ending *-(e)s*, as here in 1 Nephi 13:42. This kind of stylistic updating has never been systematically applied to the text. The critical text will restore in each case the original *-(e)th* ending whenever it is supported by the earliest text. The original text does have many examples of the standard *-(e)s* ending in the third person singular, so the critical text will not remove every instance of the modern ending. For further discussion, see INFLECTIONAL ENDINGS in volume 3.

Summary: Based on the earliest textual sources, the original *hath* in 1 Nephi 13:42 should be restored.

1 Nephi 14

■ 1 Nephi 14:1–2

and it shall come to pass that

- (1) *if the Gentiles shall hearken unto the Lamb of God
in that day that he shall manifest himself unto them in word
and also in power in very deed
unto the taking away of their stumbling blocks*
- (2) *if it so be that they harden not their hearts against the Lamb /*
- (3) *and if it so be that they harden not their hearts against the Lamb of God
they shall be numbered among the seed of thy father*

□ *earliest text*

printer's manuscript, original hand (Oliver Cowdery)

editions: A

- (2) *if it so be that they harden not their hearts against the Lamb /*
- (3) *and if it so be that they harden not their hearts against the Lamb of God*

□ *Joseph's Smith editing for 1837 edition*

printer's manuscript

- (2') **and** harden not their hearts against the Lamb **God** /
- (3') **NULL**

□ *1837 printing of Joseph Smith's editing*

editions: BCDGHKPRST

- (2') and harden not their hearts against the Lamb **of** God /
- (3') **NULL**

□ *Orson Pratt's 1849 editing of the 1837 text*

editions: EFIJLMNOQ

- (2') and **if they** harden not their hearts against the Lamb of God /
- (3') **NULL**

It is possible that the earliest text for this passage contains a dittography. We do not have the original manuscript here, but the identical repetition of the text (compare the second *if*-clause with the third one) suggests that a whole line might have been accidentally repeated by Oliver Cowdery when he copied the text from \mathcal{C} into \mathcal{P} . The length of the repeated portion (“if it so be that they

harden not their hearts against the Lamb”) agrees with the length of the line that scribe 2, the scribe here in \mathcal{O} , typically wrote down in the original manuscript (about 60 characters, including spaces), so Oliver’s eye might have skipped up one line, which would have led to a dittography of a line’s length.

Joseph Smith, in his editing for the 1837 edition, did not apparently like the repetition, so he decided to conjoin the second *if*-clause with the first one (“if the Gentiles shall hearken . . .”) by deleting the initial words of the second *if*-clause (“if it so be that they”) and by adding the conjunction *and*. He then deleted the third *if*-clause, but he wanted to retain the phrase “of God” that was at the end of the third *if*-clause, so he supralinearly inserted *God* at the end of the now-truncated second *if*-clause. The 1837 edition correctly interpreted Joseph’s intentions here and set “the Lamb **of** God” rather than “the Lamb God”.

For the 1849 LDS edition, Orson Pratt apparently thought the truncated second *if*-clause was too abrupt, so he inserted “if they” after the *and*. But this addition to the text was removed in the 1920 LDS edition, undoubtedly by reference to an earlier edition (such as the 1837 or 1840 edition).

The only substantive issue here is whether Oliver Cowdery created a long dittography. Yet such a dittography would be uncharacteristic of the scribal dittographies found in the two manuscripts: these dittographies are at most only a few words long. (A few whole-line dittographies are found in the printed editions but not in the manuscripts.) In addition, the original use of the conjunction *and* before the third *if*-clause suggests that the repetition is intended rather than accidental.

Obviously, the earliest text does work. In fact, there is one example of an *if*-clause occurring at the end of a sentence which is then followed by another sentence that begins with the semantic equivalence of restating the same condition as the previous *if*-clause. In this particular example, the second *if*-clause uses the adverbial *so* to show the repetition of the condition rather than explicitly repeating the words:

Helaman 11:16
 and now O Lord
 wilt thou turn away thine anger
 and try again
if they will serve thee /
and if so O Lord
 thou canst bless them according to thy word
 which thou hast said

Ultimately, there is no real evidence besides the repetition itself that the repeated *if*-clause in 1 Nephi 14:1–2 is due to scribal error. Both clauses were apparently in the original text, even though the result involves redundancy or wordiness.

Summary: Restore the earliest text in 1 Nephi 14:1–2, where a following *if*-clause repeats the preceding *if*-clause nearly word for word; there is nothing inherently wrong with this repetition in the earliest text.

■ 1 Nephi 14:2

and they shall be

*a [blest >js blessed 1 | blest A | blessed BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] people
upon the promised land forever*

In a few instances, the scribe spelled *blessed* as *blest*. There are two other examples of the phonetic spelling *blest* in the manuscripts:

Mosiah 2:41

and moreover I would desire that ye should consider
on the [*blest > blessed 1 | blessed* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
and happy state of those that keep the commandments of God

Mosiah 25:24

and they were [*blest >js blessed 1 | blest A | blessed* BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
and prospered in the land

All three examples of *blest* involve the participial or adjectival use of *blessed* and for this context show a tendency away from the archaic pronunciation /blɛsəd/.

In current English, *blessed* is the standard spelling, whether pronounced /blɛst/ or /blɛsəd/. The critical text will maintain the standard spelling, which conveniently avoids determining how *blessed* should be pronounced. Generally, the two-syllable pronunciation is found only in set adjectival constructions. For a complete discussion, see BLESSED in volume 3.

Summary: Maintain the standard spelling *blessed* throughout the Book of Mormon text.

■ 1 Nephi 14:2

they shall [NULL > be 1 | be BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] no more brought down into captivity

Oliver Cowdery's correction in \mathcal{P} shows a tendency to write "they shall no more be brought down into captivity". Here Oliver apparently caught his error before completing the rest of the expected verb phrase ("shall no more be brought down"). Elsewhere the text definitely favors placing "no more" right after the modal verb, including one other example later in this same verse (which may have been the source of Oliver's initial error in 1 Nephi 14:2):

1 Nephi 14:2	and the house of Israel shall no more be confounded
1 Nephi 15:20	they should no more be confounded
Alma 3:17	he . . . shall no more be called thy seed
Alma 24:13	they can no more be washed bright
Alma 45:13	or the seed of those . . . shall no more be numbered among the people of Nephi
Ether 13:8	and they shall no more be confounded
Moroni 10:31	that thou mayest no more be confounded

We have only one other case involving the placement of “no more”, and in this instance “no more” comes after the entire verb phrase:

1 Nephi 21:13 for they shall be smitten no more

Although this unique occurrence is found in an Isaiah passage, this actual sentence is not found in the corresponding Isaiah verse (Isaiah 49:13), so we can consider this clause as representing the Book of Mormon style rather than the King James style.

Here in 1 Nephi 14:2, the original manuscript probably had the exceptional order (“shall be no more brought down”); otherwise, there would have been no reason for Oliver Cowdery to have corrected the order in \mathcal{O} .

Summary: Follow the unique order “shall be no more brought down” in 1 Nephi 14:2.

■ 1 Nephi 14:7

*for the time cometh saith the Lamb of God that
I will work a great and [a 1ABDEFIJLMNOPQRST | CGHK] marvelous work
among the children of men*

Here the 1840 edition accidentally removed the repeated *a* in this example of conjoined adjectives. The 1908 RLDS edition restored the *a*. A nearly identical example is found in 3 Nephi 21:9; there the 1852 LDS edition accidentally dropped the repeated *a*, which the LDS text restored in the 1920 edition:

3 Nephi 21:9
for in that day for my sake shall the Father work a work
which shall be a great and [a 1ABCDEGHKPRST | FIJLMNOQ] marvelous work
among them

There is one other example in the Book of Mormon conjoining *great* and *marvelous*, and here the *a* is not repeated:

3 Nephi 28:32
yea even among the Gentiles shall there be
a great and marvelous work wrought by them

Both \mathcal{O} and the 1830 edition agree for this passage, which means that \mathcal{O} itself probably did not have the repeated *a*. Of course, a repeated *a* could have been omitted as Oliver Cowdery took down Joseph Smith’s dictation for this passage. Because of the small number of occurrences of conjoined *great* and *marvelous*, we simply rely in each case on the earliest textual sources to determine whether the indefinite article is repeated in “a great and (a) marvelous work”.

The King James Bible has two occurrences of “great and marvelous”, but one occurs in the plural and the other as an appositive, with the result that no article is possible:

Revelation 15:1
and I saw another sign in heaven
great and marvelous
seven angels having the seven last plagues

Revelation 15:3
great and marvelous *are* thy works

Summary: Follow the earliest textual sources in determining whether the indefinite article is repeated when adjectives are conjoined; for the phrase “a great and (a) marvelous work”, the *a* is repeated in 1 Nephi 14:7 and 3 Nephi 21:9, but not in 3 Nephi 28:32.

■ 1 Nephi 14:7

*either to the convincing of them unto peace and life eternal
or unto the deliverance of them to the hardness of their hearts and the blindness of their minds
unto their being brought down into captivity
and also [unto 1ABCDGHKPS | into EFIJLMNOQRT] destruction*

This change of the preposition *unto* to *into* in the 1849 LDS edition seems to be a typesetting error. Its probable source is the *into* in the immediately preceding prepositional phrase (“into captivity”) which is conjoined with “unto destruction”.

Elsewhere in the Book of Mormon text, we have 18 occurrences of *unto* as the preposition for *destruction* but never *into*. On the other hand, *captivity* has only *into* (14 times), never *unto*. So the mixed use of prepositions in 1 Nephi 14:7 (that is, “**into** captivity and also **unto** destruction”) is precisely correct. The 1849 edition created a unique and incorrect reading.

Summary: Restore in the LDS text the original preposition in 1 Nephi 14:7 (“unto destruction”); *unto*, not *into*, is what the text systematically uses with the noun *destruction*.

■ 1 Nephi 14:8

*[remember 1BCDG | Remember AHKPS | rememberest EF | Rememberest IJLMNOQRT] thou
the covenants of the Father unto the house of Israel*

The earliest textual sources have “remember thou” rather than the standard biblical phraseology (“rememberest thou”). The reading with the *-est* ending was first introduced in the 1849 LDS edition and has continued in the LDS text ever since. On the other hand, the RLDS text has retained the earliest form, *remember*. This example could involve an early scribal error. We should note that the word *remember* is hyphenated in \mathcal{D} , not just at the end of a line but at the end of a page:

line 37, page 23 of \mathcal{D} ; line 1, page 24 of \mathcal{D}

said
the Angel had spoken these words he <saith> unto me remem
-ber thou the covenants of the Father unto the House of Israel ...

In switching to a new page, Oliver Cowdery might have accidentally replaced *rememberest* with the simpler and more natural *remember*.

Despite the possibility of scribal error here in 1 Nephi 14:8, the original text seems to have had instances where the associated verb for *thou* had a zero ending (that is, the verb lacked the *-est* ending):

Mosiah 26:11 (“thou may judge”)

therefore we have brought them before thee
that thou [*may* 1A | *mayest* BCDEGHKNPRST | *mayst* FIJLMOQ] judge them
according to their crimes

Alma 8:15 (“thou received”)

for thou hast been faithful in keeping the commandments of God
from the time which thou [*received* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPS | *receivedst* RT]
thy first message from him

Alma 11:25 (“thou had”)

when thou [*had* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPS | *hadst* QRT] it in thy heart
to retain them from me

Ether 12:31 (“did thou manifest”)

for thus [*did* 1ABCDEFGHIJKPS | *didst* IJLMNOQRT] thou manifest thyself
unto thy disciples

In all of these cases, the text has been edited towards the expected *-est* ending.

It is important to recognize here that there is no manuscript variation involving mix-ups between the zero ending and the *-est* ending, not in any of these examples or elsewhere. This consistency implies that the original zero ending in the above examples is intentional rather than due to scribal error. The replacement of the *-est* ending with the zero ending shows up only once in the entire history of the transmission of the text and that error is in a single printed edition (the 1858 Wright edition), not in the manuscripts:

Alma 45:4

[*believest* 1BCDEF | *Believest* AHIJKLMNQRST | *believe* G] thou in Jesus Christ

By contrast, there are numerous errors in the manuscripts showing the tendency of the scribes to write down the *-eth* ending instead of the correct *-est* ending. For discussion and examples of this error, see under 1 Nephi 11:2.

We should also note that here in 1 Nephi 14:8 we have a yes-no question, not the imperative. In the imperative, we expect the zero ending, as in “and to him that would borrow of thee / **turn** thou not away” (3 Nephi 12:42). It is possible that *remember* is preferred in 1 Nephi 14:8 because the archaic word order for the yes-no question matches the word order of the imperative (as in Psalm 25:7: “**remember thou** me for thy goodness’ sake”).

Ultimately, the lack of scribal evidence for accidentally dropping the *-est* ending argues that the earliest text in 1 Nephi 14:8 (“remember thou the covenants of the Father”) is intentional and should be retained in the critical text. Furthermore, the earliest text has a number of examples of *thou* for which the corresponding verb lacks the *-est* ending.

Summary: Maintain in 1 Nephi 14:8 the phraseology of the earliest text, “remember thou”; even though this form lacks the expected *-est* ending, evidence elsewhere in the original text and the manuscripts suggests that this usage is intended.

■ 1 Nephi 14:9

*look and behold that great and abominable church
which is the mother of abominations
whose [founder 1PST | foundation ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQR] is the devil*

As discussed under 1 Nephi 13:6, the original reading *founder* should be maintained in 1 Nephi 14:9.

■ 1 Nephi 14:10

*behold there [is >js are 1 | is A | are BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
save [it be >js NULL 1 | it be A | BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] two churches
[NULL >js only 1 | A | only BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]*

Joseph Smith edited the text here from “there is save it be two churches” to “there are save two churches only”. The singular *is* seemed incongruous with the following plural (“two churches”), so Joseph changed the *is* to *are* and decided that the *it be* of “save it be” needed to be removed. Although *save* alone implies ‘only’, Joseph Smith inserted the word *only* after “two churches”. His editing here conforms with one other example in the text, although in this instance there is no *only*:

2 Nephi 25:18

for there is **save** one Messiah spoken of by the prophets

In this example the singular *is* is maintained because the delayed subject (“one Messiah”) is in the singular.

There is a similar example where Joseph Smith edited *is* to *are* but then changed his mind since he apparently decided that *none* was singular:

Ether 4:3

and there [is >js are >js is 1 | is ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] none
save it be the Lamanites

In this example Joseph left unchanged the phrase “save it be”, which suggests that he could have edited 1 Nephi 14:10 to read “there are save it be two churches” (and without the *only*).

The phrase “save it be” is quite frequent throughout the text, occurring at least 45 times (where *be* is the main verb, not a helping verb). In all these examples, either the *it* is an expletive or it explicitly refers to a singular noun or nominalization. (There is one other case where the text may have originally read “save it be”. See Helaman 13:18 for discussion.)

Although the original phraseology in 1 Nephi 14:10 is awkward and nonstandard in terms of subject-verb agreement, it is understandable and was undoubtedly intended.

Summary: Restore the original phraseology in 1 Nephi 14:10 (“there is save it be two churches”); despite its subject-verb disagreement, this reading undoubtedly represents the original text.

■ 1 Nephi 14:10

*wherefore whoso belongeth not to the church of the Lamb of God
belongeth to that great church
which is the mother of [abominations 1ABDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST | abomination C]*

The 1840 edition introduced the singular “mother of abomination”. This change occurred only here in 1 Nephi 14:10, so it is undoubtedly a typo rather than the result of Joseph Smith’s editing. In three other places (all in this chapter), the text reads “mother of abominations”—and without any variation, even in the 1840 edition.

Summary: Maintain the plural “mother of abominations” wherever it occurs (four times, all in 1 Nephi 14).

■ 1 Nephi 14:12

*and their [dominion 0A | dominion >js dominions 1 | dominions BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
upon the face of the earth [were 01BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST | was A] small*

Here we probably have one more case of scribe 2 of \mathcal{C} leaving off a plural *s* (see the list under 1 Nephi 13:23). This conclusion is supported by the use of the plural verb *were*. This use of *were* shows that there was no proximity effect from the preceding singular nouns *face* and *earth* that could have led to *was* rather than *were*.

The 1830 typesetter reconciled the subject-verb disagreement by changing the verb *were* to *was*. Joseph Smith, in his editing for the 1837 edition, correctly restored the plural *dominions* and reintroduced the original plural verb form *were*.

Summary: Maintain Joseph Smith’s restoration of the probable original reading in 1 Nephi 14:12 (“their dominions . . . were”).

■ 1 Nephi 14:13

*the great mother of abominations did gather together
[in 01PS | ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRT] multitudes
upon the face of all the earth
among all the nations of the Gentiles
to fight against the Lamb of God*

The 1830 typesetter accidentally omitted the preposition *in* before *multitudes*. The meaning of the original text is that these multitudes are a part of the great mother of abominations, not that the great mother of abominations is forming her own armies. The Book of Mormon text includes a good many examples of different peoples gathering together “in multitudes”, especially to fight wars, including these two nearby examples:

1 Nephi 12:15

I looked and beheld the people of my seed gathered together
in multitudes against the seed of my brethren
 and they were gathered together to battle

1 Nephi 12:21

and I saw them gathered together **in multitudes**
 and I saw wars and rumors of wars among them

For 1 Nephi 14:13, the 1908 RLDS edition, based on the printer's manuscript, restored the *in*.

Summary: Restore in the LDS text the preposition *in*, the reading of the original manuscript, in 1 Nephi 14:13; the Book of Mormon consistently describes people as gathering together “in multitudes” to fight wars.

■ 1 Nephi 14:13

*the great mother of abominations did gather together in multitudes
 upon the face of [all 01BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST | A] the earth
 among all the nations of the Gentiles*

Here the 1830 edition accidentally omitted *all*, but it was restored in the 1837 edition, probably by reference to \mathfrak{P} . Both “upon the face of the earth” and “upon the face of all the earth” are possible, but the one without the *all* before *the earth* definitely dominates (27 occurrences versus 2 occurrences). In addition to the example here in 1 Nephi 14:13, we also have Mosiah 28:17 (“and they were scattered abroad upon the face of **all** the earth”). For a complete discussion of the occurrence of *all* within the phrase “the face of the earth/land”, see 3 Nephi 8:20.

Summary: Maintain in 1 Nephi 14:13 the original reading “upon the face of **all** the earth”.

■ 1 Nephi 14:15

*I beheld that the wrath of God was poured out upon
 [that 0T | the 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPS] great and abominable church*

While copying from \mathfrak{C} to \mathfrak{P} , Oliver Cowdery accidentally replaced the determiner *that* with *the*. The 1981 LDS edition restored the *that*. Since the great and abominable church has already been referred to many times, either determiner will work. In all, there are 12 occurrences of “great and abominable church”, and in the earliest textual sources we have eight occurrences of *that*, two of *the*, and two of *this*. In one of these cases, the *that* was replaced by *a*, again by Oliver Cowdery when he copied from \mathfrak{C} into \mathfrak{P} (see 1 Nephi 13:26).

Summary: Based on the earliest textual source (the original manuscript), the original determiner in 1 Nephi 14:15 should be maintained (“that great and abominable church”).

■ 1 Nephi 14:17

*and when the day cometh
that the wrath of God is poured out upon the mother of harlots
which is the great and abominable church of all the earth
whose [founder >]s foundation 1 | founder AT | foundation BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRS] is the devil
then at that day the work of the Father shall commence*

As discussed under 1 Nephi 13:6, the original reading *founder* should be maintained in 1 Nephi 14:17.

■ 1 Nephi 14:27

*and I Nephi heard and [bare / bore 0 | bear 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST] record
that the name of the apostle of the Lamb was John*

As discussed under 1 Nephi 11:32, the past-tense form *bare* is probably the intended reading here in 1 Nephi 14:27. The preceding past-tense *heard* makes this passage parallel to John 1:34 (“and I saw and bare record”).

■ 1 Nephi 14:27

*and I Nephi heard and bare record that
the name [& 0 | of the 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST] apostle of the Lamb was John*

Oliver Cowdery could not make sense out of scribe 2’s use of *and* in the original manuscript, so in \mathcal{D} he wrote *of the* instead. The reading of the original manuscript does seem quite impossible, even as a mishearing, so some reinterpretation seems necessary.

Undoubtedly, Oliver Cowdery’s emendation is correct. The phraseology “name of the X” (where X is a common noun) is quite frequent in the original text, occurring 14 other times, including these four with the same basic clausal phraseology:

Mosiah 23:32	now the name of the leader of those priests was Amulon
Mosiah 24:3	and now the name of the king of the Lamanites was Laman
Alma 1:8	now the name of the man was Gideon
Ether 2:1	and the name of the valley was Nimrod

No other emendation seems plausible in 1 Nephi 14:27.

Summary: Accept in 1 Nephi 14:27 Oliver Cowdery’s emendation of “the name **and** apostle of the Lamb” to “the name **of the** apostle of the Lamb”; no other emendation seems possible.

■ 1 Nephi 14:28

*and [behold 01ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST | CGHK] I Nephi am forbidden
that I should write the remainder of the things which I saw*

The 1840 typesetter accidentally dropped the *behold* here. There is no motivation, grammatical or stylistic, for Joseph Smith to have omitted this instance of *behold* in his editing for that edition.

Elsewhere, the text has 32 occurrences of “and behold I”. There has been no tendency to remove the *behold* from these other instances; thus the omission in 1 Nephi 14:28 is clearly accidental. In accord with the reading of the printer’s manuscript, the 1908 RLDS edition restored *behold* to the RLDS text.

Summary: Maintain the use of *behold* in 1 Nephi 14:28 (“and behold I Nephi”); *behold* was accidentally dropped in the 1840 edition.

■ 1 Nephi 14:28

and behold I Nephi am forbidden

that I should write the remainder of the things

which I saw [0 | & heard 1 | and heard ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]

Although the phrase “see and hear” (and its variants) is very common in the Book of Mormon text (33 times), there is not one occurrence of it in Nephi’s vision of his father’s dream (1 Nephi 11–14). In the previous verse, Nephi does mention that he “heard and bare record that the name of the apostle of the Lamb was John according to the word of the angel” (1 Nephi 14:27)—and it is this use of the verb *heard* which undoubtedly motivated Oliver Cowdery (while copying from \mathcal{O} to \mathcal{P}) to add “and heard” in verse 28. Note, however, that the word *see* was not used in verse 27. Nephi heard the angel pronounce John’s name, but he didn’t see it written.

In 1 Nephi 11–14, when Nephi refers to what he saw, he never conjoins the verb *heard*. There are 64 uses of the verb *see* in Nephi’s account but only four occurrences of *hear*, of which three refer to what Nephi learned—namely, in 1 Nephi 12:4 (“I heard thunderings and earthquakes and all manner of tumultuous noises”), in 1 Nephi 14:5 (“thou also hast heard that whoso repenteth not must perish”), and in 1 Nephi 14:27. (The fourth one, in 1 Nephi 11:28, refers to Jesus’s preaching to the Jews: “and the multitudes were gathered together to hear him”.) Throughout 1 Nephi 14, Nephi consistently refers to what he and John see in vision, never what they hear:

1 Nephi 14:21

behold he shall **see** and **write** the remainder of these things

1 Nephi 14:24–25

and behold the things which this apostle of the Lamb shall **write**

are many things which thou hast **seen**

and behold the remainder shalt thou **see**

but the things which thou shalt **see** hereafter thou shalt not **write**

for the Lord God hath ordained the apostle of the Lamb of God

that he should **write** them

1 Nephi 14:28 (original text, based on \mathcal{O})

and behold I Nephi am forbidden that I should **write**

the remainder of the things which I **saw**

wherefore the things which I have **written** sufficeth me

and I have not **written** but a small part of the things which I **saw**

1 Nephi 14:30

and if all the things which I **saw** are not **written**
the things which I have **written** are true

Once more we see how consistent the original text was, even when it could have been written differently.

Summary: Remove Oliver Cowdery’s intrusive “and heard” in 1 Nephi 14:28; whenever Nephi uses the verb *see* elsewhere in 1 Nephi 11–14, he never conjoins it with the verb *hear*.

■ 1 Nephi 14:28

*and I have [not 01ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPS | RT] written
but a small part of the things which I saw*

Here the 1920 LDS edition removed the negative *not*, probably because it was viewed as being a double negative when combined with the following prepositional *but*, which like the conjunctive *but* has an implied negation. In two other places, the 1920 edition removed similar examples of *not* used with *but*:

Alma 58:5

but behold this did [*not* 01ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPS | RT] profit us
but little

3 Nephi 6:16

therefore they had [*not* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPS | RT] enjoyed peace
but a few years

This editing out of the *not* has occurred only in the LDS text; the RLDS text has retained the *not*. Obviously, the sense of “not . . . but” being a double negative is not that strong.

There is also one example involving “not . . . but” that has been retained in the text:

Jacob 4:1

and I **cannot** write **but** a little of my words

Consistency in usage suggests that Jacob 4:1 should be edited to “and I can write but a little of my words”). In any event, the critical text will maintain the original usage in all four of these examples. For a complete analysis of multiple negatives in the text, see NEGATION in volume 3.

Summary: Maintain the use of “not . . . but” as it originally occurred in 1 Nephi 14:28, Jacob 4:1, Alma 58:5, and 3 Nephi 6:16; the supposedly ungrammatical nature of this construction is not particularly noticeable.

■ 1 Nephi 14:29

and I [Bear 0 | bear 1 ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] record
that I saw the things which my father saw

Once more there is the possibility that this use of *bear* could be interpreted as the past-tense form *bare*. However, here Nephi is speaking directly to us, his readers. The previous text states that he has written down only what he was permitted to write. So now he bears witness to us that he did indeed see what his father saw. Thus, within the larger context, we read:

1 Nephi 14:28–29
and behold I Nephi am forbidden
that I should write the remainder of the things which I saw
wherefore the things which I have written sufficeth me
and I have not written but a small part of the things which I saw
and I **bear** record that I saw the things which my father saw

There is one other place in the Book of Mormon text proper where the writer bears direct witness to his readers. Here too the correct reading is in the present tense:

Enos 1:19–20
and now it came to pass that
I Enos went about among the people of Nephi prophesying of things to come
and testifying of the things which I had heard and seen
and I [bear 1 BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST | bare A] record
that the people of Nephi did seek diligently
to restore the Lamanites unto the true faith in God
but our labors were vain

Enos wants the reader to know that the Nephites faithfully tried to convert the Lamanites back to the gospel, but in this they failed. The 1830 typesetter interpreted Oliver Cowdery's *bear* as the past-tense *bare*, but the correct present-tense reading was restored in the next edition (1837).

Two similar examples of present-tense *bear* are found in the witness statements. This usage is appropriate since the witnesses are speaking directly to us, their readers:

three-witness statement
wherefore to be obedient unto the commandments of God
we **bear** testimony of these things

eight-witness statement
and this we **bear** record with words of soberness
that the said Smith has shewn unto us

For complete discussion of *bear* versus *bare*, see BEAR in volume 3.

Summary: Retain the present-tense usage *bear* whenever the writer speaks directly to the reader, as in 1 Nephi 14:29 and Enos 1:20 (as well as in the witness statements).

1 Nephi 15

■ 1 Nephi 15:3

therefore they did not look unto the Lord

as they [had >]s NULL 1 | had A | BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] ought

In his editing for the 1837 edition, Joseph Smith edited 16 of the 29 examples of “had ought” and its negative “had not ought”. For the ones he changed, the *had* was deleted; if there was a *not*, it was placed after the *ought* (giving “ought not”). For the remaining cases of “had (not) ought”, LDS editions in the first part of the 20th century are responsible for completing this editing. The 1953 RLDS edition has followed some of these later changes, but only in the second half of the Book of Mormon. In the first half of the text, the 1953 RLDS edition has retained the examples that Joseph Smith did not remove in his editing. For a complete listing and analysis, see OUGHT in volume 3.

Joseph Smith himself occasionally taught grammar in Kirtland, Ohio, in the School of the Prophets (also known as the Elders’ School) during the winter of 1835–36 (Documentary History of the Church [DHC] 2:301). The grammar book used in the school was Samuel Kirkham’s *English Grammar in Familiar Lectures*, first published in 1829 (see the list of books in DHC 2:200). On page 206 of Kirkham’s grammar, sentence examples using “had ought” are listed under “New-England or New-York provincialisms” and then in a parallel column are corrected by removing the *had* and placing *not* (when it occurs) after *ought*. Undoubtedly, Joseph was familiar with this prescriptive warning about the use of “had (not) ought”, so it is not surprising that he removed over half of its occurrences in his editing for the 1837 edition.

Merriam-Webster’s Dictionary of English Usage explains (under *had ought* and *ought*) that the use of *had* with *ought* is still found in American dialectal speech, with citations of *hadn’t ought* from H. L. Mencken, Sinclair Lewis, Hodding Carter, and Harry S. Truman. The critical text of the Book of Mormon will restore this older dialectal usage wherever it is supported by the earliest textual sources. There are six examples of *ought* without the *had* in the earliest text, which shows that originally there was some variation between “had (not) ought” and the standard “ought (not)”.

Summary: Restore the use of the dialectal “had (not) ought” wherever it is found in the earliest textual sources.

■ 1 Nephi 15:5

for I considered that mine afflictions

[*was* >+ *were* 0 | *were* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST] *great above all*
because of the destruction of my people

Here scribe 2 of \mathcal{C} originally wrote “mine afflictions was”, then later in considerably heavier ink flow overwrote the *as* portion of *was* with *ere*, thus making the verb agree grammatically with the plural subject. This change was definitely not immediate and suggests later editing on the part of scribe 2.

Elsewhere the plural *afflictions* takes *was* rather than *were* in the earliest text:

Mosiah 21:5

and now the afflictions of the Nephites

[*was* >js *were* 1 | *was* A | *were* BCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST] great

Mosiah 24:10

and it came to pass that so great

[*was* >js *were* 1 | *was* A | *were* BCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST] their afflictions

that they began to cry mightily to God

Alma 4:3

and so great

[*was* >js *were* 1 | *was* A | *were* BCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST] their afflictions

that every soul had cause to mourn

In all three of these cases, Joseph Smith made the grammatical change of *was* to *were* in his editing for the 1837 edition. Thus all the other examples in the earliest text support the original reading of “mine afflictions was” in 1 Nephi 15:5.

Another possibility for 1 Nephi 15:5 is that the plural *afflictions* is an early error for the singular *affliction*—that is, “mine affliction was great above all”. One could argue for the same possibility in the other three examples. The problem with this argument is that in three of the four cases, nearby sentences also use the plural *afflictions*:

1 Nephi 15:5

and it came to pass that

I was overcome because of my **afflictions**

for I considered that mine **afflictions** was great above all

Mosiah 21:5–6

and now the **afflictions** of the Nephites was great . . .

and it came to pass that the people began to murmur

with the king because of their **afflictions**

Mosiah 24:10, 13

and it came to pass that so great was their **afflictions**

that they began to cry mightily to God . . .

and it came to pass that the voice of the Lord

came to them in their **afflictions** saying . . .

In each of these examples, the reference is to the same afflictions.

Summary: Based on the earliest textual sources, we accept the plural *afflictions* with the singular *was* in 1 Nephi 15:5, Mosiah 21:5, Mosiah 24:10, and Alma 4:3.

■ 1 Nephi 15:5

*for I considered that mine afflictions was great above all
because of the [distruction 0 | destructions 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQR | destruction ST] of my people*

When he copied from \mathcal{C} into \mathcal{P} , Oliver Cowdery accidentally added a plural *s* to the word *destruction*. The 1953 RLDS edition and the 1981 LDS edition have restored the singular, although the RLDS change was based on the expectation of English speakers, while the change in the LDS text was most probably based on reference to the original manuscript (which was used to restore in the 1981 edition both minor and major changes in the text).

The singular form *destruction* is much more frequent in the Book of Mormon than the plural *destructions* (154 versus 9 occurrences). The plural form *destructions* always has the meaning ‘destructive events’ and is not used to refer to the complete destruction of a people (as here in 1 Nephi 15:5). In virtually every plural example, *destructions* either occurs in conjunction with other plural nouns or is preceded by a plural quantifier such as *all* or *many*:

1 Nephi 19:4

wherefore I Nephi did make a record upon the other plates
which gives an account or which gives a greater account
of the **wars** and **contentions** and **destructions** of my people

2 Nephi 10:6

wherefore because of their iniquities /
destructions famines pestilences and **bloodsheds** shall come upon them

2 Nephi 26:6

and they shall be visited
with **thunderings** and **lightnings** and **earthquakes**
and all manner of **destructions**

Enos 1:23

and there was nothing save it was exceeding harshness
preaching and prophesying of **wars** and **contentions** and **destructions** . . .

Alma 50:21

for it has been their quarrelings and their contentions . . .
and their abominations which were among themselves
which brought upon them their **wars** and their **destructions**

Alma 51:16

for it was his first care to put an end
to such contentions and dissensions among the people
for behold this had been hitherto a cause of
all their [destructions 0 | distructions 1 | destruction ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]

3 Nephi 9:12

and **many** great **destructions** have I caused
to come upon this land and upon this people
because of their wickedness and their abominations

3 Nephi 10:14

and see and behold
if **all** these **deaths** and **destructions** by fire
and by smoke and by tempests and by whirlwinds . . .

Ether 13:14

and as he dwelt in the cavity of a rock
he made the remainder of this record
viewing the [*destruction* >+ *destructions* 1 |
destructions ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] which came upon the people
by night

In the last example, the text is not referring to the ultimate, complete destruction of the Jaredites but instead to the destructive events that they suffered day after day. This passage, as well as the one in Alma 51:16, shows early textual variation, but in both cases the context and meaning suggest that the plural *destructions* is correct. (See Alma 51:16 and Ether 13:14 for discussion.)

Textual variants also support the conclusion that the plural *destructions* is restricted to the meaning ‘destructive events’. In the following cases, a textual source shows an initial extension of the plural to cases involving the annihilation of a nation or an army or some other group of people, but then the error is subsequently corrected:

1 Nephi 22:17 (error and correction in \mathcal{O})

wherefore he will preserve the righteous by his power
even if it so be that the fullness of his wrath must come
and the righteous be preserved
even unto the [*destructions* > *destruction* 0 |
destruction 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST] of their enemies by fire

Alma 43:39 (error and correction in the 1852 edition)

and it came to pass that
the Lamanites became frightened because of
the great [*destruction* 01ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST |
destructions > *destruction* F] among them

Ether 10:2 (error and correction in \mathcal{P})

and it came to pass that Shez did remember
the [*destructions* >% *destruction* 1 | *destruction* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST]
of his fathers

Thus in 1 Nephi 15:5, the original manuscript as well as usage elsewhere in the text supports the singular reading.

Summary: Maintain the original singular *destruction* in 1 Nephi 15:5 since there it refers to the entire destruction of Nephi’s people.

■ 1 Nephi 15:11

*do ye not remember the [thing 0 | things >% thing 1 | things ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
 which the Lord hath said
 if ye will not harden your hearts
 and ask me in faith believing that ye shall receive
 with diligence in keeping my commandments
 surely these things shall be made known unto you*

The original manuscript (in scribe 2's hand) reads *thing*. When Oliver Cowdery initially copied this word, he accidentally wrote *things*, but he immediately caught his mistake and erased the plural *s*. But the 1830 compositor set the plural anyway, probably because the text often refers to "the things which" (127 times), although there are also examples of "the thing which" (23 times). The singular reading works perfectly well here since the text is referring to one particular thing the Lord has said (namely, "if ye will not harden your hearts . . . surely these things shall be made known unto you").

There is one other place in the text where the 1830 typesetter made this same mistake:

Alma 24:24
 and there were many whose hearts had swollen in them
 for those of their brethren who had fallen under the sword
 for they repented of the [thing 1 | things ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
 which they had done

For further discussion of this second example, see Alma 24:24.

Scribes have frequently caught themselves either adding or dropping the *s* in the phrase "the thing(s) which". Besides the example in 1 Nephi 15:11, there are four other examples, with errors occurring in both directions:

1 Nephi 14:29 (Oliver Cowdery in \mathcal{P})
 and I bear record that
 I saw the [thing > things 1 | things ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
 which my father saw

Jacob 7:14 (Oliver Cowdery in \mathcal{P})
 what am I that I should tempt God to shew unto thee a sign
 in the [things >% thing 1 | thing ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
 which thou knowest to be true

Alma 7:17 (scribe 2 of \mathcal{P})
 yea concerning the [thing > things 1 | things ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
 which I have spoken

Mormon 1:1 (scribe 2 of \mathcal{P})
 and now I Mormon make a record
 of the [thing > things 1 | things ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
 which I have both seen and heard

In cases where either singular or plural will work, we use the earliest textual sources to determine the correct reading.

Summary: Restore the singular reading “the thing which” in 1 Nephi 15:11; not only does the original manuscript read in the singular, but it also makes perfectly good sense to use the singular *thing* to refer to a single statement from the Lord.

■ 1 Nephi 15:12

*behold I say unto you that the house of Israel was compared unto an olive tree
by the Spirit of the Lord which was in our [father 0T | fathers 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPS]
and behold are we not broken off from the house of Israel
and are we not a branch of the house of Israel*

Oliver Cowdery accidentally changed the singular *father* to the plural *fathers*. The 1981 LDS edition restored the correct reading. In this passage, Nephi is explaining to his brothers the meaning of their father’s prophecies about the house of Israel, mentioned earlier in 1 Nephi 10:

1 Nephi 10:12

yea even my father spake much concerning the Gentiles
and also concerning the house of Israel
that they should be compared like unto an olive tree
whose branches should be broken off
and should be scattered upon all the face of the earth

Elsewhere there are 13 places where the text refers to the Spirit being in someone. In each case, the reference is to a single individual, not a group of people. In fact, there are five examples with the same general phraseology as 1 Nephi 15:12 (that is, “the Spirit of the Lord which is/was in X”):

2 Nephi 1:27

but it was the Spirit of the Lord which was in **him**

2 Nephi 4:12

according to the feelings of his heart
and the Spirit of the Lord which was in **him**

The Words of Mormon 1:7

according to the workings of the Spirit of the Lord which is in **me**

Alma 11:22

yea I will
if it be according to the Spirit of the Lord which is in **me**

Ether 12:2

for he could not be constrained
because of the Spirit of the Lord which was in **him**

Thus the change to the plural *fathers* in 1 Nephi 15:12 is inconsistent with how this phrase is otherwise used in the Book of Mormon.

Summary: Maintain the singular *father* in 1 Nephi 15:12; the passage obviously refers to Lehi, not Nephi's ancestral fathers.

■ 1 Nephi 15:13

*yea for the space of many years and many generations
after that the Messiah [hath 0A | hath >js shall be 1 | shall be BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
manifested [himself 0A | himself >js NULL 1 | BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] in body
unto the children of men
then shall the fullness of the gospel of the Messiah come unto the Gentiles*

In this passage Joseph Smith made several stylistic changes in his editing for the 1837 edition. First, he changed the verb phrase from the active to the passive, which then required him to delete the reflexive direct object *himself*. He also replaced the perfect auxiliary *hath* with the modal verb *shall*, probably under the influence of the *shall* in the following clause (“then **shall** the fullness of the gospel of the Messiah come unto the Gentiles”).

All three of these changes are stylistic rather than grammatical. Elsewhere the text still maintains the kinds of expressions that Joseph Smith edited here in 1 Nephi 15:13. Note, in particular, that everywhere else the text says that the Savior will “manifest himself” (23 times), never that the Savior will “be manifested”. Although no other passage refers to his manifestation “in body”, six do refer to him as manifesting himself “in the flesh”:

2 Nephi 6:9

the Lord God the Holy One of Israel
should **manifest himself** unto them in the flesh

2 Nephi 25:12

yea even the Father of heaven and of earth
shall **manifest himself** unto them in the flesh

2 Nephi 32:6 (two times)

until after that he shall **manifest himself** unto you in the flesh
and when he shall **manifest himself** unto you in the flesh

Jacob 4:11

before he **manifesteth himself** in the flesh

Enos 1:8

before that he shall **manifest himself** in the flesh

There are three passages where the phraseology includes the verb *make*. One of these is in the passive; the two others are in the active and use the reflexive direct object *himself*:

1 Nephi 10:11

and should **make himself manifest** by the Holy Ghost unto the Gentiles

2 Nephi 3:5

that the Messiah should **be made manifest** unto them
in the latter days in the spirit of power

Mosiah 27:30

and he will **make himself manifest** unto all

Thus Joseph Smith's editing in 1 Nephi 15:13 created a unique reading. He could have used the expression "to make manifest" in his editing of this passage (namely, in the passive: "the Messiah shall be made manifest in body"), which would have been more consistent since "to make manifest" is used in the text. Nonetheless, such editing would have still been exceptional since the text always uses the active form with the reflexive direct object when referring to Christ's physical appearances.

Similarly, there is no need for the change from the perfect *hath* to the modal verb *shall*. The use of the present perfect in clauses referring to the future are found elsewhere, including the following nearby examples:

1 Nephi 11:7

after thou **hast** beheld the tree
which bare the fruit of which thy father tasted
thou **shalt** also behold a man descending out of heaven

1 Nephi 13:42

and after that he **hath** manifested himself unto the Jews
and also unto the Gentiles
then he **shall** manifest himself unto the Gentiles
and also unto the Jews

Summary: Restore the original phraseology in 1 Nephi 15:13 ("after that the Messiah **hath** manifested **himself** in body unto the children of men"); the verb *manifest* is always used in the active voice when referring to Christ's physical appearances; elsewhere the text sometimes uses the present perfect in an *after*-clause to describe a future event.

■ 1 Nephi 15:15

yea at that day will they not receive

[01 | *the* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *strength and nourishment from the true vine*

The 1830 typesetter accidentally added the definite article *the* before "strength and nourishment", probably in anticipation of the *the* in the following prepositional phrase ("from **the** true vine"). There is no prior reference to "strength and nourishment"; in fact, the text actually reads better without the definite article. Usage elsewhere in the text always refers to "receiving strength" rather than "receiving **the** strength":

1 Nephi 15:6

and it came to pass that
after I had **received strength**
I spake unto my brethren
desiring to know of them the cause of their disputations

Alma 52:17

therefore he abandoned his designs
and returned to the city Bountiful
to wait for the coming of Moroni
that he might **receive strength** to his army

Alma 59:7

and thus being exceeding numerous
yea and **receiving strength** from day to day
by the command of Ammoron
they came forth against the people of Nephiah

The definite article *the* occurs before *strength* only when there is some postmodifier (as in Ether 15:14, “all **the** strength **which** it were possible that they could receive”).

Summary: Remove the intrusive *the* before “strength and nourishment” in 1 Nephi 15:15; its addition in the 1830 edition is unnecessary and appears to be a typo.

■ 1 Nephi 15:16

behold I say unto you

*yea they shall be [numbered 0 | remembered 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST] again
among the house of Israel*

When Oliver Cowdery was copying from \mathcal{O} to \mathcal{P} , he apparently misread the word *numbered* at the end of the line in \mathcal{O} . His error, *remembered*, has continued in all the printed editions. Although people can be remembered again, its use here does seem odd. The original reading of “numbered again” is obviously better.

Elsewhere in the current Book of Mormon text, people are virtually always numbered as members of certain groups (31 times). Examination of the original manuscript has led to a 32nd example, one where *numbered* was accidentally omitted when Oliver Cowdery copied from \mathcal{O} into \mathcal{P} :

Alma 27:27

and they were [*numbered 0 |* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST]
among the people of Nephi
and also **numbered** among the people which were of the church of God

See Alma 27:27 for discussion of the evidence for restoring *numbered*, plus its significance for the meaning of that passage.

In the current text, there is only one other occurrence of the verb *remember* instead of *number* that is used to refer to people. This example is found in a portion of the text that is no longer extant in the original manuscript:

Alma 1:24

for the hearts of many were hardened
and their names were blotted out
that they were **remembered** no more among the people of God

As we have seen here in 1 Nephi 15:16, Oliver Cowdery can misread *numbered* as *remembered*, so *remembered* in Alma 1:24 may be a scribal error for *numbered*.

Language elsewhere in the Book of Mormon strongly suggests that this example of *remembered* in Alma 1:24 is indeed an error. Whenever names are blotted out, the associated clause always refers to these people as being no longer “numbered among” the people of the Lord:

Mosiah 26:36

and them that would not confess their sins and repent of their iniquity
the same were not **numbered among** the people of the church
and **their names were blotted out**

Alma 5:57

and behold **their names shall be blotted out**
that the names of the wicked shall not be **numbered among** the names
of the righteous

Alma 6:3

and **their names were blotted out**
that their names were not **numbered among** those of the righteous

Moroni 6:7

and if they repented not and confessed not
their names were blotted out
and they were not **numbered among** the people of Christ

As shown by 1 Nephi 15:16, Oliver Cowdery can indeed misread *number* as *remember*. The close similarity of the language of Alma 1:24 with the four other passages provides strong evidence that the text in Alma 1:24 should be emended so that the verb is *numbered* rather than *remembered*.

Summary: Based on the original manuscript, *remembered* should be replaced by *numbered* in 1 Nephi 15:16; based on internal evidence as well as this evidence of scribal error in 1 Nephi 15:16, the text in Alma 1:24 should be emended to read “they were **numbered** no more among the people of God”.

■ 1 Nephi 15:20

and it came to pass that

*I did speak [somanay 0 | many 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST] words unto my brethren
that they were pacified*

The use of *so many* as a modifier in the Book of Mormon text is fairly common (with 18 occurrences counting this one). Oliver Cowdery seems to have accidentally missed the *so* when he copied the text from \mathcal{O} into \mathcal{P} , perhaps because scribe 2 of \mathcal{O} had written *so* and *many* as one word (*somanay*).

The phrase *so many* in 1 Nephi 15:20 is not negative in implication. Rather, *so many* implies that Nephi spoke a sufficient number of words in order to pacify his brothers. The *so* is helpful since it provides a connection to the following resultive *that*-clause (“that they were pacified”). Elsewhere in the text there are eight examples where *so many* is connected to a resultive *that*-clause, as in the following example which has two occurrences of *so many* and one of *so much*:

3 Nephi 2:11

for the Gaddianton robbers had become so numerous
and did slay **so many** of the people
and did lay waste **so many** cities
and did spread **so much** death and carnage throughout the land
that it became expedient that . . .

Thus the original usage in 1 Nephi 15:20 is perfectly acceptable.

Summary: Restore the *so many* in 1 Nephi 15:20; the *so* is found in the original manuscript, and it helps the reader connect the adjective *many* with the resultive *that*-clause.

■ 1 Nephi 15:21

what meaneth [*the* 0A | *the* >js *this* 1 | *this* BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] **thing**
which our father saw in a dream
what meaneth the tree which he saw

The first question seems very general and does not specify what “the thing” is. The immediately following question seems to make it clear that “the thing” is the tree which Lehi saw. By changing the determiner *the* to *this*, Joseph Smith made the connection between the two questions more obvious, so that the reader would think that the second question was a rephrasing of the first one. Again this is an example of Joseph editing for clarity.

Nonetheless, there is no strong need for this emendation. In all the questions posed by the brothers about their father’s dream (in 1 Nephi 15), the determiner is always *the*, never *this*:

verse 21	what meaneth the thing which our father saw in a dream
verse 21	what meaneth the tree which he saw
verse 23	what meaneth the rod of iron which our father saw that led to the tree
verse 26	what meaneth the river of water which our father saw

There is another possibility here: the initial question may have originally read in the plural—that is, the brothers start out by asking, “What meaneth the **things** which our father saw in a dream?” They then ask about three specific things that Lehi saw (the tree, the rod of iron, and the river of water), and Nephi gives his response to each one. The addition of “in a dream” in the initial question suggests that this question is a general one. The following three specific questions do not repeat “in the dream”, although they do continue to refer to Lehi as having seen each of these things.

One could counterargue that the singular *thing* is correct because the associated verb form *meaneth* ends in the third person singular ending *-eth*. But in the original Book of Mormon text, the *-eth* ending was also frequently used with nouns in the plural. In fact, there is one interrogative involving *meaneth* that has never been edited out of the text:

Mosiah 12:20

what **meaneth the words** which are written
and which have been taught by our fathers saying . . .

Thus the appeal to *-eth* as an historical third person singular ending is not an argument against the original text in 1 Nephi 15:21 as having read “what meaneth the things”. In fact, one could argue that the singular *meaneth* led scribe 2 of \mathcal{O} to write the singular *thing* rather than the plural *things*.

We have already seen a number of cases where scribe 2 of \mathcal{O} accidentally dropped the plural *s* ending, at least momentarily, including one example involving *thing*:

1 Nephi 13:29
 because of the many plain and precious
 [*thing* >- *things* 0 | *things* 1 ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
 which have been taken out of the book

So we have independent evidence of scribe 2’s tendency to drop the *s* with *things*. (For a complete listing of all his examples of losing a final *s*, see under 1 Nephi 13:23.)

In 1 Nephi 10–15, the text consistently refers to “the things” which Lehi saw in his vision of the tree of life:

1 Nephi 10:17 the **things** which he saw in a vision
 1 Nephi 11:1 the **things** that my father had seen
 1 Nephi 11:3 the **things** which my father saw
 1 Nephi 14:29 the **things** which my father saw

The phraseology in all these passages parallels 1 Nephi 15:21 and supports the emended reading “the things which our father saw in a dream”.

There are a couple of places in 1 Nephi 15 where Nephi refers to “the thing which”, but in each case the context definitely implies a singular referent and not all the things Lehi saw in his vision:

1 Nephi 15:11
 do ye not remember
 the [*thing* 0 | *things* >% *thing* 1 | *things* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
 which the Lord hath said

1 Nephi 15:13
 and now the **thing** which our father meaneth
 concerning the grafting in of the natural branches
 through the fullness of the Gentiles is . . .

Earlier in the text, when Lehi refers to his dream or vision for the first time, we find one more occurrence of the singular *thing*:

1 Nephi 8:2–4
 behold I have dreamed a dream
 or in other words I have seen a vision
 and behold because of the **thing** which I have seen
 I have reason to rejoice in the Lord
 because of Nephi and also of Sam . . .
 but behold Laman and Lemuel
 I fear exceedingly because of you

Here Lehi is either referring to his dream or vision as “the thing which I have seen” or he is referring to one specific event in his dream—namely, the acceptance and rejection of the tree of life by his own family (described in 1 Nephi 8:12–18). Of course, it is possible that in 1 Nephi 8:3 we have a primitive error, that the original text actually read in the plural as “the things which I have seen”. The scribe in \mathcal{O} for 1 Nephi 8 is scribe 3, and there is evidence that this scribe tended to drop plural *s*'s (see the list under 1 Nephi 4:5). However, both the singular and the plural will work in 1 Nephi 8:3, so there we continue to follow the singular reading of the original manuscript.

In contrast to these examples, the use of the singular in 1 Nephi 15:21 does seem to be quite odd. The plural *things* makes sense and thus explains the subsequent series of three specific questions the brothers ask (in verses 21, 23, and 26).

Summary: Emend 1 Nephi 15:21 to read “what meaneth the **things** which our fathers saw in a dream”; there is evidence that scribe 2 of \mathcal{O} sometimes dropped the plural *s*, even with *things*; the more specific questions that follow ask about the meaning of three different things that Lehi saw in his dream.

■ 1 Nephi 15:24

*and I said unto them that it was the word of God
and [that 0 | 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST] whoso would hearken unto the word of God
and would hold fast unto it
they would never perish*

This sentence contains two conjoined subordinate clauses, both introduced by the subordinate conjunction *that*. In his copying from \mathcal{O} into \mathcal{P} , Oliver Cowdery accidentally omitted the repeated *that*. The second *that* makes it clear that Nephi also spoke the second clause. Such examples of conjoined *that*-clauses are found throughout the text, as in this similar example:

Mosiah 7:27

he said **that** man was created after the image of God
and that God should come down among the children of men
and take upon him flesh and blood
and go forth upon the face of the earth

For further discussion of the deletion of *that*, see under THAT in volume 3.

Summary: Restore the original repeated *that* in 1 Nephi 15:24 (“and **that** whoso would hearken”); such conjunctive repetitions are very common in the text.

■ 1 Nephi 15:28

*and I said unto them that it was an awful gulf
which [seperateth 0 | sepparateth 1 | separateth ABCDEGHKPS | separated FIJLMNOQRT]
the wicked from the tree of life*

In the 1852 LDS edition, *separateth* was changed (probably accidentally) to *separated*. The preceding past-tense form *was* may have helped induce this change. All subsequent LDS editions have retained the past-tense *separated*. On the other hand, the RLDS editions have maintained the original present-tense *separateth*.

Although most of Nephi's explanation of Lehi's dream to his brothers is in the past tense, some identifications are in the present tense since the symbols being referred to are eternal. We have a similar example nearby:

1 Nephi 15:30

and the brightness thereof **was** like unto the brightness of a flaming fire
which [*ascendeth* 01ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST | *ascended*] up unto God
forever and ever
and hath no end

But note once more the tendency (this time in the 1888 LDS large-print edition) to accidentally replace the present tense with the past tense, and once again the preceding past-tense verb form *was* seems to have influenced this shift in tense. Since the 1888 edition never served as a copy-text for subsequent LDS editions, the past-tense reading *ascended* has not been perpetuated in 1 Nephi 15:30.

Summary: Maintain the present-tense *separateth* in 1 Nephi 15:28 as well as *ascendeth* in 1 Nephi 15:30; the present-tense forms are not only found in \mathcal{O} but are also consistent with the use of the present tense to refer to the result of eternal judgments.

■ 1 Nephi 15:28

*and I said unto them that
it was an awful gulf which separateth the wicked from the tree of life
[§2 NULL > §1 & 0 | & 1 | and ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST] also from the saints of God*

Here scribe 2 of \mathcal{O} seems to have accidentally omitted the *and*. See 1 Nephi 4:10–11 and 1 Nephi 12:11 for examples of this tendency on his part. In most instances, scribe 2 of \mathcal{O} caught this type of error, but not in this instance. Here Oliver Cowdery later added the & supralinearly in \mathcal{O} with a sharper quill (but without any insert mark). Perhaps Oliver's correction occurred as he was copying the text into \mathcal{P} . This emendation was probably motivated by Oliver's uneasiness about the text as scribe 2 of \mathcal{O} had written it. The word *also* seems to require an *and*. In fact, "and also" is very common in the text. A similar passage, also in this chapter, shows that "and also" is expected when conjoining "from the tree of life" with "from the righteous" (semantically equivalent to "from the saints of God"):

1 Nephi 15:36

wherefore the wicked are separated from the righteous
and also from that tree of life

Summary: Accept Oliver Cowdery’s decision in 1 Nephi 15:28 to add *and* to the conjunct “also from the saints of God” that follows “from the tree of life”.

■ 1 Nephi 15:30

*and I said unto them that our father also saw that
 the [Justices 0 | Justice 1 | justice ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] of God
 did also divide the wicked from the righteous*

Here Oliver Cowdery emended the plural *justices* to *justice* when he copied the text from \mathfrak{C} into \mathfrak{P} . His emendation is undoubtedly correct. Not only did the scribes sometimes drop off the final *s*, but there are also a few cases where they accidentally added a plural *s*.

It is theoretically possible to consider this plural as meaning something like ‘the just decisions of God’ or even ‘justices [that is, judges] acting in God’s name’, but there is no usage in the Book of Mormon to support such interpretations; elsewhere we have only the “justice of God” (12 times, plus three more with an intervening adjective before *God*, as well as one example of “God’s justice”). A nearby example also refers to the division between the wicked and the righteous:

1 Nephi 12:18

and a great and a terrible gulf divideth them
 yea even the sword of the **justice** of the eternal God

The parallelism between 1 Nephi 12:18 and 1 Nephi 15:30 also argues that the phrase “the justices of God” in the original manuscript is not an error for “the judgments of God”, especially since all Book of Mormon occurrences of “the judgments of God” involve judgments coming upon people rather than dividing them.

One possible source for adding the plural *s* to *Justice* may derive from the difficulty Joseph Smith and the scribes may have had in pronouncing the plural *s* when added to an unstressed syllable ending in the sound /s/. Two words that show signs of this difficulty are *witness* and *wilderness*. In certain cases, it appears that the original text may have read *witnesses* and *wildernesses*, but the /əz/ ending was dropped because of the immediately preceding /əs/ at the end of the base form. (See 2 Nephi 31:18 and Alma 34:26 for discussion of *witnesses* and *wildernesses*.) Here in 1 Nephi 15:30, the opposite may have occurred. Scribe 2 of \mathfrak{C} heard the correct /jʌstəs/ but misinterpreted it as being /jʌstəsəz/, thus scribe 2’s plural spelling *justices*. In any event, usage elsewhere argues that this plural form is an error for *justice*.

Summary: Maintain in 1 Nephi 15:30 Oliver Cowdery’s emendation of *justice* for scribe 2’s *justices*; the plural reading seems impossible.

■ 1 Nephi 15:30

*and the brightness thereof was like unto the brightness of a flaming fire
which [ascendeth 01ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST | ascended J] up unto God forever and ever
and hath no end*

The 1888 LDS large-print edition accidentally set the present-tense *ascendeth* as the past-tense *ascended*, probably because of the preceding past-tense *was*. Nonetheless, the following present-tense *hath* (“and hath no end”) shows that this eternal flaming fire should be referred to in the present tense. Similar passages also use the present-tense *ascendeth*:

2 Nephi 9:16	whose flames ascendeth up forever and ever
Jacob 6:10	and whose smoke ascendeth up forever and ever
Mosiah 2:38	whose flames ascendeth up forever and ever
Mosiah 3:27	and whose smoke ascendeth up forever and ever
Alma 12:17	whose flames ascendeth up forever and ever

Also see the discussion regarding *separateth* under 1 Nephi 15:28.

Summary: Maintain the present-tense *ascendeth* in 1 Nephi 15:30.

■ 1 Nephi 15:33

*wherefore if they should die in their wickedness
they must be cast off also as to the things which are spiritual
which are pertaining [to > unto 0 | to 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST] righteousness*

Here scribe 2 of \mathcal{O} immediately corrected *to* to *unto*, but when copying from \mathcal{O} into \mathcal{P} , Oliver Cowdery ignored the inserted *un* before the *to*. Elsewhere in the Book of Mormon text, in the context of “pertaining ___ righteousness”, *to* occurs five times and *unto* four times. So either reading is possible in 1 Nephi 15:33. Perhaps the *to* in the preceding phrase (“as **to** things which are spiritual”) led scribe 2 and Oliver to write down *to* in “pertaining **to** righteousness”. Scribe 2’s correction of his initial *to* to *unto* apparently represents his attempt to get Joseph Smith’s dictation down as accurately as possible.

Summary: Restore the preposition *unto* in 1 Nephi 15:33 (“which are pertaining unto righteousness”).

■ 1 Nephi 15:33

*wherefore they must be brought to stand before God
to be judged of their [work 01 | works ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST]
and if their works have been filthiness they must needs be filthy*

Here scribe 2 of \mathcal{O} wrote down the singular *work*. Oliver Cowdery copied the singular into \mathcal{P} , but the 1830 typesetter emended the singular to the plural *works*. The following subordinate clause has the plural *works*, which supports this emendation. In addition, scribe 2 of \mathcal{O} frequently omits the plural *s* (for a list, see 1 Nephi 13:23).

Usage elsewhere in the text supports the plural *works*. People are always judged by their works, not their work: there are 14 references to being “judged according to one’s works” and 5 to being “judged of one’s works”, including one in the previous verse:

1 Nephi 15:32

for the day should come that they must be judged of their **works**
yea even the **works** which were done by the temporal body
in their days of probation

Thus the 1830 typesetter’s emendation is probably correct.

Summary: Maintain the 1830 emendation of *work* to *works* in 1 Nephi 15:33 since the text otherwise refers to people being judged according to their works.

■ 1 Nephi 15:34

but behold I say unto you

[*that* 0 | 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST] *the kingdom of God is not filthy*

[§2 *that* >+ §1 & 0 | & 1 | *and* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST]

there cannot any unclean thing enter into the kingdom of God

Here we have two changes involving the subordinate conjunction *that*. When copying from \mathcal{O} to \mathcal{P} , Oliver Cowdery omitted the first *that*, probably accidentally. There are numerous examples throughout the Book of Mormon textual history of the accidental deletion of the subordinate conjunction *that*, especially after the verb *say*. (See the examples listed under THAT in volume 3.)

Oliver Cowdery also changed the second *that* to *and*; he made this change in the original manuscript by crossing out the *that* with heavier ink flow and supralinearly inserting an ampersand. The ampersand was copied into \mathcal{P} . Another possibility would have been to simply insert an *and* before the *that* (that is, without deleting the *that*). In fact, it is quite possible that scribe 2 of \mathcal{O} left out an *and* before the second *that*. We already have seen examples of scribe 2 leaving out *and*’s (see the list under 1 Nephi 12:11). The Book of Mormon text has numerous examples of *that*-clauses conjoined by means of the conjunction *and*, including the following two examples in this same chapter:

1 Nephi 15:14

and at that day shall the remnant of our seed know
that they are of the house of Israel
and that they are the covenant people of the Lord

1 Nephi 15:24 (repeated *that* accidentally omitted)

and I said unto them
that it was the word of God
and [*that* 0 | 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST] whoso would hearken
unto the word of God and would hold fast unto it
they would never perish

See the discussion under 1 Nephi 15:24.

However, there appears to be at least one other example in the earliest text of two conjoined *that*-clauses without a connector. And in this case, the textual tendency has been to change the second *that* to *and*, just like in 1 Nephi 15:34:

3 Nephi 3:26
 and Gidgiddoni did cause
that they should make weapons of war of every kind
 [*that* 1ABCDGHKPS | *and* EFIJLMNOQRT] they should be strong
 with armor and with shields and with bucklers
 after the manner of his instructions

The original manuscript for 3 Nephi 3:26 undoubtedly had both *that*'s but no *and* since in 3 Nephi both \mathcal{P} and the 1830 edition are firsthand copies of \mathcal{O} and for this passage both read identically. The replacement of the repeated *that* with *and* was made in the 1849 LDS edition, perhaps by Orson Pratt in his minor editing for that edition. Since we do have a couple cases (in 1 Nephi 15:34 and 3 Nephi 3:26) where the original manuscript apparently read without such an *and*, we should accept such readings and restore them to the critical text, despite their infrequency.

There is a third example of a sequence of two *that*-clauses without a connecting *and*, but here the second *that*-clause is a resultive clause and thus differs from the first *that*-clause:

1 Nephi 13:15
 and I beheld the Spirit of the Lord
that it was upon the Gentiles
 [*that* 01ABDEFIJLMNOPQS | *and* CGHKRT] they did prosper
 and obtain the land for their inheritance

In this instance, the second *that* means 'so that'. Despite this difference in meaning, this second *that* was also replaced by *and* (in this case, in the 1840 edition and also in the 1920 LDS edition), showing that a sequence of *that*-clauses without a connector was considered awkward, even if intended. (See the discussion under 1 Nephi 13:15.)

Summary: Restore the reading of the earliest text in 1 Nephi 15:34 by restoring both *that*'s, but without adding any connecting *and*; a similar example is found in the earliest text for 3 Nephi 3:26; the tendency has been to change the second *that* to an *and* in order to alleviate the awkwardness of the original phraseology.

■ 1 Nephi 15:35

*and there is a place prepared
 yea even that awful hell of which I have spoken
 and the devil is the [preparator / preperator >+ prepaator 0 | preparator >js father >js foundation 1 |
 preparator AT | foundation BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRS] of it*

Oliver Cowdery was not able to figure out the word scribe 2 wrote down in \mathcal{O} to describe the devil's connection with hell. Oliver interpreted the word as *preparator*. The 1830 compositor set this word. In his editing for the 1837 edition, Joseph Smith did not like the word *preparator*. He first

thought of *father* as a possible replacement and wrote it supralinearly after crossing out *preparator*. Joseph then changed his mind and replaced *father* with *foundation*. In selecting this word, he was probably influenced by the earlier passages in 1 Nephi 13–14 which he had recently edited so that Satan would be the foundation (rather than the founder) of the great and abominable church (see the discussion under 1 Nephi 13:6). The 1981 LDS edition restored the earlier *preparator*.

In the mid-1990s, I had Renee Bangerter, one of my research assistants, make a search in Martin Lehnert's *Reverse Dictionary of Present-Day English* (Leipzig: VEB Verlag Enzyklopädie, 1971) for all nouns ending in *-tor* to see what other possible words might look like *preparator*. She found the following phonetically close candidates: *perpetuator*, *perpetrator*, *appropriator*, *procreator*, and *proprietor*, with the last being the most plausible.

Upon reexamination of the handwriting for this word in the original manuscript, I discovered that scribe 2 of \mathcal{O} had indeed written *proprietor* but had spelled it as *prepriator*. Unfortunately, scribe 2 of \mathcal{O} had made it very difficult for Oliver Cowdery to figure out the word. First of all, scribe 2's *pr* looks more like *pe*, a characteristic of his handwriting. See for instance, line 24 on this page of \mathcal{O} (page 29), where scribe 2 wrote the *pr* in *probation* this same way. Besides that difficulty, scribe 2 also overwrote the middle part of the word with an *a* in heavy ink flow, thus further obscuring the intended word. Given this confusion, Oliver was unable to recover the word as *proprietor*. So he had to guess the word; he could tell that it began with a *p* and ended in *-ator*. Bangerter further proposed that Oliver's guess, *preparator*, was influenced by the word *prepared* found in the previous line of \mathcal{O} ("there is a place prepared"), and thus Oliver interpreted the word as *preparator*, a virtually nonexistent word in English. In the Oxford English Dictionary, *preparator* is listed as meaning 'a preparer of medicines or specimens'. (For Bangerter's discussion, see pages 56–57 of her 1998 master's thesis, *Since Joseph Smith's Time: Lexical Semantic Shifts in the Book of Mormon*.)

Another possibility, perhaps more plausible semantically, would have been to interpret the unknown word as *preparer*. Nonetheless, the preceding references to hell as being prepared for the wicked never states that the devil himself prepared the place. In fact, we should rather think that the Lord prepared the place. But the devil could well be said to be the proprietor of hell.

The word *proprietor* does not occur elsewhere in the Book of Mormon text proper, although the word was used in the copyright statement for the Book of Mormon when Joseph Smith (in accord with copyright language) identified himself as the book's "author and proprietor". Joseph Smith would have known the word *proprietor*, but it seems unlikely that he would have known the specific word *preparator*, although he could have guessed that it meant 'a preparer'.

Summary: Emend 1 Nephi 15:35 to read that "the devil is the proprietor" of hell; the word in scribe 2's hand in the original manuscript apparently reads *prepriator* (that is, *proprietor*), which Oliver Cowdery misread as *preparator* under the influence of the preceding *prepared*.

■ 1 Nephi 15:35

wherefore the final state of the **souls** of [*man* 0 | *men* 1 ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
 is to dwell in the kingdom of God
 or to be cast out because of that justice of which I have spoken

The original manuscript reads “the souls of man”, a mixture of plural and singular. This is possible if we interpret *man* as semantically plural, meaning ‘mankind’. Even so, Oliver Cowdery emended the singular to the plural *men* when he copied the text from \mathcal{O} to \mathcal{P} , thus ending up with both nouns in the plural (“the souls of men”).

Elsewhere in the Book of Mormon, there are seven occurrences of “the souls of men”, so this emendation seems quite possible:

1 Nephi 14:3	that he might lead away the souls of men down to hell
Alma 40:7	what becometh of the souls of men
Alma 40:9	what becometh of the souls of men
Helaman 8:28	which seeketh to destroy the souls of men
3 Nephi 28:9	that ye might bring the souls of men unto me
Mormon 5:8	to harrow up the souls of men
Ether 12:4	maketh an anchor to the souls of men

There is also one case where both nouns are in the singular:

Alma 41:2	the soul of man should be restored to its body
-----------	--

But there are no other occurrences of mixed number (like “the souls of man” or “the soul of men”).

Further, there are quite a few cases in the manuscripts where the scribe initially wrote either *man* or *men* and then changed it to read the opposite, perhaps in the same manuscript or in copying from \mathcal{O} into \mathcal{P} :

1 Nephi 18:25 (Oliver Cowdery, copying from \mathcal{O} into \mathcal{P})
 and all manner of wild animals
 which were for the use of [*man* 0 | *men* 1 ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]

Mosiah 29:12 (Hyrum Smith, initial error in \mathcal{P} immediately corrected)
 but the judgments of [*men* > *man* 1 | *man* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
 are not always just

Alma 28:14 (Oliver Cowdery, initial error in \mathcal{O} immediately corrected)
 and thus we see the great call of the diligence
 of [*man* > *men* 0 | *men* 1 ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
 to labor in the vineyards of the Lord

Alma 34:15 (Oliver Cowdery, initial error in both \mathcal{O} and \mathcal{P} immediately corrected)
 and bringeth about means
 unto [*man* > *men* 01 | *men* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
 that they may have faith unto repentance

Alma 42:4 (Oliver Cowdery, initial error in \mathcal{O} immediately corrected)
 and thus we see that there was a time granted
 unto [*men* > *man* 0 | *man* 1 ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] to repent

3 Nephi 27:11 (Scribe 2's error in \mathcal{P} , corrected by Oliver Cowdery while proofing)
 and is built upon the works
 of [\S 2 *man* >+ \S 1 *men* 1 | *men* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]

Confusion between *man* and *men* is therefore fairly frequent.

But there is another possibility: perhaps scribe 2 of \mathcal{O} 's *souls* is an error for *soul*. We have manuscript evidence that on two different occasions scribe 2 accidentally added a plural *s*:

1 Nephi 13:32
 because of the plain and most precious parts
 of the [*gosples* > *gosples* 0 | *Gospel* 1A | *gospel* BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
 of the Lamb

1 Nephi 15:30
 our father also saw that
 the [*Justices* 0 | *Justice* 1 | *justice* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] of God
 did also divide the wicked from the righteous

Thus it is quite possible in 1 Nephi 15:35 that scribe 2 of \mathcal{O} accidentally wrote the plural *souls* instead of the correct singular, *soul*.

But the crucial factor in interpreting 1 Nephi 15:35 is an earlier verse where the brothers ask about “the final state of the soul”:

1 Nephi 15:31
 and they said unto me
 doth this thing mean the torment of the body in the days of probation
 or doth it mean **the final state of the soul** after the death of the temporal body
 or doth it speak of the things which are temporal

Thus in verse 35, Nephi answers his brothers' question, and the text there should correctly read “the final state of the **soul** of **man**”, parallel to verse 31. We can therefore assume that in verse 35, scribe 2 of \mathcal{O} accidentally added a plural *s* to *soul* when he took down Joseph Smith's dictation. The corresponding occurrence of the singular *man* in \mathcal{O} therefore represents the original reading and should not have been emended to *men*.

Summary: Emend 1 Nephi 15:35 to read “the final state of the **soul** of **man**”, which differs from \mathcal{O} in having the singular *soul* in place of the plural *souls*; 1 Nephi 15:35 answers the earlier question in 1 Nephi 15:31 that refers to “the final state of the soul”.

■ 1 Nephi 15:36

wherefore the wicked are
 [seperated 0 | rejected 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST] from the righteous
 and also from that tree of life

The reading *seperated* (spelled as *seperated*) is found on a small extant fragment that originally came from the bottom of page 29 of \mathcal{O} . This fragment can be seen still barely attached at the bottom of a gathering of sheets in the ultraviolet photographs at the LDS Church Historical Department. A legible ultraviolet photograph of this now-separated fragment (along with other fragments from the original manuscript) can be found in folder 80, box 2.

When he copied from \mathcal{O} into \mathcal{P} , Oliver Cowdery misread the word *seperated* as *rejected*. Not only do these two words have the same visual contour, but *seperated* is the next-to-last word on page 29 of \mathcal{O} . As he flipped the leaf of \mathcal{O} over to page 30, Oliver may have read the last part of the line too quickly.

Elsewhere in the Book of Mormon, people are separated as a result of sin and judgment. There are no other textual examples where the verb *reject* is used to describe the rejection of one group of people by another group. And although the wicked can be “rejected from” the righteous (even though the pronoun *from* instead of *by* seems very strange here), it is very difficult to conceive of how the wicked can be “rejected from . . . that tree of life”. Such an expression just doesn’t make sense: the tree is not an animate being that rejects unacceptable recipients. In fact, an earlier verse expresses the same idea that the wicked are separated, not rejected, from the tree of life:

1 Nephi 15:28
 and I said unto them that it was an awful gulf
 which **separateth** the wicked from the tree of life
 and also from the saints of God

Thus the original reading in 1 Nephi 15:36 is consistent with usage elsewhere in the text.

Summary: Restore the reading of the original manuscript in 1 Nephi 15:36 (“the wicked are **separated** from the righteous and also from that tree of life”); the parallel passage in 1 Nephi 15:28 supports this reading.

■ 1 Nephi 15:36

and also from that tree of life
 whose fruit is most precious and most desirable
 [of 0 | above 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST] all other fruits

As discussed under 1 Nephi 13:26, the original preposition *of* should be restored here in 1 Nephi 15:36. Even though the result is not fully logical, the use of *of* seems intended.

■ 1 Nephi 15:36

*whose fruit is most precious and most desirable
of all other [fruits 01ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST | fruit]*

The 1888 LDS large-print edition replaced the plural *fruits* with the singular. Since this edition was never used as a copy-text for later editions, the plural *fruits* has been retained in all subsequent LDS editions. Usually English speakers treat the word *fruit* as a mass noun rather than as a count noun, but occasionally the plural count noun *fruits* occurs in the original text of the Book of Mormon. In the King James Bible, the plural use is quite frequent (as in Matthew 7:20: “wherefore by their **fruits** ye shall know them”).

In 1 Nephi 8:1, we have the plural *fruits* in the phrase “the seeds of fruits”. This phrase appears nowhere else in the text. But for a number of other expressions, we get variation within the earliest textual readings, usually with the singular mass noun *fruit* dominating. In this particular instance, we see that for the phrase “all other fruit(s)”, we get the plural only once, namely here in 1 Nephi 15:36:

- *all other fruit* (3 times) / *all other fruits* (1 time)

1 Nephi 8:12	desirous above all other fruit
1 Nephi 8:15	desirable above all other fruit
1 Nephi 15:36	most desirable of all other fruits
Jacob 5:61	the most precious above all other fruit

For other phrases, *fruit* is usually more frequent than *fruits*, but not always:

- *all manner of fruit* (3 times) / *all manner of fruits* (1 time)

Enos 1:21	raise all manner of grain and of fruit
Mosiah 9:9	with seeds of all manner of fruits
Mosiah 10:4	raise all manner of grain and all manner of fruit of every kind
Ether 9:17	having all manner of fruit and of grain
- *much fruit* (11 times, with 8 examples from Jacob 5) / *much fruits* (1 time)

1 Nephi 17:5	because of its much fruit
1 Nephi 17:6	because of its much fruit
1 Nephi 18:6	we had prepared all things: much fruits and meat
Jacob 5:18	I shall lay up much fruit
Jacob 5:19	hath not brought forth much fruit also
Jacob 5:20	it had brought forth much fruit
Jacob 5:20	it hath brought forth much fruit
Jacob 5:22	it hath brought forth much fruit
Jacob 5:23	it hath brought forth much fruit
Jacob 5:31	I have laid up unto myself against the season much fruit
Jacob 5:32	it hath brought forth much fruit
Alma 29:15	and have brought forth much fruit

- *fruit of one's labor* (1 time) / *fruits of one's labors* (3 times)

Alma 26:31	and see the fruits of our labors
Alma 29:17	which are the fruit of their labor
Alma 36:25	exceeding great joy in the fruits of my labors
Alma 40:26	to partake of the fruits of their labors

Because of this variation, we let the earliest textual sources determine for each case whether the reading should be a singular mass noun (such as *fruit*) or a plural count noun (such as *fruits*).

Summary: Retain the plural count noun *fruits* in 1 Nephi 15:36 (“most desirable of all other fruits”), even though in the three other occurrences of this phrase we get the singular mass noun *fruit*; when dealing with mass versus count nouns, we generally let the earliest textual reading determine for each instance the number of the noun.

1 Nephi 16

■ 1 Nephi 16:1

*thou hast declared unto us hard things
more than [that 0A | that >js NULL 1 | BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
[which 01A | BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
we are able to bear*

In the 1837 edition, the *that which* that originally followed the comparative *more than* here in 1 Nephi 16:1 was deleted, although Joseph Smith marked only the deletion of the *that* in the printer's manuscript. The same removal of *that which* after *more than* is found later in the text, although in this second case there is an adjective, *wise*, between the *more* and the *than*:

Mormon 9:31
but rather give thanks unto God
that he hath made manifest unto you our imperfections
that ye may learn to be **more wise than**
[*that which* >js NULL 1 | *that which* A | BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
we have been

In this instance, Joseph Smith marked the deletion of both words (*that which*) in \mathcal{P} .

The Early Modern English construction “(more) than that which” can be found in the King James Bible:

Luke 3:13
exact no **more than that which** is appointed you

Galatians 1:8
but though we or an angel from heaven
preach any other gospel unto you
than that which we have preached unto you
let him be accursed

So the use of this phraseology in the Book of Mormon is quite appropriate. In fact, there is still one instance of “more than that which” in the current text:

Alma 58:36
behold we fear that
there is some faction in the government
that they do not send more men to our assistance
for we know that they are **more numerous**
than that which they have sent

Here, of course, the editing out of *that which* would not have worked. In modern English, we expect “more than what”, which is also found in the Book of Mormon:

Alma 39:1

I have somewhat **more** to say unto thee
than what I said unto thy brother

Alma 55:2

for I will not grant unto him
that he shall have any **more** power
than what he hath gat

Summary: Restore the original usage “more than that which” in 1 Nephi 16:1 (and in Mormon 9:31); this archaic usage is also found in the King James Bible as well as elsewhere in the Book of Mormon.

■ 1 Nephi 16:3

if ye were righteous and were willing to hearken
[to 01ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST | unto K] *the truth*
and give heed unto it . . .

Here the 1892 RLDS edition accidentally replaced the preposition *to* with *unto*, perhaps because of the following *unto* (“and give heed unto it”) or because “hearken unto” is much more frequent in the Book of Mormon text than “hearken to” (81 versus 12 occurrences). Nonetheless, “hearken to” does occur, so there is no reason to think that the use of “hearken to” in Ⓒ for 1 Nephi 16:3 is an error.

The tendency to replace “hearken to” with “hearken unto” is also found in the Book of Mormon quote from Isaiah 51:1:

2 Nephi 8:1

hearken [to 1 | unto ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] me

This 1830 change was probably made, whether intentional or not, because “hearken unto” is more frequent and biblical sounding. For instance, the preposition *unto* is found in the following verses 4 and 7, which both have “hearken unto me”. Interestingly, Isaiah 51 in the King James Bible shows the same variation as the original text of the Book of Mormon—namely, “hearken to me” in verse 1 but “hearken unto me” in verses 4 and 7. For further discussion, see 2 Nephi 8:1.

Summary: Maintain wherever it occurs the original preposition *to* in “hearken to”; although less frequent than *unto* with the verb *hearken*, the preposition *to* is still possible.

■ 1 Nephi 16:7

I Nephi took one of the daughters of Ishmael to wife
and also my brethren took of the daughters of Ishmael to wife
and also Zoram took the [elder 01 | eldest ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] daughter of Ishmael to wife

Here we have a passage where there has been grammatical variation between *elder* and *eldest*, the archaic comparative and superlative forms of the adjective *old*. A similar example is found later on in 1 Nephi:

1 Nephi 18:7

and now my father had begat two sons in the wilderness
the [*elder* 0QRT | *eldest* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPS] was called Jacob
and the younger Joseph

The Book of Mormon text always uses the biblical forms *elder* and *eldest*, never *older* and *oldest*, but the question in these two passages is whether the comparative should be restricted to two and the superlative to more than two.

In 1 Nephi 16:7, the 1830 typesetter replaced *elder* with *eldest*, undoubtedly because of the grammatical preference for the superlative form when more than two are being compared. Ishmael obviously had more than two daughters since earlier in this verse the text explains that Nephi and his brothers (here Laman, Lemuel, and Sam) married daughters of Ishmael. All subsequent editions have continued with *eldest*.

In 1 Nephi 18:7, Oliver Cowdery copied the grammatically correct *elder* as *eldest*, yet only Jacob and Joseph are being discussed. The 1911 LDS edition restored the grammatically correct *elder*, which happens to be the reading of \mathfrak{C} . Subsequent LDS editions continue with *elder*, but the RLDS text has retained the textually incorrect *eldest*. Note, in particular, that the original text here in 1 Nephi 18:7 conjoins *elder* with *younger* (that is, both conjuncts are comparatives).

According to Merriam-Webster's Dictionary of English Usage, the superlative has been used for comparing two throughout the history of English (see under *superlative of two*). And, in fact, the Book of Mormon text refers to the two sons of Helaman as "the eldest" and "the youngest":

Helaman 3:21

and it came to pass that he had two sons
he gave unto the **eldest** the name of Nephi
and unto the **youngest** the name of Lehi

Helaman 3:37

and it came to pass in the fifty and third year of the reign of the judges
Helaman died and his **eldest** son Nephi began to reign in his stead

An extreme desire for grammatical correctness might tempt one to change these three superlatives in Helaman 3 to their corresponding comparatives, but this would be wholly unnecessary.

The use of the comparative *elder* in 1 Nephi 16:7 goes in the opposite direction. Here the semantics clearly require the superlative ("eldest daughter"), but we get the comparative instead ("elder daughter"). There is one example of an edition replacing the superlative with the comparative:

Mosiah 9:2

for father fought against father and brother against brother
until the [*greatest* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPS | *greater* RT] number of our army
was destroyed in the wilderness

Without a doubt, this change in the 1920 LDS edition was grammatically motivated. (See the discussion under Mosiah 9:2.)

Thus this use of the comparative *elder* in 1 Nephi 16:7 is unique within the text, which suggests that this reading of \mathcal{O} is an early textual error: perhaps Oliver Cowdery accidentally wrote down *elder* when Joseph Smith dictated *eldest*, or maybe Joseph himself incorrectly read off *elder* instead of the correct *eldest*. What may have motivated the error here is the preceding word *brethren*:

1 Nephi 16:7 (proposed original text)
 and also my **brethren** took of the daughters of Ishmael to wife
 and also Zoram took the **eldest** daughter of Ishmael to wife

In the text, we get occurrences of “elder brethren”, never “eldest brethren”:

1 Nephi 2:5 and my **elder brethren** which were Laman Lemuel and Sam
 1 Nephi 4:24 to my **elder brethren** which were without the wall
 1 Nephi 7:8 thou art mine **elder brethren**
 1 Nephi 16:37 to be our ruler and our teacher who are his **elder brethren**
 2 Nephi 5:3 unto us which are the **elder brethren**

In fact, this collocation also holds between *elder* and the related noun form *brother(s)*:

2 Nephi 5:6 and Sam mine **elder brother** and his family
 Alma 39:10 counsel your **elder brothers**

In other words, there are no examples of “eldest brother(s)” or “eldest brethren” in the text.

This same collocation holds for the adjective *young*. There are no examples of “youngest brethren” or “youngest brother(s)”, only “younger brethren” and “younger brother(s)”:

1 Nephi 3:28 unto us their **younger brothers**
 1 Nephi 3:29 why do ye smite your **younger brother** with a rod
 1 Nephi 7:8 that I your **younger brother** should speak unto you
 1 Nephi 17:55 I am thy brother yea even thy **younger brother**
 1 Nephi 18:10 we will not that our **younger brother** shall be a ruler over us
 2 Nephi 5:3 our **younger brother** thinketh to rule over us
 2 Nephi 5:6 Jacob and Joseph my **younger brethren**

The point here is not that the superlatives *eldest* and *youngest* are restricted from occurring with *brethren* or *brother(s)*. Instead, the text simply has examples of only the comparatives *elder* and *younger* with *brethren* and *brother(s)*. This means that given the previously dictated word *brethren*, the following *eldest* could have readily been replaced by *elder* because of the frequent collocation of *elder* with *brethren* (and more generally, the frequent collocation of the comparative with *brother(s)* and *brethren*). In other words, the preceding occurrence of *brethren* could have prompted *elder* rather than the correct *eldest*, leading either Joseph Smith to dictate “elder daughter” or Oliver Cowdery to write down “elder daughter” (rather than the correct “eldest daughter”).

Summary: Accept in 1 Nephi 16:7 the 1830 compositor’s emendation of *elder* to *eldest* (thus “Zoram took the eldest daughter of Ishmael to wife”); the incorrect *elder* in \mathcal{O} seems to be have been prompted by the frequent collocation in the text of *elder* with the word *brethren*.

■ 1 Nephi 16:10

*and it came to pass that
as my father arose in the morning and went forth to the tent door
[& 01 | ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
to his great astonishment he beheld upon the ground a round ball of curious workmanship*

The use of the *and* before the main clause seemed inappropriate to the 1830 typesetter, so he omitted it from the text. It is possible that Oliver Cowdery, the scribe in \mathcal{O} , accidentally inserted the extra *and*. He could have been influenced by the *and* in the immediately preceding predicate (“**and** went forth to the tent door”), although independent evidence for Oliver making this kind of scribal error is virtually nonexistent.

Another possibility is that the *and* here represents a Hebraism in the text—namely, the use of *and* to connect a main clause to a preceding subordinate clause. In this case, the subordinate clause begins with the subordinate conjunction *as* (“**as** my father arose in the morning and went forth to the tent door”). For another example involving *as*, see 1 Nephi 8:13. (For a complete discussion and a list of examples, see HEBRAISMS in volume 3.) Since this Hebraistic use of *and* appears to be intended, the critical text will restore such *and*’s whenever they are supported by the earliest textual sources.

Summary: Restore in 1 Nephi 16:10 the Hebraistic *and* that connects the main clause with the preceding *as*-clause.

■ 1 Nephi 16:12

*and it came to pass that we did take our tents
and [departed 01 | depart ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] into the wilderness*

Here the 1830 typesetter changed the past-tense *departed* to *depart*, perhaps accidentally. The original text has examples of the past-tense auxiliary verb *did* conjoined with a following simple past-tense verb form:

1 Nephi 8:11	I did go forth and partook of the fruit thereof
1 Nephi 8:22	they did come forth and commenced in the path
1 Nephi 8:24	they did come forth and partook of the fruit of the tree

In his editing for the 1837 edition, Joseph Smith changed these three past-tense forms in 1 Nephi 8 to the base form of the verb. Such stylistic editing is, of course, unnecessary. (See the discussion under 1 Nephi 8:11.)

Summary: Restore the past-tense *departed* in 1 Nephi 16:12; such verb conjuncts are found elsewhere in the original text.

■ 1 Nephi 16:21

*now it came to pass that
I Nephi having been afflicted with my brethren because of the loss of my bow
and their bows having lost their [springs 01ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQPRT | spring s]
it began to be exceeding difficult . . .*

Each bow lost its spring; thus the use of the plural *springs* with *bows* will work, although in modern English we expect the singular when referring to an essential quality of a tool or weapon, even in the plural (as in “the strings lost their tension”, not “their tensions”). Here in 1 Nephi 16:21, the 1953 RLDS edition changed the plural to the singular *spring*, but apparently the plural reading of the original manuscript is the intended reading.

Summary: Maintain the unusual, but possible, plural *springs* in 1 Nephi 16:21.

■ 1 Nephi 16:23

*and it came to pass that I Nephi did make out of wood a bow
and out of a [strait 01 | straight ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQPRT] stick an arrow*

The correct interpretation here is “out of a straight stick” since an arrow must be straight in order to be effective in shooting. The alternative *strait* (meaning ‘narrow’) is theoretically possible if one interprets a narrow stick as a thin stick: if an arrow is too thick, it would be too heavy to shoot. Historically, the Oxford English Dictionary lists a few cases where *strait* meant ‘having little breadth or width’, but all of the citations date from between 1391 and 1527 (see definition 4 under *strait* in the OED). The scribal spellings for *straight* and *strait* in the Book of Mormon manuscripts provide no help in determining the correct word since in the manuscripts both *straight* and *strait* are virtually always spelled identically (as *strait*), no matter what the meaning. See the discussion under 1 Nephi 8:20; also see STRAIT in volume 3.

Summary: Maintain the spelling *straight* in 1 Nephi 16:23 (“a straight stick”) since an effective arrow cannot be crooked or bent.

■ 1 Nephi 16:24

*for they had humbled themselves
because of my [words 0T | word 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQPQRS]
for I did say many things unto them in the energy of my soul*

The original manuscript has the plural *words*, which makes perfectly good sense, especially given the following reference to the “many things” Nephi said to his family. In copying from \mathfrak{C} into \mathfrak{P} , Oliver Cowdery accidentally replaced the plural with the singular *word*. The 1981 LDS edition restored the plural reading of the original manuscript.

Throughout the history of the text there are many examples of *word* and *words* having been mixed up. (For a nearby example, see 1 Nephi 17:22.) In most instances, the earliest text prefers

the plural when referring to a person's words. When referring to God's word(s), we can have either the singular or the plural. For instance, we have the following statistics for "my word(s)" in the earliest textual sources:

	<i>the Lord's</i>	<i>a person's</i>
my word	12	1
my words	18	51

There is only one example in the text of "my word" referring to a person's word:

Alma 7:26 (☉ not extant)
 and my soul doth exceedingly rejoice
 because of the exceeding diligence and heed
 which ye have given unto **my word**

Although the singular in Alma 7:26 could be an error for "my words", there are enough occurrences of "his word" referring to a person's word that we should be reluctant about pluralizing all occurrences of "someone's word", which would include the following examples:

Mosiah 17:11 (referring to Abinadi)
 and now king Noah was about to release him for he feared **his word**

Mosiah 18:3 (referring to Alma)
 and as many as would hear **his word** he did teach

Mosiah 18:7 (referring to Alma)
 yea all were gathered together that believed on **his word** to hear him

For each case, we let the earliest textual sources determine whether the text should read *word* or *words*.

Summary: Maintain the plural "my words" in 1 Nephi 16:24 since the original manuscript reads this way; the plural is expected in this context.

■ 1 Nephi 16:25

*and he was truly chastened
 because of his [murmurings 0 | murmuring 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST] against the Lord*

When copying from ☉ to ☽, Oliver Cowdery changed the plural *murmurings* in 1 Nephi 16:25 to the singular. Generally, the plural is the expected number for the count noun *murmuring*, as in the two other nongrundive cases of *murmuring(s)* in the Book of Mormon:

Mosiah 29:33
 yea all the travails of soul for their people
 and also all the **murmurings** of the people to their king

Alma 22:24
 and there began to be great **murmurings** among them

So there is nothing exceptional about the original plural reading *murmurings* in 1 Nephi 16:25. (For discussion of the gerundive use of *murmuring*, see 1 Nephi 17:2.)

Summary: Restore the plural reading of the original manuscript in 1 Nephi 16:25 (“because of his murmurings”); here *murmuring(s)* is used as a count noun and elsewhere the text favors the plural *murmurings* over the singular *murmuring* for such count noun uses.

■ 1 Nephi 16:28

and it came to pass that

I Nephi beheld [that 0 | that >js NULL 1 | ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]

the pointers which were in the ball

that they did work according to the faith and diligence and heed

which we did give unto them

In the original text in 1 Nephi 16:28, the complex subject “the pointers which were in the ball” is first given without its predicate, then it is restated using the pronominal form of the subject, followed by the predicate (thus “**they** did work according to the faith . . .”). As a result, the subordinate conjunction *that* occurs twice: before the complex subject and before the pronominal subject.

This kind of repetitive construction occurs in spoken English and is used to help the listener understand a complex subject followed by a long predicate. As a result of the influence of Latinate literary style, such repetition of the subject has been avoided in written English for the past several centuries. Thus the 1830 typesetter deleted the first *that* after *beheld* and made the original complex subject the direct object of the verb *beheld*. (Later, in his editing of *Ø* for the 1837 edition, Joseph Smith crossed out that same *that*, thus making *Ø* agree with the 1830 reading.) As a consequence of this editing, the following *that*-clause became an additive clause rather than the immediate clausal complement of the verb *beheld*. For more examples of the repeated subject, see SUBJECT REPETITION in volume 3. The critical text will, of course, restore such usage when it is supported by the earliest textual sources.

Summary: Restore the subordinate conjunction *that* in 1 Nephi 16:28, thereby restoring the repeated subject for this passage; this kind of syntax is found in spoken English but is avoided in written English.

■ 1 Nephi 16:35

and we have suffered much [afflictions 01 | affliction ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]

hunger thirst and fatigue

The 1830 typesetter replaced the plural *afflictions* with the singular *affliction*, probably because he expected the singular after the determiner *much*. The following singulars (*hunger*, *thirst*, and *fatigue*) may have also influenced this change in number.

The plural *afflictions* is probably correct. First of all, it is supported by the plural *afflictions* found earlier in the verse:

1 Nephi 16:35

and it came to pass that
the daughters of Ishmael did mourn exceedingly
because of the loss of their father
and because of their [*affliction* > *afflictions* 0 |
afflictions 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST] in the wilderness

Note, by the way, that Oliver Cowdery initially wrote the singular *affliction* in \mathcal{O} , which he immediately corrected to the plural.

More importantly, there are a number of other cases of “much afflictions” in the text, as well as “many afflictions” and “much affliction”. In a few cases, textual variation has also occurred:

- *many afflictions* (eight times)

1 Nephi 1:1

and having seen **many afflictions** in the course of my days

1 Nephi 17:6

and notwithstanding we had suffered **many afflictions** and much difficulty

Alma 17:5

for they had **many afflictions**

Alma 25:6

after having suffered much loss and so **many afflictions**
they began to be stirred up in remembrance of the words

Alma 53:13

when they saw the danger
and the **many afflictions** and tribulations
which the Nephites bare for them
they were moved with compassion

Helaman 12:3

and thus we see that except the Lord doth chasten
his people with **many afflictions**

Helaman 15:12

and notwithstanding the **many afflictions** which they shall have

3 Nephi 2:19

and thus were the people in a state of **many afflictions**

- *much affliction* (four times)

1 Nephi 17:1

and we did travel and wade through
much [*affliction* 0ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST | *afflictions* >% *affliction* 1]
in the wilderness

Alma 1:23

and it was a cause of **much affliction** to the church

Alma 4:7

now this was the cause of **much affliction** to Alma

Helaman 3:34

now this was a great evil
which did cause the more humble part of the people
to suffer great persecutions
and to wade through

much [*affliction* 1ABDEFIJLMNOPQRST | *afflictions* CGHK]

- *much afflictions* (three times, including 1 Nephi 16:35)

1 Nephi 16:35

and we have suffered

much [*afflictions* 01 | *affliction* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]

hunger thirst and fatigue

Alma 7:5 (two occurrences)

nevertheless I do not desire that
my joy over you should come
by the cause of so **much afflictions** and sorrow
which I have had for the brethren at Zarahemla
for behold my joy cometh over them
after wading through

much [*afflictions* 1ABCDEGHKPS | *affliction* FIJLMNOQRT] and sorrow

Two observations about the textual variation should be made. First, there has actually been a tendency to change “much affliction” to “much afflictions”: namely, in 1 Nephi 17:1, where Oliver Cowdery initially wrote *afflictions* in \mathcal{D} but immediately corrected his error by erasing the plural *s*; and in Helaman 3:34, where the 1840 typesetter seems to have accidentally set *afflictions*. This second change persisted in the RLDS text until the third RLDS edition (1908).

Second, we observe that in the last example listed above (the second occurrence in Alma 7:5), the 1852 LDS edition changed the plural *afflictions* to the singular, which has continued in all subsequent LDS editions. (Note, however, that the first occurrence of “much afflictions” in that verse was left unchanged.) The plural should be restored not only in 1 Nephi 16:35 but also in Alma 7:5.

Summary: Based on the earliest textual sources, restore “much afflictions” in 1 Nephi 16:35 and at the end of Alma 7:5; the same expression occurs earlier in Alma 7:5, but this instance of “much afflictions” has never been edited to the singular.

■ 1 Nephi 16:38

he hath thought to make himself

a king and [*a* 01ABCDEFGHIJKLMNPQRST | *K*] *ruler over us*

The 1892 RLDS edition accidentally dropped the repeated *a* here in 1 Nephi 16:38. This error has not continued in subsequent RLDS editions. Like the case of the repeated *a* before a conjoined

adjective, the determiner (usually the indefinite article *a*) can be repeated when the two nouns *king* and *ruler* are conjoined. In one other case, there has been textual variation (see Jacob 1:9 in the following list), but the current LDS and RLDS texts now read correctly (and systematically) for all instances of conjoined *king* and *ruler*:

Jacob 1:9

wherefore he anointed a man to be [*a* 1ABCDEFGHIJKNOPRST | LMQ] king
and [*a* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST | CGHK] ruler over his people

Mosiah 1:10

that thou art **a** king and **a** ruler over this people

Mosiah 2:11

that I should be **a** ruler and **a** king over this people

Mosiah 2:30

that my son Mosiah is **a** king and **a** ruler over you

Mosiah 6:3

and had consecrated his son Mosiah to be **a** ruler and **a** king over his people

Mosiah 23:39

and the king of the Lamanites had granted unto Amulon
that he should be **a** king and **a** ruler over his people

Mosiah 29:2

we are desirous that Aaron thy son should be **our** king and **our** ruler

For further discussion, see CONJUNCTIVE REPETITION in volume 3.

Summary: Maintain in 1 Nephi 16:38 the repeated indefinite article *a* for conjoined *king* and *ruler*.

1 Nephi 17

■ 1 Nephi 17:1

*and it came to pass that we did again take our journey in the wilderness
and we did travel nearly eastward from that time forth
and we did travel and wade through much affliction in the wilderness
and our women [bare 01 | did bear ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] children in the wilderness*

The 1830 typesetter added the auxiliary verb *do*, undoubtedly because of the extensive use of the paraphrastic *do* earlier in the verse (“we **did** again take our journey . . . and we **did** travel . . . and we **did** travel”). The original *bare* is, of course, perfectly acceptable. There are, for instance, other well-supported instances of the simple past-tense *bare* in the Book of Mormon text, including the following three involving quotations from Isaiah:

- 2 Nephi 8:2 (see Isaiah 51:2)
look unto Abraham your father and unto Sarah
she that **bare** you
- 2 Nephi 18:3 (see Isaiah 8:3)
and I went unto the prophetess
and she conceived and **bare** a son
- Mosiah 14:12 (see Isaiah 53:12)
and he was numbered with the transgressors
and he **bare** the sins of many
and made intercession for the transgressors

There are other examples in the transmission of the text where the auxiliary verb *do* has been accidentally added; in the following two instances, Oliver Cowdery added the *do* as he copied from \mathfrak{C} into \mathfrak{D} :

- 1 Nephi 2:16
wherefore I [*cried* 0 | *did cry* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST] unto the Lord
- 1 Nephi 18:11
nevertheless the Lord [*suffered* 0 | *did suffer* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST] it
that he might shew forth his power

(See the discussion under these two passages.) Here in 1 Nephi 17:1, there is no reason why the original *bare* should not be restored.

Summary: Replace *did bear* in 1 Nephi 17:1 with *bare*, the reading of the two manuscripts.

■ 1 Nephi 17:2

our women did give plenty of suck
 [for 01ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST | to K] *their children*

The 1892 RLDS edition changed the preposition here in 1 Nephi 17:2 from *for* to *to*, probably accidentally. The phraseology “to give suck to children” seems more expected in biblical language, although it occurs only once in the King James Bible:

Lamentations 4:3
 even the sea monsters draw out the breast
 they give suck **to** their young ones

The more common phraseology is “to give children suck” (as in Genesis 21:7, 1 Samuel 1:23, and 1 Kings 3:21).

The only other example of the phrase “to give suck” in the Book of Mormon text is in Helaman 15:2: “your women shall have great cause to mourn in the day that they shall give suck”. Thus there is no other evidence to suggest that the *for* in 1 Nephi 17:2 is wrong, so we accept *for*, the reading of the earliest textual sources.

Summary: Maintain the preposition *for* in 1 Nephi 17:2 (“our women did give plenty of suck **for** their children”) rather than the more expected *to*.

■ 1 Nephi 17:2

and they began to bear their journeyings
 without [murmuring 0 | murmurings 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST]

While copying from \mathcal{O} to \mathcal{P} , Oliver Cowdery accidentally replaced the singular *murmuring* with the plural *murmurings*. This error may have been influenced by the immediately preceding plural form *journeyings*. The plural noun form *journeyings* itself is undoubtedly correct; the text prefers the plural *journeyings* over the singular noun *journeying* (7 to 1).

Elsewhere the text has a variety of examples with the gerundive verbal following the preposition *without*:

Mosiah 26:39
 being commanded of God to pray **without ceasing**
 [“without ceasing” also occurs in Alma 26:22, Alma 36:24,
 3 Nephi 19:24, and 3 Nephi 19:30]

Alma 24:22
 and thus **without meeting** any resistance
 they did slay a thousand and five of them

Alma 32:16
 therefore blessed are they who humbleth themselves
without being compelled to be humble

Alma 32:16

yea **without being brought** to know the word
or even compelled to know before they will believe

Alma 58:28 (similarly in 3 Nephi 3:10)

we did take possession of the city of Manti **without the shedding** of blood

Mormon 5:2

for they repented not of their iniquities
but did struggle for their lives
without calling upon that Being who had created them

Thus in 1 Nephi 17:2, the singular *murmuring* in \mathcal{O} should be accepted as a gerundive verbal since it is preceded by *without*. On the other hand, the count noun *murmuring(s)* is always in the plural; for discussion, see 1 Nephi 16:25.

Summary: Restore the gerundive *murmuring* in 1 Nephi 17:2; the gerundive verbal is perfectly acceptable after the preposition *without*.

■ 1 Nephi 17:3

*and if it so be that the children of men keep the commandments of God
he doth nourish them and strengthen them and provide*

(1) [*ways & means* 0 | *means* 1 ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]

*whereby they can accomplish the thing which he hath commanded them
wherefore he did provide*

(2) [*way & means* > *ways & means* 0 | *means* 1 ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *for us*

while we did sojourn in the wilderness

Here in \mathcal{O} we have two occurrences of the phrase “ways and means” that Oliver Cowdery copied into \mathcal{P} as simply *means*. The word *ways* refers to methods of doing things, while *means* is a mass noun that refers to the physical objects and materials needed to carry out those ways. This phraseology is rare today in English but is still accurately used in the designation of the congressional committee “Ways and Means”.

There is ample evidence for the use of the phrase “ways and means” elsewhere in the Book of Mormon text, with its corresponding “way or means” in negative contexts (such as “no other way nor means”). Notice how all of the following examples involve a *whereby*-clause, just like the first example in 1 Nephi 17:3 (“provide ways and means **whereby** they can accomplish the thing which he hath commanded them”):

Mosiah 3:17

there shall be no other name given
nor **no other way nor means**
whereby salvation can come unto the children of men

Mosiah 4:29

I cannot tell you all the things
whereby ye may commit sin
 for there are **divers ways and means**
 even so many that I cannot number them

Alma 38:9

there is **no other way nor means**
whereby man can be saved

Helaman 5:9

there is **no other way nor means**
whereby man can be saved

All these other uses of “ways and means” have been left unaltered in the text. Why Oliver Cowdery decided to shorten the two occurrences in 1 Nephi 17:3 seems inexplicable. This editing of his seems to be intentional but totally unnecessary. (For an additional example of where the original text may have also read “ways and means”, see Alma 34:15.)

Summary: Restore both occurrences of “ways and means” in 1 Nephi 17:3, according to the reading of the original manuscript.

■ 1 Nephi 17:5

and we beheld the sea which we called

[*Irreantum* > *Irreaantum* >- *Irreantum* o | *Irreantum* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST]

which being interpreted is many waters

The name *Irreantum* is the first word written at the top of page 33 of \mathcal{O} . After writing it, Oliver Cowdery immediately corrected the spelling by supralinearly inserting a second *a* letter after the first one, thus *Irreaantum*. Later, however, with very light ink flow, this second (supralinear) *a* letter was crossed out. There is no strong motivation for correcting the spelling the second time except that the additional *a* must have been an error that Joseph Smith and Oliver Cowdery later caught, possibly when Oliver read back the sentence to Joseph and the spelling was rechecked. One possible explanation for Oliver writing down the extra *a* in the first place is that he may have momentarily thought he had missed the single *a* when he first wrote down the name (especially since he would have just turned to a new page of \mathcal{O} , which could have distracted him). Eventually, Oliver realized he hadn’t missed the *a*, so he crossed out the extra one.

Less plausible is the suggestion that Oliver just thought the double *a* spelling was somehow incorrect and made the last spelling change on his own. Since Joseph Smith was controlling for the spelling of Book of Mormon names (by spelling them out letter for letter, when needed), one would think that in taking down the dictated text, Oliver would do his best to write down the correct spelling as Joseph gave it to him. Thus the final spelling, *Irreantum*, is most probably the correct spelling.

The name *Irreantum* appears only here in 1 Nephi 17:5. This spelling with just one *a* is consistent with the spelling of other Book of Mormon names and words. Consider, for instance, the

following spellings: *Archeantus*, *Hearthom*, *neas*, *Seantum*, and *Teancum*. Each of these has *ea*, not *eea*. And in two cases, the *ea* is followed by *nt* (just like *Irreantum*). In addition, there are two names that end in *-iantum*, *Coriantum* and *Moriantum*. Other similar names with *ia* followed by an *n* and a consonant (most often *t*) include *Anianti*, *Corianton*, *Coriantor*, *Coriantumr*, *Gadiandi*, *Gaddianton*, *Giddianhi*, and *Moriancumer*. The only Book of Mormon name with a long *a* is *Paanchi*, but here the *aa* is preceded by a consonant rather than a vowel.

Summary: Maintain the spelling *Irreantum* rather than Oliver Cowdery’s initial correction to *Irreaantum*; even though the second *a* letter is later crossed out with weaker ink flow, the resulting spelling *Irreantum* does appear to be the correct one.

■ 1 Nephi 17:7

*and it came to pass that after I Nephi had been
in the land [01 | of ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] Bountiful
for the space of many days
the voice of the Lord came unto me saying . . .*

Here the 1830 typesetter unnecessarily added the preposition *of*. According to the manuscripts, there are 4 occurrences of “the land of Bountiful” but 19 of “the land Bountiful”; similarly, there are 2 occurrences of “the city of Bountiful” but 6 of “the city Bountiful”. In other words, the tendency in the original text is to omit the *of* when the accompanying name is *Bountiful*.

In most cases, the current text follows the manuscript readings. The only lasting changes (in addition to this one in 1 Nephi 17:7) show a contrary tendency—namely, to delete the *of* when the name is *Bountiful*:

Alma 50:32
the people which were in the land
[*or* >% *of* 0 | 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST] Bountiful . . .

Alma 52:15
Teancum . . . had began his march towards the land
[*of* 01 | ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST] Bountiful

In the first case, Oliver Cowdery dropped the *of*—probably accidentally since there is no evidence in the manuscripts of Oliver (or any other scribe) ever trying to systematically add or delete *of* in the construction “the land/city (of) X”. Similarly, the 1830 typesetter also accidentally omitted the *of* in the second case. In both instances, the *of* should be restored.

The tendency to accidentally add the *of* is also found in the 1841 edition, but this error did not persist:

Alma 52:9
and he also sent orders unto him
that he should fortify the land [1ABCEFGHIJKLMNQRST | *of* D] Bountiful

Summary: Restore the original “the land Bountiful” in 1 Nephi 17:7 as well as the two cases of “the land of Bountiful” in Alma 50:32 and Alma 52:15.

■ 1 Nephi 17:11

and it came to pass that I Nephi did make

- (1) [Bellowses 01 | bellowses A | a bellows BCDEFGHIJKLMNOQRT | bellows PS]

wherewith to blow the fire

of the skins of beasts

and after that I had made

- (2) [bellowses 0A | Bellowses 1 | a bellows BCDEFGHIJKLMNOQRT | bellows PS]

that I might have wherewith to blow the fire

I did smite two stones together that I might make fire

The double plural *bellowses* is grammatically unacceptable in standard English. There have been two solutions in editing the Book of Mormon text: one is to say that Nephi made *a bellows* and the other is that Nephi made *bellows* (which is equivalent to ‘some bellows’). The first option appeared in the 1837 edition (but was not marked by Joseph Smith in the printer’s manuscript), and the other option first appeared in the 1908 RLDS edition. Since the original *bellowses* implies ‘some bellows’, the best grammatical solution is to use simply *bellows*. Obviously, the original text intended the double plural *bellowses*, which is how the critical text will read.

Historically, *bellows* is a plural but has been construed as a singular. Thus both *a bellows* and *bellowses* have resulted; and, according to the Oxford English Dictionary (under *bellows*), these two forms continue dialectally. The first grammatical revision (as *a bellows* in the 1837 edition) can thus be considered just as ungrammatical as *bellowses*. The OED also points out that *gallows* has developed in the same way dialectally (namely, as *a gallows* and *gallowses*).

Summary: Restore the original double plural *bellowses* in 1 Nephi 17:11; the best grammatical revision would be to replace *bellowses* with *bellows*, without the indefinite article *a*.

■ 1 Nephi 17:11

and after that I had made bellowses

that I might have wherewith to blow the fire

[01ABCDEFGHIJLMNOPQRST | and HK] *I did smite two stones together*

that I might make fire

Here the 1874 RLDS edition accidentally inserted the conjunction *and* between the initial subordinate clause and the following main clause. One could view this change as creating a Hebraistic reading. We have seen evidence that the original text had such Hebraistic forms (see the discussion under 1 Nephi 13:29, where originally such an *and* is found following an *after*-clause). Ultimately, the best evidence that such Hebraistic uses of *and* are not due to scribal error is found in Helaman 12:13–21 where we have a sequence of seven occurrences of *if*-clauses, each with an intervening *and* before its following main clause. (See the discussion under Helaman 12:13–21.)

Nonetheless, here in 1 Nephi 17:11 the original text does not have this Hebraistic construction. This example reminds us that such *and*’s can be accidentally introduced into the text. In each instance, we let the earliest textual sources determine whether a Hebraistic *and* occurred in the original text.

Summary: Maintain in 1 Nephi 17:11 the original text without the intrusive *and* following the *after*-clause.

■ 1 Nephi 17:12

*for the Lord had not hitherto suffered that we should make much fire
as we journeyed in the wilderness*

*for he [sayeth 0 | sayeth >js said 1 | saith A | said BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
I will make that thy food shall become sweet that ye cook it not*

Here we have a direct quote from the Lord which the text introduces using the historical present. Such a use of the present tense seems strange here since the preceding text is in the past perfect (“the Lord had not hitherto suffered that we should make much fire”). Normally, the historical present is found in narratives that describe the alternating discourse between two individuals (such as between Nephi and the angel of the Lord in 1 Nephi 11–14 or between Amulek and Zeezrom in Alma 11). Nonetheless, the text does sometimes use the historical present unexpectedly, such as here in 1 Nephi 17:12. A similar oddity is found later on in this same chapter when Nephi introduces an indirect quote with the historical present *saith*:

1 Nephi 17:49

and it came to pass that I Nephi
[sayeth 0 | sayeth >js said 1 | saith A | said BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] unto them
that they should murmur no more against their father

Such instances of *saith* seem intentional and will be maintained in the critical text. For a complete discussion and a full listing of examples, see HISTORICAL PRESENT in volume 3.

Summary: In accord with the earliest textual sources, restore the use of the historical present *saith* in 1 Nephi 17:12 and 1 Nephi 17:49, even though the historical present may seem strange in instances like these.

■ 1 Nephi 17:12

*I will make [that 0A | that >js NULL 1 | BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
thy food [shall 0A | shall >js NULL 1 | BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] become sweet
that ye cook it not*

Here we have an example where Joseph Smith replaced a *that*-clause with an infinitive clause but without the infinitival *to* (from “that thy food shall become sweet” to “thy food become sweet”). The original construction is apparently the only case in the earliest text where the verb *make* is immediately followed by a *that*-clause. Its exceptionality apparently led Joseph to alter the *that*-clause. Nonetheless, the original text here in 1 Nephi 17:12 is perfectly understandable and will be restored in the critical text. (For an example of a similar kind of editing but with the verb *cause*, see 1 Nephi 17:46.)

In the text there are four examples similar to 1 Nephi 17:12. For these examples, however, there is an intervening direct object between the verb *make* and the following *that*-clause. In addition, the following *that*-clause contains a subject pronominal form of the preceding object:

2 Nephi 4:31

wilt thou make **me** that **I** may shake at the appearance of sin

Ether 12:23

for thou hast made **all this people** that **they** could speak much
because of the Holy Ghost which thou hast given them

Ether 12:24

and thou hast made **us** that **we** could write but little
because of the awkwardness of our hands

Ether 12:24

for thou madest **him** that the things which **he** wrote were mighty . . .

On the other hand, there are also four examples in the original text that have the same construction as Joseph Smith's editing in 1 Nephi 17:12:

2 Nephi 21:15 (quoting Isaiah 11:15)

and with his mighty wind
he shall shake his hand over the river
and shall smite it in the seven streams
and make **men go** over dry-shod

Alma 10:16

that thereby they might make **him cross** his words

Ether 8:3

and he did carry away his father into captivity
and did make **him serve** in captivity

Ether 12:27

then will I make **weak things become** strong unto them

Summary: Restore in 1 Nephi 17:12 the original construction “I will make that thy food shall become sweet”; related phraseology (but with a supporting direct object) can be found elsewhere in the text, as in Ether 12:23 (“for thou hast made **all this people** that **they** could speak much”).

■ 1 Nephi 17:13

ye shall be led [towards 01ABCDEFGHIJLMNOQRT | toward KPS] the promised land

In the 1892 RLDS edition, this instance of *towards* was accidentally replaced by *toward*, which has continued since then in the RLDS text. As discussed under 1 Nephi 5:22, for each case of *toward(s)*, the critical text will follow the earliest reading (thus *towards* here in 1 Nephi 17:13).

■ 1 Nephi 17:14

yea and the Lord said also that

*after ye have [ariven 0 | ariven >js arived 1 | arrived ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
[to 01ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPS | in RT] the promised land . . .*

In the original text, the past participle for *arrive* is typically *arriven* (five out of six times), an analogical form derived from the verb *drive* and its past participle *driven*. In the simple past,

however, we do not find *arrove* (based on *drove*), only the standard *arrived* (in Mosiah 22:13, Mosiah 24:25, and Alma 56:15). Eventually all occurrences of *arriven* were replaced by the standard *arrived* in both the LDS and RLDS texts:

- 1 Nephi 17:14 (1830, \mathcal{P} js)
 [*ariven* 0 | *arriven* >js *arived* 1 | *arrived* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
- Mosiah 10:15 (1840, 1907, 1920)
 [*ariven* 1 | *arriven* ABDEFIJLMNQ | *arrived* CGHKOPRST]
- Mosiah 21:26 (no editing needed; \mathcal{C} not extant)
 [*arived* 1 | *arrived* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
- Alma 17:13 (\mathcal{P}^* , 1837)
 [*arived* > *ariven* 1 | *arriven* A | *arrived* BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
- Alma 20:30 (1840, 1920)
 [*ariven* 1 | *arriven* ABDEFIJLMNOQ | *arrived* CGHKPRST]
- Helaman 13:24 (1840, 1852^c)
 [*ariven* 1 | *arriven* A | *arriven* BDE | *arrived* CGHIJKLMNOPQRST |
arriven > *arrived* F]

The example in Alma 17:13 shows the tendency of Oliver Cowdery, when copying from \mathcal{C} to \mathcal{P} , to initially write the standard *arrived*. One then wonders if the example of *arrived* in Mosiah 21:26 might have actually been *arriven* in the original text (and perhaps in \mathcal{C} itself, which is not extant here). In the critical text, we follow the earliest textual sources, thus restoring five occurrences of *arriven* but leaving *arrived* in Mosiah 21:26. For further discussion, see PAST PARTICIPLE in volume 3.

Another aspect of the editing has been to change the preposition that occurs with the verb *arrive*. Out of a total of 17 examples, 12 have prepositional phrase complements, and of these 7 had their preposition changed from *to* to either *in* or *at* in the 1920 LDS edition:

- 1 Nephi 17:14 (*to* > *in*, 1920)
 after ye have arriven [*to* 01ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPS | *in* RT] the promised land
- 1 Nephi 18:23 (*to* > *at*, 1920)
 we did arrive [*to* 01ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPS | *at* RT] the promised land
- Mosiah 10:15 (*to* > *in*, 1920)
 when they had arriven [*to* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPS | *in* RT] the promised land
- Mosiah 21:26 (no change; \mathcal{C} not extant)
 having arrived **in** the borders of the land
- Mosiah 22:13 (no change; \mathcal{C} not extant)
 they arrived **in** the land of Zarahemla
- Mosiah 24:25 (*to* > *in*, 1920)
 they arrived [*to* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPS | *in* RT] the land of Zarahemla
- Alma 17:13 (no change; \mathcal{C} not extant)
 when they had arriven **in** the borders of the land of the Lamanites

Alma 20:30 (*to* > *in*, 1920)

until they had arriven [*to* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPS | *in* RT] the land of Middoni

Alma 52:18 (*to* > *at*, 1920)

Moroni did arrive with his army [*to* 01ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPS | *at* RT]
the land of Bountiful

Alma 56:15 (*at* > *to* > *at*, \mathfrak{C} > \mathfrak{P}^* > \mathfrak{P}^c)

when I arrived [*at* 0ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST | *to* > *at* 1] the city of Judea

Alma 58:27 (*to* > *at*, 1920)

we did arrive before them
[*to* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPS | *at* RT] the city of Manti

Alma 58:29 (no change; \mathfrak{C} extant)

when the armies of the Lamanites did arrive **near** the city

It is immediately obvious that this 1920 editing was inconsistent. When the original text refers to arriving “to a land”, the 1920 edition usually changed the preposition *to* to *in* (four times), which is what we expect in modern English (and which is actually found in the earliest text at Mosiah 22:13). But in two cases (1 Nephi 18:23 and Alma 52:18), the preposition *to* was changed to *at*, which seems strange when referring to lands. Normally, we get *at* when referring to cities (originally in Alma 56:15 and in the 1920 editing of Alma 58:27). Of course, the original text itself is not consistent with respect to the choice of preposition since one can arrive “at a city” (Alma 56:15) as well as “to a city” (Alma 58:27) or one can arrive “in a land” (Mosiah 22:13) as well as “to a land” (six times). The critical text will in each case follow the reading of the earliest textual sources.

Summary: Maintain the past participial form *arriven* in the five places where the earliest textual sources support it; also maintain the original phraseology “arrive to” in the seven places where it is found in the earliest text.

■ 1 Nephi 17:18

for they did not believe that I could build a ship

neither [*would* 01ABCDEFGHIJLMNOPQRST | *did* κ] *they believe that*

I [*were* 01 | *was* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST] *instructed of the Lord*

The original text of the Book of Mormon tends to use the subjunctive more frequently than what speakers of modern English expect. A similar example is found later on in this chapter:

1 Nephi 17:41

and after they were bitten
he prepared a way that they might be healed
and the labor which they had to perform
[*were* 01 | *was* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST] to look

In 1 Nephi 17:18, the subjunctive *were* occurs in a negative context; in 1 Nephi 17:41, *were* is found in a conditional context. Both these examples of *were* were replaced by *was* in the 1830 edition,

perhaps intentionally. The critical text will restore these instances of the subjunctive *were*. For a complete analysis of the editing involving the subjunctive, see under MOOD in volume 3.

The passage in 1 Nephi 17:18 also shows a minor error that entered the 1892 RLDS edition. Under the influence of the preceding main clause (“for **they did not believe** that I could build a ship”), the modal *would* was replaced by *did*, thus increasing the parallelism with the following clausal conjunct (“neither **did they believe** that I was instructed of the Lord”). This error was removed in the subsequent RLDS edition (1908).

Summary: Maintain the use of the subjunctive *were* whenever it is supported by the earliest textual sources, as here in 1 Nephi 17:18 and also in 1 Nephi 17:41.

■ 1 Nephi 17:20

and our women have toiled being big with child
and they have [bore > born 0 | bourn 1 | borne ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] children
in the wilderness

In the original manuscript, Oliver Cowdery initially wrote “they have bore children”, which he immediately corrected by overwriting the final *e* of *bore* with an *n* (there is no change in the level of ink flow). The original text has numerous examples where the past participle is identical to the simple past-tense form (as in 1 Nephi 5:1, “we had came down” rather than “we had come down”). Thus one could interpret the initial *bore* here in 1 Nephi 17:20 as a past participial extension of the simple past-tense form *bore* (as in “they **bore** children”), although usage elsewhere in the text suggests we should actually expect “they have **bare** children”, from “they **bare** children” (see the discussion under 1 Nephi 11:7). For a complete listing of past participial forms based on simple past-tense forms, see PAST PARTICIPLE in volume 3.

Here in 1 Nephi 17:20, Oliver Cowdery’s corrected *born* undoubtedly represents the reading of the original text (although in standard English the spelling is, of course, *borne*). There are seven other passages in the text that have the past participle of the verb *bear*, and in each instance the form is *borne* rather than *bare* or *bore*. (The standard spelling *borne* is spelled variously in the manuscripts as *bourn*, *bourne*, *born*, and the correct *borne*.)

Summary: Follow Oliver Cowdery’s immediate correction in 1 Nephi 17:20 but with its standard spelling *borne* (“they have **borne** children”); the use of the past participle *borne* agrees with all other usage in the text.

■ 1 Nephi 17:21

behold these many years we have suffered in the wilderness
which time *we might have enjoyed our possessions and the land of our inheritance*

One wonders here if the original text might have read “**in the which time** we might have enjoyed our possessions”. One could argue that due to the preceding “in the wilderness”, Oliver Cowdery accidentally dropped the second *in the*; that is, the original text read “**in the wilderness in the which time**”.

In support of the emendation “in the which time”, we note that elsewhere in the original text there are two examples of this phrase:

3 Nephi 4:4

that they might subsist for the space of seven years
in the which time they did hope to destroy the robbers
 from off the face of the land

Ether 13:31

and Shared wounded Coriantumr in his thigh
 that he did not go to battle again for the space of two years
in the which time all the people upon all the face of the land
 were a shedding blood

Alternatively, one could argue for an original “in which time” (based on the usage of the King James Bible, as in Acts 7:20: “in which time Moses was born”).

There are two other places in the text where one could argue that the preposition *in* was dropped because of its occurrence in an immediately preceding prepositional phrase headed by *in*. In both these cases, the 1920 edition supplied the seemingly necessary *in* (thus producing “in which”):

2 Nephi 2:22 (☉ not extant)

and all things which were created must have remained
in the same state [1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPS | *in* RT] which they were
 after that they were created

Ether 13:15 (☉ not extant)

and it came to pass that
in that same year [1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPS | *in* RT] which he was cast out
 from among the people
 there began to be a great war among the people

These two examples could be used in support of the earliest text in 1 Nephi 17:21—namely, the preceding prepositional phrase headed by *in* allows a following relative pronoun *which* to occur without an *in*, contrary to normal expectations in modern English. (For further discussion, see 2 Nephi 2:22 and Ether 13:15.)

Despite this evidence, there is textual evidence that directly argues for the earliest text in 1 Nephi 17:21:

3 Nephi 6:16

and thus Satan did lead away the hearts of the people
 to do all manner of iniquity
 therefore they had not enjoyed peace but **a few years**

We note there that the verb *enjoy* permits an adverbial noun phrase without a preposition—that is, we have a noun phrase acting as a direct object (namely, the word *peace*) and a second noun phrase (“a few years”) acting adverbially. In other words, we have “but a few years” instead of “but for a few years”. Similarly, in 1 Nephi 17:21, we have “which time we might have enjoyed our possessions and the land of our inheritance”. The direct object (“our possessions and the land of

our inheritance”) is, of course, a noun phrase, as is the adverbial noun phrase “which time”, which occurs without any preposition such as *in*. The usage in 3 Nephi 6:16 should therefore make us cautious about emending the text in 1 Nephi 17:21.

Summary: Although the adverbial noun phrase “which time” seems strange, its use in 1 Nephi 17:21 is consistent with the adverbial noun phrase that the verb *enjoy* takes in 3 Nephi 6:16.

■ 1 Nephi 17:22

and we know that the people which were in the land of Jerusalem were a righteous people for they [keep 01 | kept ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] the statutes and the judgments of the Lord and all his commandments according to the law of Moses wherefore we know that they are a righteous people

Here Nephi’s brothers are referring to the people in Jerusalem, who (as far as they know) have not yet been destroyed but who are initially referred to in the past tense (“the people which **were** in the land of Jerusalem **were** a righteous people”). But since these people may still exist, the brothers also refer to them in the present tense: “for they **keep** the statutes . . . wherefore we know that they **are** a righteous people”. Under the influence of the preceding *were*, the 1830 typesetter changed the nearby present-tense *keep* to the past-tense *kept* but left unchanged the present-tense *are* (which is some distance away and occurs immediately after the present-tense *know*). There is really nothing wrong with this shifting from the past to the present within this passage, and therefore the critical text will restore the original *keep*. For another example of this kind of tense shifting, see 2 Nephi 25:1–2.

Summary: Restore the present-tense *keep* in 1 Nephi 17:22 since it is the reading of the manuscripts and is perfectly acceptable, despite its coming right after a past-tense *were*.

■ 1 Nephi 17:22

for they keep the statutes and [the 01ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPS | QRT] judgments of the Lord and all his commandments according to the law of Moses

The omission of the repeated *the* is undoubtedly a typo in the 1911 LDS edition. This reading has been followed by all subsequent LDS editions.

The use of *the* for all conjuncts in a conjoined structure is characteristic of the Book of Mormon text and is, in fact, a Hebraism that has generally been maintained in the text, as in the following extended conjuncts from 1 Nephi:

1 Nephi 13:8

the gold and **the** silver and **the** silks and **the** scarlets
and **the** fine-twined linen and **the** precious clothing and **the** harlots

1 Nephi 18:25

the cow and **the** ox and **the** ass and **the** horse and **the** goat and **the** wild goat

Elsewhere in the Book of Mormon, we find that for conjuncts of *statutes* and *judgments* the determiner is usually repeated:

2 Nephi 1:16	the statutes and the judgments of the Lord
2 Nephi 5:10	the judgments and the statutes and the commandments of the Lord
Mosiah 6:6	his judgments and his statutes
Alma 58:40	his statutes and his judgments and his commandments
Helaman 3:20	the statutes and the judgments and the commandments of God
Helaman 15:5	his commandments and his statutes and his judgments

But in two cases, the initial determiner is not repeated:

Alma 8:17	the statutes and judgments and commandments which he hath given unto his people
3 Nephi 25:4	the statutes and judgments

The last example quotes Malachi 4:4 and exemplifies the variation that is also found in the King James Bible, which has 22 examples of the repeated determiner in conjuncts of *statutes* and *judgments* but 6 examples without the repetition.

All this evidence indicates that for the Book of Mormon text we let the earliest textual sources determine whether the determiner is repeated in conjuncts. In 1 Nephi 17:22, the definite article *the* is repeated. For a list of other examples of the repeated determiner, see CONJUNCTIVE REPETITION in volume 3.

Summary: Maintain the repeated *the* in 1 Nephi 17:22 (“for they keep the statutes and **the** judgments of the Lord”).

■ 1 Nephi 17:22

*and our father hath judged them and hath led us away
because we would hearken unto his [word 0GHKPS | words > word 1 | words ABCDEFIJLMNOQRT]*

Here the original manuscript has the singular “unto his word”. In copying from \mathcal{O} to \mathcal{P} , Oliver Cowdery initially wrote the plural *words* but then immediately crossed out the plural *s*, thus making \mathcal{P} agree with \mathcal{O} . (There is no apparent change in ink flow for this correction.) Nonetheless, the plural is expected, which led the 1830 typesetter to set the plural *words*. In this instance, the error was not caught. The 1858 Wright edition accidentally, it would seem, reverted to the singular *word*. All the RLDS editions have continued with the singular.

Under 1 Nephi 16:24, it was noted that usually “his words” rather than “his word” is used to refer to a person’s word. On the other hand, “his word” usually refers to the Lord’s word, but there is textual evidence for “his word” referring to a person’s word(s):

Mosiah 17:11 (Abinadi’s word)
and now king Noah was about to release him
for he feared **his word**

Mosiah 18:3 (Alma’s word)
and as many as would hear **his word** he did teach

Mosiah 18:7 (Alma’s word)
yea all were gathered together that believed on **his word** to hear him

Thus the singular reading of \mathcal{O} in 1 Nephi 17:22 (“his word”) should be accepted. In each case, we determine the correct reading, *word* or *words*, according to the earliest textual sources.

Summary: Maintain the singular “his word” in 1 Nephi 17:22, the reading in \mathcal{O} and the corrected reading in \mathcal{P} ; the singular noun *word* is sometimes used to refer to a person’s word(s).

■ 1 Nephi 17:25

and ye know that they were laden with tasks
which were [*grievous* 01 | *grievous* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] to be borne

The word *grievous* was apparently pronounced as /griviəs/ by Joseph Smith and Oliver Cowdery. Besides the case here in 1 Nephi 17:25, we have nine other places in the text where /griviəs/ is found:

2 Nephi 19:1	[<i>grievously</i> 1 <i>grievously</i> ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST <i>grievously</i> 1]
2 Nephi 20:1	[<i>grievousness</i> 1 <i>grievousness</i> ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
Mosiah 2:14	[<i>grievous</i> 1B <i>grievous</i> ACEFGHIJKNOPQRST <i>grievous</i> DLM]
Mosiah 7:15	[<i>grievous</i> 1 <i>grievous</i> ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST <i>grievous</i> L]
Mosiah 7:23	[<i>grievous</i> 1 <i>grievous</i> ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST <i>grievous</i> L]
Alma 39:3	[<i>grievous</i> 0 <i>grievous</i> 1 <i>grievous</i> ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
Ether 6:23	[<i>grievous</i> 01 <i>grievous</i> ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
Ether 10:5	[<i>grievous</i> 01 <i>grievous</i> ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST <i>grievous</i> E]
Moroni 9:1	[<i>grievous</i> 1 <i>grievous</i> ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]

Every occurrence of /griviəs/ in the manuscripts has a spelling with an extra vowel (either *i*, *e*, *ee*, or *ei*). Counting each manuscript occurrence of this word individually, we get the following statistics for the various spellings:

	\mathcal{O}	\mathcal{P}
<i>grievous</i>	2	6
<i>grievous</i>	2	2
<i>grievous</i>	0	1
<i>grievous</i>	0	1

Only four occurrences are extant in the original manuscript.

One could argue that the manuscript spelling *grievous* stands for the word *grievous* and its standard pronunciation /grivəs/. Oliver Cowdery produced this spelling four times in the manuscripts: in \mathcal{O} and \mathcal{P} for 1 Nephi 17:25, in \mathcal{O} for Alma 39:3, and in \mathcal{P} for Moroni 9:1. In support of this interpretation of the spelling *grievous*, one could refer to the spelling *grievous* that occurs in \mathcal{P} for 2 Nephi 19:1. Although this particular spelling clearly represents the pronunciation

/griviəs/, the spelling should probably be analyzed as *grieve* + *i* + *ous*, with the result that *grieve*, with its final silent *e*, stands for /griv/. Consequently, *grievous* could be interpreted as *grieve* + *ous*, thus implying the pronunciation /grivəs/.

On the other hand, there is considerable evidence that Oliver Cowdery intended *grievous* to stand for the pronunciation /griviəs/. Note first that in Alma 39:3, Oliver wrote *grievous* in \mathcal{O} , but when he copied the word from \mathcal{O} into \mathcal{P} , he respelled this word as *grievious*. This respelling implies that he interpreted his earlier *grievous* as standing for /griviəs/. In addition, Oliver once misspelled the word *lasciviousness* as *lasiveousness* (in \mathcal{P} for Alma 16:18), thus showing that he sometimes spelled /viəs/ at the end of a word as *-veous*. Nor is the spelling *-eous* for /iəs/ impossible since it is found in fairly common words such as *courteous*, *hideous*, and *miscellaneous*. Finally, we should note that except for the four instances of the spelling *grievous* in the manuscripts, all the other manuscript spellings of /griviəs/ directly support the nonstandard pronunciation /griviəs/. Consequently, the most reasonable assumption is that the four manuscript instances of the spelling *grievous* also represent the pronunciation /griviəs/.

For convenience's sake, the critical text will consistently use the spelling *grievious* (the most frequent spelling in the manuscripts) to stand for the pronunciation /griviəs/. This spelling *grievious* will be used in the ten different passages where the current text reads *grievous*. In other words, the spelling *grievious* will serve as the "standard spelling" for the nonstandard pronunciation /griviəs/.

It is possible that Joseph Smith actually saw *grievous* as the text was revealed to him and that for each passage he read off *grievous* as *grievious* (just as many today read off *mischievous* as if it were written *mischievious*). Despite this possibility, it is worth noting that there is no manuscript evidence of any tendency to correct *grievious* to *grievous*. The critical text does not presume that the original text was in standard English, which means that nonstandard dialectal forms are accepted providing they are supported by the earliest textual evidence (as they are here for each case of *grievious*).

The 1830 typesetter replaced every case of the dialectal *grievious* with the standard *grievous*. Nonetheless, there has been some tendency for typesetters of subsequent editions to reintroduce the dialectal *grievious*. For instance, the spelling *grevious* (a variant of *grievious*) has shown up quite a few times (three times in the 1902 LDS edition and once in each of the following editions: 1841, 1849, 1879, and 1905). The manuscript spelling *grievious* also shows up once (in the 1837 edition). The Oxford English Dictionary (online version, 21 January 2004) lists not only three historical occurrences of the spelling *grievious* but also four of *grevious*.

The nonstandard pronunciation /griviəs/ has been fairly common in the history of the English language and appears to be due to the influence of similar words ending in /iviəs/ (such as *previous*, *devious*, and especially the nonstandard but very common *mischievious*). For another example of a Book of Mormon word with an extra /i/ vowel before the adjective ending *-ous*, see the word *tremendious* (discussed under Alma 28:2–3); this nonstandard form of *tremendous* was variously spelled in the manuscripts as *tremendious*, *tremendeeous*, and *tremendeeos*.

Summary: Accept the nonstandard *grievious* in lieu of the standard *grievous* throughout the critical text; all the manuscript spellings indicate that the word was systematically pronounced with an extra /i/ after the /v/.

■ 1 Nephi 17:30

and doing all things for them

which [was 0A | was >js were 1 | were BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] expedient for man to receive

Here we have another case of subject-verb disagreement in the original text (“all things . . . which was expedient”). For the 1837 edition, Joseph Smith edited the singular *was* to the plural *were*. The critical text will follow the earliest reading, despite its ungrammaticality in standard English. For a complete discussion, see SUBJECT-VERB AGREEMENT in volume 3.

In this particular instance, we have a plural antecedent (“all things”) for the relative pronoun *which*. The original text consistently used the singular in the relative clause “which is/was expedient”, no matter whether the antecedent was singular or plural. Besides the example here in 1 Nephi 17:30, we have the following:

2 Nephi 2:27

and **all things** are given them

which [is >js are 1 | is A | are BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] expedient unto man

2 Nephi 3:19

and the words which he shall write shall be **the words**

which [is >js are 1 | is A | are BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] expedient in my wisdom should go forth unto the fruit of thy loins

3 Nephi 26:9

and when they shall have received **this**

which is expedient that they should have first to try their faith . . .

Moroni 10:23

if ye have faith ye can do **all things**

which [is 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNP | are OQRST] expedient unto me

The singular form of the *be* verb (either *is* or *was*) has been edited to the plural *are* or *were* in all these cases where the antecedent is plural.

Summary: Restore the singular verb form in the relative clause “which is/was expedient”; for this construction, the original text consistently uses the singular form of the *be* verb no matter whether the antecedent is singular or plural.

■ 1 Nephi 17:31

and there was not any thing done

save it [were 01ABCDEFGHIJKLMNPQRST | was 0] by his word

Here the 1907 LDS vest-pocket edition replaced the subjunctive *were* with the indicative *was*. This edition was not used as a copy-text for any subsequent LDS edition; thus the subjunctive *were* has been maintained in the LDS text. Elsewhere in the earliest text, there are 78 occurrences of “save it were”. For one of the 78 cases (in Mosiah 6:2), the current text reads “except it were”, but the original text read “save it were”.

Two occurrences of original “save it were” have been changed to “save it was”, probably accidentally since all the other examples of “save it were” have been left unchanged:

Alma 17:38 (1840 change)

now six of them had fallen by the sling
but he slew none save it [*were* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST | *was* CGHK] their leader

Ether 15:12 (1837 change, not marked in \mathcal{P})

and it came to pass that they did gather together
all the people upon all the face of the land which had not been slain
save it [*were* 1A | *was* BCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST] Ether

There is one instance of a momentary scribal slip that shows the tendency to replace “save it were” with “save it was”:

Alma 63:12 (\mathcal{C} is extant)

now behold all those engravings which were in the possession of Helaman
were written and sent forth among the children of men throughout all the land
save it [*were* 0ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST | *was* > *were* 1] those parts
which had been commanded by Alma should not go forth

Here Oliver Cowdery corrected his initial error in \mathcal{P} .

The earliest text has three occurrences of “save it was”, one of which is extant in the original manuscript:

Enos 1:20 (\mathcal{C} is not extant)

and many of them did eat nothing **save it was** raw meat

Enos 1:23 (\mathcal{C} is not extant)

and there was nothing **save it was** exceeding harshness
preaching and prophesying of wars and contentions and destructions . . .

Alma 49:4 (\mathcal{C} is extant)

neither could they come upon them **save it was** by their place of entrance

These three earliest examples of “save it was” will be retained in the critical text, even though they may be errors for “save it were”. The natural tendency in the history of the text has been to occasionally replace the subjunctive *were* with the indicative *was*. For additional examples of the subjunctive in the Book of Mormon, see under MOOD in volume 3.

Summary: Maintain “save it was” only when it is supported by the earliest textual sources; usually the earliest text reads “save it were”, as here in 1 Nephi 17:31.

■ 1 Nephi 17:32

he did make them mighty unto the driving out
 [01ABCDEFGHIKPS | of FIJLMNOQRT] *the children of the land*
yea unto the scattering [01ABCDEFGHIJKLMNPQRST | of O] *them to destruction*

The original text of the Book of Mormon frequently uses a special blend of the nominal and verbal gerundive constructions. When the article *the* appears before the gerund, the gerund is treated as a nominal, with the result that standard English expects the preposition *of* before the object of the verb (thus “the doing of something”). On the other hand, if the *the* is not there, the gerund is verbal and the object appears directly after the verb without any intervening *of* (thus “doing something”). Here in 1 Nephi 17:32, we have two examples of the unexpected blended construction “the doing something”.

Editors and typesetters of the text have frequently removed this mixed nominal-verbal gerundive, including the two examples of this blend found in the original text for 1 Nephi 17:32. Here the preposition *unto*, since it is followed by *the*, requires the nominal gerundive; thus in the 1852 LDS edition the *of* was added to the first example, but inexplicably not to the second one. The 1907 LDS vest-pocket edition did add the *of* in the second case, but this change has not been followed by subsequent LDS editions.

Elsewhere in the text, we have examples where the original gerundive blend has never been edited out:

Helaman 3:35

nevertheless they did fast and pray oft
 and did wax stronger and stronger in their humility
 and firmer and firmer in the faith of Christ
 unto **the filling their souls** with joy and consolation

Ether 4:7

then will I manifest unto them the things which the brother of Jared saw
 even to **the unfolding** unto them **all my revelations**

Moroni 8:25

and the first fruits of repentance is baptism
 and baptism cometh by faith
 unto **the fulfilling the commandments**
 and **the fulfilling the commandments** bringeth remission of sins

Sometimes the *of* is added, thus making the gerundive completely nominal:

Alma 55:19

but he delighted
 in the saving [0 | of 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST] his people from destruction

And other times the definite article *the* is deleted, thus creating a completely verbal gerundive:

Alma 17:14

a people which delighted
 in [*the* >js NULL 1 | *the* A | BCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST] murdering the Nephites
 and robbing and plundering them

Mormon 5:14

that the Father may bring about through his most Beloved
 his great and eternal purpose
 in [*the* >js NULL 1 | *the* A | BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] restoring the Jews
 or all the house of Israel
 to the land of their inheritance

Based on the earliest textual sources, the critical text will restore all those original examples of the blended gerundive that have been removed from the text. For a full list of this mixed construction, see GERUNDIVES in volume 3.

Summary: Maintain the blended gerundives wherever they are supported by the earliest textual sources, such as the two examples in 1 Nephi 17:32: “unto the driving out the children of the land / yea unto the scattering them to destruction”.

■ 1 Nephi 17:39–40

he ruleth high in the heavens
for it is his throne
and [*his* >+ *this* 0 | *this* 1 ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *earth is his footstool*
 [NULL >+ & 0 | & 1 | *And* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
he loveth them which will have him to be their God

■ 1 Nephi 17:40

and he covenanted with them
yea even Abraham [NULL >- & 0 | 1 ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *Isaac and Jacob*

Here we have two examples in \mathcal{O} where Oliver Cowdery initially omitted the *and* as he took down Joseph Smith’s dictation. In the first case, Oliver inserted an & with heavier and broader ink flow. The insertion is slightly elevated from the original line and is therefore inserted between the words *footstool* and *he*. The second example of an inserted & is also slightly elevated between the words (here *Abraham* and *Isaac*), although in this second case the correction was done with a very weak ink flow, with the result that the & was not noticed when Oliver copied \mathcal{O} into \mathcal{P} . (Close examination of the original manuscript, especially using multispectral imaging as well as ultraviolet photographs, shows that there is an ampersand inserted after *Abraham* in \mathcal{O} .) On the other hand, the first example of the inserted & was copied into \mathcal{P} since that ampersand was written with heavier ink flow.

Neither of these insertions is an immediate correction. In the first case, it appears that Oliver Cowdery dipped his quill before writing in the &; in the second case, it appears that he had little ink in his quill. The clear difference in ink flow implies that the two ampersands were inserted at different times.

The heavier ink correction for the first & is also found for another non-immediate correction, namely Oliver Cowdery’s correction of *his* to *this* near the end of verse 39. Here Oliver initially wrote “for it is **his** throne and **his** earth is **his** footstool”. Obviously, Oliver mistakenly wrote “his earth” due to the influence of the nearby “his throne” and “his footstool”. The correction of

the *his* to *this* (the *t* is inserted right in front of the *h* of the *his*) looks like it was made at about the same time the & was inserted after *footstool*.

In both these cases involving the inserted &, the motivation for editing the text is not strong. Note that the sentence that begins verse 39 has no initial *and* (“he ruleth high in the heavens”), so the sentence that begins verse 40 could have also had no initial *and*. And in the case of “Abraham (and) Isaac and Jacob”, English speakers prefer no *and* between the first two names. This preference was probably responsible for Oliver Cowdery accidentally dropping the *and* between *Abraham* and *Isaac* when he initially wrote down 1 Nephi 17:40. Elsewhere, the text has examples with and without this extra *and*:

Mosiah 7:19

and put your trust in God
in that God who was the God of Abraham **and** Isaac **and** Jacob

Alma 7:25

that ye may at last be brought to sit down
with Abraham Isaac **and** Jacob and the holy prophets

Thus variation is possible. Ultimately, there seems to be no motivation for Oliver to have inserted the ampersand between *Abraham* and *Isaac* except that this *and* was part of the original text that Joseph Smith dictated to him.

Summary: Maintain in 1 Nephi 17:39–40 the pair of corrections in Ⓞ involving heavier ink flow, namely *this* for *his* before *earth* and the *and* that begins verse 40 (“**and** he loveth them”); based on the weakly inserted & in Ⓞ, the *and* between *Abraham* and *Isaac* in 1 Nephi 17:40 should be restored.

■ 1 Nephi 17:41

*and he did [straiten 01OQRT | straighten ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOP] them in the wilderness
with his rod
for they hardened their hearts even as ye have
and the Lord [straitened 01OQRT | straightened ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOP] them
because of their iniquity*

The current LDS text spells the verb as *straiten*, while the RLDS text spells it as *straighten*. Clearly the meaning here is ‘to subject to hardship or distress’ rather than ‘to make straight’; thus the correct spelling of the verb is *straiten*, which derives from the adjective *strait*, meaning ‘narrow’. For discussion regarding the spelling of *strait* and *straight*, see 1 Nephi 8:20. Also see STRAIT in volume 3.

Summary: Based on the meaning, the correct spelling is *straiten* for the two occurrences of that verb in 1 Nephi 17:41.

■ 1 Nephi 17:41

he sent [*flying fiery* 0 | *fiery flying* 1 | *firy-flying* A | *fiery-flying* BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQS | *fiery flying* RT] *serpents among them*

The original manuscript reads “flying fiery serpents” (with *fiery* spelled as *fiery*). In copying from \mathcal{O} into \mathcal{P} , Oliver Cowdery switched the order of the two modifiers *flying* and *fiery*. The text now conforms to the phrase “fiery flying serpent” that is found in Isaiah in the King James Bible:

Isaiah 14:29

and his fruit *shall be a fiery flying serpent*

Isaiah 30:6

from whence *come* the young and old lion
the viper and **fiery flying serpent**

The first of these is quoted in the Book of Mormon:

2 Nephi 24:29

and his fruit shall be a **fiery flying serpent**

In all of these, the order is “fiery flying serpent”.

But the use of “flying fiery serpents” in 1 Nephi 17:41 refers to the “fiery serpents” that attacked the Israelites while they wandered in the wilderness:

Numbers 21:6

and the LORD sent **fiery serpents** among the people
and they bit the people and much people of Israel died

Numbers 21:8

make thee a **fiery serpent** and set it upon a pole
and it shall come to pass that
every one that is bitten when he looketh upon it shall live

Deuteronomy 8:15

who led thee through that great and terrible wilderness
wherein were fiery serpents and scorpions and drought

In these passages from the Torah, the word *flying* does not occur, so its use in 1 Nephi 17:41 seems to have been influenced by the Isaiah passages. Probably Nephi himself is responsible for the intrusive word *flying*, especially given his frequently expressed preference for citing from the book of Isaiah (see 2 Nephi 6:4, 2 Nephi 11:2, and 2 Nephi 25:5). We should not be surprised that the language of Isaiah might influence Nephi’s own phraseology.

In the two Isaiah passages as well as the one in Numbers 21:8, there is a single Hebrew word for ‘fiery serpent’, namely *sārāf*, which is interpreted as being derived from a verb stem originally meaning ‘to burn’ (see under *ś-r-p* in Francis Brown, S. R. Driver, and Charles A. Briggs, *A Hebrew and English Lexicon of the Old Testament* [Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1952]). In the two other passages (Numbers 21:6 and Deuteronomy 8:15), the Hebrew word for ‘serpent’, *nāḥāš*, occurs with the modifying *sārāf* (literally, ‘burning serpent’). Essentially, the reference in all these cases is to a poisonous snake (whose bite “burns”). Thus, in a literal translation of the Hebrew in any of

these five passages, the words *fiery* and *serpent* should occur together. In the Isaiah passages, where the word for *flying* is added, the literal translation would thus be “flying fiery serpent”, which is the word order found in the original manuscript for 1 Nephi 17:41. But in 2 Nephi 24:29 (which quotes Isaiah 14:29 from the King James Bible), the Book of Mormon text follows the King James word order, namely “fiery flying serpent”, while the Hebrew there supports the original reading in 1 Nephi 17:41, where *fiery* and *serpent* occur together and *flying* precedes *fiery*.

Summary: Restore in 1 Nephi 17:41 “flying fiery serpents”, the reading of the original manuscript; this word order follows the Hebrew construction, while in 2 Nephi 24:29 the word order found in the King James version of Isaiah 14:29 is maintained (as “fiery flying serpent”).

■ 1 Nephi 17:41

*and after they were bitten
he prepared a way that they might be healed
and the labor which they had to perform
[were 01 | was ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] to look*

Here the original text had the subjunctive *were* in a conditional context. Such usage is characteristic of older English. (For another example, see 1 Nephi 17:18.) In this instance, the 1830 compositor replaced the *were* with the indicative *was*, perhaps intentionally. The critical text will restore this case of the subjunctive *were*. For a complete analysis of the editing involving the subjunctive, see MOOD in volume 3.

It is also possible that the *were* is simply due to the preceding plural *they* in the relative clause that modifies the singular *labor*. Even so, the critical text will maintain the *were* of the earliest textual sources. (For further discussion of the influence of proximity, see SUBJECT-VERB AGREEMENT in volume 3.)

Summary: Restore in 1 Nephi 17:41 the subjunctive *were*, the reading of the manuscripts; the original text uses the subjunctive more frequently than current English does.

■ 1 Nephi 17:43

*and now after all these things the time has come
that they [have become 0 | have become 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST | havebecome F] wicked*

Based on the earliest textual sources, there are 66 occurrences of the past participle of the verb *become*. In most instances, the standard past-participial form *become* is found in the earliest sources (61 times), but in five cases we get the nonstandard *became* (which derives from the simple past-tense form). All five of these cases have been edited to *become* (as here in 1 Nephi 17:43). The critical text will, of course, maintain the original dialectal usage in these five cases. For further discussion, see under PAST PARTICIPLE in volume 3.

Summary: Maintain the few original cases of *became* as the past participle for the verb *become*.

■ 1 Nephi 17:43

*and I know not **but** they are at this day about to be destroyed*

One wonders if the text here isn't missing a *what* after *but*. The original manuscript is extant for this passage and there is no *what* inserted there. Elsewhere in the text we have three examples of "know not but what":

Alma 60:18 (two times)

for we know not **but what** ye yourselves are a seeking for authority
we know not **but what** ye are also traitors to your country

3 Nephi 18:32

for ye know not **but what** they will return and repent

There is also one example of "know not but that":

Alma 54:21

but if it so be that there is such a being
we know not **but that** he hath made us as well as you

Despite these examples, there is also an example without either the *what* or the *that*, and the original manuscript is extant for this passage:

Alma 56:43

behold we know not **but** they have halted
for the purpose that we should come against them

Although the expression "know not but" without the *what* seems strange in 1 Nephi 17:43 and Alma 56:43, it does appear to be possible in the Book of Mormon text.

Summary: Maintain the expression "know not but" without a following *what* or *that* in 1 Nephi 17:43 and Alma 56:43; both readings are supported by the original manuscript.

■ 1 Nephi 17:44

and ye are like unto [they 0A | they >js them 1 | them BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]

Grammatically, we expect the object form of the pronoun after prepositions; thus Joseph Smith edited the text for the 1837 edition from "unto they" to "unto them". The critical text will restore the ungrammatical pronoun usage unless there is specific evidence that a scribal error is involved. For another example (involving *I* versus *me* after *against*), see 1 Nephi 7:6. For a complete listing of this type of editing, see under PRONOUNS in volume 3.

Summary: In the critical text we follow the original pronoun forms (as found in the earliest textual sources), even when these forms are ungrammatical in standard English; here in 1 Nephi 17:44, we restore the subject pronoun *they* after the preposition *unto* ("and ye are like unto **they**").

■ 1 Nephi 17:46

*yea and ye know that by his word he can cause [that 01A | BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
rough places [0A | NULL >js to 1 | to BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] be made smooth
and smooth places shall be broken up*

The editing for 1 Nephi 17:46 involves replacing a *that*-clause with an infinitive clause. The earliest textual source (the original manuscript) reads “he can cause that rough places be made smooth and smooth places shall be broken up”. Joseph Smith probably found the lack of a finite verb in “rough places be made smooth” awkward, so he deleted the *that* and inserted the *to* (although only the second change is marked in the printer’s manuscript). A similar kind of editing is found in 1 Nephi 17:12, although here in 1 Nephi 17:46 there is a different verb (*cause* instead of *make*). In addition, restoring the original text for 1 Nephi 17:46 turns out to be more complicated.

Elsewhere the original text is about equally divided between cases where the verb *cause* is followed by a *that*-clause and by an infinitive clause (123 to 106). There are also 12 additional cases involving the *that*-clause where the subject of the clause appears first as the direct object right after the verb *cause* and is then repeated as a subject pronoun in the *that*-clause. In fact, such an example is found earlier in this same verse:

1 Nephi 17:46
and ye also know that by the power of his almighty word
he can cause **the earth** that **it** shall pass away

So elsewhere in the text there are a total of 135 (= 123 + 12) occurrences of *cause* followed by a *that*-clause. And in every one of these other cases, the *that*-clause has a modal verb, either *should* (121 times), *shall* (11 times), or *may* (3 times). (The *should* dominates because in most instances the verb *cause* is in the past tense, which consequently requires the past-tense modal *should* in the following *that*-clause.) These statistics mean that there is not one other example where the verb in the following *that*-clause is in the subjunctive rather than the indicative mood. In other words, there is no support elsewhere for the subjunctive phraseology of “that rough places be broken up” after the verb *cause*. Thus the earliest reading in 1 Nephi 17:46 is doubtful as the original text; the *that*-clause following *cause* seems to be missing its modal verb. And the following conjunct (“and smooth places **shall** be broken up”) suggests, of course, that the missing modal is *shall*. In any event, Joseph Smith’s editing is problematic here since it ends up conjoining an infinitive clause and an indicative clause (“he can cause rough places to be made smooth and smooth places shall be broken up”). To be consistent, Joseph could have changed the second clause to “and smooth places to be broken up”.

There is scribal evidence elsewhere that Oliver Cowdery sometimes dropped the modal verb *shall*. All of the examples involve his copying from \mathcal{C} into \mathcal{P} . And in all of these cases but the first one, he caught his error:

1 Nephi 11:7
and after that ye [*Shal* 0 | 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST] have witnessed him

2 Nephi 26:10
and when these things [NULL >+ *shall* 1 | *shall* APS | BCDEFGHIJKLMNOQRT]
have passed away

2 Nephi 26:15

after that my seed and the seed of my brethren
 [NULL > shall 1 | shall ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] have dwindled in unbelief

Alma 50:20

and inasmuch as they [shall 0ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST | NULL > shall 1]
 keep my commandments

Helaman 9:22

except ye [NULL > shall 1 | shall ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] repent

3 Nephi 12:11

and blessed are ye
 when men shall revile you and persecute
 and [NULL >+ shall 1 | shall ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] say
 all manner of evil against you falsely for my sake

In the last example, Oliver Cowdery initially omitted the *shall* in \mathcal{P} , but shortly afterwards he supralinearly inserted it (the level of ink flow is somewhat heavier). For this part of the text, both \mathcal{P} and the 1830 edition are firsthand copies of \mathcal{C} . In addition, the corresponding verse in the King James Bible has the *shall* (“and **shall** say all manner of evil against you”, in Matthew 5:11).

We should note that in each of these instances, the omitted *shall* is found in a dependent clause, just as it would have been in 1 Nephi 17:46. Although none of these examples show Oliver Cowdery omitting *shall* in the original manuscript, they do show that he has a tendency to drop this modal verb in subordinate clauses. Another difference is that in each of these six examples of scribal error, the resulting text (that is, without the *shall*) is acceptable. In 1 Nephi 17:46, on the other hand, the missing *shall* does seem to create an awkward expression. In any event, the internal evidence from usage elsewhere in the text argues that 1 Nephi 17:46 originally read “he can cause that rough places **shall** be made smooth”.

Summary: In 1 Nephi 17:46, emend the text to read “he can cause that rough places **shall** be made smooth and smooth places shall be broken up”; there is strong internal support for proposing that the original text had *shall* in both of the conjoined indicative clauses.

■ 1 Nephi 17:46

yea and ye know that by his word he can cause that
 [01A | the BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *rough places shall be made smooth*
and smooth places shall be broken up

As discussed above, Joseph Smith altered this passage in his editing for the 1837 edition by replacing the *that*-clause with an infinitive clause. In addition, the definite article *the* was inserted in the 1837 edition before “rough places” but not before “smooth places”, which implies that the addition of the *the* was unintentional. Joseph did not add the *the* in \mathcal{P} when he edited the text for the 1837 edition.

Summary: Remove the definite article *the* that was added before “rough places” in the 1837 edition.

■ 1 Nephi 17:47

and my heart is pained

[01ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST | *for* J] *I fear lest ye shall be cast off forever*

The 1888 LDS large-print edition added the conjunction *for*, perhaps because there was no connector between the two sentences. It is also possible that the following word *forever* suggested the conjunction *for*. No later LDS edition was typeset from the 1888 edition, so this intrusive *for* has never been transmitted into any subsequent LDS edition.

Summary: Ignore the conjunction *for* that was added in the 1888 LDS edition.

■ 1 Nephi 17:47

behold I am full of the Spirit of God

insomuch [*as if* 0A | *as if* >js *that* 1 | *that* BCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST]

my frame [*had* 0A | *had* >js *has* 1 | *has* BCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST] *no strength*

In dealing with the awkwardness of the original subordinate clause in this verse, Joseph Smith replaced the conditional *as if* with *that* and then changed the past-tense subjunctive *had* to the present-tense indicative *has*. The resulting text says that Nephi was so full of the Spirit of God that his frame had no strength, which is not equivalent to saying that he was full of the Spirit so much that it was **as if** his frame had no strength. The use of “insomuch that” elsewhere in the text always implies that whatever follows actually happened, as in this nearby passage:

1 Nephi 17:52

and it came to pass that I Nephi said many things unto my brethren

insomuch that they were confounded and could not contend against me

Summary: Restore the original conditional phraseology in 1 Nephi 17:47 (“insomuch **as if** my frame **had** no strength”); the original clause is hypothetical, while the edited one (“insomuch **that** my frame **has** no strength”) claims an actuality.

■ 1 Nephi 17:48

and whoso shall lay [*their* 01ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPS | *his* RT] *hands upon me*

shall wither even as a dried reed

and he shall be as naught before the power of God

for God shall smite him

The 1920 LDS edition replaced the plural possessive pronoun *their* with the singular *his* because the rest of the verse uses the singular pronoun forms *he* and *him*. In general, the text allows both singular and plural interpretations for *whoso*, *whosoever*, and *whomsoever*. Consider the following two examples from chapter 26 of Mosiah:

Mosiah 26:32

and **whosoever** will not repent of **his** sins
the same shall not be numbered among my people

Mosiah 26:35

and **whosoever** repented of **their** sins and did confess them
them he did number among the people of the church

There are seven other cases in the original text of *whoso(ever)* occurring with a mixture of singular and plural pronouns. All of these have been edited except for one (in 3 Nephi 11:23); in one case the editing has only been partial (in Alma 12:34):

Mosiah 5:10 (1920 editing)

and now it shall come to pass that
whosoever shall not take upon [*them* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPS | *him* RT]
the name of Christ
must be called by some other name
therefore **he** findeth **himself** on the left hand of God

Alma 12:34 (Joseph Smith's 1837 editing)

therefore **whosoever** repenteth and hardeneth not **his** heart
he shall have claim on mercy through mine only begotten Son
unto a remission of [*their* >js *his* 1 | *their* A | *his* BCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST] sins
and **these** shall enter into my rest

Alma 12:35 (Joseph Smith's 1837 editing)

and **whosoever** will harden **his** heart and will do iniquity
behold I swear in my wrath that
[*they* >js *he* 1 | *they* A | *he* BCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST] shall not enter into my rest

Alma 36:3 (Joseph Smith's 1837 editing)

for I do know that **whomsoever** shall put
[*his* 0A | *his* >js *their* 1 | *their* BCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST] trust in God
shall be supported in **their** trials and **their** troubles and **their** afflictions

3 Nephi 11:23 (no editing of these pronouns)

verily I say unto you
that **whoso** repenteth of **his** sins through your words
and desireth to be baptized in my name
on this wise shall ye baptize **them**

Mormon 9:21 (Joseph Smith's 1837 editing)

behold I say unto you
that **whoso** believeth in Christ doubting nothing
whatsoever **he** shall ask the Father in the name of Christ
it shall be granted [*them* >js *him* 1 | *them* A | *him* BCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST]

Moroni 7:47 (1920 editing)

and **whoso is** found possessed of it at the last day
it shall be well with [*them* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPS | *him* RT]

For three of these cases (Mosiah 5:10, Mormon 9:21, and Moroni 7:47), one could argue that the *them* of the earliest textual sources may be an error for *him*, since there is evidence for scribal mix-ups between *them* and *him* (for the evidence, see 1 Nephi 10:18–19). Yet as noted in the discussion under 1 Nephi 10:18–19, the shifting between singular and plural pronoun forms can be fully intended, especially in generic contexts. And this is precisely what we have here in these passages, the generic pronoun *whoso(ever)*. Thus there is no strong reason to assume that for these three cases the manuscript occurrence of *them* is an error for *him*.

The critical text will therefore restore these cases of mixture since all of them may be intentional. None of them cause any real problem in understanding. For a complete discussion of whether *whoso*, *whosoever*, and *whomsoever* should be considered singular or plural, see WHOSO in volume 3.

Summary: The critical text will restore the cases of mixed singularity and plurality for the generic pronouns *whoso*, *whosoever*, and *whomsoever* (such as here in 1 Nephi 17:48).

■ 1 Nephi 17:48

*and whoso shall lay their hands upon me
shall wither even as a dried [weed 01 | reed ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]*

The 1830 typesetter interpreted *weed* as an error and replaced it with the phonetically similar *reed*. The semivowels *r* and *w* are acoustically very similar in American English, so it is quite possible that as he was taking down Joseph Smith’s dictation, Oliver Cowdery misheard *reed* as *weed*, especially since *weed* is considerably more frequent in everyday spoken English. Of course, either word will work semantically, but *reed* is probably the correct choice given that there is a passage in Isaiah that uses the same three key words as in Nephi’s metaphorical “wither even as a dried reed”:

Isaiah 19:6
*and the brooks of defense shall be emptied and **dried** up
the **reeds** and flags shall **wither***

The book of Isaiah was, of course, the major source for Nephi’s extensive biblical quoting in the small plates.

Summary: Retain the 1830 typesetter’s emendation of *reed* for *weed*; Oliver Cowdery probably misheard the word as he was taking down Joseph Smith’s dictation.

■ 1 Nephi 17:50

*if God had commanded me to do all things
I could do [it 0A | it >js them 1 | them BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]*

The use of the singular *it* seems inappropriate as the pronominal referent for the preceding plural “all things”; thus Joseph Smith edited the *it* to the plural *them*. Semantically, “all things” is equivalent to ‘anything’ — that is, Nephi is saying that he can do whatever God commands him. In verses 50–51, Nephi gives two specific examples, one theoretical and one actual: changing water into

earth and receiving instructions from the Lord on how to build a ship. There is no implication that God would literally command Nephi to do “all things” — that is, everything. Thus the use of the singular *it* in the original text is actually appropriate, given the intended meaning. The difficulty in understanding comes from the phrase “all things” rather than from the singular pronoun *it*.

There is one other example where “all things” is used in a context such that the appropriate pronominal reference is the singular *it*, thus showing that this kind of usage is not accidental:

Ether 3:26

for the Lord had said unto him in times before
that if he would believe in him that he could shew unto him **all things**
it should be shewn unto him

Unlike the example in 1 Nephi 17:50, the *it* in Ether 3:26 has not been edited to *they*.

Summary: Restore the singular pronoun *it* in 1 Nephi 17:50; the use here of “all things” means ‘anything’ and thus the singular *it* is semantically appropriate, just as it is in Ether 3:26.

■ 1 Nephi 17:50

if he should command me that I should say unto this water be thou earth
[& 0 | 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST]
it [shall 0 | should 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST] be earth
and if I should say it
it would be done

Here we have another example of a Hebraism in the text: namely, the use of *and* between a preceding subordinate clause and a following main clause. Such a construction is not English, and as a consequence Oliver Cowdery omitted the *and* when he copied the text from \mathcal{O} into \mathcal{P} . While copying, he also replaced the modal *shall* with *should*, undoubtedly under the influence of the occurrences of *should* found just before and after this clause. The use of the original *shall* is, of course, more vivid.

Hebraisms like this (when supported by the earliest textual sources) will be restored in the critical text, even though they are not easy for English readers to understand. Note, however, that the following sentence (“and if I should say it / it would be done”) also involves an *if*-clause, but in this case there is no *and* separating it from its following main clause. In other words, the original text varies with respect to this Hebraistic construction. For a complete list of where this Hebraism is found in the earliest textual sources, see under **HEBRAISMS** in volume 3.

Summary: Restore in 1 Nephi 17:50 the original Hebraistic *and* that connects the preceding *if*-clause with its following main clause; also restore the original modal *shall*.

■ 1 Nephi 17:53

*and it came to pass that the Lord said unto me
stretch forth thine hand again unto thy brethren
and they shall not wither before thee
but I will **shock** them
saith the Lord*

The original manuscript has the verb *shock*, but on the basis of the following two verses, it appears that the verb should actually be *shake*:

1 Nephi 17:54–55

and it came to pass that I stretched forth my hand unto my brethren
and they did not wither before me
but the Lord did **shake** them
even according to the word which he had spoken
and now they said
we know of a surety that the Lord is with thee
for we know that it is the power of the Lord that hath **shaken** us

Note in particular that the parallelism between the language of verses 53 and 54 virtually requires that the verb in verse 53 be *shake*, not *shock*:

<p>53 and it came to pass that the Lord said unto me stretch forth thine hand again unto thy brethren and they shall not wither before thee but I will shake them saith the Lord</p>	<p>54 and it came to pass that I stretched forth my hand unto my brethren and they did not wither before me but the Lord did shake them even according to the word which he had spoken</p>
--	---

Verse 54 ends by specifically stating that “the Lord did shake them even according to the word which he had spoken”, which definitely implies that the Lord must have told Nephi that he would **shake** them. The suggestion that *shock* in verse 53 should be replaced by *shake* was first made by Brian Best (personal communication).

There is a close phonetic similarity between *shock* and *shake*. Oliver Cowdery apparently misheard the first occurrence of the verb *shake*; he may have even expected *shock* over *shake*. In any event, he heard the next two occurrences of the verb correctly. (It is highly unlikely that the first *shock* is correct and that Oliver somehow misheard two following cases of *shock* as *shake*.)

The verb *shock* never appears elsewhere in the Book of Mormon text, or in the King James Bible for that matter. Unlike *shock*, the word *shake* is used numerous times in the Book of Mormon text, including a situation earlier in Nephi’s account that is similar to this one:

1 Nephi 2:14

and it came to pass that my father did speak unto them
in the valley of Lemuel with power
being filled with the Spirit
until their frames did **shake** before him

Of course, *shock* and *shake* are semantically similar (but in English derive from different words). There is one definition of *shock* in the Oxford English Dictionary with the meaning ‘shake’, namely definition 3b for the second verb *shock*: ‘to shake (a building, etc.) with an earthquake shock’ (with two citations from the 1700s). Although this use of the verb *shock* is listed as obsolete, the related noun *shock* retains this sense of shaking with respect to earthquakes. Except for earthquakes, there is no evidence for a general extension of the meaning ‘shake’ for *shock*, one that would be necessary in 1 Nephi 17:53; thus the occurrence of *shock* in the original manuscript for this verse remains anomalous.

Summary: Emend 1 Nephi 17:53 so that the unexpected verb *shock* is replaced by the appropriate verb *shake* (“I will shake them”), which agrees with the use of the verb *shake* in the two following verses.

■ 1 Nephi 17:53

*and it came to pass that the Lord said unto me
stretch forth thine hand again unto thy brethren
and they shall not wither before thee but I will shake them
saith the Lord*

Here we have an occurrence of the historical present *saith* that has never been edited to *said*. The probable reason for this lack of editing is that normally the present-tense phrase “saith the Lord (God)” is used to refer to prophetic pronouncements, ones that last beyond the immediate present. A nearby example has this more common interpretation for “saith the Lord”:

1 Nephi 19:16

yea and all the people which are of the house of Israel will I gather in
saith the Lord
according to the words of the prophet Zenos
from the four quarters of the earth

The critical text will, of course, restore all instances of the historical present whenever they are found in the earliest textual sources. This instance of the historical present in 1 Nephi 17:53 will therefore remain unchanged. For a similar example, see 2 Nephi 6:11 (“for thus saith the angel”). For a general discussion, see HISTORICAL PRESENT in volume 3.

Summary: Maintain in 1 Nephi 17:53 the use of the historical present “saith the Lord”.

1 Nephi 18

■ 1 Nephi 18:2

*now I Nephi did not work the timbers after the manner which was learned by men
neither did [I 0ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST | 1] build the ship after the manner of men*

In his copying from \mathcal{O} to \mathcal{P} , Oliver Cowdery accidentally omitted the pronoun *I* in the conjoined clause (“neither did **I** build the ship after the manner of men”). The resulting fragment apparently seemed odd to the 1830 compositor, who supplied the obviously necessary pronoun on his own. (There is no evidence that the original manuscript was consulted in proofing any of the early gatherings of the 1830 edition. \mathcal{O} was used in proofing gathering 22 of the 1830 edition, which covers pages 337–352 of that edition. For the evidence of this proofing, see Alma 41:8–46:30. Also see plate 11 of volume 1 of the critical text.)

Elsewhere in the text we always get a subject after “neither did”:

1 Nephi 2:13	neither did they believe that Jerusalem . . . could be destroyed
Jarom 1:5	neither did they blaspheme
Mosiah 24:5	neither did the brethren of Amulon teach them any thing . . .
Mosiah 26:2	neither did they believe concerning the coming of Christ
Alma 11:4	neither did they measure after the manner of the Jews
Alma 17:35	neither did they know any thing concerning the Lord
Alma 56:38	neither did Antipus overtake them
Helaman 5:44	neither did it take hold upon the walls of the prison
3 Nephi 4:15	neither did they come again in the twentieth year
Moroni 6:2	neither did they receive any unto baptism . . .

Thus the 1830 compositor was correct to supply the missing *I* in 1 Nephi 18:2. In this instance, \mathcal{O} is extant and agrees with his emendation.

Summary: Maintain in 1 Nephi 18:2 the subject pronoun *I* in the conjoined clause “neither did **I** build the ship after the manner of men”.

■ 1 Nephi 18:2

*now I Nephi did not work the timbers after the manner which was learned by men
neither did I build the ship after the manner of [man 01 | men ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST]
but I did build it after the manner which the Lord had shewn unto me
wherefore it was not after the manner of men*

Here in 1 Nephi 18:2, the 1830 compositor replaced the singular *man* (the reading of the manuscripts) with the plural form *men*. The plural form is consistent with the rest of the passage—namely, “after the manner which was learned by **men**” and (especially) “wherefore it was not after the manner of **men**”.

Elsewhere in the Book of Mormon text, in the phrase “after the manner of X” (where X refers to people), the X is always in the plural, never in the singular as a representative of the whole group:

“after the manner of the Jews” (not *the Jew*)

2 Nephi 25:6, Alma 11:4 (two times), Alma 16:13

“after the manner of the Lamanites” (not *the Lamanite*)

Alma 3:4, Alma 18:43

“after the manner of robbers” (not *a robber*)

3 Nephi 4:7

“after the manner of the ancients” (not *the ancient*)

Ether 10:33

This usage is also found in the King James Bible, where all 13 examples of “after the manner of X” use the plural for X, including three with the phraseology “after the manner of men”:

Romans 6:19

I speak after the manner of **men**
because of the infirmity of your flesh

1 Corinthians 15:32

if after the manner of **men**
I have fought with beasts at Ephesus
what advantageth it me if the dead rise not

Galatians 3:15

brethren I speak after the manner of **men**

Finally, there are specific cases in the manuscripts where Oliver Cowdery mistakenly wrote *man* in place of *men*. In the following example, found in both manuscripts, Oliver initially wrote *man*, then corrected it to *men*:

Alma 34:15

which overpowereth justice and bringeth about means
unto [*man* > *men* 01 | *men* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
that **they** may have faith unto repentance

In both manuscripts, Oliver overwrote the *a* with an *e* and without any change in the level of ink flow, which implies that both times Oliver caught his mistake immediately. The correction is not surprising since the following plural pronoun *they* jarringly contradicts the singular *man*.

The probable cause in 1 Nephi 18:2 for why Oliver Cowdery might have accidentally written *man* rather than *men* is the preceding word *manner*. Having just written down *manner*, Oliver was perhaps prompted to write the letters *man* once more; thus he ended up writing “after the **manner of man**” instead of the correct “after the manner of men”.

Summary: Accept the 1830 typesetter’s emendation of *man* to *men* in 1 Nephi 18:2 (“after the manner of men”); the evidence for this correction depends largely on the regularity of plural phraseology for this construction elsewhere in the Book of Mormon and the King James Bible.

■ 1 Nephi 18:6

*we did go down into the ship with all our **loading** and our seeds
and whatsoever things we had brought with us*

A possible emendation for *loading* is *lading*. Both *loading* and *lading* have the same etymological source, but *loading* is the more common word in English. One could possibly consider *loading* in the original manuscript to be an error on the part of the scribe, replacing the less familiar term *lading* with the much more frequent *loading*. On the other hand, according to the Oxford English Dictionary (see definition 1a), *loading* is perfectly acceptable as a term for the cargo of a ship.

In the King James Version, we have two occurrences of *lading*. It occurs only once as a noun:

Acts 27:10

I perceive that this voyage will be with hurt and much damage
not only of the **lading** and ship but also of our lives

The other occurrence of *lading* is a verbal form:

Nehemiah 13:15

in those days saw I in Judah *some* treading wine presses on the sabbath
and bringing in sheaves and **lading** asses

The word *loading* never occurs in the King James Bible, and it occurs only once in the Book of Mormon (here in 1 Nephi 18:6). But *lading* itself is infrequent in the King James Bible, so there is no strong evidence for replacing *loading* with *lading* in the Book of Mormon text.

Summary: Maintain *loading* in 1 Nephi 18:6 instead of *lading*, its etymologically related alternative; there is no textual evidence that *loading* is a mistake for *lading*.

■ 1 Nephi 18:6

*we did go down into the ship with all our loading and our seeds
and whatsoever [things 0 | thing 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST] we had brought with us*

In this passage Oliver Cowdery accidentally dropped the plural *s* from *things* as he copied from \mathcal{O} into \mathcal{P} . In the original text, “whatsoever things” is just as frequent as “whatsoever thing”: there are 11 occurrences of the plural and 11 of the singular. But more importantly, whenever the text refers to the gathering together of supplies for a trip, we otherwise get only the plural “whatsoever things”:

1 Nephi 16:11

we did gather together **whatsoever things**
we should carry into the wilderness

2 Nephi 5:7

and we did take our tents and **whatsoever things** were possible for us
and did journey in the wilderness for the space of many days

Like 1 Nephi 18:6, the plural “whatsoever things” is extant in \mathcal{G} for 1 Nephi 16:11.

Summary: Restore in 1 Nephi 18:6 the plural “whatsoever things” of the original manuscript; such plural usage is found elsewhere in the text when referring to preparations for a journey.

■ 1 Nephi 18:7

*and now my father had [begat 0ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST | beg at 1] two sons
in the wilderness*

The original text of the Book of Mormon frequently uses the simple past-tense form of the verb for the past participle. Here we have “had begat” instead of the grammatically standard form “had begotten” (that is, standard for Early Modern English). The Book of Mormon text has two occurrences of the past participle *begotten* used with the perfect auxiliary *have*, although one of them is a quotation from Isaiah in the King James Bible:

1 Nephi 21:21 (Isaiah 49:21)
who **hath begotten** me these

Mosiah 5:7
for behold this day he **hath** spiritually **begotten** you

Of course, *begotten* is used adjectivally when referring to the “Only Begotten” of God the Father (nine times). And the simple past-tense form *begat* occurs 41 times (all in the book of Ether). The critical text will, of course, retain the nonstandard usage “had begat” here in 1 Nephi 18:7. For further discussion, see PAST PARTICIPLE in volume 3.

Summary: Retain in 1 Nephi 18:7 the nonstandard past-participial phrase “had begat”, the reading of all the textual sources (including \mathcal{G}).

■ 1 Nephi 18:7

*and now my father had begat two sons in the wilderness
the [elder 0QRT | eldest 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPS] was called Jacob
and the younger Joseph*

When copying from \mathcal{G} into \mathcal{P} , Oliver Cowdery accidentally replaced the comparative *elder* with the superlative *eldest*. Since only two are being compared, the comparative is perfectly acceptable. The 1911 LDS edition grammatically emended *eldest* to *elder*, which happens to be the reading of \mathcal{G} . Subsequent LDS editions have continued with *elder*, but the RLDS text has the textually incorrect *eldest*. For a full discussion, see under 1 Nephi 16:7.

Summary: Maintain in 1 Nephi 18:7 the original comparative *elder*, the reading of the original manuscript.

■ 1 Nephi 18:9

*insomuch that they began to dance and to sing and to speak with much rudeness
yea even [to 0A | to >js NULL 1 | BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
that they did forget by what power they had been brought thither*

The original construction here seems to be a conflation of two common possibilities. One possibility has *even* followed directly by a *that*-clause, and the other has *even to* followed by a gerundive phrase. There are 18 examples of the *that*-clause type in the original text, of which five are preceded by *yea*:

1 Nephi 10:9

and he also spake that he should baptize with water
yea even that he should baptize the Messiah with water

1 Nephi 12:3

and I beheld many cities
yea even that I did not number them

Alma 29:10

then do I remember what the Lord has done for me
yea even that he hath heard my prayer

Alma 34:3–4

yea and he hath exhorted you unto faith and to patience
yea even that ye would have so much faith
as even to plant the word in your hearts
that ye may try the experiment of its goodness

Helaman 10:5

and I will make thee mighty in word and in deed / in faith and in works
yea even that all things shall be done unto thee according to thy word

On the other hand, there are six examples of the second type (*even to* followed by a gerundive phrase); one of these examples is preceded by *yea*:

Helaman 3:35

nevertheless they did fast and pray oft
and did wax stronger and stronger in their humility
and firmer and firmer in the faith of Christ
unto the filling their souls with joy and consolation
yea even to the purifying and the sanctification of their hearts

Related to this second type are seven occurrences of *even unto* followed by a gerundive phrase, as in 1 Nephi 17:48 (“even unto the consuming of my flesh”).

In his editing of 1 Nephi 18:9 for the 1837 edition, Joseph Smith removed the infinitival *to* that preceded the *that*-clause. Thus he ended up creating an example of the first type—that is, a *that*-clause immediately following *even*. If Joseph had edited towards the second type, the edited text would have read something like “yea even to (the) forgetting by what power they had been brought thither”.

David Calabro has suggested (personal communication) that the reading of the original text (“even to that they did forget by what power they had been brought thither”) may be a Hebraism. In the Hebrew Bible, there are instances of the preposition ‘*ad*’ ‘to’ followed by ‘*ašer*’ ‘that’. Such examples are typically translated as *until*, as in this example:

□ Genesis 27:44

King James Bible:

and tarry with him a few days
until thy brother’s fury turn away

literal translation of the Hebrew:

and stay with him for a few days
to that your brother’s anger subsides

In other words, the original *to that* in 1 Nephi 18:9 could be interpreted as meaning ‘until’ — that is, “insomuch that they began to dance and to sing and to speak with much rudeness / yea even **until** they did forget by what power they had been brought thither”. Of course, the Book of Mormon has examples of *even until*. The most common type (with 38 occurrences) has *even until* followed by a declarative sentence without an intervening *that*, as in 1 Nephi 8:24: “even until they did come forth and partook of the fruit of the tree”. There is also one occurrence of *even until* followed by a gerundive phrase (in Ether 12:3: “even until the going down of the sun”).

The Hebrew-like construction “even to that” suggests that the original text in 1 Nephi 18:9 could be interpreted as meaning ‘even to **the state** that’. Despite its awkwardness and uniqueness, the earliest reading appears to be intentional and may be considered equivalent to ‘even until’ in modern English.

Summary: Restore the original preposition *to* in 1 Nephi 18:9 (“yea even **to** that they did forget by what power they had been brought thither”); the construction “even to that” appears to mean ‘even to the state that’ or ‘even until’.

■ 1 Nephi 18:11

*and it came to pass that Laman and Lemuel did take me and bind me with cords
and they did treat me with much harshness
nevertheless the Lord [suffered 0 | did suffer 1 ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] it
that he might shew forth his power unto the fulfilling of his word
which he hath spoken concerning the wicked*

We have already seen one other example (in 1 Nephi 2:16) where Oliver Cowdery, in his copying from \mathcal{O} to \mathcal{P} , accidentally added the auxiliary verb *do*. Here in 1 Nephi 18:11, Oliver seems to have been influenced by the use of the auxiliary verb *do* earlier in this verse: “Laman and Lemuel **did take** me and bind me with cords and they **did treat** me with much harshness”. Elsewhere the text has nine occurrences of the simple past-tense *suffered* and four occurrences of *did suffer*, so either reading is theoretically possible. In each case, we let the earliest textual sources determine the reading. In 1 Nephi 18:11, \mathcal{O} has *suffered* rather than *did suffer*.

Summary: Restore the reading of the original manuscript in 1 Nephi 18:11 (“the Lord suffered it”).

■ 1 Nephi 18:11

*and it came to pass that Laman and Lemuel did take me and bind me with cords
and they did treat me with much harshness
nevertheless the Lord suffered it that he might shew forth his power
unto the fulfilling of his word
which he [hath o | hath >js had 1 | hath A | had BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] spoken
concerning the wicked*

The actual reading of the original manuscript here is not obvious: the *th* at the end of *hath* could also be interpreted as a *d*. However, for all other examples of the word *had* on this page of the original manuscript (page 37 of \mathcal{O} , with 12 occurrences of *had*), the *d* looks consistently different than the supposed *d* of this single occurrence of *hath*. Therefore, it seems reasonable to interpret the word in this verse as *hath* rather than *had*. When Oliver Cowdery copied this word from \mathcal{O} into \mathcal{P} , he was copying his own hand, and he correctly interpreted the word as *hath* and wrote that in \mathcal{P} . But Joseph Smith changed *hath* to *had* in his editing for the 1837 edition. Undoubtedly, Joseph was influenced by the abundant use of the past-tense form throughout this narrative of Nephi's, in particular the specific reference earlier in this verse to Laman and Lemuel tying up Nephi: "Laman and Lemuel **did** take me and bind me with cords and they **did** treat me with much harshness nevertheless the Lord **suffered** it".

The original text here in 1 Nephi 18:11 suggests that what the Lord has spoken concerning the wicked is eternally true, so the present tense *hath* is perfectly acceptable, even if it is found in a narrative that frequently uses the past tense. We do find cases of "the Lord had spoken" elsewhere in the Book of Mormon, but in each of these instances the reference is to some specific statement of the Lord's found earlier in the narrative:

1 Nephi 17:53–54

and they shall not wither before thee
but I will shake them saith the Lord
and this will I do that they may know that I am the Lord their God
and it came to pass that I stretched forth my hand unto my brethren
and they did not wither before me
but the Lord did shake them
even according to the word which he **had** spoken

Helaman 10:11–12

and now behold I command you
that ye shall go and declare unto this people that
thus saith the Lord God who is the Almighty
except ye repent ye shall be smitten even unto destruction
and behold now it came to pass that
when the Lord **had** spoken these words unto Nephi
he did stop and did not go unto his own house
but did return unto the multitudes
which were scattered about upon the face of the land
and began to declare unto them the word of the Lord
which **had** been spoken unto him
concerning their destruction if they did not repent

Ether 10:28 (referring back to Ether 1:42)
and they were in a land that was choice above all lands
for the Lord **had** spoken it

Ether 12:20 (referring back to Ether 3:9)
and behold we have seen in this record
that one of these was the brother of Jared
for so great was his faith in God that
when God put forth his finger
he could not hide it from the sight of the brother of Jared
because of his word which he **had** spoken unto him
which word he had obtained by faith

On the other hand, whenever the text refers to the eternal judgment of the Lord, we have the present perfect “hath spoken”. Besides the example here in 1 Nephi 8:11, we have these examples:

2 Nephi 9:15–16
and then cometh the judgment
and then must they be judged according to the holy judgment of God
and assuredly as the Lord liveth
for the Lord God **hath** spoken it
and it is his eternal word which cannot pass away
that they which are righteous shall be righteous still
and they which are filthy shall be filthy still

2 Nephi 9:24
and if they will not repent and believe in his name
and be baptized in his name and endure to the end
they must be damned
for the Lord God the Holy One of Israel **hath** spoken it

2 Nephi 25:3
wherefore I write unto my people
unto all they that shall receive hereafter these things which I write
that they may know the judgments of God
that they come upon all nations
according to the word which he **hath** spoken

Mosiah 2:41
and moreover I would desire that ye should consider
on the blessed and happy state of those that keep the commandments of God
for behold they are blessed in all things both temporal and spiritual
and if they hold out faithful to the end
they are received into heaven
that thereby they may dwell with God in a state of never-ending happiness
O remember remember that these things are true
for the Lord God **hath** spoken it

Alma 5:32

yea even woe unto all ye workers of iniquity
repent repent for the Lord God **hath** spoken it

Thus the use of *hath* in 1 Nephi 18:11 is precisely correct.

Summary: Restore in 1 Nephi 18:11 the present-tense reading of the original manuscript (“unto the fulfilling of his word which he **hath** spoken concerning the wicked”).

■ 1 Nephi 18:13

nevertheless they did

[*loose me not* 0A | *loose me not >*js *not loose me* 1 | *not loose me* BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]

The original text has the archaic construction “did loose me not”. For the 1837 edition, Joseph Smith changed this awkward verb phrase to “did not loose me”. Elsewhere the Book of Mormon text has several examples of the simple past tense of the verb followed by *not* but without the auxiliary verb *do*, as in these examples involving *me*:

2 Nephi 27:27 (quoting Isaiah 29:16)

for shall the work say of him that made it
he **made me not**

3 Nephi 9:16

I came unto my own
and my own **received me not**

compare with John 1:11 in the King James Bible:

he came unto his own
and his own received him not

3 Nephi 15:22–23

and they **understood me not**
for they supposed it had been the Gentiles
for they understood not
that the Gentiles should be converted through their preaching
and they **understood me not**
that I said they shall hear my voice
and they **understood me not**
that the Gentiles should not at any time hear my voice

All these examples show a strong biblical context (scriptural quotation or Jesus speaking). This kind of archaic construction is, of course, quite frequent in the King James Bible.

These examples imply another possible kind of editing for 1 Nephi 18:13—namely, removing the auxiliary verb *do* to give “they loosed me not”. In any event, the original combined use of the auxiliary *do* with the negative adverb *not* after the main verb appears to be intended in 1 Nephi 18:13 and will therefore be restored in the critical text.

Summary: Restore the original word order in 1 Nephi 18:13: “they did loose me not”.

■ 1 Nephi 18:15

*my brethren began to see that
the [judgments 0CDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST | Judgments 1 | judgment A | judgements B] of God
[was 0A | was >js were 1 | were BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] upon them*

Here the manuscripts originally read “the judgments of God was upon them”. The 1830 typesetter dealt with the number disagreement by changing the plural *judgments* to the singular *judgment*. But Joseph Smith, working from the printer’s manuscript in his editing for the 1837 edition, kept the original plural *judgments* and changed the verb *was* to the plural *were*.

The problem here is to determine the intended meaning of the earliest text. One possibility is that the *s* of *judgments* in the manuscripts was due to scribal error. The other possibility is that the earliest text simply reflects a common dialectal possibility in the original language of the Book of Mormon—namely, the singular verb form of *be* could be used with both singular and plural subjects. For instance, 1 Nephi 4:4 originally read “they was yet wroth”. See the discussion under SUBJECT-VERB AGREEMENT in volume 3.

The singular “judgment of God” is consistent with the phraseology in the King James Bible:

Romans 1:32

who knowing the **judgment** of God
that they which commit such things are worthy of death
not only do the same but have pleasure in them that do them

2 Thessalonians 1:5

which is a manifest token of the righteous **judgment** of God

There are also occurrences of “judgment of God” in Romans 2 (verses 2, 3, and 5).

In the Book of Mormon text, on the other hand, the plural phrase “judgments of God” is the expected one. There are 12 other occurrences of the plural phrase in the original text:

2 Nephi 25:3	they may know the judgments of God
2 Nephi 25:6	I have made mention . . . concerning the judgments of God
Mosiah 17:11	the judgments of God would come upon him
Mosiah 29:12	the judgments of God are always just
Mosiah 29:27	the judgments of God will come upon you
Alma 4:3	it was the judgments of God sent upon them
Alma 37:30	the judgments of God did come upon them workers of darkness
Alma 58:9	the judgments of God should come upon our land
Alma 60:14	the judgments of God will come upon this people
Helaman 4:23	the judgments of God did stare them in the face
Helaman 14:11	ye might hear and know of the judgments of God
Mormon 4:5	the judgments of God will overtake the wicked

In the 1858 Wright edition for Alma 58:9, the plural “judgments of God” was accidentally replaced by the singular “judgment of God”, but this reading has not persisted.

In contrast, there are only two cases of “judgment of God” in the original text of the Book of Mormon:

2 Nephi 9:15

they must appear before the judgment seat of the Holy One of Israel
and then cometh the judgment
and then must they be judged
according to the holy **judgment** of God

3 Nephi 12:21

and whosoever shall kill shall be in danger of the **judgment** of God

These two instances are each exceptional in their own way. In 2 Nephi 9:15, the text is referring to the final judgment rather than the judgments that come upon people in this life. Moreover, the word *judgment* is preceded by the word *holy*, unlike the occurrences of “judgments of God” elsewhere in the text. The example in 3 Nephi 12:21 parallels the language of the King James Bible (in Matthew 5:21: “and whosoever shall kill shall be in danger of the judgment”). There is only one difference with the biblical text—namely, the additional prepositional phrase “of God” in the Book of Mormon. But the use of *judgment* in 3 Nephi 12:21 maintains the singular of the King James text.

Thus “the judgments of God” is the normal reading in the Book of Mormon text. Therefore, the final *s* of the original reading should be accepted in 1 Nephi 18:15. The 1830 typesetter’s emendation to the singular *judgment* was in error. From an editing point of view, Joseph Smith was correct to change the verb *was* to *were* when he restored the original plural “the judgments of God”.

Summary: Maintain in 1 Nephi 18:15 the original plural phraseology of “the judgments of God”; the critical text will also retain the nonstandard singular verb form *was* rather than the standard *were*.

■ 1 Nephi 18:15

and behold they had

[*much* 0A | *much* >js NULL 1 | BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *swollen*

[*exceedingly* 0 | *exceedingly* >js NULL >js *exceedingly* 1 | *exceedingly* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]

and also mine ankles were much swollen

In 1 Nephi 18:15, the earliest text (the original manuscript) has two occurrences of the phrase “much swollen”. The first one, however, is exceptional in that it also has *exceedingly* (“much swollen exceedingly”), which is highly redundant. Nowhere else in the text do we simultaneously get both the adverbs *much* and *exceedingly* modifying the same verbal form. Furthermore, when the adverb *much* (meaning ‘to a large degree or extent’) modifies a verb phrase, *much* always follows the verb phrase rather than coming just before the main verb:

1 Nephi 16:35	we have wandered much in the wilderness
2 Nephi 5:1	I Nephi did cry much unto the Lord my God
2 Nephi 9:4	thou hast searched much
Jacob 4:1	having ministered much unto my people
Jacob 7:6	thou goest about much

Omni 1:2	I fought much with the sword
Alma 8:10	Alma labored much in the spirit
Alma 17:9	they fasted much and prayed much
Alma 45:1	they did fast much and pray much
Alma 50:30	he fell upon her and beat her much
Alma 58:23	after having traveled much in the wilderness
Ether 10:34	Com did fight against them much
Ether 13:19	the sons of Coriantumr fought much and bled much

On the other hand, when *be* is the main verb and there is an adjectival past participle, we always get *much* before the past participle. The following list includes the second occurrence of “much swollen” from 1 Nephi 18:15:

1 Nephi 16:19	being much fatigued
1 Nephi 18:15	mine ankles were much swollen
Mosiah 23:26	they were much frightened
Alma 17:24	king Lamoni was much pleased with Ammon
Alma 52:36	being much confused
Helaman 10:3	being much cast down
Helaman 16:22	they were much disturbed

The problem with the first occurrence of “much swollen” in 1 Nephi 18:15 is that, in contradiction to the placement of *much*, the word *swollen* is a verb (“they had swollen exceedingly”) rather than an adjective. For this reason, Joseph Smith, in his editing for the 1837 edition, ended up deleting the *much*. Initially, however, Joseph deleted *exceedingly*, but then he changed his mind and restored the *exceedingly* and deleted the *much*. If he had ended up deleting *exceedingly*, the resulting “they had much swollen” would have still been wrong since the helping verb was *had* instead of *be*. The verb phrase “had swollen” would have required that the *much* come after the main verb (“they had swollen much”). Of course, another editing alternative is that the perfect auxiliary verb *had* could have been replaced by *were* (“they were much swollen”, where *they* refers to Nephi’s wrists).

All of this evidence suggests that Joseph Smith’s final editing actually represents the original text for this passage—namely, “they had swollen exceedingly”. The original manuscript reads incorrectly, it would seem, because the word *much* was accidentally inserted before the first *swollen* under the influence of the following “mine ankles were much swollen”. This error could have easily occurred during dictation. If Joseph Smith had dictated this passage without pausing between the two clauses containing *swollen* (a dictation sequence of only 13 words, which would have normally been perfectly acceptable), Oliver Cowdery could have readily miswritten the earlier *swollen* as *much swollen* since he would have just heard Joseph dictate the later “were much swollen” as he (Oliver) came to write down the first *swollen* (“they had swollen exceedingly”).

Summary: Accept Joseph Smith’s emendation “they had swollen exceedingly” since this reading probably represents the original text; the original manuscript reads “they had **much swollen** exceedingly”, an error apparently due to the immediately following clause, “mine ankles were **much swollen**”.

■ 1 Nephi 18:17–18

*and having suffered much grief because of their children
they were brought down
yea even upon their sickbeds
[01 | . ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
because of their grief and much sorrow and the iniquity of my brethren
[01 | , ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
they were brought near even to be carried out of this time to meet their God*

Here we have one case where a sentence-initial *because-of* phrase could possibly be reinterpreted as sentence-final. In 1990, David B. Grant, one of my students in my textual criticism class, wrote a research paper on the question of whether sentences in the Book of Mormon text can begin with a *because-of* phrase. Using the punctuation in the current LDS text, he found a handful of cases where “because of” begins a sentence. Later, Nathan Ritchie did additional analysis of this problem in a research paper for a 1999 class in textual criticism. Their research has helped to identify cases where the positioning of the *because-of* phrase may need to be reconsidered. Besides the one here in 1 Nephi 18:17–18, we have the following two passages:

2 Nephi 3:20–21

and it shall come to pass that their cry shall go forth
even according to the simpleness of their words
[1 | . ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
because of their faith
[1RT | , ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQS]
their words shall proceed forth out of my mouth unto their brethren
which are the fruit of thy loins

2 Nephi 28:11–12 (three instances)

yea they have all gone out of the way
they have become corrupted
[1 | . ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
because of pride
and **because of** false teachers and false doctrines
[1 | , ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
their churches have become corrupted
and their churches are lifted up
[1 | ; ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
because of pride
[1EFIJLMNOQRT | , ABCDGHKPS]
they are puffed up

For a third example, see 3 Nephi 4:18–19.

Here in 1 Nephi 18:17–18, the preceding clause ends in a parenthetical phrase that seems to prevent the attachment of the *because-of* phrase at the end of the sentence, although it is not impossible:

1 Nephi 18:17–18 (structure reinterpreted)

and having suffered much grief because of their children
 they were brought down—yea even upon their sickbeds—
 because of their grief and much sorrow and the iniquity of my brethren /
 they were brought near even to be carried out of this time to meet their God

The problem with altering the punctuation for this passage is that the following sentence (“they were brought near even to be carried out of this time to meet their God”) would then begin with no connector at all. There seems to be a need for some kind of connector, such as a word like *thus*, *therefore*, or *yea*. The abruptness of the resulting text suggests that the *because-of* phrase should not be assigned to the end of the previous sentence (that is, not at the end of verse 17). Instead, this phrase is needed to initiate the following sentence (that is, at the beginning of verse 18).

Summary: Retain the current punctuation separating verses 17 and 18 of 1 Nephi 18; in this instance the *because-of* phrase works better at the beginning of the following sentence than at the end of the preceding sentence.

■ 1 Nephi 18:18

yea even they were near to be cast

[*with sorrow* 0CGHKPRST | 1ABDEFIJLMNOQ]

into [a 01ACGHKPRST | *the* BDEFIJLMNOQ] *watery grave*

In this passage we have two transmission errors that have been corrected in both the LDS and RLDS texts. The first error deals with the prepositional phrase “with sorrow”, which was lost as Oliver Cowdery copied \mathcal{O} into \mathcal{P} . The 1840 edition restored the phrase by reference to the original manuscript. In his editing for the 1840 edition, Joseph Smith restored several phrases that had been accidentally lost when Oliver copied from \mathcal{O} into \mathcal{P} . The other examples are (1) “the name of” in the 1 Nephi preface, (2) “and partake of the fruit” in 1 Nephi 8:18, and (3) “for all men” in 1 Nephi 10:18.

The second error in this verse occurred when the 1837 typesetter replaced the indefinite article *a* with the definite article *the* in the phrase “into **a** watery grave”, thus changing it to “into **the** watery grave”. This replacement was probably accidental since either *a* or *the* will work in this phrase. In addition, Joseph Smith did not mark the change in \mathcal{P} when he did his editing for the 1837 edition. Moreover, the following (1840) edition restored the original *a*. The most probable explanation of what happened here in the 1840 editing is that when Joseph used \mathcal{O} to restore the nearby prepositional phrase “with sorrow”, he probably also noticed that \mathcal{O} read “into **a** watery grave” rather than “into **the** watery grave”. The RLDS text (which derives from the 1840 edition) has consistently maintained the original *a*. The LDS text restored the correct *a* in the 1920 edition by reference to either the 1830 or 1840 edition.

Summary: Maintain the readings of the original text in 1 Nephi 18:18 (the prepositional phrase “with sorrow” and the indefinite article *a* for “into a watery grave”); both readings are found in the original manuscript.

■ 1 Nephi 18:23

we did arrive [to 01ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPS | at RT] the promised land

The editors for the 1920 LDS edition changed the preposition in this passage from *to* to *at*. The critical text will follow the original preposition *to*. For a complete discussion of this change, see 1 Nephi 17:14.

Summary: Maintain in 1 Nephi 18:23 the original preposition *to* in the phrase “arrive to the promised land”.

■ 1 Nephi 18:25

there was beasts in the [forests 01ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST | forest G] of every kind

The 1858 Wright edition replaced the plural *forests* with the singular *forest*, but this change was not transmitted into the 1874 RLDS edition (which sometimes follows readings unique to the 1858 Wright edition).

Elsewhere the Book of Mormon text prefers the singular *forest* when it occurs with *beasts* or *animals*:

Enos 1:3

behold I went to hunt beasts in the [*forest* 1ABCDEFGHIJKNOPS | *forests* LMQRT]

Mosiah 8:21

yea they are as a wild flock
which fleeth from the shepherd and scattereth
and are driven and are devoured by the beasts of the **forest**

3 Nephi 20:16

and ye shall be among them
as a lion among the beasts of the [*forest* 01ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST | *forests* S]

3 Nephi 21:12

yea in the midst of them
as a lion among the beasts of the [*forest* 1ABCDEFGHIJKMNQRST | *forests* L]

Ether 10:19

for the land was covered with animals of the **forest**

The Book of Mormon text consistently uses the singular *forest* when the accompanying preposition is *of* (“the beasts of the forest” or “animals of the forest”), although it should be pointed out that the two passages in 3 Nephi 20–21 follow (with some variation) the language of Micah 5:8 from the King James Bible, which has the singular *forest*.

But when the preposition is *in*, the earliest textual sources can read with either the singular *forest* (in Enos 1:3) or the plural *forests* (in 1 Nephi 18:25). Of course, in 1 Nephi 18:25 the beasts would have been found in many different forests, while in Enos 1:3 we can assume that on this occasion Enos was hunting in one particular forest, thus the singular. In any event, when the

preposition is *in*, the context largely determines whether we have *forest* or *forests*. (See the discussion for Enos 1:3.)

Summary: Maintain the plural *forests* in 1 Nephi 18:25 (“beasts in the forests of every kind”); only the 1858 Wright edition has the singular *forest*.

■ 1 Nephi 18:25

*there was beasts in the forests of every kind
both the cow and the ox and the ass and the horse and the goat and the wild goat
and all manner of wild animals
which were for the use of [man 0 | men 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST]*

As in 1 Nephi 18:2, we have here variation between *man* and *men*. When Oliver Cowdery copied from \mathcal{O} to \mathcal{P} here in verse 25, he accidentally changed the singular *man* to the plural *men*. Although there is no other occurrence in the text of the precise phrase “use of man” (or “use of men”), there is one extensive passage in Ether that parallels 1 Nephi 18:25. Here the associated word is *useful* rather than *use*, but still the text has the singular *man* rather than the plural *men*:

Ether 9:18–19
and also all manner of cattle
of oxen and cows and of sheep and of swine and of goats
and also many other kind of animals
which were **useful** for the food of **man**
and they also had horses and asses
and there were elephants and cureloms and cumoms
all of which were **useful** unto **man**

This passage thus supports the singular “use of man” in the original manuscript for 1 Nephi 18:25.

Summary: Based on the original manuscript, restore the singular *man* in 1 Nephi 18:25 (“which were for the use of man”); usage in Ether 9:18–19 also supports the singular *man* in this context.

1 Nephi 19

■ 1 Nephi 19:1

*wherefore I did make plates of ore
that I might [engraven 01ABCDEFGHIJKLMNPRST | engrave OQ] upon them
the record of my people
and upon the plates which I made
I did [engraven 01ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPRT | engrave QS] the record of my father*

Here in 1 Nephi 19:1 we have two possible verbs, *engraven* and *engrave*. The infinitive verb form *engraven*, according to the Oxford English Dictionary, is now obsolete; the OED quotes examples from 1605 through 1713. There are quite a few examples of the past participial form *engraven* in the Book of Mormon text (24 in the passive, 2 in the perfect). None of these, however, have the variant *engravened*.

If we consider only the infinitive form, we find that *engrave* occurs only once but *engraven* five times. There has been some tendency in twentieth-century editions to occasionally replace *engraven* with *engrave*, as here in 1 Nephi 19:1. But in the current LDS and RLDS texts, the original *engraven* has been maintained for the most part:

1 Nephi 19:1	I might <i>engraven</i> > <i>engrave</i> (1907, 1911)
1 Nephi 19:1	I did <i>engraven</i> > <i>engrave</i> (1911, 1953R)
2 Nephi 5:30	thou shalt <i>engraven</i> > <i>engrave</i> (1905 ^c , 1907, 1911)
Jacob 1:4	I should <i>engraven</i> > <i>engrave</i> (1911, 1953R)
Jacob 4:3	to <i>engraven</i> > <i>engrave</i> (1907, 1911)
Mormon 1:4	ye shall <i>engrave</i> [no variation]

The 1911 LDS edition changed all five cases of *engraven* to *engrave*, but the subsequent LDS edition (1920) reversed each of these five changes, undoubtedly by reference to some earlier edition since the *engrave* in Mormon 1:4 was not changed to *engraven*. This example of *engrave* in Mormon 1:4 may be an early error for *engraven*, although such an error would have been in \mathfrak{C} since here both \mathfrak{D} and the 1830 edition are firsthand copies of \mathfrak{C} and both read *engrave*.

There is only one example of the simple past-tense form and originally it was *engravened*, but this form was changed to *engraved* in the 1837 edition:

2 Nephi 5:32
and I [*engravened* 1A | *engraved* BCDEFGHIJKLMNQPQRST]
that which is pleasing unto God

This change of *engravened* to *engraved* was not marked by Joseph Smith in the printer’s manuscript, so its occurrence in the 1837 edition may be accidental since none of the other five occurrences of the verb *engraven* (the five infinitive forms listed above) were changed in the 1837 edition.

There is also one example of the verb *engrave* used as a gerund (in Jacob 4:1, “because of the difficulty of **engraving** our words upon plates”). And of course, there is the plural noun usage *engravings* (15 of them), which never take the variant *engravenings*.

Summary: Based on the earliest textual sources, there are six occurrences of the verb *engraven*, five as infinitives (including the two here in 1 Nephi 19:1) and one as a simple past-tense form (in 2 Nephi 5:32); there is one example of *engrave* as an infinitive (in Mormon 1:4); all other forms are based on the verb *engrave*.

■ 1 Nephi 19:1

*wherefore I did make plates of ore
that I might engraven upon them the record of my people
and upon the plates [01ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST | of] which I made
I did engraven the record of my father*

The 1888 LDS large-print edition accidentally added the preposition *of* at the beginning of the relative clause “which I made”. This intrusive *of* may have resulted from the previous occurrence of *of* in the phrase “the record **of** my people”. For this context, the meaning prevents the verb *make* from taking a complement prepositional phrase headed by *of*. For a similar example of this kind of typo (but in the 1830 edition), see 1 Nephi 19:24.

Summary: Maintain the original text in 1 Nephi 19:1 without the intrusive *of* before the relative clause “which I made”.

■ 1 Nephi 19:2

*and I knew not at [that 0A | that >js the 1 | the BCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST] time
[which >+ when 0 | when 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST] I made them
that I should be commanded of the Lord to make these plates*

For the 1837 edition, Joseph Smith changed the determiner from *that* to *the* in the phrase “at that time”. This change makes the determiner consistent with usage elsewhere in the text: when the determiner is specific (either *that*, *any*, *this*, or *some*), the prepositional phrase “at <determiner> time” takes no postmodifier; but when the determiner is *the*, we always get some kind of postmodification. We have the following statistics (where NP stands for “noun phrase” and S for “sentence”):

□ *without a postmodifier*

at that time	9
at any time	8
at this time	34

at this present time	1
at this period of time	4
at some period of time	1

□ *with a postmodifier*

at the time + of + NP	11
at the time + S	12
at the time + that + S	6
at the same time + S	1
at the same time + that + S	1

In the cases where the postmodifier is a sentence, sometimes the *that* is present, sometimes not. Where the *that* is not stated, we can consider its omission as a case of ellipsis. The *that*, whether stated or not, is a relative pronoun and is adverbial in nature; in each instance, its antecedent is the preceding word *time*.

The above list excludes cases where the postmodifier is a clause that begins with a *wh*-initial relative pronoun acting adverbially, such as *when*:

Helaman 12:2

yea and we may see at the very time
when he doth prosper his people . . .

There are also cases where the relative pronoun is *which*. This alternative is suggested by the frequent occurrence in the list of the adverbial *that* serving as the relative pronoun. For instance, in 1 Nephi 19:2 the original manuscript first read “at that time **which** I made them”. This construction, although odd, is equivalent to “at that time that I made them”. Another example, left unedited, maintains the original *which* instead of the more normal *that*:

Alma 11:1

now it was in the law of Mosiah that every man which was a judge of the law . . .
should receive his wages according to **the time which** they labored
to judge those which were brought before them to be judged

Of course, in 1 Nephi 19:2, the repetition of the two *that*'s (in the hypothetical “at **that** time **that** I made them”) is awkward, which may be the reason why the original text read “at **that** time **which** I made them”.

At some later time, Oliver Cowdery edited the *which* in \mathcal{O} to *when*. His correction to *when* has a heavier and uneven ink flow, so this change is definitely not an immediate correction. At the same time he made this correction, Oliver also made another correction two lines earlier in \mathcal{O} (compare the supralinear corrections in lines 27 and 29 on page 38 of \mathcal{O}). Here Oliver inserted the determiner *my* in order to correct “the Record of father” to “the Record of my father”. This correction is obvious and is sufficiently far enough away from the change of *which* to *when* to suggest that neither of these two changes were made when Oliver Cowdery repeated the text back to Joseph Smith right after having first copied it down. In other words, the nature of these two changes in \mathcal{O} strongly suggest that both involve later editing.

There are other examples in the original text of *which* occurring where modern English readers would expect *when*:

Alma 8:15

for thou hast been faithful in keeping
the commandments of God from the time
which thou received thy first message from him

Alma 13:1

I would cite your minds forward to the time
[*which* 01ABDEPS | *when* CGHIJKLMNOQRT | *which* > *when* F]
the Lord God gave these commandments unto his children

3 Nephi 2:7

and nine years had passed away from the time
[*which* >]s *when* 1 | *which* A | *when* BCDEFGHIJKLMNOQRST]
the sign was given which was spoken of by the prophets

3 Nephi 2:8

now the Nephites began to reckon their time from this period
[*which* >]s *whn* 1 | *which* A | *when* BCDEFGHIJKLMNOQRST]
the sign was given

Ether 13:15

and it came to pass that in that same year
[1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPS | *in* RT] **which** he was cast out
from among the people
there began to be a great war among the people

In three of these cases, Joseph Smith edited the *which* to *when* (the ones in 3 Nephi 2 for the 1837 edition, the one in Alma 13:1 for the 1840 edition), but in the first example (in Alma 8:15) the *which* has never been edited to *when*. In the last example, the 1920 LDS edition inserted the preposition *in* at the head of the relative clause (before the relative pronoun *which*).

David Calabro points out (personal communication) that the use of the relative pronoun *which* instead of the adverbial *when* may be viewed as a Hebraism. Hebrew uniformly uses the single relative pronoun *’asher* ‘which’, even when dealing with time, as in the following example:

□ 1 Kings 22:25

King James Bible:

in that day **when** thou shalt go into an inner chamber to hide thyself

literal translation of the Hebrew:

in that day **which** you go to a room within a room to hide

(For other examples, see page 334 in Bruce K. Waltke and M. O’Connor, *An Introduction to Biblical Hebrew Syntax* [Winona Lake, Indiana: Eisenbrauns, 1990].) From this Hebraistic point of view, all of the Book of Mormon examples that use *which* to mean ‘when’ are acceptable. And even in English the use of the alternative relative pronoun *that* readily occurs as an adverbial relative pronoun (as in 1 Nephi 10:4, “from the time **that** my father left Jerusalem”).

Therefore, in accord with the earliest textual sources, the original *which* will be restored in four passages (1 Nephi 19:2, Alma 13:1, 3 Nephi 2:7, and 3 Nephi 2:8). Despite the uniqueness of the *that* in “at that time” in 1 Nephi 19:2, given that *time* is postmodified, its use appears to be intended and should therefore be maintained. In fact, there is one example involving a different preposition for which *that* rather than the expected *the* occurs:

Alma 19:11

and it came to pass that she watched over the bed of her husband
from that time even until **that** time on the morrow
which Ammon had appointed **that** he should rise

The syntax here is considerably convoluted, but we do have the prepositional phrase “until that time” and it is eventually modified by a *that*-clause (“that he should rise”), after an intervening prepositional phrase (“on the morrow”) and a relative clause (“which Ammon had appointed”). And it is also possible that the preceding “from that time” may have influenced the choice of *that* in the following “until that time”. Although this is only one example (and a complex one), it does show that it is possible to have “<preposition> that time” postmodified by a clause.

Summary: Restore the original reading in 1 Nephi 19:2 (“at **that** time **which** I made them”), even though the text definitely prefers *the* rather than *that* when *time* is postmodified; also maintain *which* as an adverbial relative pronoun whenever it is supported by the earliest textual sources, as here in 1 Nephi 19:2.

■ 1 Nephi 19:2

*wherefore the record of my father
and the genealogy of his [fore fathers 0 | forefathers 1CGHKPS | fathers ABDEFIJLMNOQRT]
and the more part of all our proceedings in the wilderness
are engraven upon those first plates of which I have spoken*

Here the manuscripts read *forefathers*, but the 1830 typesetter accidentally shortened it to *fathers*, probably because of the preceding occurrence of the word *father*. In the 1840 edition, Joseph Smith restored the reading of the original manuscript—and undoubtedly by reference to that manuscript (since we know he used the original manuscript to make a few corrections in the 1840 edition, especially for the first part of the text). The RLDS text follows the 1840 edition, but the LDS text here follows the 1841 edition, which was set from the 1837 edition.

Both “genealogy of X’s fathers” and “genealogy of X’s forefathers” are found in the Book of Mormon text—and about equally divided: four occurrences of the reading with *fathers* (1 Nephi 5:14, 1 Nephi 5:16, 1 Nephi 6:1, and Omni 1:18) and three occurrences with *forefathers* (1 Nephi 3:3, 1 Nephi 19:2, and Alma 37:3).

Summary: Follow in 1 Nephi 19:2 the reading of the original text, “the genealogy of his forefathers”.

■ 1 Nephi 19:2

*wherefore the record of my father and the genealogy of his forefathers
and the more part of all our proceedings in the wilderness
are engraven upon those [first 0T | 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQPORS] plates of which I have spoken*

While copying from \mathcal{O} to \mathcal{P} , Oliver Cowdery accidentally omitted the word *first*. The editors for the 1981 LDS edition restored it by reference to \mathcal{O} . The verse later refers once more to these other plates:

1 Nephi 19:2
wherefore the things which transpired before that I made these plates
are of a truth more particularly made mention upon the **first plates**

Summary: Maintain the *first* in “upon those first plates” in 1 Nephi 19:2.

■ 1 Nephi 19:3

*and after that I [01 | had ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQPQRST] made these plates
by way of commandment
I Nephi received a commandment that the ministry and the prophecies
—the more plain and precious parts of them—
should be written upon these plates*

The 1830 typesetter added the perfect auxiliary *had*, but there is no need to put the verb phrase in the past perfect. Elsewhere in the text there are instances where the verb phrase in an *after*-clause does not take the perfect auxiliary *have*:

1 Nephi 12:5
and it came to pass that after I **saw** these things
I saw the vapor of darkness

1 Nephi 16:18
and after that I **did break** my bow
behold my brethren were angry with me

Thus the original reading in 1 Nephi 19:3, without the perfective *had*, is quite acceptable.

It may be that the 1830 typesetter simply expected the perfect auxiliary. Usually in the Book of Mormon, the verb of the subordinate clause is in the past perfect when the following main clause is in the simple past tense. For instance, when the initial subordinate clause begins with “after (that) I”, the finite verb is typically the past perfect *had* (21 times). But such a tendency does not mean that the perfect auxiliary must be there.

Summary: Remove the intrusive *had* that the 1830 typesetter added when copying the subordinate clause at the beginning of 1 Nephi 19:3; although the *had* is expected, there are other examples in the text without the *had*.

■ 1 Nephi 19:4

*wherefore I Nephi did make a record upon the other plates
which gives an account or which gives a greater account
of the wars and contentions and destructions of my people
and [now 0 | 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST] this have I done
and commanded my people that they should do after that I was gone*

Oliver Cowdery dropped the adverb *now* while copying from \mathcal{O} into \mathcal{P} . The connecting phrase “and now” occurs hundreds of times in the text, so there is no reason why the *now* shouldn’t be restored here. One similar example has the demonstrative pronoun *this* acting as a direct object immediately following a sentence-initial “and now”, just like here in 1 Nephi 19:4:

2 Nephi 25:11

and now this I speak because of the Spirit which is in me

Summary: Restore the *now* in 1 Nephi 19:4 that Oliver Cowdery accidentally omitted in his copying; the connecting phrase “and now” is very common in the Book of Mormon text.

■ 1 Nephi 19:4

*wherefore I Nephi did make a record upon the other plates
which gives an account or which gives a greater account
of the wars and contentions and destructions of my people
and now this have I done and commanded my people
[that 01A | what BCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST] they should do
after that I was gone*

A more significant change in 1 Nephi 19:4 is the replacement of *that* with *what* in the 1837 edition. This change was not marked by Joseph Smith in the printer’s manuscript. Since the two words differ from one another by only a single letter, it is probable that *what* is a simple typo. More importantly, this change makes a difference in the meaning of the sentence. In the original text, Nephi is saying that “this have I . . . commanded my people that they should do after that I was gone”—namely, keep a record of the people on the other plates. By replacing *that* with *what*, the text no longer specifically refers to record keeping, but rather to some general unspecified instructions regarding what the people should do after Nephi has died. In addition, the *what* now acts as the direct object of the verb *command*, with the result that the earlier *this* is the direct object of only the first verb (that is, *do*). This means that the verb *command* is now missing its subject. The substitution of *what* for *that* thus created a very awkward sentence, plus an unintentional change in the meaning.

Summary: Restore the reading of the original manuscript: “and now this have I done and commanded my people that they should do”; Nephi specifically commanded his people to continue keeping a record of their history.

■ 1 Nephi 19:7

*they [do 0A | do >js NULL 1 | BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] set him at naught
and hearken not to the voice of his counsels*

Here Joseph Smith once more removed the biblical use of the auxiliary *do*. Such editing was never applied consistently; thus we find, for instance, an unedited example of “do set” in Helaman 12:6 (“they do set at naught his counsels”). The critical text will restore all cases of the auxiliary *do* when supported by the earliest textual sources. For further discussion, see 1 Nephi 2:14 or, more generally, under DO AUXILIARY in volume 3.

Summary: Restore the biblical phraseology “do set” here in 1 Nephi 19:7 since the earliest text reads this way.

■ 1 Nephi 19:10

*and the God of our fathers
which [01ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST | {our fathers} s] were led out of Egypt out of bondage
and also were preserved in the wilderness by him . . .*

The 1953 RLDS edition placed a parenthetical explanation in braces after *which* in order to prevent the reader from misinterpreting the *which* as referring to *God*, the head of the preceding prepositional phrase. Of course, this repetition of “our fathers” is really quite unnecessary since the following verb (*were*) is in the plural and obviously the Israelites were the ones led out of bondage in Egypt and preserved in the wilderness. Such clarifications should be restricted to footnotes since parenthetical additions tend to get inserted into the actual text. (See, for example, the phrase “or out of the waters of baptism” in 1 Nephi 20:1.)

Summary: Maintain the original text in 1 Nephi 19:10, which lacks the intrusive and unnecessary parenthetical “our fathers”.

■ Nephi 19:10

*yea the God of Abraham **and of Isaac** and the God of Jacob yieldeth himself
according to the words of the angel
as a man into the hands of wicked men*

It is possible here that the reading of the original manuscript is in error. Elsewhere in the Book of Mormon, as well as in the King James Bible, when the word *God* occurs in conjuncts involving Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, there is a consistent aspect to the repetition of elements: either the full phrasing of each element is repeated, or once a word or phrase is dropped from the repetition, it is not used again. We have the following examples from the Book of Mormon and from the King James Bible:

- *and the God of*
the God of Abraham **and the God of** Isaac **and the God of** Jacob
1 Nephi 6:4, Alma 29:11, Alma 36:2, 3 Nephi 4:30, Mormon 9:11;
Matthew 22:32, Mark 12:26, Luke 20:37, Acts 7:32
- *the God of*
the God of Abraham **the God of** Isaac and **the God of** Jacob
Exodus 3:6, Exodus 3:15, Exodus 4:5
- *and of*
the God of Abraham **and of** Isaac **and of** Jacob
Mosiah 23:23; Acts 3:13
- *and*
the God of Abraham **and** Isaac **and** Jacob
Mosiah 7:19
- *of*
the God of Abraham **of** Isaac and **of** Jacob
Exodus 3:16

David Calabro notes (personal communication) that all the King James examples of *and* before *Isaac* are found in New Testament examples, while that *and* is missing in all the Old Testament ones. He further notes that this systematic difference in the use of *and* in the King James Bible is found in the original languages (in the Hebrew of the Old Testament and the Greek of the New Testament).

The pattern of repetition is also found in other conjuncts in the Book of Mormon involving *Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob*:

- *repetition of preposition*
“with Abraham **with** Isaac and **with** Jacob”
Alma 5:24
- *repetition of conjunction*
“Abraham **and** Isaac **and** Jacob”
1 Nephi 17:40
- *no repetition*
“with Abraham Isaac and Jacob”
Alma 7:25

There are also 17 examples in the King James Bible that support this same pattern of repetition.

The example from Mosiah 23:23 provides support for the accidental loss of repetitive elements in the *Isaac* conjunct. The 1837 edition accidentally lost the preposition *of*, giving “the God of Abraham and Isaac and of Jacob”:

Mosiah 23:23

yea even the God of Abraham
and [*of* 1APS | BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRT] Isaac and of Jacob

All these examples, including the 1837 loss of *of* in Mosiah 23:23, imply that the original text in 1 Nephi 19:10 may have read “the God of Abraham and **the God** of Isaac and the God of Jacob” and that the first repetition of *of God* was accidentally dropped when Oliver Cowdery took down Joseph Smith’s dictation. In fact, for this conjunct the original manuscript (lines 25–26 of page 39) actually reads line for line as follows:

... yea the God of Abraham & of
Isaac & the God of <Isa> Jacob ...

After he had written “& of Isaac &”, Oliver started to write “the God of Isaac”. He crossed out that part of *Isaac* which he had already written (that is, *Isa*), then wrote *Jacob* inline immediately after. This corrected error suggests that Joseph actually dictated “the God of Abraham and the God of Isaac and the God of Jacob” and that Oliver accidentally dropped the first repetition of *the God*. The error would have occurred at the end of the line, a common place where errors in writing down dictation can occur.

There is one other case in the Book of Mormon that violates the normal pattern of repetition:

Helaman 3:30

to sit down **with** Abraham and Isaac and **with** Jacob
and **with** all our holy fathers
to go no more out

One could argue here that the repetitive element (namely, the preposition *with*) has been accidentally dropped, just like the preposition *of* in Mosiah 23:23. Unfortunately, the original manuscript is not extant for Helaman 3:30.

It may be that 1 Nephi 19:10 and Helaman 3:30 originally had the repetitive element before *Isaac*, but ultimately the evidence for emending the text in these two cases is not especially strong. (The scribal deletion of *Isa* in \mathcal{C} makes the argument somewhat stronger for 1 Nephi 19:10.) In both cases, the text is understandable even with the repetitive elements missing. Thus the most conservative decision would be to rely in each case on the earliest textual sources to determine the reading.

Summary: Based on the earliest textual sources, maintain the inconsistently repetitive conjuncts in 1 Nephi 19:10 (“the God of Abraham and of Isaac and the God of Jacob”) and in Helaman 3:30 (“with Abraham and Isaac and with Jacob and with all our holy fathers”); these two examples could well involve accidental omissions of repetitive elements, but we cannot be sure.

■ 1 Nephi 19:10

yea the God of Abraham and of Isaac and the God of Jacob **yieldeth himself**
according to the words of the angel
as a man into the hands of wicked men

One wonders here whether the adverbial *up* shouldn't follow the verb phrase "yieldeth himself". Elsewhere the text consistently uses *up* when anyone "yields something into someone's hands":

Mosiah 7:21

and having yielded **up** into his hands the possessions of a part of the land

Alma 57:12

therefore they yielded **up** the city into our hands

Alma 62:43

and Moroni yielded **up** the command of his armies into the hands of his son

Helaman 1:32

and the Lamanites did yield themselves [*up* 0] 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST]
 into the hands of the Nephites

The last example provides clear evidence for Oliver Cowdery accidentally omitting the adverbial *up* (in this case, when he copied from \mathcal{O} into \mathcal{P}). Thus it is very possible that 1 Nephi 19:10 may have also involved the loss of the *up*, especially since both examples involve a reflexive pronoun as the direct object:

1 Nephi 19:10

yieldeth himself . . .
into the hands of wicked men

Helaman 1:32

did **yield themselves up**
into the hands of the Nephites

In addition to these examples involving "into someone's hands", we more generally get the adverb *up* whenever the transitive verb *yield* specifically refers to surrendering something (including one's self):

Mosiah 2:26	to yield up this mortal frame
Mosiah 9:10	he yielded up the land
Alma 52:25	all those who would not yield up their weapons of war
Helaman 5:4	he yielded up the judgment seat
Helaman 5:52	they did yield up unto the Nephites the lands of their possession
Helaman 14:21	he shall yield up the ghost
Helaman 14:25	and many graves . . . shall yield up many of their dead
3 Nephi 3:6	that ye would yield up unto this my people your cities your lands and your possessions
3 Nephi 3:7	yield yourselves up unto us
3 Nephi 4:16	to yield themselves up according to their wishes
3 Nephi 4:27	which did yield themselves up prisoners unto the Nephites

In the example from 3 Nephi 4:16, the printer's manuscript is missing the *up*, but the 1830 edition has it. In this example, Oliver Cowdery apparently dropped the *up* when copying from \mathcal{O} to \mathcal{P} , while the 1830 typesetter (also copying from \mathcal{O} here in 3 Nephi) retained it. This analysis provides one more example where Oliver omitted the *up* when copying from \mathcal{O} to \mathcal{P} . (See 3 Nephi 4:16 for discussion.)

When the transitive verb *yield* has the figurative sense of voluntarily yielding to someone else's power, no *up* occurs. In all these instances the implication is one of willingness and agreement to submit, even to be of the same mind:

Alma 5:20	you have yielded yourselves to become subjects to the devil
Alma 10:25	why will ye yield yourselves unto him that he may have power over you
Helaman 3:35	because of their yielding their hearts unto God
Helaman 16:21	if we will yield ourselves unto them all the days of our lives
3 Nephi 7:5	they did yield themselves unto the power of Satan

Of course, with regard to 1 Nephi 19:10, Jesus wasn't of the same mind as those who had him arrested, but it is true that he did submit and allowed himself to be arrested. Under such an interpretation, somewhat different from the five examples listed just above, the figurative sense of surrendering could be applied to 1 Nephi 19:10. Thus it may not be absolutely necessary that *up* occur in this passage.

David Calabro has suggested (personal communication) that we could examine this problem from a syntactic point of view. If we consider just the cases where *yield* takes a reflexive pronoun as the direct object, the usage is evenly divided between *up* and no *up* (excluding, of course, the case in 1 Nephi 19:10):

Alma 5:20	you have yielded yourselves to become subjects to the devil
Alma 10:25	why will ye yield yourselves unto him
Helaman 1:32	and the Lamanites did yield themselves up into the hands of the Nephites
Helaman 16:21	if we will yield ourselves unto them all the days of our lives
3 Nephi 3:7	yield yourselves up unto us
3 Nephi 4:16	to yield themselves up according to their wishes
3 Nephi 4:27	which did yield themselves up prisoners unto the Nephites
3 Nephi 7:5	they did yield themselves unto the power of Satan

This equivalence in syntactic usage argues against the need to emend the text in 1 Nephi 19:10.

If this passage in 1 Nephi 19:10 is to be emended, then there is the question of where the *up* should go: before or after the parenthetical phrase "according to the words of the angel", or even after the phrase "as a man"? We have three possible emendations:

- (1) yieldeth himself **up** according to the words of the angel
as a man into the hands of wicked men
- (2) yieldeth himself according to the words of the angel
up as a man into the hands of wicked men

- (3) yieldeth himself according to the words of the angel
as a man **up** into the hands of wicked men

The last two possibilities seem particularly awkward. The example from 3 Nephi 4:16 (“to yield themselves **up** according to their wishes”) supports placing the *up* right after *himself* in 1 Nephi 19:10—that is, before the parenthetical phrase “according to the words of the angel”. If this passage is to be emended, the *up* should probably be placed right after *himself* (the first case listed above).

Given the complexity of the proposed emendation in 1 Nephi 19:10, it is probably safest to keep the text as it is. On the one hand, we have evidence that Oliver Cowdery sometimes omitted the *up* when it should occur with *yield*. Semantically, 1 Nephi 19:10 refers to Jesus surrendering himself to the Jewish authorities, where a sense of submission is possible (which would not require the *up*).

Summary: It is difficult to determine whether 1 Nephi 19:10 should be emended to read “yieldeth himself up”; since the current text without the adverb *up* will work, it is perhaps best to leave the reading of the original manuscript unchanged, even though the lack of *up* could easily be due to scribal error.

■ 1 Nephi 19:10

to be lifted up according to the words of Zenock

Here in 1 Nephi 19:10 all the textual sources (including \mathcal{O} , which is extant here) read *Zenock*. But when we consider the textual variation for all five spellings of this name, we get considerable variation between *Zenock* and *Zenoch*:

1 Nephi 19:10	[<i>Zenock</i> 01ABCDEF GHIJKLMNOPQRST]
Alma 33:15	[<i>Zenock</i> > NULL 0 1ABCDEF GHIJKLMNOPQRST] [<i>Zenoch</i> 0 <i>Zenock</i> 1ABCDEF GHIJKLMNOPQRST]
Alma 34:7	[<i>Zenoch</i> 0ILMNOQ <i>Zenock</i> 1ABCDEF GHIJKPRST]
Helaman 8:20	[<i>Zenock</i> / <i>Zenoch</i> 1 <i>Zenoch</i> ABDE <i>Zenock</i> CGHIJKLMNOPQRST <i>Zenoch</i> > <i>Zenock</i> F]
3 Nephi 10:16	[<i>Zenock</i> 1ABCDEF GHIJKLMNOPQRST]

In the example from Alma 33:15, Oliver Cowdery initially wrote *Zenock*, then crossed out the whole name and rewrote it inline as *Zenoch* (that is, immediately after the crossed-out *Zenock*).

If we place the spellings of the name in the probable order of their dictation (that is, with the translation of the small plates coming last for the original manuscript), we get the following spelling variation in the earliest textual sources:

□ *order in the original manuscript*

Alma 33:15	<i>Zenock</i> > <i>Zenoch</i>
Alma 34:7	<i>Zenoch</i>
Helaman 8:20	<not extant>
3 Nephi 10:16	<not extant>
1 Nephi 19:10	<i>Zenock</i>

□ *order in the printer's manuscript and the 1830 edition*

	℘	1830
1 Nephi 19:10	Zenock	Zenock
Alma 33:15	Zenock	Zenock
Alma 34:7	Zenock	Zenock
Helaman 8:20	Zenoc[k h]	Zenoch
3 Nephi 10:16	Zenock	Zenock

In other words, the first occurrence of this name in ℘ was apparently in Alma 33:15, where Oliver Cowdery initially wrote *Zenoch* as *Zenock* (that is, ending in *-ck*). This first spelling was a phonetic one. Most probably, Joseph Smith spelled out the name for Oliver, who then corrected his spelling by crossing out all of *Zenock* and writing *Zenoch* inline, which means that the correction was an immediate one. Soon thereafter, in Alma 34:7, Oliver met the name a second time and spelled it correctly in ℘ as *Zenoch*.

Yet after these two first occurrences in ℘ of the name *Zenoch*, Oliver Cowdery eventually reverted to his original phonetic misspelling of the name as *Zenock*. In Helaman 8:20, ℘ is not extant, so we can't be sure how Oliver spelled it there. But in 3 Nephi 10:16, where both the printer's manuscript and the 1830 edition are firsthand copies of ℘, they both read *Zenock*, which suggests that ℘ itself read *Zenock* in 3 Nephi 10:16. This misspelling continued when Oliver wrote down the text in ℘ for 1 Nephi 19:10, which was apparently dictated after the book of Moroni was completed.

When Oliver Cowdery came to copying all these examples from ℘ into ℙ, he consistently misspelled the name as *Zenock*. Nonetheless, in one case (Helaman 8:20), his word-final *k* in ℙ almost looks like an *h*, which led the 1830 typesetter to accidentally spell this one occurrence as *Zenoch*. But all the other occurrences are incorrectly spelled as *Zenock* in the 1830 edition.

The spelling with *-ch* is undoubtedly correct. First of all, the name is spelled just like the biblical name *Enoch*; except for the initial *z* of *Zenoch*, both names are identical. In fact, no biblical name or any other Book of Mormon name ends in the English spelling *-ck*, but there are dozens of biblical names ending in *-c*, *-k*, and *-ch* (such as *Isaac*, *Melchizedek*, and *Melech*), plus a number of Book of Mormon names (*Amulek*, *Melek*, *Mulek*, and *Muloch*).

For two of the spellings for this name, *Zenoch* has alternated with *Zenock* several times in the publishing history of the text:

Alma 34:7 (changed to *Zenoch* in 1879, then back to *Zenock* in 1888 and 1920)
 [*Zenoch* 0ILMNOQ | *Zenock* 1ABCDEFGHJKPRST]

Helaman 8:20 (changed to *Zenock* in 1840 and 1852^c)
 [*Zenock* / *Zenoch* 1 | *Zenoch* ABDE | *Zenock* CGHIJKLMNOPQRST |
Zenoch > *Zenock* F]

For the three other spellings, the incorrect *Zenock* has persisted in all the printed editions.

Ultimately the incorrect *Zenock* has completely replaced the correct *Zenoch* within the text proper. But one surprising finding is that the “Pronouncing Vocabulary” at the end of the 1920

edition and the “Pronouncing Guide” at the end of the 1981 edition list the name as *Zenoch*, not *Zenock* (the consistent spelling in those two LDS editions).

Summary: Restore the correct spelling *Zenoch* everywhere it occurs in the text (1 Nephi 19:10, Alma 33:15, Alma 34:7, Helaman 8:20, and 3 Nephi 10:16); *Zenoch* is spelled like *Enoch*.

■ 1 Nephi 19:10

yea the God of Abraham and of Isaac and the God of Jacob yieldeth himself

- (1) *according to the words of the angel
as a man into the hands of wicked men*

to be lifted up

- (2) *according to the words of Zenoch*

and to be crucified

- (3) *according to the words of Neum*

and to be buried in a sepulchre

[& 0|& >js NULL 1|and A| BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]

- (4) *according to the words of Zenos
which he spake concerning the three days of darkness
which should be a sign given of his death unto them who should inhabit the isles of the sea
more especially given unto them which are of the house of Israel*

When compared with the rest of the passage, the *and* in front of the fourth “according to the words of X” seems intrusive; thus Joseph Smith removed this extra *and* in his editing for the 1837 edition. If the *and* is maintained, the rest of the verse becomes a sentence fragment and the infinitive phrase “and to be buried in a sepulchre” is not directly assigned to a prophetic source, unlike the three preceding examples in the passage.

The importance of Zenos’s prophesying of Christ’s burial in a sepulchre is that during the period covering three days (when Christ’s body would be in the tomb), great destruction would visit the Nephites and the Lamanites. Otherwise, a prophecy about being buried in a sepulchre would not be particularly noteworthy. Thus it does seem inappropriate to have the conjunction *and* separate off the text referring to “the three days of darkness” from the preceding “to be buried in a sepulchre”.

It is possible that the *and* was accidentally inserted as Oliver Cowdery took down Joseph Smith’s dictation, especially since he had just written down two *and*’s (“and to be crucified . . . and to be buried in a sepulchre”). In the following example from the book of Alma, we have a clear case of this tendency for Oliver to accidentally insert an extra *and* in the original manuscript. In this instance, the error was obvious, and thus Oliver immediately deleted the extra *and*:

Alma 55:4

and now it came to pass

[& > NULL 0| 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST]

that when Moroni had said these words

he caused that a search should be made among his men

The probable source for Oliver accidentally writing the & after “and now it came to pass” was the preceding *and*.

As an aside, we should note that in this one verse (1 Nephi 19:10), Oliver Cowdery may have made as many as three scribal errors as he wrote down Joseph Smith’s dictation in the original manuscript: (1) the skipping of *the God* in “and the God of Isaac”, (2) the omission of the word *up* from “yieldeth himself up”, and (3) the addition of an extra *and* before “according to the words of Zenos”.

Summary: Accept Joseph Smith’s emendation of 1 Nephi 19:10 (namely, his removal of the conjunction *and* after *sepulchre*) as the probable reading of the original text; such an emendation maintains the parallelism of the text, prevents a following sentence fragment, and connects the period of time in the sepulchre with Zenos’s prophecy about the three days of darkness.

■ 1 Nephi 19:11

*the Lord God surely shall visit all the house of Israel at that day
some with his voice because of their righteousness unto their great joy and salvation
and others with the thunderings and the lightnings of his power
by [tempest 01ABCDGHKPRST | tempests EFIJLMNOQ] by fire and by smoke and vapor of darkness
and by the opening of the earth and by mountains which shall be carried up*

The 1849 LDS edition accidentally replaced the singular *tempest* with the plural, but the singular was restored in the 1920 edition, probably by reference to one of the earlier editions. The prepositional phrase “by tempest” is associated with two following *by*-phrases, both of which have singular nouns (*fire*, *smoke*, and *vapor*). But the preceding *with*-phrase has plurals (*thunderings* and *lightnings*), which undoubtedly led to the 1849 typo.

We find that in conjuncts the word *tempest* agrees in number (singular or plural) with the nearest nouns, as in the following examples involving prepositions:

2 Nephi 6:15	both by fire and by tempest
2 Nephi 27:2	and with storm and tempest
3 Nephi 8:12	because of the tempests and the whirlwinds and the thunderings and the lightnings
3 Nephi 8:17	because of the tempests and the thunderings and the lightnings
3 Nephi 10:14	and by tempests and by whirlwinds

The two examples in 3 Nephi 8 actually involve early textual variation between *tempest* and *tempests*, but in each case the evidence supports the plural. (See the discussion for those two verses.) Here in 1 Nephi 19:11 there is no difficulty in determining the original text since the plural was accidentally introduced considerably later in the printed editions.

Summary: Based on the earliest textual sources, maintain the singular *tempest* in 1 Nephi 19:11; the following singulars in “by fire and by smoke and vapor of darkness” support the singular *tempest*.

■ 1 Nephi 19:13

*and as for they which are at Jerusalem
saith the prophet
[they 0FIJLMNOQRST | 1ABCDEFGHIKP] shall be scourged by all people
saith the prophet
because they crucified the God of Israel and turned their hearts aside*

In this passage, Oliver Cowdery accidentally dropped the subject pronoun *they* when he copied the text from Œ into Ɔ. The RLDS text has retained this ungrammatical reading. For the 1852 LDS edition, the *they* was added, but simply because it was needed and not by reference to Œ (which at the time was still in the cornerstone of the Nauvoo House). The LDS text has maintained the subject pronoun.

Summary: In accord with the reading of Œ, the subject pronoun *they* should be maintained in 1 Nephi 19:13.

■ 1 Nephi 19:13

*and as for they which are at Jerusalem
saith the prophet
they shall be scourged by all people
[saith the prophet 0A | saith the Prophet >js NULL 1 | BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
because they crucified the God of Israel and turned their hearts aside*

In his editing for the 1837 edition, Joseph Smith removed this example of “saith the prophet” since it had already occurred in the same sentence. Such redundancies are often editorially removed from the text, even though the original repetition is not particularly bothersome. In fact, throughout this portion of the text, the phrase “saith the prophet” is found in almost every verse (six times from verses 12 through 17), although it is never otherwise repeated within the same sentence. The critical text will, of course, maintain such redundancies.

Summary: Restore the repeated “saith the prophet” in 1 Nephi 19:13 since it appears to be intentional.

■ 1 Nephi 19:13

*and as for they which are at Jerusalem
saith the prophet
they shall be scourged by all people
saith the prophet
because they crucified the God of Israel and turned their hearts aside
rejecting signs and wonders
and [01ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPS | the RT] power and glory of the God of Israel*

The 1920 LDS edition added the definite article *the* before *power* since “power and glory” are followed by a prepositional phrase “of the God of Israel”. English speakers expect the definite article

in such a construction. We can accept “rejecting signs of the God of Israel” and “rejecting wonders of the God of Israel” since here we are dealing with plural nouns. But when the nouns are singular, the resulting “rejecting power of the God of Israel” and “rejecting glory of the God of Israel” sound strange without the definite article before *power* (or before *glory*, when it stands alone).

Nonetheless, the added *the* does create something of an anomaly by introducing a *the* in the middle of a conjoined list. When we look at other conjoined lists involving *power* and *glory*, we find that the determiner is usually missing. If the determiner is repeated, it is repeated before each conjoined noun. If the determiner occurs once, it occurs only at the beginning of a list of conjuncts:

1 Nephi 11:28

he went forth ministering unto the people in power and great glory

1 Nephi 22:24

and the Holy One of Israel must reign
in dominion and might and power and great glory

2 Nephi 6:14

wherefore he will manifest himself unto them in power and great glory

2 Nephi 33:11

for Christ will shew unto you with power and great glory
that they are his words

Alma 5:50 (*his* only at the beginning of a list)

yea the Son of God cometh in his glory
in **his** might majesty power and dominion

Alma 12:15 (*his* only at the beginning of a list)

we must come forth and stand before him
in his glory and in his power
and in **his** might majesty and dominion

3 Nephi 13:13 (*the* before each conjoined noun, as in Matthew 6:13)

for thine is **the** kingdom and **the** power and **the** glory forever

Moroni 7:35

and God will shew unto you with power and great glory at the last day
that they are true

The two examples from Alma suggest another possible revision for 1 Nephi 19:13—namely, to introduce the definite article *the* right after *rejecting* so that the text would have the *the* only at the beginning of the list: “rejecting **the** signs and wonders and power and glory of the God of Israel”.

The critical text will reject the intrusive *the* added in the 1920 LDS edition, even though this *the* is what English readers expect. Adding the definite article at the front of the list is a more plausible emendation, as noted above. It is, of course, possible that Oliver Cowdery could have missed an initial *the* as he was copying down Joseph Smith’s dictation. However, other examples involving lists with *power* and *glory* do show that conjuncts of this type agree with respect to their determiners. There are no determiners throughout this long conjunct in 1 Nephi 19:13, just

like in 1 Nephi 22:24. On the other hand, the example in 1 Nephi 22:24 is not postmodified by a prepositional phrase like “of the God of Israel”.

Summary: Despite its awkwardness, maintain the reading of the earliest textual sources in 1 Nephi 19:13 (without the definite article *the* before either *signs* or *power*), although it is possible that the original text had a *the* before *signs* (the first conjunct).

■ 1 Nephi 19:13–14

*and as for they which are at Jerusalem
saith the prophet
they shall be scourged by all people
saith the prophet
because they [crucified 0 | Crucify 1 | crucify ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] the God of Israel
and [turned 0A | turned >js turn 1 | turn BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] their hearts aside
rejecting signs and wonders and power and glory of the God of Israel
and because they [have turned 0 | turned >js turn 1 | turned A | turn BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
their hearts aside
saith the prophet
and have despised the Holy One of Israel
they shall wander in the flesh*

Ultimately the text in this passage has undergone considerable shifting towards the present tense. The transition began when Oliver Cowdery accidentally changed the past-tense *crucified* to *crucify* when he copied the text from \mathfrak{O} to \mathfrak{P} . Then Joseph Smith, in his editing for the 1837 edition, changed the conjoined past-tense verb form *turned* to *turn* (thus producing “and turn their hearts aside”). Later, in the next verse, while copying from \mathfrak{O} to \mathfrak{P} , Oliver also accidentally dropped the present perfective *have* from “because they have turned their hearts aside”. Thus in his editing for the 1837 edition, Joseph was again confronted with the past-tense form *turned*, which he once more edited to the present-tense *turn*. Instead, the original *have*, if it had been restored, would have brought back the original parallelism in verse 14 between the two perfective verb phrases *have turned* and *have despised*. But Joseph did not examine \mathfrak{O} in his editing for the 1837 edition.

The original past-tense forms in verse 13 are acceptable because by the time the people of Jerusalem “shall be scourged by all people”, they will have already “crucified the God of Israel and turned their hearts aside”. The main reason Joseph Smith edited the two occurrences of the past-tense form *turned* was because they conflicted with the preceding present-tense *crucify*, which was an accident in the first place.

Summary: Restore in 1 Nephi 19:13–14 the past-tense *crucified* and *turned* as well as the present perfect *have turned*, the readings of the original manuscript.

■ 1 Nephi 19:16

yea then will he remember the isles of the sea

[*yea* 01ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOQRT | K | *Yea* PS]

and all the people which are of the house of Israel will I gather in

The 1892 RLDS edition removed the second *yea*, perhaps because the previous clause began with a *yea*. The following RLDS edition (in 1908) restored the *yea*, undoubtedly because the word is in the printer’s manuscript (which was used to edit the text for the 1908 RLDS edition). The phrases “*yea then*” and “*yea and*” are found frequently in the text, especially the second one (which was the one that was altered here in 1 Nephi 19:16).

Summary: Maintain in 1 Nephi 19:16 the case of *yea and* that was changed to *and* in the 1892 RLDS edition.

■ 1 Nephi 19:16

yea and all the people which are of the house of Israel

will I gather in—saith the Lord—

according to the words of the

[*prophets* >+ *prophet* 0 | *Prophets* >% *Prophet* 1 | *Prophet* A | *prophet* BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]

[*Zenos* > NULL >% *Zenos* 0 | *Zenos* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOQRST]

from the four quarters of the earth

It appears that Oliver Cowdery first wrote “the prophets Zenos” in the original manuscript and then did not correct it until months later when he was copying from \mathcal{O} into \mathcal{P} . The plural *s* was probably the result of Oliver misinterpreting Joseph Smith’s dictation of “the words of the prophet Zenos”. Oliver was probably expecting “the words of the prophets”, which occurs 14 times in the Book of Mormon. It would have been very difficult to hear the difference between “the prophet Zenos” and “the prophets Zenos”, so it would have been hard to catch this error when Oliver read back the text to Joseph. This kind of *s* addition sometimes occurs when the following word begins with a sibilant sound (such as /s/, /z/, or /ʒ/). Oliver made this same kind of mistake in Alma 41:14 when he took down Joseph’s dictation for “my son see” as “my sons see” (see the discussion under Alma 41:14).

When Oliver Cowdery copied the text for this passage from \mathcal{O} into \mathcal{P} , he initially wrote “the Prophets Zenos” in the printer’s manuscript. Realizing that the word *prophet* should be in the singular, he erased the *s* in the printer’s manuscript, then apparently turned to correct \mathcal{O} so that it would agree with \mathcal{P} . But for some reason he also crossed out *Zenos*, as if he were correcting \mathcal{O} to read “according to the words of the prophets”, a distinct possibility but wrong in this case. Instead of rewriting the name *Zenos*, Oliver tried to erase the crossout lines, but only at the beginning of the name *Zenos*. He realized he had correctly copied the name into \mathcal{P} , so it was unnecessary to fully correct \mathcal{O} . In the end, he crossed out the plural *s* of *prophets* in \mathcal{O} with a heavier ink flow. (He probably dipped his pen after having tried to erase the crossing out of *Zenos*.)

If Oliver Cowdery had crossed out *Zenos* originally when Joseph Smith was dictating the manuscript, he probably wouldn't have accidentally written it a second time when producing the printer's manuscript. It seems very likely that Joseph Smith read off the name *Zenos*; adding *Zenos* by accident seems highly unlikely since there is no nearby occurrence of this (or any other) prophet's name. (The name *Zenos* last occurred in verse 12, on the previous manuscript page of \mathcal{O} .) Moreover, nowhere else in either manuscript does Oliver Cowdery (or any other scribe) accidentally add a name after writing the word *prophet*.

Whenever we find the phrase "the words of the prophet" in the text (that is, with the singular *prophet*), the text does not typically add the name after the word *prophet*. If the name X occurs, we usually just get "the words of X", such as "the words of Zenoch", "the words of Neum", and "the words of Zenos", all found earlier in verse 10 of this chapter (and eight other examples elsewhere in the text). Even so, there are a couple of examples where we have "the words of the prophet X", just as in 1 Nephi 19:16:

Jacob 5:1

do ye not remember to have read the words of the prophet Zenos

3 Nephi 16:17

and then the words of the prophet Isaiah shall be fulfilled

Thus all the evidence suggests that the correct reading ("according to the words of the prophet Zenos") was ultimately transmitted to \mathcal{P} .

Summary: Maintain the current reading in 1 Nephi 19:16, which refers to "the words of the prophet Zenos"; the reading in \mathcal{O} remains problematic because *Zenos* appears to be partially crossed out, but was nonetheless transmitted correctly to \mathcal{P} .

■ 1 Nephi 19:20–21

*for behold I have workings in the spirit which doth weary me
even that all my joints are weak for they which are at Jerusalem
for had not the Lord been merciful to shew unto me concerning them
even as he had prophets of old*

[0A | NULL >js I should have perished also 1 |

I should have perished also BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]

[for 0A | for >js NULL 1 | and BCDEFGHK | And IJKLMNOPQRST]

he surely did shew unto prophets of old all things concerning them

The original Book of Mormon text for this passage contains a sentence fragment:

for had not the Lord been merciful to shew unto me concerning them . . .
for he surely did shew unto prophets of old all things concerning them

In his editing for the 1837 edition, Joseph Smith attempted to eliminate this sentence fragment. He first crossed out the last *for* and started to write something slightly above the line, which is not fully legible. It could be the pronoun *I* (presumably, a first attempt at writing "I should have

perished also”). It may also be some kind of defective ampersand. In any event, Joseph crossed the word out and higher up supralinearly inserted the main clause “I should have perished also”. But deleting the conjunction *for* made an awkward transition to the following independent clause (“he surely did shew unto prophets of old all things concerning them”); the 1837 edition ended up fixing the transition by inserting *and* as the connector. Clearly *and* works better than *for*, given that the main clause “I should have perished also” has been inserted between “even as he had prophets of old” and “he surely did shew unto prophets of old”.

Joseph Smith’s inserted main clause (“I should have perished also”) seems to be based on the language found a little later in the text, at the beginning of the next book:

2 Nephi 1:4
 and had we remained in Jerusalem
 we should also have perished

Notice the initial use of the inverted *had*-clause as a conditional clause, which is then followed by virtually the same language as in the edited text for 1 Nephi 19:20. The idea that seeing a vision prevented someone from perishing (in this case, Lehi) is also found earlier in the text:

1 Nephi 5:4
 I know that I am a visionary man
 for if I had not seen the things of God in a vision
 I should not have known the goodness of God
 but had tarried at Jerusalem
 and had perished with my brethren

Thus Joseph Smith’s additional clause in 1 Nephi 19:20 seems appropriate. And one might go so far to suggest that the earliest textual source (the original manuscript) is indeed in error and that here the original text was re-revealed to Joseph. Although possible, this suggestion goes against all the other (very human) editing Joseph Smith did for the 1837 edition.

Actually, there is some evidence that the original language in 1 Nephi 19:20 represents a Hebraism rather than an accidental sentence fragment. Biblical Hebrew has examples of a conditional clause standing alone as the equivalent of a negative imperative or emphatic declarative clause (usually used for oaths). For instance, in the following passage from 2 Kings in the Hebrew Bible, I place the reading of the King James Bible alongside a literal translation of the Hebrew:

□ 2 Kings 2:4

KING JAMES BIBLE	LITERAL HEBREW
and he said	and he said
as the LORD liveth	the life of YHWH
and as thy soul liveth	and the life of thy soul
I will not leave thee	if I leave thee

One interesting example (pointed out by David Calabro, personal communication) involves the Hebrew equivalent of “had not I”, which is just like the “had not the Lord” of 1 Nephi 19:20:

□ Psalm 27:13

KING JAMES BIBLE

I had fainted

unless I had believed

to see the goodness of the LORD

in the land of the living

LITERAL HEBREW

had not I believed

to see in the goodness of YHWH

in the land of the living

The King James Bible supplied the main clause “I had fainted” at the beginning of this verse in order to avoid a stranded conditional clause. These three words are set in italics in order to show that they are not in the original Hebrew. Similarly, Joseph Smith (in his editing for the 1837 edition) supplied the main clause “I should have perished also” at the end of 1 Nephi 19:20.

Other examples of this Hebraism are found in the Greek of the New Testament. In the following two examples, I give the reading of the King James Bible set alongside a literal translation of the Greek:

□ Mark 8:12

KING JAMES BIBLE

verily I say unto you

there shall no sign be given

unto this generation

LITERAL GREEK

truly I say to you

if a sign be given

to this generation

□ Hebrews 3:11

KING JAMES BIBLE

so I swear in my wrath

they shall not enter into my rest

LITERAL GREEK

as I swore in my anger

if they shall enter into my rest

Blass and Debrunner state that this use of *if*-clauses “in oaths and asseverations is a strong Hebraism” that means ‘certainly not’. See number (4) under paragraph 372 on page 189 of F. Blass and A. Debrunner, *A Greek Grammar of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1961).

Given this pattern, we may “translate” the original text of 1 Nephi 19:20–21 as follows by replacing the conditional clause with a declarative main clause and by reversing the polarity (that is, by removing the negative *not*):

1 Nephi 19:20–21 (equivalent meaning)

for behold I have workings in the spirit which doth weary me

even that all my joints are weak for they which are at Jerusalem

for **the Lord had been merciful** to shew unto me concerning them

even as he had prophets of old

for he surely did shew unto prophets of old all things concerning them

Under this interpretation, there is clearly no need in the critical text for the intervening “I should have perished also”.

Another example of this literal Hebraism in the original text of the Book of Mormon occurs when Alma threatens Korihor:

Alma 30:39 (original text)

now Alma saith unto him
if ye deny again that there is a God and also deny the Christ
for behold I say unto you
I know there is a God and also that Christ shall come

Joseph Smith removed this oath-like Hebraistic *if*-clause by changing the *if*-clause to a yes-no question (“will ye deny again that there is a God and also deny the Christ”), although even the question form can be interpreted as a threat. See Alma 30:39 for further discussion. And for a complete discussion of this particular Hebraism, see emphatic conditional clauses under HEBRAISMS in volume 3.

Stan Larson has suggested that the passage in 1 Nephi 19:20–21 could be readily dealt with by treating the *had*-clause as a yes-no rhetorical question. A question mark could be placed at the end of the whole sentence: “for had not the Lord been merciful to shew unto me concerning them even as he had prophets of old?” (See page 49 of Stan Larson, “Early Book of Mormon Texts: Textual Changes to the Book of Mormon in 1837 and 1840”, *Sunstone* 1/4 [Fall 1976], 44–55.)

Usage elsewhere in the text, however, argues for treating *had* as the beginning of a conditional clause rather than a yes-no question. There are 12 occurrences of *had*-conditional clauses but none as a yes-no question:

2 Nephi 1:4

and **had** we remained in Jerusalem
we should also have perished

Mosiah 21:23

and **had** they been the priests of Noah
he would have caused that they should be put to death

Alma 50:25

there would also have been peace among the people of Nephi
had it not been for a contention which took place among them

Alma 53:11

yea they would have suffered themselves to have fallen
into the hands of their brethren
had it not been for the pity and the exceeding love
which Ammon and his brethren had had for them

Alma 55:18

but **had** they awoke the Lamanites
—behold they were drunken—
and the Nephites could have slain them

Alma 56:19

for **had** they come upon us in this our weakness
they might have perhaps destroyed our little army

Alma 56:50

and **had** I not returned with my two thousand
they would have obtained their purpose

Alma 60:16 (three occurrences)

yea **had** it not been for the war which brake out among ourselves . . .
yea **had** it not been for the desire of power and authority
which those kingmen had over us
had they been true to the cause of our freedom and united with us
and gone forth against our enemies . . .
we should have dispersed our enemies

Helaman 4:11

now this great loss of the Nephites and the great slaughter
which was among them
would not have happened
had it not been for their wickedness . . .

Helaman 15:15

for behold **had** the mighty works been shewn unto them
which have been shewn unto you
yea unto them which have dwindled in unbelief
because of the traditions of their fathers
ye can see of yourselves that they never would again have dwindled in unbelief

Note also that two examples (Alma 56:19 and Helaman 15:15) begin with a connective *for* just like in 1 Nephi 19:20. Thus Joseph Smith’s interpretation of the *had*-clause as a conditional one is consistent with usage elsewhere in the text.

Summary: Despite its difficulty for English speakers, the critical text will restore the original Hebraistic conditional clause in 1 Nephi 19:20 (that is, without the added main clause “I should have perished also”); the following connective *for* will also be restored.

■ 1 Nephi 19:20–21

*for had not the Lord been merciful to shew unto me concerning them
even as he had prophets of old
for he surely did shew unto [01 | the ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] prophets of old
all things concerning them*

The 1830 typesetter added the definite article *the* before “prophets of old”. The same phrase (that is, without the *the*) was first used in the preceding verse, which may have led the typesetter to view the second occurrence of the phrase as an already identified subject; thus he could have decided that the definite article was necessary. (In English, we typically use the definite article *the* to refer to something that has already been identified.)

There are two other places in the text that have “prophets of old”, one with and one without the definite article:

1 Nephi 1:20

and when the Jews heard these things they were angry with him
yea even as with **the** prophets of old
whom they had cast out and stoned and slain

Jacob 4:13

but behold we are not witnesses alone in these things
for God also spake them unto prophets of old

We thus let the earliest textual sources determine whether *the* should precede “prophets of old”. There is nothing inappropriate about having simply “prophets of old” both times in 1 Nephi 19:20–21.

Summary: Remove the definite article *the* that the 1830 typesetter added before “prophets of old” in 1 Nephi 19:21.

■ 1 Nephi 19:23

and I did read many things unto them

which were [NULL >- *written* 0 | NULL >+ *writhen* 1 | *written* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]

in the [Books 0 | Book 1A | *book* BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRS | *books* T] *of Moses*

The original manuscript barely shows a supralinear insertion after the verb *were*. The insert mark is fairly clear in the actual manuscript (but not as visible in the ultraviolet photographs of the original manuscript). The supralinear word is not fully readable but appears to be *written*. This insertion was probably done later and with very weak ink flow, which suggests that it is a secondary change. It is possible that the word *written* was introduced into the text when Oliver Cowdery copied the text from \mathcal{O} into \mathcal{P} . As in \mathcal{O} , this extra word (miswritten as *writhen*) was also supralinearly inserted in \mathcal{P} ; but unlike in \mathcal{O} , it was written with heavier ink flow.

Probably because his attention was drawn to whether *written* should be added to the text, Oliver Cowdery accidentally changed the plural *books* to *book* as he copied from \mathcal{O} to \mathcal{P} . The original text seems to have read “which were in the books of Moses”, but this ended up being copied into \mathcal{P} as “which were written in the book of Moses”. The 1981 LDS edition restored the plural *books*, but the intrusive *written* has been maintained in all editions. The plural is, of course, appropriate since there are five books of Moses, not one: namely, Genesis, Exodus, Leviticus, Numbers, and Deuteronomy, which are collectively referred to as the Torah (meaning, ‘the law’). The Book of Mormon explicitly states that the plates of brass contained “the five books of Moses”:

1 Nephi 5:11

and he beheld that they did contain the five books of Moses

Thus “the books of Moses” is correct in 1 Nephi 19:23.

Elsewhere in the Book of Mormon there are a number of occurrences involving the word *book* (either singular *book* or plural *books*) for which the past participle *written* could theoretically be removed from a passive verb phrase without fundamentally changing the basic sense:

1 Nephi 14:23	they are written in the book
Mosiah 1:8	which are not written in this book
Alma 5:58	the names of the righteous shall be written in the book of life
Alma 9:34	a part of his words are written in this book
Alma 13:31	which are not written in this book
3 Nephi 5:8	they cannot all be written in this book
3 Nephi 7:17	they are not written in this book
3 Nephi 27:26	out of the books which shall be written shall the world be judged
4 Nephi 1:21	it was also written in the book of Nephi

In these examples, the word *written* is expected but not crucially necessary. Undoubtedly this expectation served as the motivation for later inserting *written* in 1 Nephi 19:23. Nor is there any evidence that the scribes (in the manuscripts) or the typesetters (in the editions) have ever had difficulty keeping *written* in the text. In other words, there has been no tendency to accidentally delete occurrences of *written* in those cases where it could have naturally occurred. Thus the lack of *written* originally in 1 Nephi 19:23 seems to be intentional rather than due to scribal or dictation error.

In support of the original reading in 1 Nephi 19:23, there is one example in the text where *written* is not used when it could have been:

2 Nephi 27:12
and they shall testify to the truth of the book and the things therein

Theoretically, the text could have been “the truth of the book and the things **written** therein”. Thus the earliest text for 1 Nephi 19:23 is fully possible and should be restored. The secondary addition of *written* was unnecessary (although expected). And the use of the plural *books* is wholly appropriate when referring to the five books of Moses.

Summary: Remove the intrusive *written* and maintain the plural “in the books of Moses”, thus restoring the earliest form of the original manuscript (“and I did read many things unto them which were in the books of Moses”).

■ 1 Nephi 19:23

but that I might more fully persuade them to believe in the Lord their Redeemer
[wherefore 0A | wherefore >js NULL 1 | BDEFIJLMNOPQRST | Wherefore CGHK]
I did read unto them that which was written by the prophet Isaiah

Joseph Smith deleted *wherefore* in the printer’s manuscript for the 1837 edition, but then he apparently restored it in the 1840 edition (based perhaps on his minor use of the original manuscript to restore some lost words and phrases in the 1840 edition). It seems that Joseph was unsure whether he should delete *wherefore* when it was preceded by a dependent clause.

In the original Book of Mormon text, there are 12 other occurrences of *wherefore* preceded by a dependent clause. Joseph Smith removed four of these (for a complete list, see the discussion under 1 Nephi 11:1). But in eight cases, the original *wherefore* has never been removed, despite a preceding dependent clause:

1 Nephi 2:16

and it came to pass that I Nephi being exceeding young
nevertheless being large in stature
and also having great desires to know of the mysteries of God
wherefore I cried unto the Lord

1 Nephi 4:26

and he supposing that I spake of the brethren of the church
and that I was truly that Laban whom I had slew
wherefore he did follow me

Jacob 7:26

and the record of this people being kept on the other plates of Nephi
wherefore I conclude this record

Jarom 1:2

and as these plates are small and as these things are written
for the intent of the benefit of our brethren the Lamanites
wherefore it must needs be that I write a little

Omni 1:25

and having no seed
and knowing king Benjamin to be a just man before the Lord
wherefore I shall deliver up these plates unto him

Omni 1:28

and their leader being a strong and a mighty man and a stiff-necked man
wherefore he caused a contention among them

Ether 10:1

and it came to pass that Shez which was a descendant of Heth
for Heth had perished by the famine and all his household save it were Shez
wherefore Shez began to build up again a broken people

Ether 13:16

and now Coriantumr having studied himself in all the arts of war
and all the cunning of the world
wherefore he gave battle unto them

Thus there is nothing particularly unusual about the use of *wherefore* in 1 Nephi 19:23. And for the 1840 edition, Joseph Smith apparently decided to restore the *wherefore* that he had consciously deleted in the 1837 edition.

Summary: Restore in 1 Nephi 19:23 the *wherefore* that follows the dependent clause (in agreement with the 1840 edition as well as the manuscripts and the 1830 edition).

■ 1 Nephi 19:24

hear ye the words of the prophet
 ye **which** are a remnant of the house of Israel
 a branch [01BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST | of A]
 [which 0A | which >js who 1 | who BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] have been broken off

The 1830 typesetter accidentally added the preposition *of* at the head of the relative clause “which have been broken off”, perhaps because the word *of* appears twice in the preceding noun phrase “a remnant **of** the house **of** Israel”. See 1 Nephi 19:1 for a similar typo in the 1888 LDS edition. Of course, the intrusive *of* does not work here in 1 Nephi 19:24, and so it was removed in the second (1837) edition.

For the 1837 edition, Joseph Smith edited the relative pronoun *which* to *who*. This editing is generally consistent with Joseph’s editing of *which* elsewhere in the text whenever *which* refers to people rather than things; here the plural verb *have* in the relative clause shows that the intended antecedent for *which* is plural rather than the specific singular nouns *remnant* and *branch*. On the other hand, the *which* that occurs earlier in this verse was left unedited (“ye **which** are a remnant of the house of Israel”). A similar example of such a mixture in editing is found later in the text:

Alma 46:27
 and now who knoweth but what the remnant of the seed of Joseph
which shall perish as his garment
 are those [which >js who 1 | which A | who BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
 have dissented from us

For additional examples, see under WHICH in volume 3. The critical text will, of course, retain all these original uses of *which*, regardless of whether or not they have been edited to *who*.

Summary: Restore the original *which* in 1 Nephi 19:24 (“a branch **which** have been broken off”); the intrusive *of* found in the 1830 edition (“a branch **of** which have been broken off”) is a simple typo and did not persist.

■ 1 Nephi 19:24

hear ye the words of the prophet
 which [was 0A | was >js ware 1 | were BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] written
 unto all the house of Israel
 and liken [it 0A | it >js them 1 | them BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] unto yourselves

Here we have an interesting example of number shifting. First we start out with the plural “words of the prophet”. In the following relative clause, the text uses the singular verb *was* to refer to these words from a single prophet, Isaiah. The singular *was* can be considered either a grammatical error due to the proximity of the immediately preceding singular *prophet* or, more likely, as the typical occurrence of *was* in relative clauses modifying a plural noun (see, for instance, 1 Nephi 2:5: “in the borders which was nearer the Red Sea”). In any event, the use of the singular *was* here in 1 Nephi 19:24 seems to have triggered the use of the singular pronoun *it* later on in the passage

(“and liken it unto yourselves”). From a semantic perspective, the words of a single prophet can be collectively considered as one text and can thus be referred to in the singular. For more discussion of such problems with number, see under SUBJECT-VERB AGREEMENT in volume 3.

Joseph Smith, in his editing for the 1837 edition, changed the *was* to *were* and the *it* to *them*. The result is that the edited text in 1 Nephi 19:24 is consistent with a later example that also introduces a long scriptural quotation from Isaiah:

2 Nephi 11:8

now these are the **words**

and ye may liken **them** unto you and unto all men

The critical text will, of course, follow the earliest textual sources in determining the reading for cases involving issues of grammaticality. Thus the singulars *was* and *it* will be restored in 1 Nephi 19:24.

Summary: Restore the singular *was* and *it* in 1 Nephi 19:24; the plural “words of the prophet” can be collectively considered singular in number.

1 Nephi 20

■ 1 Nephi 20:1

hearken and *hear this O house of Jacob*

□ Isaiah 48:1 (King James Bible)

hear **ye** this O house of Jacob

There are numerous differences between the King James version of Isaiah and how it is quoted in the Book of Mormon. For instance, in this very first line, the Book of Mormon text begins with “hearken and”, which is not in the corresponding Isaiah passage. Similarly, the first line from the Isaiah text has the subject pronoun *ye*, which is omitted from the Book of Mormon version. For both of these differences, there is no textual variation at all within the Book of Mormon sources; the only difference is found when we compare the Book of Mormon text with the King James Bible. These kinds of changes appear to be intentional, and unless there is evidence that the Book of Mormon reading is in error, such differences will not be discussed here in volume 4. However, such variants are discussed in a more general way in volume 3 in the section dealing with biblical quotations. In that volume, I also consider issues such as (1) the relationship of these variants to the Joseph Smith Translation of the Bible and (2) the possible relationship between the italicized words in the King James Bible and changes in the Book of Mormon version. Volume 3 also includes a line-by-line comparison of the King James Bible with the reconstructed original text of the biblical quotations in the Book of Mormon.

■ 1 Nephi 20:1

*hearken and hear this O house of Jacob
which are called by the name of Israel
and are come forth out of the waters of Judah*
[01ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPS|,(CGH|(K|, RT]
[01ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPS| *or out of the waters of baptism* CGHKRT]
[01|, ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST|,) CG|), HK]
which swear by the name of the Lord

□ Isaiah 48:1 (King James Bible)

hear **ye** this O house of Jacob
which are called by the name of Israel
and are come forth out of the waters of Judah
which swear by the name of the LORD

Joseph Smith's addition in the 1840 edition of the phrase "or out of the waters of baptism" can be considered a marginal note since it appears within parentheses in that edition. This parenthetical phrase continued in the early RLDS textual tradition, but was removed from the 1908 RLDS edition since the phrase does not appear in the printer's manuscript.

On 16 January 1883, Ebenezer Robinson, who helped Joseph Smith prepare the 1840 edition for publication, described the printing of that edition to Joseph Smith III (Joseph Smith's oldest son and president of the RLDS Church at that time). As part of a long statement, Robinson described in some detail the editing for the 1840 edition:

Your father and I sat down; we took the Palmyra edition and the Kirtland edition, of which latter I helped to set the type, (those were the only two editions that had been printed then), and we compared them, reading the book entirely through, and there is only just one sentence in that book that is not in the other, in what is called the Nauvoo edition, and all the editions since. That is the only one that is not in the Palmyra edition. It is in Nephi's second book I believe. He put a few words there in parenthesis, when he refers to the waters of Judah or the waters of Baptism, he put a few words there in parenthesis. That is the only thing, excepting some little ungrammatical expressions that were altered.

Of course, the addition is found near the end of 1 Nephi rather than in 2 Nephi. (This quote is found on page 146 of Joseph Smith III, "A Historical Reminiscence", *The Saints' Herald*, 30/3 [10 March 1883]: 146–147.)

The LDS text, on the other hand, did not adopt this extra phrase until the 1920 edition, but in that edition the parentheses were replaced by commas. Originally the parentheses, written in red ink along with the added words, were written in the 1920 committee copy (a copy of the 1911 large-print Chicago edition used by the committee to indicate the textual changes for the 1920 edition). Later the parentheses were crossed out with red penciling; thus the extra phrase in the actual 1920 edition is set off by commas. This change can mislead the reader into thinking that this parenthetical comment was actually part of the original text, even perhaps concluding not only that this extra phrase is the original biblical text, but also that some scribe deliberately edited it out of the Hebrew text because of its reference to baptism, assumed to be a strictly Christian practice. Joseph Smith's probable intention was to provide an interpretative reading. There is no evidence to suggest in any way that he was restoring the original text of the Book of Mormon, especially since the original manuscript is here extant and it agrees with the reading of the King James Bible (which follows the traditional Hebrew text) and is also in agreement with all other ancient versions of the text insofar as they all lack this extra phrase mentioning baptism.

Hugh Nibley, on page 151 of *Since Cumorah* (Salt Lake City, Utah: Deseret Book, 1967), has made several provocative claims regarding this change in the text:

The very first Isaiah passage cited in the Book of Mormon (1 Nephi 20:1) differs radically as we have seen, from both the Masoretic [standard Hebrew] and the LXX [Septuagint] versions, which by their own disagreements show that the original text had been corrupted. But that is not all, for the second edition of the Book of Mormon contains an addition not found in the first: ". . . out of the waters of Judah, *or out of the waters of baptism.*" It is said that Parley P. Pratt suggested the phrase, and

certainly Joseph Smith approved it, for it stands in all the early editions after the first. Those added words are not only permissible—they are necessary. If a translation is, as Wilamowitz-Moellendorff defined it, “a statement in the translator’s own words of what he thinks the author had in mind,” then surely that phrase about baptism cannot be omitted. Isaiah did not have to tell his ancient hearers that he had the waters of baptism in mind, but it is necessary to tell it to the modern reader who without such an explanation would miss the point—for him the translation would be a misleading one without that specification. Where continued revelation is accepted and where all the prophets are speaking the same piece, this sort of thing makes no difficulty at all.

Unfortunately, this statement provides no documentation for the offhand remark that “it is said that Parley P. Pratt suggested the phrase”. Despite the wide circulation of this claim of Nibley’s, I have not been able to find any evidence to substantiate it. One wonders about the scholarship in this passage since all its details are wrong. The change first appeared in the third (1840) edition, not the second (1837) edition. The text quoted is actually from the 1920 edition—that is, the parentheses are missing, thus obscuring the marginal nature of the phrase in the 1840 edition. It is not true that the phrase “stands in all the early editions after the first”. Presumably, Nibley is referring to all early editions from 1840 on. Yet even this interpretation is wrong: the phrase appears only in the early RLDS textual tradition (the 1858 Wright edition and the first two RLDS editions, 1874 and 1892). It appears in none of the immediately following LDS editions: the 1841, 1849, and 1852 British editions or the 1879 Orson Pratt edition. And finally, contrary to Nibley’s claim, the phrase is definitely not necessary. There is no convincing evidence that Joseph’s parenthetical phrase was intended to revise the original text. The parentheses imply that Joseph viewed this additional phrase as a marginal explanation. The critical text will, of course, remove this secondary phrase from the text proper and relegate it to the apparatus.

Summary: Delete from 1 Nephi 20:1 the intrusive parenthetical phrase “or out of the waters of baptism”, which was added by Joseph Smith for the 1840 edition, apparently as an explanation of what was meant by “the waters of Judah”.

■ 1 Nephi 20:4

*and I did it
because I knew that
thou [art 01ABCDEFGHIKPRST | wert FIJLMNOQ] obstinate
and thy neck [was 01ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPS | is RT] an iron sinew*

□ Isaiah 48:4 (King James Bible)

because I knew that
thou *art* obstinate
and thy neck *is* an iron sinew

The original manuscript shows a difference in tense for this passage—the present-tense *art* followed by the past-tense *was*. In the Hebrew original, the linking *be* verb is unstated. The King

James Bible provides two italicized present-tense forms, *art* and *is*. In the Book of Mormon textual history, there have been two attempts to resolve the disagreement. In the 1852 LDS edition, the *art* was changed to *wert* (thus making both verbs in the past tense). But for the 1920 LDS edition, the present-tense *art* was restored and the *was* was changed to *is*, making the tenses agree with the King James Bible.

It is possible to argue that the original text actually read *is* and that the *is* was accidentally changed to *was* because of the preceding past-tense *knew* (as well as the preceding past-tense clause “and I did it”). Nonetheless, we should note that there is the intervening present-tense *art*.

Generally speaking, the critical text will retain the reading of the earliest textual sources for the biblical quotations in the Book of Mormon, even when they disagree with the King James Bible—unless there is substantial reason to think that there is some error in the transmission of the quotation. Our basic procedure is that if the earliest Book of Mormon reading works, we will retain it. These principles, when applied here in 1 Nephi 20:4, require that we retain the mixture of tenses, “art obstinate” but “was an iron sinew”. For another example of such a mixture in tense, see 1 Nephi 20:13.

Summary: In general, the critical text will maintain the reading of the earliest textual sources; here in 1 Nephi 20:4, the earliest reading (in \mathcal{C} , \mathcal{P} , and the 1830 edition) has a present-tense *art* and a past-tense *was*; in the original Hebrew, there is in each case an implied *be* verb unspecified for tense; the King James Bible translates both cases in the present tense and puts the words *art* and *is* in italics.

■ 1 Nephi 20:5

*lest thou [shouldst >% shouldst 0 | shouldst 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST] say
mine idol hath done them*

□ Isaiah 48:5 (King James Bible)

lest thou **shouldest** say
mine idol hath done them

There is some evidence that Joseph Smith, when translating the Book of Mormon, could see the actual spelling of the English words (see the discussion in volume 3). In particular, the words *shouldst* and *wouldst* (as used in the current Book of Mormon text) may have originally been spelled as *shouldest* and *wouldest*. The typical pronunciation of these words for Oliver Cowdery seems to have been the one-syllable *e*-less pronunciation. When dictating the Isaiah 48–49 passages found in 1 Nephi 20–21, Joseph Smith may have actually seen these words with the *e* vowels, just as they appear in the King James Bible. And he may have dictated these words with their two-syllable pronunciations, although the evidence for that possibility (found here in 1 Nephi 20:5 and perhaps in 3 Nephi 27:3) is meager.

In 1 Nephi 20:5, Oliver Cowdery initially wrote down *shouldst* in \mathcal{C} , then he erased the *st* at the end of the word (which shows that the correction was an immediate one). His erasure created a hole in the paper, so just after the erased *st* he wrote out *est*. Thus Oliver Cowdery corrected *shouldst* to *shouldest*. Perhaps Joseph Smith insisted on the *-est* spelling and could well have even

pronounced the *e*. Nonetheless, in all subsequent uses of *shouldest* and *wouldest* in 1 Nephi 20–21 (quoting from Isaiah 48–49), Oliver Cowdery wrote only *shouldst* and *wouldst*.

In all, there are 17 occurrences of *should(e)st* and *would(e)st* in the Book of Mormon text. In the following complete list, the *-est* ending, whenever it occurs, is marked in bold. The five Isaiah quotations are marked with an asterisk (*), and all take the *-est* ending in the King James Bible itself. If the original manuscript is not extant, a minus sign (–) is placed before the item:

* 1 Nephi 20:5	[<i>shouldst</i> >% shouldest 0 <i>shouldst</i> 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST]
* 1 Nephi 20:7	<i>shouldst</i>
* 1 Nephi 20:8	[<i>wouldst</i> 01BCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST wouldest A]
* 1 Nephi 20:17	<i>shouldst</i>
* 1 Nephi 21:6	[<i>shouldst</i> 0BCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST <i>shoulds</i> 1 shouldest A]
2 Nephi 4:33	[<i>wouldst</i> 01AEFHIJKLMNQRST wouldest BCDG]
– 2 Nephi 8:12	[<i>shouldst</i> 1AGHKLMPQRST shouldest BCDEFIJNO]
– Mosiah 22:4	<i>wouldst</i>
– Alma 9:4	<i>shouldst</i>
– Alma 20:17	<i>shouldst</i>
– Alma 20:18	<i>shouldst</i>
– Alma 20:18	[<i>shouldst</i> 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST HK]
– Alma 20:18	<i>wouldst</i>
Alma 30:47	[<i>shouldst</i> 01AIJLMNQRST shouldest BCDEFGHK]
Alma 30:55	[<i>wouldst</i> 01AFIJLMNOQRT wouldest BCDEGHKPS]
Alma 39:4	<i>shouldst</i>
– 3 Nephi 27:3	[wouldest 1 <i>wouldst</i> ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST]

In the original manuscript (where extant) and in the printer’s manuscript, Oliver Cowdery always wrote *shouldst* and *wouldst* except for this one case in 1 Nephi 20:5. In the printer’s manuscript, the unknown scribe 2 wrote the *-est* form *wouldest* in 3 Nephi 27:3 (his only opportunity). But the 1830 edition, also here a firsthand copy of \mathcal{O} , reads *wouldst*. The original manuscript itself is not extant for this passage, so it is difficult to tell whether \mathcal{O} in 3 Nephi 27:3 read *wouldest* or *wouldst*. (For discussion of this variant, see 3 Nephi 27:3.) Finally, in two cases, the 1830 typesetter set the *-est* ending (*wouldest* in 1 Nephi 20:8 and *shouldest* in 1 Nephi 21:6). Both cases involve quotations from Isaiah and suggest that the typesetter may have consulted his King James Bible in these two instances. Finally, the 1837 edition occasionally introduced the *-est* ending, but it has not persisted except in one case in the RLDS text (namely, in Alma 30:55).

Although Joseph Smith might have seen *shouldest* and *wouldest* when the text was quoting Isaiah, only once did he make sure that Oliver Cowdery wrote it down that way (namely, the first time, in 1 Nephi 20:5). For that one case, we will restore the *e* form. One could even argue that despite the *-est* spelling, this ending could nonetheless be correctly pronounced without the *e*. Thus maybe all cases of *shouldst* and *wouldst* could be written with *-est* (as in the King James Bible). The critical text, on the other hand, will take a conservative textual viewpoint and restore the *-est* spelling (*shouldest* and *wouldest*) only when the earliest textual evidence directly supports doing so, which is not often.

Summary: Restore the spelling *shouldest* in 1 Nephi 20:5 since the correction in \mathcal{O} suggests that at least in this case Joseph Smith made sure that Oliver Cowdery spelled out the full *-est*; in general, we let the earliest textual sources determine whether the ending is *-st* or *-est*; in nearly every case, the earliest textual evidence favors only the *-st* ending.

■ **1 Nephi 20:6**

thou hast [heard & seen 0 | seen & heard 1 | seen and heard ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] all this

□ **Isaiah 48:6** (King James Bible)

thou hast **heard** / **see** all this

The reading of the original manuscript follows the word order in Isaiah (a form of the verb *hear*, followed by a form of the verb *see*); the King James Bible has the two verbs in different clauses, separated by a comma. In copying from \mathcal{O} to \mathcal{P} , Oliver Cowdery accidentally switched the order of “heard and seen” to “seen and heard”. Both orders occur with equal frequency elsewhere in the text (with seven occurrences of “seen and heard” and seven of “heard and seen”). There is, however, one other instance that shows Oliver’s tendency to place the verb *hear* after the verb *see* — namely, his change in 1 Nephi 14:28 of “the things which I saw” to “the things which I saw and heard”.

Summary: Restore in 1 Nephi 20:6 the original word order “heard and seen” (the reading of the original manuscript); this reading is closer to the reading of the King James Bible.

■ **1 Nephi 20:8**

for I knew that

thou [wouldst 01BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST | wouldst A] deal very treacherously

□ **Isaiah 48:8** (King James Bible)

for I knew that

thou **wouldst** deal very treacherously

Here the 1830 typesetter replaced the *wouldst* of the manuscripts with the spelling *wouldest*, the King James Bible’s form of the word. The typesetter may have referred to his own Bible to make this change to *-est* in 1 Nephi 20:8 (as also for the word *shouldest* in 1 Nephi 21:6). Later editions have reverted to the original *wouldst*. For a complete discussion, see 1 Nephi 20:5.

Summary: Maintain *wouldst* in 1 Nephi 20:8 since it is the reading in both manuscripts.

■ 1 Nephi 20:8

*for I knew that thou wouldst deal very treacherously
and wast called a transgressor from [the 0ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST | thy >js the 1] womb*

□ Isaiah 48:8 (King James Bible)

for I knew that thou wouldst deal very treacherously
and wast called a transgressor from **the** womb

When Oliver Cowdery copied from \mathcal{C} to \mathcal{D} , he accidentally replaced the definite article *the* with the pronominal possessive *thy*, probably because this whole passage in Isaiah continually uses the second person pronominal forms (such as three preceding occurrences of *thou* and one of *thine* in this verse). David Calabro points out (personal communication) that if this reading with *thy* were to make any sense, we would need to emend the whole phrase to read “from thy **mother’s** womb”.

The *thy* in \mathcal{D} was later crossed out with heavy dark ink, and the correct *the* was supralinearly inserted. Multispectral imaging of the ink agrees with the nearby corrections Joseph Smith made on the manuscript when he edited the text for the 1837 edition. In addition, the handwriting seems to be Joseph’s rather than the 1830 typesetter’s (that is, John Gilbert’s). The 1830 edition has the correct *the*, which implies that the 1830 typesetter may have once more checked his King James Bible to make the text conform to the Isaiah text. This interpretation would mean that in this instance Joseph Smith corrected \mathcal{D} to make it agree with the 1830 edition.

One other possibility is that the correction in the printer’s manuscript is not Joseph’s, but actually the 1830 typesetter’s. We know this is a possibility since later on, in 2 Nephi 20:10, the 1830 typesetter supralinearly inserted in \mathcal{D} the words *did excel*, which Oliver Cowdery had not copied into \mathcal{D} . We also know that in the extensive quotation from Isaiah in 2 Nephi 12–24, the 1830 typesetter systematically used his King James Bible to determine the punctuation and the spelling for these Isaiah chapters. It would not therefore be surprising if he used his Bible to do the same in 1 Nephi 20:8—and even to mark the correct reading in the printer’s manuscript. But the handwriting of *did excel* of 2 Nephi 20:10 looks much different than the correcting *the* found in \mathcal{D} for 1 Nephi 20:8.

Summary: Despite the shifting in \mathcal{D} for 1 Nephi 20:8 (from *the* to *thy* and then back to *the* in the phrase “from the womb”), the critical text will maintain the *the* of the original manuscript, which also agrees with the reading of the King James Bible.

■ 1 Nephi 20:11

*for [how should I >+ I will not 0 | I will not 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST] suffer
my name to be polluted
and I will not give my glory unto another*

□ Isaiah 48:11 (King James Bible)

for **how should** *my name* be polluted
and I will not give my glory unto another

Oliver Cowdery's emendation in the original manuscript is with heavier ink flow and removes a difficult syntactic structure (a question followed by a declarative statement). The emended clause "**I will not** suffer my name to be polluted" creates a parallelism with the following declarative clause ("**I will not** give my glory unto another"), which is undoubtedly the source of the emendation. Of course, the original text itself does not fully follow the King James reading; the Book of Mormon text adds the words *I, suffer, and to*, but is otherwise substantially closer to the Isaiah of the King James Bible ("for how should **I suffer** my name **to** be polluted" versus "for how should *my name* be polluted").

There definitely appears to be editing here in the original manuscript. The heavier level of ink flow suggests that the correction is secondary and not a part of the original text. We have already seen examples of how Oliver Cowdery later emended the original manuscript in an attempt to clarify what he felt was difficult language:

□ 1 Nephi 3:16

unknown scribe 2 in G:

and all this he hath done because of the commandment

Oliver Cowdery's later emendation in G:

and all this he hath done because of the commandment **of the Lord**

□ 1 Nephi 7:17

unknown scribe 3 in G:

O Lord according to my faith which is in **me**

Oliver Cowdery's later emendation in G:

O Lord according to my faith which is in **thee**

□ 1 Nephi 12:4

unknown scribe 3 in G:

and I saw the earth **that it rent** the rocks

scribe 3's own emendation in G:

and I saw the earth **rent** the rocks

Oliver Cowdery's later emendation in G:

and I saw the earth **and** the rocks **that they rent**

In the original manuscript, corrections written with differing ink or by a different scribe represent editing, providing the change removes a difficult (but not totally impossible) reading. Impossible readings, of course, can be altered at any time. (For complete discussion, see 1 Nephi 3:16, 1 Nephi 7:17, and 1 Nephi 12:4.)

Stan Larson has argued that the change in 1 Nephi 20:11 shows that Joseph Smith revised his translation as he dictated the text (see pages 10–11 of "Textual Variants in Book of Mormon Manuscripts", *Dialogue: A Journal of Mormon Thought* 10 [Autumn 1977]: 8–30). The distinct change in level of ink flow at least argues that the change was definitely not immediate. If Joseph revised the text in this way, there is very little evidence for it beyond this one purported example. Elsewhere, there are only two examples in the original manuscript of textual variation within the

biblical quotations that would argue that Joseph, while dictating, revised an original King James reading to something different. These two possibilities involve minor scribal corrections and may simply represent Oliver Cowdery’s attempt to correct what he had initially written down incorrectly. One involves changing *had* to *have* (in 1 Nephi 21:21) and the other the insertion of *for* at the beginning of a clause (in 1 Nephi 21:24); for discussion, see these two passages. Given the three clear examples where Oliver emended the original text written in some other scribe’s hand, it seems much more probable that the change in 1 Nephi 20:11 is the result of later editing on the part of Oliver himself. For further discussion, see pages 382–385 in Royal Skousen, “Textual Variants in the Isaiah Quotations in the Book of Mormon”, *Isaiah in the Book of Mormon*, edited by Donald W. Parry and John W. Welch (Provo, Utah: Foundation for Ancient Research and Mormon Studies, 1998), 369–390.

Summary: Restore in 1 Nephi 20:11 the original reading of the original manuscript (“for how should I suffer my name to be polluted”); this reading is much closer, but not identical, to the language of the King James Bible; Oliver Cowdery’s emendation (“for I will not suffer my name to be polluted”) is based on the syntax of the following clause (“and I will not give my glory unto another”).

■ 1 Nephi 20:12–13

for I am he

- (1) [& 0 | & >js NULL 1 | and A | BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *I am the first*
- (2) *and I am also the last*
mine hand hath also laid the foundation of the earth
- (3) *and my right hand hath spanned the heavens*
- (4) [& 01 | and A | BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *I called unto them*
- (5) *and they stand up together*

□ Isaiah 48:12–13 (King James Bible)

I am he

- (1′) *I am the first*
- (2′) *I also am the last*
mine hand also hath laid the foundation of the earth
- (3′) *and my right hand hath spanned the heavens*
- (4′) *when I call unto them*
- (5′) *they stand up together*

In this passage we have two examples (identified as 1 and 4) where the original Book of Mormon text has an *and* that Joseph Smith deleted in his editing for the 1837 edition. Perhaps he felt that there were just too many *and*’s in this passage. For both of these cases, the corresponding Isaiah passage does not have the *and* (see 1′ and 4′ above). On the other hand, Joseph did leave two other examples of *and* (identified as 2 and 5) for which the Isaiah text does not have any *and* (see 2′ and 5′ above). In only one case, identified as 3/3′, do both the Book and Mormon and the King James Bible have the *and*.

Unlike the King James text for Isaiah, the original Book of Mormon text uses all these *and*’s to create a more connected text. Joseph Smith’s editing for the 1837 edition restores, in part,

some of the disconnected style found in the King James version of Isaiah. The critical text will maintain all of the original *and*'s, in accord with the reading of the earliest textual sources.

Summary: Restore the two *and*'s in 1 Nephi 20:12–13 that Joseph Smith deleted for the 1837 edition.

■ **1 Nephi 20:13**

*mine hand hath also laid the foundation of the earth
and my right hand hath spanned the heavens
and I [called 0A | called >js call 1 | call BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] unto them
and they stand up together*

□ **Isaiah 48:13** (King James Bible)

mine hand also hath laid the foundation of the earth
and my right hand hath spanned the heavens
when I **call** unto them
they stand up together

In order to remove the tense inconsistency (the past-tense *called* versus the present-tense *stand*), Joseph Smith deleted the past-tense *-ed* ending for the 1837 edition, thus making the text conform to the King James Bible (at least with respect to the tense). It is quite possible that the adding of the *-ed* to the verb *call* was an error due to the two immediately preceding past participial verb forms (“hath also laid” and “hath spanned”).

This chapter has one other case of tense mixture (namely, in 1 Nephi 20:4). Another example is found in the next chapter (1 Nephi 21:21). The Book of Mormon text seems to allow such, more so than the King James Bible does. The critical text will maintain the mixtures except in those cases where there is specific evidence that the mixture is due to error in transmission.

Summary: Restore the original past-tense *called* in 1 Nephi 20:13, even though it does result in a mixture in tense; such mixtures seem to be intended in the Book of Mormon quotations from Isaiah (for other examples, see 1 Nephi 20:4 and 1 Nephi 21:21).

■ **1 Nephi 20:16**

*I have not spoken in secret
[01ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPS |; RT]
from the beginning
[01 |; ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPS |, RT]
from the time that it was declared have I spoken*

□ **Isaiah 48:16** (King James Bible, current punctuation included)

I have not spoken in secret from the beginning;
from the time that it was, there *am* I:

The 1920 LDS edition changed the punctuation in this verse so that the phrase “from the beginning” would be directly associated with the phrase “from the time that it was declared” in the

following clause. But this change in punctuation works only in terms of the word order in the King James translation. In the original Hebrew, the two prepositional phrases “from the beginning” and “from the time” are not adjacent. A literal word-for-word translation of the Hebrew (but using the words of the King James Bible) shows that “from the beginning” must belong in the first clause. In the following, hyphens are used to connect groups of English words that represent single words in Hebrew:

not from-the-beginning in-secret have-I-spoken
from-the-time that-it-was there I

Thus the punctuation found in the King James Bible accurately represents the clausal break between the two clauses.

Summary: Restore in 1 Nephi 20:16 the original punctuation, a semicolon after “from the beginning” (as found in pre-1920 LDS editions, all RLDS editions, and the King James Bible).

■ 1 Nephi 20:17

*the Lord thy God
which teacheth thee to profit
which leadeth thee by the way thou shouldst go
[hath 01ART | has BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQS] done it*

□ Isaiah 48:17 (King James Bible)

I *am* the LORD thy God
which teacheth thee to profit
which leadeth thee by the way *that* thou shouldst go

The 1837 change from *hath* to *has* seems inappropriate given that the preceding verbs in this sentence (*teacheth*, *leadeth*) take the inflectional ending *-eth*. Moreover, this change was not marked by Joseph Smith in the printer’s manuscript, although he could still be responsible for the 1837 change. The 1920 LDS edition restored the *hath*, probably to avoid the mixture of third person singular forms rather than simply to restore biblical-sounding language. Consider, for instance, a passage in which the change from *hath* to *has* has never been reversed, even though the corresponding Isaiah passage has *hath*:

2 Nephi 16:7
lo this [*hath* 1 | *has* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] touched thy lips
Isaiah 6:7 (King James Bible)
lo this *hath* touched thy lips

Of course, the critical text will restore the *hath* in 2 Nephi 16:7, just as in 1 Nephi 20:17. For further discussion, see INFLECTIONAL ENDINGS in volume 3.

Summary: Maintain the original *hath* in 1 Nephi 20:17 since this is the reading of the manuscripts as well as the King James Bible.

■ 1 Nephi 20:18

*O that thou hadst hearkened
to my [commandments 01AT | commandment BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRS]
then had thy peace been as a river*

□ Isaiah 48:18 (King James Bible)

O that thou hadst hearkened to my **commandments**
then had thy peace been as a river

The 1837 edition changed the plural *commandments* to the singular. This change was undoubtedly a typo since there is no motivation here to edit the text. Elsewhere in the Book of Mormon there are only two examples of “hearken (un)to one’s commandment(s)”; in each case the verb *hearken* takes the plural *commandments* rather than the singular:

1 Nephi 4:11

yea and he would not hearken unto the **commandments** of the Lord

2 Nephi 2:28

I would that ye should look to the great Mediator
and hearken unto his great **commandments**

And of course, the corresponding Isaiah passage for 1 Nephi 20:18 has the plural *commandments*. In accord with the early textual sources, the 1981 LDS edition restored the correct plural.

Summary: Maintain the plural *commandments* in 1 Nephi 20:18, the reading in the manuscripts and the King James Bible; the 1837 change to the singular was simply a typo.

■ 1 Nephi 20:21

*he caused the waters to flow out of the rock for them
he [claved >+ clave 0 | cleaved >js cleav 1 | cleaved A | clave BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] the rock also
and the waters gushed out*

□ Isaiah 48:21 (King James Bible)

he caused the waters to flow out of the rock for them
he **clave** the rock also
and the waters gushed out

The past-tense form *clave* was probably what Joseph Smith originally saw, but because of the rarity of this past-tense form and its lack of an overt sign of the past tense, the past-tense marker *-d* was accidentally added, perhaps by Joseph Smith as he read off the text or by Oliver Cowdery as he wrote down Joseph’s dictation. It is also possible, as David Calabro points out (personal communication), that the following *the* (which begins with a voiced interdental fricative) would have made it easy for Oliver to have misinterpreted /kleiv ðə/ as having a /d/ at the end of *clave*; that is, he misheard /kleiv ðə/ as /kleivd ðə/ and thus wrote down “claved the rock”. For a similar kind of misinterpretation, see the discussion regarding the phrase “as we supposed that” in Alma 56:37.

At some later time, this extra *d* in *claved* was crossed out in the original manuscript with heavier ink flow. It is quite possible that this deletion occurred even after the printer's manuscript was copied since that manuscript (namely, \mathcal{P}) reads *cleaved*, a regularization of the past tense that is more easily derived from the spelling "claved" than from "clave". This same regularized past-tense form *cleaved* is found in the 1830 edition. In his editing of \mathcal{P} for the 1837 edition, Joseph Smith crossed out the final *d* of *cleaved* (as well as the *e* right before the *d*), but he neglected to cross out the first *e* in *cleaved*. In any event, the 1837 typesetter interpreted Joseph's correction as *clave* (not *cleave*, which would not have made sense). The archaic (but textually correct) past-tense *clave* has been the reading in the Book of Mormon text ever since.

There are no other occurrences of the simple past-tense *clave* in the Book of Mormon. There are eight occurrences of the verb *cleave*, of which two use the auxiliary *do* to form the past tense (namely, "did cleave" in 3 Nephi 10:10 and Ether 14:2).

Summary: Maintain the archaic past-tense form *clave* in 1 Nephi 20:21, the corrected reading in \mathcal{C} and the reading in the King James Bible.

■ 1 Nephi 20:22

and notwithstanding he hath done all this

[01 | , ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]

and greater also

[01 | , ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]

there is no peace saith the Lord unto the wicked

□ Isaiah 48:22 (King James Bible)

there is no peace saith the LORD unto the wicked

Here in 1 Nephi 20:22, the Book of Mormon text has some additional text: "and notwithstanding he hath done all this and greater also". John A. Tvedtnes has suggested that the *also* at the end of this addition should be placed with the following clause: "also there is no peace . . . unto the wicked" (see page 72 of "The Isaiah Variants in the Book of Mormon", FARMS preliminary report, 1984). The 1830 typesetter placed commas around the phrase "and greater also", interpreting the *also* as part of that phrase. This punctuation has continued in all subsequent editions. Semantically, the 1830 typesetter's interpretation seems to work perfectly well. On the other hand, "also there is no peace . . . unto the wicked" seems strange because the immediately preceding text (verses 20–21) mentions nothing else that the wicked have been deprived of. The critical text will maintain the traditional placement of the *also* (as part of the phrase "and greater also").

Summary: In 1 Nephi 20:22, the adverb *also* belongs to the phrase "and greater also" rather than at the beginning of the following clause.

1 Nephi 21

■ 1 Nephi 21:6

it is a light thing

that thou [shouldst 0BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST | shoulds 1 | shouldest A] be my servant

□ Isaiah 49:6 (King James Bible)

it is a light thing

that thou **shouldest** be my servant

As noted in the discussion for 1 Nephi 20:5, the original text of the Book of Mormon favors the one-syllable *shouldst* over the two-syllable *shouldest*. In each case, we let the earliest textual sources determine the reading. In this instance, we have *shouldst* in the original manuscript, whereas the King James Bible has *shouldest*. The 1830 compositor set *shouldest*, probably by reference to the Bible he was using to check the Isaiah text. He made the same change for *wouldst* in 1 Nephi 20:8.

Summary: Maintain *shouldst* in 1 Nephi 21:6, the reading of the original manuscript.

■ 1 Nephi 21:6

I will also give thee for a light to the Gentiles

that thou mayest be my salvation

unto the [ends >+ end 0 | ends 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST] of the earth

□ Isaiah 49:6 (King James Bible)

I will also give thee for a light to the Gentiles

that thou mayest be my salvation

unto the **end** of the earth

Here the textual correction in the original manuscript is just like a change found a few verses earlier—namely, *claved* to *clave* in 1 Nephi 20:21. As noted there, the deletion in \mathcal{O} of the *d* of *claved* appears to have been done after \mathcal{P} was copied from \mathcal{O} . Here in 1 Nephi 21:6, the crossout in \mathcal{O} of the final *s* in *ends* also seems to have been done after \mathcal{P} was copied (note that \mathcal{P} has *ends*). In addition, the ink flow for the crossout in \mathcal{O} is considerably heavier. In fact, the change to *end* in \mathcal{O} was probably done by referring to the King James Bible since the expected form in English is *ends*. The plural has continued in every printed edition.

In order to deal with this variation, we first consider the phrase “end(s) of the earth” in the book of Isaiah. It occurs 11 times in the Isaiah of the King James translation. The English word *end*

corresponds to two different words in the Hebrew original. When the text refers to the geographical end(s) of the earth (or the peoples living there), the Hebrew word is derived from the consonantal root *q-ṣ-h* (meaning ‘end, extremity’); when the text directly refers to all peoples and nations (only in Isaiah 45:22 and 52:10), the Hebrew word is *’efes* (also meaning ‘end, extremity’). In terms of number, the Hebrew text is fairly evenly divided here, with five cases taking the singular and six taking the plural. The King James Bible agrees with the Hebrew in 10 of the 11 cases, but in Isaiah 43:6 (marked below with an asterisk), the Hebrew singular was translated into English as a plural, thus showing once more the tendency in English to favor the plural “ends of the earth”:

VERSE	HEBREW	KING JAMES BIBLE
5:26	singular	hiss . . . from the end of the earth
26:15	plural	removed . . . <i>unto</i> all the ends of the earth
40:28	plural	the creator of the ends of the earth
41:5	plural	the ends of the earth were afraid
41:9	plural	taken from the ends of the earth
42:10	singular	sing . . . from the end of the earth
* 43:6	singular	bring . . . from the ends of the earth
45:22	plural (<i>’efes</i>)	be ye saved / all the ends of the earth
48:20	singular	utter . . . to the end of the earth
49:6	singular	be my salvation unto the end of the earth
52:10	plural (<i>’efes</i>)	all the ends of the earth shall see

The Book of Mormon quotes three of these passages. Besides the passage here in 1 Nephi 21:6 (quoting Isaiah 49:6), the two other passages have the singular “end of the earth” and occur without variation in the Book of Mormon textual history:

1 Nephi 20:20 (quoting Isaiah 48:20, ☉ extant)
utter to the **end** of the earth

2 Nephi 15:26 (quoting Isaiah 5:26, ☉ not extant)
and he will lift up an ensign to the nations from far
and will hiss unto them from the **end** of the earth

So here we have two cases where the original King James singular has been maintained in the Book of Mormon text.

Generally, the Book of Mormon text prefers the plural “ends of the earth”. The singular occurs in only one other place, but here the meaning refers to the end of time for this world:

2 Nephi 27:11
and all things shall be revealed unto the children of men
which ever hath been among the children of men and which ever will be
even unto the **end** of the earth

Excluding the Isaiah quotations and this example dealing with time, the text uses only the plural “ends of the earth” (22 times), and in each case the meaning deals with only geography or people.

Several of these 22 other cases are particularly interesting because they show how the Book of Mormon text prefers the plural *ends*, even when the text is strongly associated with Isaiah. First, consider the following two lines of additional text found later in Nephi’s long quote of Isaiah 2–14:

2 Nephi 24:2

and the people shall take them
and bring them to their place
yea from far unto the ends of the earth
and they shall return to their lands of promise
and the house of Israel shall possess them

Isaiah 14:2 (King James Bible)

and the people shall take them
and bring them to their place
and the house of Israel shall possess them

We see here that the two added lines use the plural “ends of the earth” rather than the singular.

In addition, there is Nephi’s later paraphrastic reference in 2 Nephi 29 to the Isaiah quotation in 2 Nephi 15:26 (from Isaiah 5:26). Both passages refer to the ensign (or standard) that will be lifted up and how its message will hiss forth, yet in Nephi’s commentary in 2 Nephi 29 we get the plural phraseology instead of the singular of the direct quote found earlier in 2 Nephi 15:

2 Nephi 29:2

and my words shall hiss forth unto the **ends** of the earth
for a standard unto my people

Finally, there are four passages in the Book of Mormon that quote the language of Isaiah 52:10 with its plural *ends* (namely, “and all the **ends** of the earth shall see the salvation of our God”): Mosiah 12:24, Mosiah 15:31, 3 Nephi 16:20, and 3 Nephi 20:35.

In summary, there is minor variation in number between the Hebrew original and the King James Bible, as well as between the King James Bible and the corresponding quotations and paraphrases in the Book of Mormon. In each case, the tendency has been to increase the plural usage in the English text. This variation implies, then, that we should let the earliest textual sources determine the number of “end(s) of the earth”. The plural usage is the expected one, and this perhaps explains why the direct quote in 1 Nephi 21:6 ended up as “ends of the earth”. Here the original Book of Mormon text seems to have read in the plural; the correction in \mathcal{C} definitely seems to be due to later editing of \mathcal{C} (probably even after \mathcal{D} itself had been copied) and apparently by reference to a King James Bible.

Summary: Maintain the plural reading “ends of the earth” in 1 Nephi 21:6; the Book of Mormon text prefers this plural usage, although in two other Isaiah quotations we have the reading “end of the earth”, the original singular of the King James Bible.

■ 1 Nephi 21:7

to him whom man depiseth

to him whom the [Nation 0 | Nations 1 | nations ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] abhorreth

□ Isaiah 49:7 (King James Bible)

to him whom man despiseth

to him whom the **nation** abhorreth

Oliver Cowdery accidentally pluralized *nation* when he copied from \mathcal{O} to \mathcal{P} . According to the grammar of the King James Bible, the associated verb should have also been changed to *abhor*, since in the biblical text the present-tense *-eth* ending is used only with third person singular subjects. In the original Book of Mormon text, *-eth* was used with both singular and plural subjects, so the resulting language of Oliver’s “whom the nations abhorreth” is actually acceptable according to the grammar of the original text of the Book of Mormon. For further discussion, see INFLECTIONAL ENDINGS in volume 3.

Of course, the King James Bible (as well as the original Hebrew) has the singular *nation*, and thus the reading of the original manuscript is quite correct. In fact, these two lines in English form an almost exact parallelism “to him whom man depiseth / to him whom the nation abhorreth”. (And the original Hebrew is even more exact in its parallelism because there the noun *nation* does not have the definite article *the*.)

Summary: Restore the singular *nation* in 1 Nephi 21:7; this reading is found in \mathcal{O} as well as in the King James Bible.

■ 1 Nephi 21:7

to him whom man despiseth

to him whom the nation abhorreth

[*for >- to 0 | to 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST*] *servant of rulers*

kings shall see and arise

□ Isaiah 49:7 (King James Bible)

to him whom man despiseth

to him whom the nation abhorreth

to a servant of rulers

kings shall see and arise

The indefinite article *a* before *servant* is not in any of the manuscripts or editions of the Book of Mormon, yet the current reading seems quite awkward and suggests that the use of the article in the King James text is wholly appropriate (and perhaps even necessary for English readers). I doubt that the lack of the *a* in the Book of Mormon text should be explained as a Hebraism. There is no indefinite article at all in Hebrew, yet the indefinite article *a/an* is virtually always maintained in the Book of Mormon quotations of the King James Bible. For instance, in the King James version of Isaiah 48–49, there are 13 other occurrences of the indefinite article *a* and 3 of the variant *an*, yet all of these other occurrences of *a/an* were correctly transmitted into the corresponding Book

of Mormon text (1 Nephi 20–21). In only a handful of cases do we have instances where a King James indefinite article is missing in the Book of Mormon text. See 2 Nephi 7:11 and Alma 42:2 for two examples where the *a* of King James phraseology was accidentally omitted because of difficulty Oliver Cowdery had in hearing the *a*.

Here in 1 Nephi 21:7 it appears that the *a* was accidentally dropped from the text as Oliver Cowdery took down Joseph Smith’s dictation. In fact, Oliver initially wrote *for* instead of the *to* (the text reads “to a servant of rulers” in the King James Bible). Oliver later corrected the *for* to *to* (but with weaker ink flow). Perhaps because Oliver initially misheard or misinterpreted the *to* as *for*, he may have also omitted the indefinite article at the same time.

Summary: Add the indefinite article *a* in 1 Nephi 21:7 so that the text reads “to a servant of rulers” (the reading of the King James Bible); the current text without the *a* (“to servant of rulers”) is very awkward and suggests an early error in the transmission of the text; Oliver Cowdery probably dropped the *a* here when he initially wrote down the wrong preposition (*for* instead of *to*), and this error may have interfered with his writing down the *a*.

■ 1 Nephi 21:10

*they shall not hunger nor thirst
neither shall the heat nor **the** sun smite them*

□ Isaiah 49:10 (King James Bible)

they shall not hunger nor thirst
neither shall the heat nor sun smite them

Here the Book of Mormon text repeats the definite article *the* in the conjunct “the heat nor **the** sun”, which is characteristic of the Hebrew-like style of the Book of Mormon. (For discussion and examples, see CONJUNCTIVE REPETITION in volume 3.) The corresponding King James passage does not repeat the *the* (“the heat nor sun”). The original Hebrew here has no determiner for either conjunct (literally, “heat and sun”, which occurs within the scope of a preceding negation). Modern English translations treat this conjunct by having the article *the* for both conjuncts or for neither, thus maintaining some parallelism:

- Revised Standard Version (RSV, 1952)
neither scorching wind nor sun shall smite them
- New International Version (NIV, 1978)
nor will **the** desert heat or **the** sun beat upon them

Like the NIV, the Book of Mormon version of Isaiah 49:10 indirectly preserves the parallelism of the original Hebrew.

Summary: Maintain the repeated definite article *the* in “the heat nor the sun” in 1 Nephi 21:10; the use of the repeated *the* maintains the parallelism but not the literalness of the Hebrew (which lacks the definite article for both conjuncts).

■ 1 Nephi 21:10

*for he that hath mercy on them shall lead them
even by the springs of [water 0ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST | waters 1] shall he guide them*

□ Isaiah 49:10 (King James Bible)

for he that hath mercy on them shall lead them
even by the springs of **water** shall he guide them

The original Hebrew here literally reads “the springs of waters”, but the King James Bible has the singular *water*. When copying from \mathcal{O} to \mathcal{P} , Oliver Cowdery accidentally pluralized *water* to *waters*, thus creating a Hebraism! He was probably influenced by the plurality of the preceding *springs*. In any event, the 1830 compositor set the expected singular; he may have also referenced his King James Bible to make sure that *water* was correct.

Summary: Maintain the singular *water* in “the springs of water”, the reading of \mathcal{O} and the King James Bible (even though the original Hebrew actually has the plural *waters*).

■ 1 Nephi 21:11

*and I will make all my mountains
[away 01ABDE | a way CGHIJKLMNQRST | away > a way F]
and my highways shall be exalted*

□ Isaiah 49:11 (King James Bible)

and I will make all my mountains **a way**
and my highways shall be exalted

Here Oliver Cowdery misinterpreted *a way* as the adverb *away* and wrote it that way in both manuscripts. Its occurrence in the original manuscript shows once more that this manuscript is indeed a dictated manuscript. It was up to Oliver to determine whether Joseph Smith’s /əwei/ was *a way* or *away*. Oliver might have been subconsciously influenced by the much more frequent (and phonetically similar) phrasal verb *take away*, although he did not actually write “I will **take** all my mountains away”.

The first two editions (1830, 1837) continued with “I will make all my mountains away”. For the 1840 edition, the correct *a way* was set. On the other hand, the first three LDS British editions continued to set *away* (since they derive from the 1837 edition). Finally, in the second printing of the 1852 edition, *away* was corrected in the stereotyped plates to *a way*, probably by reference to the 1840 edition (which was frequently used to correct the text for the second 1852 printing).

The Hebrew word here is the noun *derek* ‘path, way, road’, which the King James Bible literally translates in the singular. The English word *away* actually derives from the two-word phrase “on way”, but of course its original meaning is no longer recoverable from *away*, nor would that meaning work here in 1 Nephi 21:11.

Elsewhere in the manuscripts, the scribes occasionally mixed up *away* and *a way*, but none of these other instances of error entered any printed edition (unlike the case in 1 Nephi 21:11):

2 Nephi 8:10 (Oliver Cowdery in \mathcal{O} and \mathcal{P} ; *a way* in Isaiah 51:10)
 that hath made the depths of the sea
 [*away* 01 | *a way* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] for the ransomed to pass over

Mosiah 29:7 (Hyrum Smith in \mathcal{P} ; \mathcal{O} not extant; John Gilbert corrected \mathcal{P})
 and draw [*a way* >jg *away* 1 | *away* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
 a part of this people after him

Mormon 3:4 (scribe 2 in \mathcal{P} , but immediately corrected by him; \mathcal{O} not extant)
 after this tenth year had passed
 [*a way* > *away* 1 | *away* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]

Ether 14:25 (Oliver Cowdery in \mathcal{O} ; corrected by him when he copied from \mathcal{O} into \mathcal{P})
 and their wickedness and abominations had prepared
 [*away* 0 | *a way* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST] for their everlasting destruction

All of these misspellings probably occurred in \mathcal{O} itself, which is consistent with other evidence that \mathcal{O} was written down from dictation rather than visually copied from some other written text.

Summary: Maintain the two-word spelling *a way* in 1 Nephi 21:11; this reading agrees with the King James Bible as well as the original Hebrew.

■ 1 Nephi 21:20

*the children which thou shalt have
 after thou hast lost the [other 0A | other >js first 1 | first BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
 shall say again in thine ears . . .*

□ Isaiah 49:20 (King James Bible)

the children which thou shalt have
 after thou hast lost the **other**
 shall say again in thine ears . . .

The King James translation is an attempt to interpret the original Hebrew, which can be literally translated word for word as follows:

again shall-say in-thine-ears children-of thy-bereavement

The hyphens are used to show that each group of hyphenated words represents one word in the Hebrew. The larger passage (verses 19–22) refers to an initial loss of children to be followed by an abundance of children. Here the King James Bible identifies the lost children as “the other”, but the reader can still be confused about what “the other” actually refers to. Joseph Smith, in his editing for the 1837 edition, emended “the other” to read “the first”, which still refers to the original children that were lost. Even so, both readings are difficult because in either case the reader is required to mentally supply *children*, either “the other children” or “the first children”. The critical text will restore the original text, despite its difficulty. Obviously, the original text of the Book of Mormon followed the King James translation here in 1 Nephi 21:20.

Summary: Restore in 1 Nephi 21:20 the original King James text of “after thou hast lost the **other**”; Joseph Smith’s change of *other* to *first* is an attempt to more clearly identify what “the other” refers to.

■ 1 Nephi 21:20

*the children which thou shalt have
after thou hast lost the other
shall again in thine ears [NULL >+ say 0 | say 1 ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
the place is too strait for me*

□ Isaiah 49:20 (King James Bible)

the children which thou shalt have
after thou hast lost the other
shall **say** again in thine ears
the place *is* too strait for me

Oliver Cowdery initially omitted the verb *say* when he wrote down “shall again in thine ears” in \mathcal{O} . At some later time, he recognized that the main verb was missing and inserted *say* in heavier ink in \mathcal{O} , perhaps after first writing it in \mathcal{P} . In other words, the correction in \mathcal{O} could have been made while he was copying from \mathcal{O} to \mathcal{P} . In any event, he placed the *say* right before the quote; in fact, the choice of the verb *say* may have been a reasonable guess on his part. But the corresponding King James passage has *say* right after the helping verb, *shall*. Comparing 1 Nephi 20–21 with Isaiah 48–49, we find no other cases of variation in word order except for the occasional switching of two immediately adjacent words. The uniqueness of the switch here, plus the fact that it is in heavier ink, suggests that Oliver’s correction was his own and that he put *say* in the wrong place.

In this long quotation from Isaiah 48–49, Oliver Cowdery made a number of non-immediate changes with heavier ink flow in the original manuscript. Note, in particular, the correction of *claved* to *clave* in 1 Nephi 20:21 and of *ends* to *end* in 1 Nephi 21:6; these two corrections in heavy ink were apparently done after \mathcal{P} had been copied from \mathcal{O} .

Another possible word order for 1 Nephi 21:20 is “shall again say in thine ears”. Elsewhere the text does permit a short adverb like *also* to separate *shall* and *say*:

2 Nephi 2:13
and if ye shall say there is no law
ye **shall** also **say** there is no sin

When the adverb is longer, *shall* and *say* are kept together, as in the following instance where the adverb is the prepositional phrase “at that day”:

3 Nephi 29:7
yea and woe unto him that **shall say** at that day . . .

However, these are the only examples involving *shall* and *say*, so we cannot deduce too much from this meager evidence regarding the word order in 1 Nephi 21:20.

In any case, the placement in 1 Nephi 21:20 of the main verb *say* after both *again* and *in thine ears* definitely sounds awkward. The differences between the King James text and the corresponding Book of Mormon quotes virtually always make the text easier to read. But moving *say* to the end of the clause clearly creates a more difficult reading in 1 Nephi 21:20. The most reasonable assumption here is that Oliver Cowdery’s placement of *say* is an error and that the original

Book of Mormon text followed the word order of the King James Bible (namely, “shall say again in thine ears”).

Summary: Place *say* after the helping verb *shall* in 1 Nephi 21:20, with the result that the Book of Mormon text follows the King James text of Isaiah; Oliver Cowdery initially omitted the main verb *say* in ☉ when he first took down Joseph Smith’s dictation; Oliver later added the *say* in the wrong place.

■ 1 Nephi 21:20

*the place is too [strait 01RT | straight ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQS] for me
give place to me that I may dwell*

□ Isaiah 49:20 (King James Bible)

the place *is* too **strait** for me
give place to me that I may dwell

The context here refers to not having enough space to live, so the correct word is *strait* ‘narrow’, not *straight* ‘not crooked’. The King James *strait* correctly reflects the Hebrew *šar*. The 1920 edition restored the correct *strait* to the LDS text, but the RLDS text still retains the incorrect *straight*. For more discussion, see 1 Nephi 8:20.

Summary: Follow the King James *strait* here in 1 Nephi 21:20.

■ 1 Nephi 21:21

*behold I was left alone
these / where [had > have 0 | have 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST] they been*

□ Isaiah 49:21 (King James Bible)

behold I was left alone
these / where **had** they *been*

The ink level for the correction from *had* to *have* in ☉ is the same as that of the original hand; thus the correction seems to have been an immediate one. The phraseology of “where had they been” is rather awkward. While it is true that one could interpret the change as Joseph Smith’s decision (while translating) to replace the awkward *had* with *have*, it is also possible that the past-tense form *had* was actually a scribal error influenced by the preceding past-tense form *was*. Since the correction appears to be immediate, it is probably best to accept the correction *have* as the reading of the original text for the Book of Mormon, even though it disagrees with the *had* of the King James Bible.

Either *had* or *have* would work in a translation from the Hebrew, since the Hebrew text here has no actual word for the *be* verb (which is why *had been* is in italics in the King James text). Another possible translation could have been “these / where were they”.

Summary: Maintain in 1 Nephi 21:21 the *have* of “where have they been”; the correction in \mathcal{O} from the *had* to *have* appears to have been immediate; the initial *had* is probably due to scribal error, even though it does agree with the *had* of the King James Bible.

■ 1 Nephi 21:23

they shall bow down to thee with their face towards the earth

□ Isaiah 49:23 (King James Bible)

they shall bow down to thee with *their face toward* the earth

As discussed under 1 Nephi 5:22, Oliver Cowdery (and perhaps Joseph Smith) preferred the form *towards* over *toward*. We see this here in the Isaiah quotations, where the King James Bible systematically has only *toward*, but the tendency for the Book of Mormon text is to read *towards*. Thus later in 2 Nephi 6, which quotes the last part of Isaiah 49, we get *towards* once more in the earliest textual source (in this case, \mathcal{P} ; the second half of *towards* is not extant in \mathcal{O}):

2 Nephi 6:7 (also quoting Isaiah 49:23)

they shall bow down to thee with their faces **towards** the earth

(This verse also has *faces* rather than the singular *face* of 1 Nephi 21:23 and Isaiah 49:23. See 2 Nephi 6:7 for discussion of this variant.)

The adverb *towards* occurs twice in the long quotation from Isaiah 2–14 in 2 Nephi:

	EARLIEST SOURCE (\mathcal{P})	KING JAMES BIBLE
2 Nephi 17:1	towards	toward
2 Nephi 21:14	towards >% toward	toward

The first example shows once more the overriding preference in the Book of Mormon for *towards*. The second example clearly shows Oliver Cowdery’s tendency to write *towards*; in this instance the original manuscript apparently read *toward*, in agreement with the corresponding Isaiah passage. This example suggests that the use of *towards* in the Book of Mormon quotations of Isaiah may be due to dialectal overlay from Joseph Smith and Oliver Cowdery. Nonetheless, as noted in the discussion under 1 Nephi 5:22, the most conservative solution is to accept the earliest textual reading for each case of *toward(s)*, even if it does differ with the reading in the King James Bible.

Summary: Retain the use of *towards* in 1 Nephi 21:23, the reading of the earliest textual source (the original manuscript); the King James Bible has *toward*, but the Book of Mormon text favors *towards* in almost all instances.

■ 1 Nephi 21:24

[NULL >+ for 0|for 1|For ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
*shall the prey be taken from the mighty
 or the lawful captive delivered*

□ Isaiah 49:24 (King James Bible)

shall the prey be taken from the mighty
 or the lawful captive delivered

The ink level for this correction in the original manuscript seems to indicate an immediate correction. The level of ink flow for first part of the supralinear *for* is unchanged, but slightly more ink flow occurs at the end of the word as well as for the insert mark, which may indicate that Oliver Cowdery redipped his quill while making this correction.

The corresponding King James passage does not have the *for*, so one could interpret the supralinear *for* as Joseph Smith's decision to edit the King James text as he was translating. However, evidence elsewhere suggests that the Book of Mormon often has the connecting *for* when the King James Bible lacks it. Consider these examples from 1 Nephi 20–21:

1 Nephi 20:10	for behold I have refined thee
Isaiah 48:10	behold I have refined thee
1 Nephi 20:12	for I am he
Isaiah 48:12	I <i>am</i> he
1 Nephi 21:15	for can a woman forget her sucking child
Isaiah 49:15	can a woman forget her sucking child

In these three examples, the text in \mathcal{O} shows no correction: in each case, the connecting *for* was there from the beginning—that is, when Oliver Cowdery first took down Joseph Smith's dictation. Yet in each case the *for* is missing from the King James passage. Also note that in both 1 Nephi 21:15 and 1 Nephi 21:24, the connecting *for* is placed before a yes-no question. In all of these cases, the difference between the two texts seems to be intentional. Moreover, the use of the *for* is consistent with the Book of Mormon's tendency to increase the connectiveness of the text (see, for instance, the increased use of *and* in 1 Nephi 20:12–13).

Additional evidence for the connecting *for* here in 1 Nephi 21:24 is that it also appears later on in 2 Nephi 6 when Isaiah 49:24 is quoted a second time:

2 Nephi 6:16	for shall the prey be taken from the mighty
Isaiah 49:24	shall the prey be taken from the mighty

Thus the Book of Mormon tendency to insert *for* before yes-no questions in Isaiah quotes seems to be quite strong.

Summary: Maintain in 1 Nephi 21:24 the connecting *for* that was immediately added in the original manuscript; the difference here with the King James Bible parallels the extra *for* found elsewhere in the Book of Mormon's Isaiah quotes.

■ 1 Nephi 21:24–25

- (a) *for shall the prey be taken from the mighty*
- (b) *or the lawful [captive 01 | captives ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] delivered*
but thus saith the Lord
- (b') *even the [captive 01 | captives ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] of the mighty shall be taken away*
- (a') *and the prey of the terrible shall be delivered*

□ Isaiah 49:24–25 (King James Bible)

- (a) shall the prey be taken from the mighty
- (b) or the lawful **captive** delivered
but thus saith the LORD
- (b') even the **captives** of the mighty shall be taken away
- (a') and the prey of the terrible shall be delivered

In the two Book of Mormon manuscripts, we consistently have the singular *captive* in this chiasmus (based on *prey-captive-captive-prey* and represented above as *a-b-b'-a'*). The 1830 typesetter changed both examples of the singular *captive* to the plural, and all subsequent editions have consistently followed this plurality.

In the King James Bible, we have the singular *captive* in verse 24 and the plural *captives* in verse 25. Of course, this disagreement in number partially breaks the identity of the noun forms in the chiasmus. Note that otherwise the chiasmus in English uses only singular forms (*prey*, *mighty*, and *terrible*).

The Hebrew text has the same form for *captive(s)*, thus maintaining the noun identity of the chiasmus. In both cases, this word can be translated in either the singular or the plural (since the word historically meant ‘captivity’, but the word’s usage was expanded to also mean ‘a captive’ or ‘captives’). In the Hebrew, the words *prey*, *mighty*, and *terrible* are all singular forms. The most consistent translation would therefore be to use the singular throughout, which is how the original text of the Book of Mormon apparently read here in 1 Nephi 21:24–25. But if the plural *captives* is chosen instead of the singular, both occurrences should read in the plural (as in all the printed editions of the Book of Mormon).

Another possibility is that the reading in \mathcal{S} is due to scribal error. It is possible that Oliver Cowdery accidentally dropped the plural *s* for the *captives* in verse 25 (under the influence of the preceding singular *captive* in verse 24). As scribe, Oliver sometimes accidentally dropped the plural *s*. (There are a couple of nearby examples in \mathcal{S} : *affliction* > *afflictions* in 1 Nephi 16:35 and *way* > *ways* in 1 Nephi 17:3.)

Substantial support for a scribal error in 1 Nephi 21:25 comes from 2 Nephi 6, where this same Isaiah passage is again quoted word for word:

2 Nephi 6:16–17

- for shall the prey be taken from the mighty
- or the lawful **captive** delivered
- but thus saith the Lord
- even the **captives** of the mighty shall be taken away
- and the prey of the terrible shall be delivered

Here the King James use of both *captive* and *captives* is maintained. Thus it is quite possible in 1 Nephi 21:24–25 that the second *captive* was just a scribal error for *captives*.

In other places where the King James Bible is quoted more than once, differences between the multiple Book of Mormon quotations do occur. For instance, verses 22–26 here in 1 Nephi 21 are also directly quoted in 2 Nephi 6:6–7, 16–18. There are two additional clauses in the Book of Mormon text, but also one of the King James clauses is omitted. Further, there are three minor differences between the two passages: *face* versus *faces* in 2 Nephi 6:7, *him* versus *them* in 2 Nephi 6:17, and an omitted *and* in 1 Nephi 21:26. Generally speaking, we will allow such differences, both major and minor, to remain in the critical text unless there is specific evidence for scribal error.

Since the singular *captive* clearly works in 1 Nephi 21:24–25, the best solution is to follow the earliest textual evidence for this passage (namely, two occurrences of the singular). On the other hand, again basing our decision on the earliest textual sources, we will retain the disagreement in number found in 2 Nephi 6:16–17 (which there follows the King James text).

Summary: Restore the two singular readings of *captive* in 1 Nephi 21:24–25, as found in both the original and printer’s manuscripts; on the other hand, the King James Bible’s *captive/captives* will be retained in 2 Nephi 6:16–17.

■ 1 Nephi 21:26

they shall be drunken with their own blood as with sweet wine

□ Isaiah 49:26 (King James Bible)

and they shall be drunken with their own blood as with sweet wine

The King James text here begins the sentence with an *and*, but the connecting *and* is missing in the Book of Mormon text. Although this loss of *and* may be due to scribal error, it is probably best to follow the earliest textual sources (here the original manuscript) since whether or not the *and* is there makes little difference in the meaning. When this passage is quoted a second time in 2 Nephi 6, the *and* is there:

2 Nephi 6:18 = Isaiah 49:26 (King James Bible)

and they shall be drunken with their own blood as with sweet wine

There are other cases where the King James *and* is missing from the corresponding Book of Mormon quotation. Here are a couple of examples from 1 Nephi 20–21:

1 Nephi 20:19	the offspring of thy bowels like the gravel thereof
Isaiah 48:19	and the offspring of thy bowels like the gravel thereof
1 Nephi 21:7	the Redeemer of Israel his Holy One
Isaiah 49:7	the Redeemer of Israel and his Holy One

Although the loss of *and* in 1 Nephi 21:26 may be an error, it is also possible that its omission is intentional. Sometimes there are differences when an Isaiah passage is multiply quoted in the Book of Mormon. And there is evidence that such differences can be intentional. For an example, see

the discussion regarding *him* versus *them* under 2 Nephi 6:17–18 (a quotation from Isaiah 49:25–26, which is also quoted here in 1 Nephi 21:25–26).

Summary: Maintain in 1 Nephi 21:26 the clause “they shall be drunken”, which occurs without any connecting *and* at the beginning of the clause; although the *and* occurs when this same verse is quoted in 2 Nephi 6:18, its omission here in 1 Nephi 21:26 may be intentional.

■ 1 Nephi 21:26

they shall be drunken with their own blood

as with sweet [wines >+ wine 0 | wine 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST]

□ Isaiah 49:26 (King James Bible)

and they shall be drunken with their own blood

as with sweet **wine**

Oliver Cowdery initially wrote *wines*, then later, in heavier ink, he crossed out the plural *s*. He probably did this without reference to a King James Bible since he was simply removing what was an obvious error. Nonetheless, this change does represent later editing of the text, which was perhaps done after \mathcal{C} had been copied into \mathcal{P} . Of course, the obvious error was not copied into \mathcal{P} .

When this verse is quoted a second time in 2 Nephi 6, the singular *wine* occurs—and without any correction:

2 Nephi 6:18 = Isaiah 49:26 (King James Bible)

and they shall be drunken with their own blood as with sweet **wine**

Summary: Retain the current reading *wine* in 1 Nephi 21:26, which follows the King James reading and the corrected reading in \mathcal{C} .

1 Nephi 22

■ 1 Nephi 22:1

*and now it came to pass that after I Nephi
[after that I 0A | after that I >js NULL 1 | BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
had read these things which were engraven upon the plates of brass
my brethren came unto me and said unto me . . .*

The earliest text has an unusual redundancy (“after I Nephi after that I”), which Joseph Smith removed in his editing for the 1837 edition. The edited version agrees with other usage in the text:

1 Nephi 16:1

and now it came to pass that
after I Nephi had made an end of speaking to my brethren
behold **they** said unto me . . .

1 Nephi 17:7

and it came to pass that
after I Nephi had been in the land Bountiful for the space of many days
the voice of the Lord came unto me saying . . .

2 Nephi 1:1

and now it came to pass
after I Nephi had made an end of teaching my brethren
our father Lehi also spake many things unto them

In these three examples, the subject of the following main clause is not *Nephi*; thus the subordinate conjunction *after* necessarily precedes the subject of the subordinate clause “I Nephi”. Similarly, in 1 Nephi 22:1, the *after* needs to precede the “I Nephi” since the main clause subject is “my brethren”. Thus if there is an early transmission error in this passage, it must be that the words *after that I* were accidentally added (either in dictating the text or in taking down the dictation). Yet one would think that it would have been easier to have accidentally repeated simply *after I*, not the longer *after that I*. The longer form suggests that the repetition, despite its redundancy, is intentional.

There are a couple of other examples where the subordinate conjunction *after* is used redundantly, but not as egregiously as here in 1 Nephi 22:1. In each case there is an intervening phrase or clause (marked in bold below) that made it necessary to repeat the *after*-clause:

1 Nephi 10:11

and **after** that they had slain the Messiah **which should come**
and **after** that he had been slain
he should rise from the dead

Alma 3:1

and it came to pass that the Nephites
 which were not slain by the weapons of war
after having buried those which had been slain
— now the number of the slain were not numbered
because of the greatness of their number —
 and **after** they had finished burying their dead
 they all returned to their lands
 and to their houses and their wives and their children

In 1 Nephi 22:1, the intervening phrase is only a single word (namely, the name *Nephi*). Further, in the two other examples the first *after*-clause is always completed, whereas here in 1 Nephi 22:1, the subject *Nephi* occurs without any associated verb phrase: “after I **Nephi** / after that I had read these things”. Nonetheless, the two other examples do suggest that the redundancy in 1 Nephi 22:1 is possible, and thus the critical text will retain the extra “after that I” despite its unusualness.

Summary: Restore the redundancy of the earliest text in 1 Nephi 22:1 (“after I Nephi / after that I had read these things”).

■ 1 Nephi 22:1

my brethren came unto me and said unto me
what [mean 01 | meaneth ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] these things which ye have read

The 1830 typesetter added the *-eth* ending to the verb, probably because he interpreted the initial *what* as the subject of the clause, when in actual fact “these things” is the subject. Note, for instance, that in standard English we have “what do these things mean”, not “what does these things mean”. Since “these things” is plural, the reading of the manuscripts is correct, even though the original text allows *-(e)th* to occur with plural subjects, as in Mosiah 12:20 (“what **meaneth** the words which are written”) and Helaman 5:38 (“what **doth** all these things mean”). But here in 1 Nephi 22:1, the earliest text supports the standard plural form *mean*. For further discussion, see INFLECTIONAL ENDINGS in volume 3.

Summary: Restore the original reading “what **mean** these things” in 1 Nephi 22:1, which is grammatically correct for Early Modern English.

■ 1 Nephi 22:1

behold are they to be understood
according to [01ABCDEFGHIJLMNOQRT | the HKPS] things which are spiritual

The 1874 RLDS edition added the definite article *the* before *things*, and the RLDS text has continued this reading. However, there is no need to add the *the*. Elsewhere in the text, there are other occurrences of “things which are” without any preceding determiner, including this one similar to 1 Nephi 22:1:

Alma 37:43
 even so it is with things which are spiritual

Summary: Maintain the earliest text in 1 Nephi 22:1, which lacks *the* before “things which are spiritual”.

■ 1 Nephi 22:2

behold they were [made 01APS | BCDEFGHIJKLMNOQRT] manifest unto the prophet

Both *made* and *manifest* begin the same (with the two letters *ma*), which may have led the 1837 typesetter to accidentally skip the *made*. The deletion of *made* was not marked by Joseph Smith in the printer’s manuscript. Elsewhere the Book of Mormon text has 14 occurrences of the passive “to be made manifest”, three of “to be manifested”, but none of “to be manifest”. Nor did Joseph Smith ever attempt to change any of the 14 other occurrences of “to be made manifest” by deleting the *made*. Thus we have an example here in 1 Nephi 22:2 of an accidental error creating the only occurrence of “to be manifest” in the text. In accord with the printer’s manuscript, the 1908 RLDS edition restored the original reading, “they were made manifest”.

A similar error where *made* was accidentally skipped occurred in Alma 37:21 of the original manuscript. There Oliver Cowdery initially wrote “all their wickedness and abominations may be manifest”. Oliver immediately caught his error, erased *manifest* and overwrote the erasure with *made*, and then wrote *manifest* immediately afterwards on the same line (see line 9 on page 297’ of \mathcal{O}).

Summary: Follow the original reading of “to be made manifest” in 1 Nephi 22:2; the 1837 reading of “to be manifest” is a unique reading and otherwise nonexistent in the text.

■ 1 Nephi 22:2

behold they were made manifest

- (1) *unto the [prophets >+ prophet 0 | prophet 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST]
 by the voice of the Spirit
 for by the Spirit are all things made known*
- (2) *unto the [prophets 0BCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST | Prophets 1 | prophet A]*

Here we have two cases of the word *prophet(s)*, and both have involved variation. In the first case, Oliver Cowdery initially wrote down in the original manuscript the plural *prophets*, possibly because the plural is expected, given the preceding plural pronoun *they*. Somewhat later Oliver crossed out the *s* with heavier ink flow. Perhaps the correction was made when Oliver read back the text to Joseph. In any event, the singular seems to be correct for the first occurrence of *prophet(s)*. The pronoun *they* (“they were made manifest”) relates to the brothers’ question found just before in verse 1 (“what mean **these things** which ye have read”). Nephi had just finished reading a long passage from the prophet Isaiah (Isaiah 48–49 in 1 Nephi 20–21), so in the first case the singular *prophet* is more appropriate than the plural *prophets*.

In the second case of *prophet(s)*, Nephi expands the scope of his remarks to say more generally that all things are made known to the prophets by the Spirit. The expansion extends to “all things”, not just the things that Nephi has just finished reading to his brothers. Moreover, Nephi now refers to all prophets, not just one prophet (Isaiah). And since prophets prophesy throughout time, Nephi uses the present tense rather than the past tense to refer to their prophecies (“for by the Spirit **are** all things made known”). Thus the plural *prophets* appears to be correct in the second case. The 1830 compositor, probably influenced by the preceding singular *prophet*, also set the second one in the singular. But the 1837 edition restored the plural *prophets*, probably by reference to the printer’s manuscript.

Summary: Maintain in 1 Nephi 22:2 the singular *prophet* followed by the plural *prophets*.

■ 1 Nephi 22:4

and [behold 0BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST | before >js behold 1 | before A]

there are many which are already lost from the knowledge of they which are at Jerusalem

Oliver Cowdery accidentally misread \mathcal{O} when he copied from \mathcal{O} into \mathcal{P} , and he ended up replacing *behold* with *before*. The use of *before* didn’t create a completely nonsensical reading; one can interpret *before* as an adverb meaning ‘before this time’. Yet *before* is otherwise not used like this in the Book of Mormon. Usually, *before* acts as either a preposition or a subordinate conjunction (that is, *before* usually takes a complement). When *before* acts alone as a one-word adverbial, either it modifies the main verb in the clause (such as in 1 Nephi 8:11, “above all that I ever had **before** tasted”) or, in one instance, it acts as a predicate adverb (in an Isaiah quote in 2 Nephi 19:12, “the Syrians before and the Philistines behind”).

This error of *before* for *behold* in 1 Nephi 22:4 was not caught until the 1837 (second) edition was produced. As far as we can tell, the original manuscript was not used to restore readings for the 1837 edition, so the restoration of the original *behold* here seems to be Joseph Smith’s own emendation to the text, which turns out to be the correct reading. In nearly all of his changes to the text for the second and third editions, Joseph did not restore readings found uniquely in \mathcal{O} unless he actually checked the original manuscript. We have specific evidence for Joseph using \mathcal{O} , but only in his editing for the 1840 (third) edition. For the few cases where the 1837 edition restores a unique reading in \mathcal{O} , the incorrect reading is sufficiently difficult that it invites a more reasonable reading, as here in 1 Nephi 22:4.

Summary: Maintain the reading of \mathcal{O} in 1 Nephi 22:4 (“and **behold** there are many which are already lost”); the change of *behold* to *before* is a simple visual misreading and was corrected by Joseph Smith for the 1837 edition, but apparently without reference to \mathcal{O} .

■ 1 Nephi 22:4

and [*whither* 0ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST | *whether* 1] *they are none of us knoweth*

Oliver Cowdery had considerable difficulty distinguishing *whether* from the archaic *whither*, often mixing up the spelling of the two words in the manuscripts. Here in 1 Nephi 22:4, Oliver copied *whither* as *whether* into \mathcal{D} . But the 1830 typesetter set the correct *whither* because it was quite obvious that *whither* (meaning ‘where’) is the correct choice. The preceding clause states that “the more part of all the tribes have been led away and they are scattered to and fro upon the isles of the sea”, so these people (or their descendants) were still alive, but no one knew where they were.

In most instances, the choice of *whither*(*soever*) versus *whether*(*soever*) is clear. There are 34 clear cases of *whither*(*soever*) in the original text and 43 of *whether*(*soever*). But for 15 cases there is variation, and in each of these cases we are required to examine the context in order to determine whether *whether*(*soever*) or *whither*(*soever*) is intended. Each of these cases of variation will be discussed as they occur. I list here the 14 other cases, giving only the variation. The ones marked with an asterisk have caused particular difficulty, while for the others it has been fairly easy to determine the correct variant:

* Alma 16:5	[<i>whether</i> >js <i>whither</i> 1 <i>whether</i> ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST <i>whither</i> T]
Alma 29:4	[<i>whether</i> > <i>whither</i> 0 <i>whither</i> >jg <i>whether</i> 1 <i>whether</i> ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST]
* Alma 43:22	[<i>whither</i> 01ABDEFHIJKLMNQRST <i>whether</i> CG]
* Alma 43:23	[<i>whither</i> 1ABDEFIJLMNQRST <i>whether</i> CGHK]
* Alma 48:16	[<i>whither</i> / <i>whether</i> 0 <i>whither</i> 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST]
* Alma 52:36	[<i>whither</i> 0DEFT <i>where</i> > <i>whether</i> 1 <i>whether</i> ABCGHIJKLMNQRST]
Alma 63:8	[<i>whither</i> 0ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST <i>whether</i> 1]
Helaman 6:8	[<i>whithersoever</i> 1 <i>whithersoever</i> ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST]
Helaman 9:12	[<i>whither</i> >jg <i>whether</i> 1 <i>whether</i> ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST]
3 Nephi 1:3	[<i>whether</i> >+ <i>whither</i> 1 <i>whither</i> ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST]
* Mormon 8:10	[<i>whither</i> 1 <i>whether</i> ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST]
Ether 1:38	[<i>whither</i> 1 <i>whether</i> ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST]
Ether 1:38	[<i>whither</i> 1ABCFGHIJKLMNQRST <i>whether</i> DE]
Ether 14:1	[<i>which</i> > <i>whither</i> 1 <i>whither</i> ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRT <i>whether</i> s]

Much of the inconsequential variation is due to the scribes. There is one other case with variation, but this one involves the change of *whithersoever* to *wheresoever*, not to *whithersoever*. For discussion of that example, see Alma 23:14.

Summary: Maintain *whither* ‘where’ in 1 Nephi 22:4 since in this case the context readily determines that the correct word is *whither*, not *whether*.

■ 1 Nephi 22:5

and since [that 0A | that >js NULL 1 | BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] they have been led away these things have been prophesied concerning them

As with other subordinate conjunctions in the original text of the Book of Mormon, *since* can be followed by *that*, although this is the only one in the text. In 18 other cases, the subordinate conjunction *since* is directly followed by the full clause—that is, without the *that* (as in the ubiquitous phrase “since the world began” found in 1 Nephi 3:20 and five other places). In his editing for the 1837 edition, Joseph Smith removed most instances of the archaic use of *that* after subordinate conjunctions, including the one following *since* here in 1 Nephi 22:5. For a complete discussion, see SUBORDINATE CONJUNCTIONS in volume 3.

Summary: Restore the original *that* which followed the subordinate conjunction *since* in 1 Nephi 22:5.

■ 1 Nephi 22:5

wherefore they shall be scattered among all nations and shall be hated [by 01A | of BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] all men

The change of *by* to *of* appeared first in the 1837 edition. Joseph Smith did not mark it in the printer’s manuscript. The agentive use of the preposition *of* is now archaic in English, but there are numerous examples of it in the King James Bible. In fact, the use of the preposition *of* in 1 Nephi 22:5 may have been influenced by the well-known phraseology of the following passage in the synoptic Gospels:

Matthew 10:22 (also Mark 13:13 and Luke 21:17)
and ye shall be hated **of** all *men* for my name’s sake

In the Book of Mormon, there are two other agentive examples involving the past participle *hated*, one of which takes *of* and the other *by*. In neither of these two cases has there been any variation in the textual tradition:

Jacob 7:26 and hated **of** our brethren
3 Nephi 16:9 and to become hated **by** them

For other verbs in the passive, we have the following statistics in the original text:

VERB	<i>by</i>	<i>of</i>
despised	1	3
rejected	3	3
esteemed	2	0

Thus both *by* and *of* are used as agentive prepositions in the Book of Mormon text. There has been no systematic attempt or accidental tendency to change any of these other examples.

Summary: Restore in 1 Nephi 22:5 the reading of the manuscripts, “hated by all men”; the 1837 change may be due to the familiarity of the King James phraseology “hated of all men” (found in the synoptic Gospels).

■ 1 Nephi 22:6

nevertheless after that

- (1) *they [have been 0APS | have been >js been >js have been 1 | shall be BCDEFGHIJKLMNOQRT]
nursed by the Gentiles
and the Lord hath lifted up his hand upon the Gentiles and set them up for a standard*
- (2) *and their children [shall be 0A | shall be >js have been 1 | have been BCDEFGHIJKLMNQPQRST]
carried in their arms*
- (3) *and their daughters [shall be 0A | shall be >js have been 1 | have been BCDEFGHIJKLMNQPQRST]
carried upon their shoulders
behold . . .*

There are three passive verb phrases in this long *after*-clause. Originally, the first verb phrase read “have been nursed”, and the second and third read “shall be carried”. In his editing of the printer’s manuscript for the 1837 edition, Joseph Smith changed the last two to agree with the first, so that all three read “have been” in \mathcal{P} . But in the 1837 edition, the first one was changed to “shall be”, as if to agree with the original “shall be” in the two following cases. It is possible that Joseph considered making all three verb phrases read as “shall be”. Perhaps Joseph (or an assistant) changed the first passive verb phrase to “shall be” in the copy of the 1830 Book of Mormon that served as the copy-text for typesetting the 1837 edition; then later the changes for the second and third cases were also transferred from \mathcal{P} to that copy. In any event, the 1837 edition ended up by reversing all three verb phrases, thus retaining the inconsistency of the original passage.

In the King James Bible, which this passage in 1 Nephi 22:6 paraphrases, the future modal *shall* is used. This use of *shall* agrees with the second and third cases in the Book of Mormon passage, which originally had *shall*:

Isaiah 49:22–23

and they **shall** bring thy sons in *their* arms
and thy daughters **shall** be carried upon *their* shoulders
and kings **shall** be thy nursing fathers
and their queens thy nursing mothers

There is further agreement between the King James Bible’s “shall be carried” and the two occurrences of the same passive verb phrase in the original Book of Mormon text.

The critical text will follow the reading of the original manuscript (“have been . . . shall be . . . shall be”). As far as the first case is concerned, there is nothing wrong with the present perfect passive in *after*-clauses, even when the reference is to the future. In fact, the very next verse has an example that has never been edited:

1 Nephi 22:7

and it meaneth that the time cometh that
after all the house of Israel **have been scattered and confounded**
that the Lord God will raise up a mighty nation among the Gentiles

Summary: Restore in 1 Nephi 22:6 the three original verb phrases in the *after*-clause; according to his editing of the printer’s manuscript, Joseph Smith intended for all three verb phrases to read the same (as the perfect passive “have been”); the 1837 edition followed this editing for the second and third cases but changed the first verb phrase to “shall be”, which resulted in a systematic reversal of the original verb phrase usage in this *after*-clause.

■ 1 Nephi 22:6

*for thus [is the covenants 01ABDE | are the covenants CGHKPRST | is the covenant FIJLMNOQ]
of the Lord with our fathers
and it meaneth us in the days to come
and also all our brethren which are of the house of Israel*

The original Book of Mormon text has the singular verb *is* and the plural *covenants*. There have been two possible solutions to this grammatical difficulty: (1) change the verb form to the plural *are* (beginning with the 1840 edition and continuing in the RLDS textual tradition, and also adopted by the 1920 LDS edition); (2) change the noun to the singular *covenant* (beginning with the 1852 LDS edition and continuing in the LDS text up to the 1920 edition).

The singular *it* in “it meaneth” could be interpreted as referring to a singular *covenant*. This interpretation would imply that the plural *covenants* was another case of the scribe accidentally (and unnecessarily) adding the plural *s* to a word. More likely, however, the singular pronoun *it* is a more general reference to Isaiah’s prophecy of how the Gentiles would assist in restoring the house of Israel. The following verse also begins with “it meaneth”, and in that case *it* seems to refer more generally to the prophecy itself (“and it meaneth that the time cometh that . . .”).

A stronger case can be made for the plural “covenants of the Lord”. There are 40 occurrences of the singular “covenant of the Lord” in the King James Bible, but none in the Book of Mormon. On the other hand, the Book of Mormon has only the plural “covenants of the Lord” (11 occurrences, counting this one in 1 Nephi 22:6), but none of “covenant of the Lord”. Thus usage elsewhere argues that the original phrase “for thus is the covenants of the Lord with our fathers” meant ‘for thus are the covenants of the Lord with our fathers’. The use of *is* followed by a plural noun is quite common in the original Book of Mormon text. This kind of usage is found, for instance, in the original text for 2 Nephi 10:21 (“great is the promises of the Lord”) and Alma 11:22 (“here is six onties of silver”). For additional discussion, see SUBJECT-VERB AGREEMENT in volume 3.

The standard text can therefore continue to follow the plural verb *are* in “for thus are the covenants”, but the critical text will restore the original singular verb *is*.

Summary: Maintain in 1 Nephi 22:6 the plural *covenants* and restore the singular verb *is* in “for thus is the covenants of the Lord with our fathers”.

■ 1 Nephi 22:8

wherefore it is likened

unto [the 01ABDE | their CGHIJKLMNOPQRST | the > their F] being nursed by the Gentiles

The change of *the* to *their* before the gerundive “being nursed by the Gentiles” appeared first in the 1840 edition. This change may be Joseph Smith’s, although it is also possible that it is a typo. The second printing of the 1852 LDS edition, which often corrected the text by reference to the 1840 edition, replaced the *the* with *their*.

The use of the definite article *the* in front of a gerund phrase is fairly common in the Book of Mormon, even though it may sound rather awkward to today’s reader. For instance, in the very next verse we have another example of *the* before a gerund phrase:

1 Nephi 22:9

and it shall also be of worth unto the Gentiles
and not only unto the Gentiles but unto all the house of Israel
unto **the** making known of the covenants of the Father of heaven unto Abraham

Don Brugger (personal communication) points out a difference here: in the first instance (in verse 8), the replacement of *the* with *their* is possible, but in the second instance (in verse 9), *the* cannot be emended to *their*. Even so, there are gerundive uses like the example here in verse 8:

1 Nephi 17:32

he did make them mighty unto **the** driving out the children of the land
yea unto **the** scattering them to destruction

It is very doubtful that both these instances of *the* are errors for *their*. For further discussion of this kind of gerundive, see under 1 Nephi 17:32. For a complete list of its occurrences in the original text, see GERUNDIVES in volume 3.

Summary: Restore the original gerundive construction in 1 Nephi 22:8 (“unto **the** being nursed by the Gentiles”).

■ 1 Nephi 22:8

wherefore it is likened

unto the being [nursed 0 | nourished 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST] by the Gentiles
and being carried in their arms and upon their shoulders

As he was copying from \mathcal{C} into \mathcal{P} , Oliver Cowdery accidentally misread *nursed* as the visually similar *nourished*. Of course, the semantic possibility of *nourished* has prevented its discovery as an error, except by reference to the original manuscript.

This passage is an obvious reference to Isaiah’s prophecy just quoted by Nephi:

1 Nephi 21:22–23 (Isaiah 49:22–23)

and they shall bring thy sons in their arms
and thy daughters shall be carried upon their shoulders
and kings shall be thy nursing fathers
and their queens thy nursing mothers

In addition, just two verses before 1 Nephi 22:8, Nephi refers to this same prophecy, and once more the word used is *nursed* and not *nourished*:

1 Nephi 22:6

nevertheless after that they have been **nursed** by the Gentiles . . .
and their children shall be carried in their arms
and their daughters shall be carried upon their shoulders . . .

Summary: Based on the original manuscript, the verb form *nursed* should be restored in 1 Nephi 22:8 (“it is likened unto the being nursed by the Gentiles”); the reference here is to the Isaiah quotation in 1 Nephi 21:22–23, which uses the verb *nurse*, not *nourish* (“nursing fathers” and “nursing mothers”).

■ 1 Nephi 22:12

*and they shall be gathered together to the lands
of their [first 0| 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST] inheritance*

Oliver Cowdery accidentally omitted the word *first* while copying from \mathcal{O} to \mathcal{P} , probably because of the high frequency of the phrase “land of their inheritance” (see the discussion under 1 Nephi 10:3). Yet the phrase “the land(s) of X’s **first** inheritance” occurs five other times in the text; there is also one occurrence of “the place of X’s **first** inheritance” (in Alma 22:28). In each instance, the reference is to a people that first inherited a land but were later displaced. In five cases the reference is to the land of Nephi, which the Nephites abandoned to the Lamanites during the times of the first king Mosiah (as recorded in Omni 1:12). The people of Zeniff were the first Nephites to return to the land of Nephi:

Mosiah 9:1

and having had a knowledge of the land of Nephi
or of the land of our fathers’ **first** inheritance

We have similar references to the land of Nephi as a land or place of first inheritance in Mosiah 10:13, Alma 22:28, Alma 54:12, and Alma 54:13.

The sixth case describes the result of a war between two Jaredite kings, Noah and Shule:

Ether 7:16

and he gave battle unto Shule the king
in the which he did obtain the land of their **first** inheritance
and he became a king over that part of the land

In 1 Nephi 22:12, the phrase “lands of their first inheritance” refers to the return of the house of Israel to their original land of inheritance in the land of Palestine.

Summary: Restore the modifier *first* in 1 Nephi 22:12, the reading of the original manuscript (“the lands of their first inheritance”); such usage is consistent with other references to peoples being restored to their original lands.

■ 1 Nephi 22:12

*and they shall know that the Lord is their Savior
and [their 01ABCDEFHIJKLMNOPQRST | G] Redeemer*

The 1858 Wright edition dropped the repeated determiner *their* here in 1 Nephi 22:12. This error was not followed by the subsequent RLDS 1874 edition, which derives (in part) from the 1858 edition. This omission of the repeated *their* was a typo since elsewhere that edition (as well as every other one) has retained this repetition:

1 Nephi 21:26 (also 2 Nephi 6:18)
and all flesh shall know that
I the Lord am **thy** Savior and **thy** Redeemer

Isaiah 49:26 (King James Bible)
and all flesh shall know that
I the LORD *am* **thy** Savior and **thy** Redeemer

For further discussion and examples, see CONJUNCTIVE REPETITION in volume 3.

Summary: Maintain the repeated determiner *their* in 1 Nephi 22:12 (“their Savior and **their** Redeemer”); the language here derives from Isaiah 49:26, which is quoted twice elsewhere in the Book of Mormon and always with the repeated determiner.

■ 1 Nephi 22:14

*and all [they 0 | 1ABCDEFHIJKLMNOPQRST]
[which 0 | which >js who >js that 1 | that ABCDEFHIJKLMNOPQRST] fight against Zion
shall be destroyed*

While copying from \mathcal{G} to \mathcal{P} , Oliver Cowdery omitted the pronoun *they*, thus changing “all they which” to “all which”. The 1830 typesetter rejected the awkwardness of “all which” and replaced the relative pronoun *which* with *that*. In his editing of \mathcal{P} for the 1837 edition, Joseph Smith first emended the *which* to *who* (his normal practice), but then noting that the 1830 edition had *that*, he crossed out his first correction and supralinearly inserted the *that*. If the original *they* hadn’t been omitted by Oliver Cowdery, Joseph Smith would have probably ended up editing the text here to read (according to his normal practice) as “all **those who** fight against Zion”.

Nearby we have another example where the 1830 typesetter changed the relative pronoun *which* to *that*. Once more Joseph Smith edited \mathcal{P} to agree with the 1830 reading:

1 Nephi 22:31
wherefore ye need not suppose that
I and my father are the only ones
[which 0 | which >js that 1 | that ABCDEFHIJKLMNOPQRST]
have testified and also taught them

Occasionally, Joseph himself made the change from *which* to *that* (for instance, in 1 Nephi 13:19, which originally read “the Gentiles **which** had gone out of captivity”). But normally he changed the *which* to *who*—in fact, 17 times in 1 Nephi 22, including five examples where he altered “all they which”. In four cases the resulting phraseology is “all those who” (verses 5 and 20 and twice in verse 23), and in one case “all they who” (verse 19).

1 Nephi 22 also has one more example where a *wh*-initial relative pronoun was replaced by *that*. In this instance, the 1874 RLDS edition replaced one of Joseph Smith’s edited *who*’s with a *that*, probably by accident:

1 Nephi 22:15
 for the day soon cometh that all the proud
 and they [*which* 0A | *which* >js *who* 1 | *who* BCDEFGIJKLMNOPQRST | *that* HK]
 do wickedly
 shall be as stubble

For a complete discussion regarding the change (when referring to persons) of the relative pronoun *which* to *who(m)* or *that*, see WHICH in volume 3. Unless there is specific evidence to suggest a primitive error, the critical text will depend upon the earliest textual sources in determining which relative pronoun should be used in any particular case.

Summary: Restore in 1 Nephi 22:14 the original pronoun *they* that Oliver Cowdery accidentally omitted as he copied from \mathcal{G} to \mathcal{P} ; also restore the original use of the relative pronoun *which* in this verse as well as elsewhere in the text (when supported by the earliest textual sources); here in 1 Nephi 22, Joseph Smith usually changed the *which* to *who*, but in a couple of cases the 1830 typesetter changed the *which* to *that*, and Joseph accepted these instances of *that* in his editing for the 1837 edition.

■ 1 Nephi 22:14

and [*that* 01ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST | *the* s] *great whore*
which hath perverted the right ways of the Lord
—yea that great and abominable church—
shall tumble to the dust

The current RLDS text has replaced the demonstrative *that* with the definite article *the*. This change appears to be a typo and dates from the 1953 RLDS edition. This verse is not the first reference to the great and abominable church as the great whore. In fact, the previous verse states as much:

1 Nephi 22:13
 and the blood of that great and abominable church
 which is the whore of all the earth
 shall turn upon their own heads

Thus there is no doubt that the determiner *that* is correct for “that great whore” in verse 14.

Summary: In 1 Nephi 22:14 maintain *that* in “that great whore”; the 1953 RLDS edition’s change of *that* to *the* appears to be a typo.

■ 1 Nephi 22:14

*yea that great and abominable church shall tumble
to [the 01ABC GHIJKLMNOPQRST | DE | NULL > the F] dust*

The 1841 LDS British edition accidentally dropped the definite article *the* from the phrase “to the dust”. This *the* was restored in the second printing of the 1852 edition, probably by reference to the 1840 edition. Elsewhere the text has 34 occurrences of “the dust”. The only occurrence of *dust* without *the* is in 2 Nephi 15:24, an Isaiah quotation (“and their blossom shall go up as dust”).

Summary: Maintain the definite article for “the dust” in 1 Nephi 22:14.

■ 1 Nephi 22:15

*for behold saith the prophet
[that 0A | that >js NULL 1 | BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
the time cometh speedily that Satan shall have no more power
over the hearts of the children of men*

The subordinate conjunction *that* originally appeared after the clause “saith the prophet”. The *that* would work better if the phraseology had been “for behold **the prophet saith** that the time cometh” since English readers expect “saith that” without an intervening subject. But in actuality, the clause “saith the prophet” acts parenthetically, with the result that without the parenthetical clause the sentence would read “for behold that the time cometh”. Such use of “for behold that S” (where S stands for a sentence) is quite unexpected in modern English, which is probably the reason why Joseph Smith removed the *that* in his editing for the 1837 edition.

A similar example, but with a different intervening parenthetical clause, underwent the same editing for the 1837 edition:

2 Nephi 6:2
behold my beloved brethren
[*that* >js NULL 1 | *that* A | BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] I Jacob
having been called of God
and ordained after the manner of his holy order . . .

There are also examples in the original text where *that* directly follows an imperative *behold*:

Jacob 5:24
behold **that** I have nourished it also
and it hath brought forth fruit

Mosiah 4:5
for behold
[*that* >js NULL 1 | *that* A | BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
if the knowledge of the goodness of God at this time
hath awakened you to a sense of your nothingness . . .

Moroni 8:22

for behold **that** all little children are alive in Christ

The first example involves a conjectured *it* after *nourished*. For discussion, see Jacob 5:24.

We also have clear evidence that the subordinate conjunction *that* can follow a parenthetical “saith the prophet” or “saith the Lord”. In each case, the *that* complements the verb preceding the parenthetical clause:

1 Nephi 19:15 (“that day cometh that . . .”)

nevertheless when that day **cometh**

saith the prophet

that they no more turn aside their hearts against the Holy One of Israel

then will he remember the covenants which he made to their fathers

Jacob 2:32 (“I will not suffer that . . .”)

and I will not **suffer**

saith the Lord of Hosts

that the cries of the fair daughters of this people

which I have led out of the land of Jerusalem

shall come up unto me against the men of my people

Helaman 13:12 (“I perceive that . . .”)

for I **perceive**

saith the Lord

that there are many

yea even the more part of this great city

that will harden their hearts against me

Helaman 13:14 (“the time cometh that . . .”)

but behold the time **cometh**

saith the Lord

that when ye shall cast out the righteous from among you

then shall ye be ripe for destruction

Helaman 13:18 (“it shall come to pass that . . .”)

and it shall come to **pass**

saith the Lord of Hosts

yea our great and true God

that whoso shall hide up treasures in the earth

shall find them again no more

Helaman 13:19 (“I will that . . .”)

for I **will**

saith the Lord

that they shall hide up their treasures unto me

These examples suggest that the original reading in 1 Nephi 22:15 (“for **behold** saith the prophet **that** the time cometh”) is indeed intended. The expression “for behold that S” is acceptable in the original text of the Book of Mormon.

Summary: Restore in 1 Nephi 22:15 the *that* in “for behold saith the prophet that the time cometh speedily”; the *that* does not complement the verb *saith* (which occurs in a parenthetical clause) but rather the preceding verb *behold*; Joseph Smith sometimes deleted the following *that* when *behold* occurred as an imperative (or as an interjection without a subject).

■ 1 Nephi 22:17–18

wherefore he will preserve the righteous by his power

- (1) *even if it [so be 01ABCDEFGHIJLMNOQRT | be so HKPS]
that the fullness of his wrath must come . . .*

they shall be saved

- (2) *even if it [so be 01ABCDEFGHIJKLNOPQRST | be so M] as by fire . . .*

and it cometh unto men according to the flesh

- (3) *if it [so be 01ABCDEFGHIJKLMOPQRST | be so N]
that they will harden their hearts against the Holy One of Israel*

There has been a sporadic, but persistent, tendency in the history of the text to replace “if it so be” with “if it be so”. Here in two verses, we have three cases where editions have made this change. The first occurred in the 1874 RLDS edition and has been retained since then in the RLDS text. The second occurred in the 1905 LDS edition and the third in the 1906 LDS edition, but these two changes were never copied into subsequent LDS editions.

The original text was fully consistent with respect to the word order *so be* in conditional clauses. Originally, there were 42 occurrences of “if it so be”, plus two more with an intervening modal auxiliary (“if it **should** so be” in Enos 1:13 and 3 Nephi 26:9), but there was not one with the order *be so*. Besides the three instances listed above, there are two other cases where the original word order has been switched:

Jacob 5:64

and if it [*so be* 1ABCDEFGHIKPS | *be so* FIJLMNOQRT]
that these last grafts shall grow and bring forth the natural fruit
then shall ye prepare the way for them that they may grow

Ether 2:20

and if it [*so be* 1ABCDGHKPS | *be so* EFIJLMNOQRT]
that the water come in upon thee
behold ye shall stop the hole thereof
that ye may not perish in the flood

The first change to *be so* occurred in the 1852 LDS edition, the second in the 1849 LDS edition. In both of these cases, the incorrect word order has persisted in the LDS text. The critical text will restore all the cases of the original word order that have been accidentally changed (namely, 1 Nephi 22:17 for the RLDS text, and Jacob 5:64 and Ether 2:20 for the LDS text).

Summary: Restore all cases of the original word order *so be* in the conditional clause “if it so be”: 1 Nephi 22:17, Jacob 5:64, and Ether 2:20; the original text has only the word order *so be* in conditional clauses (44 times).

■ 1 Nephi 22:22–23

and the righteous need not fear

- (1) for [it is 0A | it is >js thy are 1 | they are BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
 [they 0A | they >js those 1 | those BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
 [which 0A | which >js who 1 | who BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] shall not be confounded . . .

yea in fine

- all [they 0A | they >js thos 1 | those BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
 [which 0A | which >js who 1 | who BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] belong to the kingdom of the devil
- (2) [it is 0A | it is >js are 1 | are BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] they
 [which 0A | which >js who 1 | who BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] need fear and tremble and quake
- (3) [it is 0A | it is >js they are 1 | they are BCDEFGHIJKLMNOQRT | They are PS]
 [they 0A | they >js those those 1 | those BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
 [which 0A | which >js who 1 | who BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] must be brought low in the dust
- (4) [it is 0A | it is >js they are 1 | they are BCDEFGHIJKLMNOQRT | They are PS]
 [they 01A | those BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
 [which 0A | which >js who 1 | who BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] must be consumed as stubble

In his editing for the 1837 edition, Joseph Smith interpreted the pronoun *it* in these four cases as standing for explicit plurals. Under this interpretation, the first one refers to the righteous (verse 22) and the three others refer to “all they which belong to the kingdom of the devil” (verse 23). Thus Joseph decided to generally edit “it is” to “they are”, although in the second example he did not change *it* to *they* because *they* would have redundantly restated its referent (namely, “all they which belong to the kingdom of the devil”); instead, Joseph just deleted the *it*.

In reality, the *it* is being used in these examples as an existential subject, not a specific pronoun referring to an inherent plural. In other words, the original text is basically saying that “it is the righteous which shall not be confounded” (in verse 22) and that “it is the wicked [those who belong to the kingdom of the devil] which need fear” (in verse 23). Such usage is perfectly acceptable and normal in English. In fact, the text has several unedited examples of this same existential “it is” followed by a plural pronominal subject modified by a *wh*-initial relative clause:

Alma 3:12

and **it is they which** have kept the records
 — which are true— of their people

Alma 61:4

and **it is those who** have sought to take away the judgment seat from me
 that have been the cause of this great iniquity

Ether 13:10

for **it is they whose** garments are white through the blood of the Lamb

Thus the original examples of the existential *it* in 1 Nephi 22:22–23 are wholly appropriate.

Summary: Restore the four instances of existential *it* in 1 Nephi 22:22–23.

2 Nephi

2 Nephi Narrative Structure

■ book title for 2 Nephi

- *The Book of Nephi* 0*1*
- *The Second Book of Nephi* 0^c1^cABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST

The original text gives the name of this book as simply “The Book of Nephi”. Oliver Cowdery later emended the name by adding the word *second* (with heavier ink flow in *Œ* and with lighter ink flow in *Œ*). In fact, the original text gives all four books of Nephi the same name, “The Book of Nephi”. Within the text proper, the critical text will retain the original indistinguishable title “The Book of Nephi” for all four books. For discussion, see the section entitled “book title for 1 Nephi” (in this volume under “1 Nephi Narrative Structure”).

Summary: The original name for 2 Nephi was “The Book of Nephi”; there is no number designation in the original text itself; for purposes of reference, the four books are distinguished as 1 Nephi, 2 Nephi, 3 Nephi, and 4 Nephi.

■ placement of the first chapter of 2 Nephi

(1) before the book title

Chapter VIII 0*
The Book of Nephi
An account of the death of Lehi
. . . his journeyings in the wilderness & C

(2) after the book title

The Book of Nephi 0^c1
Chapter I
An account of the death of Lehi
. . . his journeyings in the wilderness & C

The Book of Nephi 1*
Chapter 1st
An account of the death of Lehi
. . . his journeyings in the wilderness & C

<i>The second Book of Nephi</i>	0 ^{c2}
Chapter I	
<i>An account of the death of Lehi</i>	
<i>. . . his journeyings in the wilderness &C</i>	
<i>The second Book of Nephi</i>	1 ^c
Chapter 1st	
<i>An account of the death of Lehi</i>	
<i>. . . his journeyings in the wilderness &C</i>	
THE SECOND BOOK OF NEPHI	ABCDEFGHIHK
Chapter I	
<i>An account of the death of Lehi</i>	
<i>. . . his journeyings in the wilderness &c</i>	
THE SECOND BOOK OF NEPHI	PS
Chapter 1	
<i>An account of the death of Lehi</i>	
<i>. . . his journeyings in the wilderness &c</i>	

(3) after the preface

THE SECOND BOOK OF NEPHI	ILMNOQR
<i>An account of the death of Lehi</i>	
<i>. . . his journeyings in the wilderness &c</i>	
Chapter 1	
THE SECOND BOOK OF NEPHI	J
<i>An account of the death of Lehi</i>	
<i>. . . his journeyings in the wilderness &c</i>	
Chapter I	
THE SECOND BOOK OF NEPHI	T
<i>An account of the death of Lehi</i>	
<i>. . . his journeyings in the wilderness and so forth</i>	
Chapter 1	

Evidence from both the original and printer's manuscripts shows that Joseph Smith apparently saw some indication at the end of a section that the section was ending. Although this break in the narrative may have been indicated by a special symbol of some kind, a more likely possibility is that the last words of the section were followed by blankness, with the result that Joseph had no indication of what the beginning words of the next section might be. Of course, it is also possible that there was a special symbol plus the blankness. What seems to be crucial is that Joseph could not yet see the following text. But recognizing at least that the section was ending, Joseph told the scribe to write the word *chapter*, with the understanding that the appropriate number would be added later.

2 Nephi Narrative Structure

One important result of this procedure is that chapters may accidentally be assigned just before the beginning of a new book. Consider, for instance, the end of 1 Nephi and the beginning of 2 Nephi, according to the transcript of the original manuscript (lines 12–14 on page 46 of \mathcal{O}):

to the end ye shall be saved at the last day & thus it is Amen

<Chapter VIII>

second Chapter I
The ^ Book of Nephi ^ An account of the death of Lehi . . .

Oliver Cowdery initially wrote *Chapter* at the conclusion of the last section in 1 Nephi—that is, at the end of chapter VII in the original chapter system. (The current LDS chapter system dates from Orson Pratt’s 1879 edition, which has 22 chapters in 1 Nephi. The RLDS text has retained the original chapter system.) As Joseph Smith finished dictating the end of chapter VII of 1 Nephi, he apparently could not yet determine that a new book was starting. All he could see was the end of chapter VII (namely, the words “and thus it is Amen”, probably followed by blankness, plus maybe a special symbol). Later, when Oliver was adding the chapter numbers, he first assigned the roman numeral VIII to the next chapter (see under 1 in the above list). But when he realized that this was actually the beginning of a new book, he crossed out the whole chapter designation and inserted (with slightly weaker ink flow) *Chapter I* after the title of the book, which originally was simply designated as “The Book of Nephi” (see under 2 in the above list).

Oliver Cowdery’s final decision regarding the placement of the chapter specification was incorrect. He should have placed the chapter number after the preface to 2 Nephi since the preface mentions events that occur in later chapters of 2 Nephi. For instance, Lehi dies in chapter III, and Nephi’s flight into the wilderness is described in chapter IV. (The corresponding chapters in the current LDS system are 4 and 5.) Orson Pratt, in his editing for the 1879 LDS edition, placed the specification for the first chapter of 2 Nephi after the preface (see under 3 in the above list). But the RLDS text has continued with Oliver Cowdery’s original placement of the chapter specification immediately after the book title and before the preface.

Summary: The critical text will use white space to show when new sections begin; all the chapter specifications are textually secondary, although obviously some kind of numbering system is necessary in order to reference the text; the correct placement for the first chapter of 2 Nephi is after the preface to that book.

2 Nephi Preface

■ 2 Nephi preface

Nephi's brethren [rebelleth 01ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPS | rebel RT] against him

The original text of the Book of Mormon frequently used the third person singular present-tense ending *-eth* with plural subjects, as here in the preface to 2 Nephi. This inflectional ending was removed in the 1920 LDS edition. The critical text will restore such usage. For complete discussion, see INFLECTIONAL ENDINGS in volume 3.

Summary: In accord with the earliest textual sources, the original *-eth* ending in the preface to 2 Nephi should be maintained; this verbal ending, characteristic of the biblical style, frequently occurs with plural subjects in the original text.

■ 2 Nephi preface

*An account of the death of Lehi
Nephi's brethren rebelleth against him
the Lord warns Nephi to depart into the wilderness
[&C 0 | .&C. >js NULL 1 | &c. A | BCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST]
his journeyings in the wilderness
[&C 0 | .&C. 1 | &c. ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRS | and so forth T]*

The original text of the Book of Mormon frequently used the Latin phrase *et cetera* (spelled as either *&c.* or *etc.*). Here in the preface to 2 Nephi, it was used twice. In his editing for the 1837 edition, Joseph Smith deleted the first *etc.*, probably because it seemed that only one *etc.* was necessary here and that it should come at the end of the preface. The 1981 LDS edition expanded the second *etc.* to “and so forth”. That edition made sure that every original *etc.* in the text was either deleted or translated into native English words. The critical text will retain the original use of *etc.*, even when it seems to be redundant. For complete discussion, see ETC. in volume 3.

Summary: Maintain all cases of *etc.* found in the earliest textual sources, even if redundantly used (as in the preface to 2 Nephi).

2 Nephi 1

■ 2 Nephi 1:1

*And now it came to pass [0ABCDEFGHIJKLNPS | that > NULL 1 | that MOQRT]
after I Nephi had made an end of teaching my brethren
our father Lehi also spake many things unto them*

The conjunction *that* is highly expected after the “come to pass” predicate. In the context of a following *after*-clause, we usually get *that* with the preceding “come to pass” predicate (67 times in the original text). But we also have a number of cases where the *that* is not found. The manuscripts have six cases where no *that* occurs between an initial “come to pass” predicate and the immediately following subordinate conjunction *after*. In two of these cases (each marked below with an asterisk), the *that* does occur but only following the entire *after*-clause:

* Mosiah 13:5

now it came to pass
after Abinadi had spoken these words
that the people of king Noah durst not lay their hands on him

Mosiah 27:23

and it came to pass
after they had fasted and prayed for the space of two days and two nights
the limbs of Alma received their strength

Mosiah 29:37

and now it came to pass
after king Mosiah had sent these things forth among the people
they were convinced of the truth of his words

* Alma 14:23

and it came to pass
after they had thus suffered for many days
—and it was on the twelfth day in the tenth month in the tenth year
of the reign of the judges over the people of Nephi—
that the chief judge over the land of Ammonihah and many of their teachers
and their lawyers went in unto the prison

Alma 62:16

and it came to pass
after they had took them
they caused them to enter into a covenant

Ether 6:2

for it came to pass [0ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQPQRST | *that* > NULL 1]
 after that the Lord had prepared the stones
 which the brother of Jared had carried up into the mount
 the brother of Jared came down out of the mount

Except for the last case, the original manuscript is not extant. In addition to these original examples without the *that*, Joseph Smith (in his editing for the 1837 edition) created 12 additional cases of “come to pass” immediately followed by a dependent *after*-clause. Here is one example:

1 Nephi 18:21

and it came to pass [*that* 0A | *that* >js NULL 1 | BCDEFGHIJKLMNQPQRST]
 after they had loosed me
 behold I took the compass
 and it did work whither I desired it

Ten of these 12 examples are in the small plates. The two other examples are found in Alma 30:1–2, one of which was never implemented in the 1837 edition. For a complete list, see THAT in volume 3.

In this example from 2 Nephi 1:1, the conjunction *that* was inserted (perhaps accidentally) in the 1905 LDS Chicago edition, and this reading with *that* has continued in the LDS text up through the current edition. The critical text, in accord with the earliest textual sources, will remove the extra *that* in this passage.

Summary: Remove the secondary *that* introduced by the 1905 LDS edition near the beginning of 2 Nephi 1:1.

■ 2 Nephi 1:1

our father Lehi also spake many things unto them

[& *rehearsed unto them* 0 | 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQPQRS | *and rehearsed unto them* T]

how great things the Lord had done for them

When copying from \mathfrak{C} into \mathfrak{P} , Oliver Cowdery accidentally skipped the conjoined predicate “and rehearsed unto them”, probably because his eye skipped from the preceding *unto them* to the following one as he copied the text (“many things **unto them** and rehearsed **unto them**”). The 1981 LDS edition restored the phrase. Without that phrase, the following noun phrase “how great things the Lord had done for them” seems stranded and must therefore be interpreted as an appositive to the previous “many things”. Whenever it occurs in the text, “how great things” always complements a main verb:

title page	to shew . . . how great things the Lord hath done
1 Nephi 7:11	ye have forgotten how great things the Lord hath done
2 Nephi 1:1	and rehearsed unto them how great things the Lord had done
Mosiah 27:16	and remember how great things he hath done
Alma 62:50	they did remember how great things the Lord had done

Ether 4:14 and it shall be **made manifest** unto you
 how great things the Father hath laid up for you
 Ether 6:30 and did **remember** how great things the Lord had done
 Ether 6:30 and also **taught** his people how great things the Lord had done

Thus a verb is definitely expected in 2 Nephi 1:1.

Joseph Smith himself did not restore the phrase “and rehearsed unto them” in his editing for the 1840 edition. As noted earlier, there are four places in that edition where Joseph restored phrases from \mathcal{O} that Oliver Cowdery had accidentally omitted in his copying from \mathcal{O} into \mathcal{P} : “the name of” in the 1 Nephi preface, “and partake of the fruit” in 1 Nephi 8:18, “for all men” in 1 Nephi 10:18, and “with sorrow” in 1 Nephi 18:18. All four of these are in 1 Nephi; thus it appears that Joseph’s checking of the text against \mathcal{O} did not continue much past the first book.

Summary: Maintain the reading of the original manuscript in 2 Nephi 1:1 (“and rehearsed unto them how great things the Lord had done for them”).

■ 2 Nephi 1:4

I have seen a vision

[*in the which* 0A | *inthewhich* 1 | *in which* BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]

I know that Jerusalem is destroyed

Here the 1837 edition removed the definite article *the* from the phrase “in the which”. This change may have been the result of conscious editing on the part of Joseph Smith, although he did not mark it in the printer’s manuscript. Most of his editing of the phrase “in the which” occurred when he got to the book of Ether. This archaic phrase will be restored in the critical text wherever it is supported by the earliest textual sources. For a brief discussion, see 1 Nephi 3:2. For a complete analysis, see IN THE WHICH in volume 3.

Summary: Restore in 2 Nephi 1:4 the definite article *the* in the archaic phrase “in the which” since this is the reading of the earliest textual sources for this passage.

■ 2 Nephi 1:5

*yea the Lord hath [concecrated 0] covenanted 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] this land unto me
 and to my children forever*

This error, introduced by Oliver Cowdery as he copied from \mathcal{O} to \mathcal{P} , probably resulted from the preceding occurrence of *covenanted* in the line above, especially since *consecrated* and *covenanted* are visually similar:

2 Nephi 1:5
 a land which the Lord God hath **covenanted** with me
 should be a land for the inheritance of my seed

This correct example of *covenanted* shows that the Lord covenants with individuals. It turns out that the Book of Mormon text never says the Lord covenants lands: in every place where either *covenant* or *consecrate* could appear with *land* as the semantic object, only *consecrate* is actually found:

2 Nephi 1:7

wherefore this land is **consecrated** unto him whom he shall bring

2 Nephi 1:32

the Lord hath [*covenanted* > *consecrated* 1 |
consecrated ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] this land
for the security of thy seed with the seed of my son

2 Nephi 3:2

and may the Lord **consecrate** also unto thee this land
which is a most precious land for thine inheritance
and the inheritance of thy seed with thy brethren

2 Nephi 10:19

wherefore I will **consecrate** this land unto thy seed
and they which shall be numbered among thy seed

Although the original manuscript no longer exists for the example from 2 Nephi 1:32, the printer's manuscript apparently shows Oliver Cowdery once more miscopying *consecrated* as *covenanted*, but this time Oliver immediately caught his error (the correction shows no change in the level of ink flow).

Summary: Restore in 2 Nephi 1:5 the reading of the original manuscript: “the Lord hath **consecrated** this land unto me and to my children forever”.

■ 2 Nephi 1:5

*yea the Lord hath consecrated this land unto me and to my children forever
and also all [they 01A | those BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
[which 0A | which >js who 1 | who BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] should be led
out of other countries by the hand of the Lord*

The original text read “all they which should be led out of other countries”. The original phraseology “all they which” is nonstandard. From the perspective of standard English, the use of the subject pronoun *they* is inappropriate here since the text intends to say that “the Lord hath also consecrated this land (**un**)to **all those** who should be led out of other countries”—in other words, we expect an object pronoun form after the preposition *to* or *unto*. In the original text, we have related examples with the object pronoun *them*, such as “all them whom he hath chosen” in 1 Nephi 1:20. This example has the object form *them*, but when followed by a relative clause such usage is nonstandard. In the Book of Mormon, both *they* and *them*, when followed by a relative clause, have normally been edited to *those*, as here in 2 Nephi 1:5 and in 1 Nephi 1:20. For a complete discussion, see PRONOMINAL DETERMINERS in volume 3. Here in 2 Nephi 1:5,

Joseph Smith also edited the *which* to *who* since the referent was human. For further discussion of this editing, see WHICH in volume 3. The critical text will, of course, restore the original non-standard phraseology “all they which”.

Summary: In accord with the earliest textual sources, the archaic and dialectal phraseology “all they which” should be restored in 2 Nephi 1:5.

■ 2 Nephi 1:6

*there shall [be 0A | be >js NULL 1 | BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] none come into this land
save they should be brought by the hand of the Lord*

Joseph Smith’s deletion of *be* for the 1837 edition of the Book of Mormon represents an attempt to deal with the awkwardness and rarity of the clause “there shall be none come”. Yet Joseph Smith’s alteration of this clause to “there shall none come” is also awkward. There are no other occurrences of “there shall none” in the Book of Mormon, although there are four in the King James Bible:

Leviticus 21:1	there shall none be defiled
Joshua 9:23	there shall none of you be freed
Job 20:21	there shall none of his meat be left
Ezekiel 12:28	there shall none of my words be prolonged any more

Yet in each of these biblical examples, “there shall none” is followed by the helping verb *be* and the past participle of a main verb, not by the infinitive form of the main verb as in the example “there shall be none **come**” in 2 Nephi 1:6.

When we look for other cases in the Book of Mormon text of the *be* verb followed by *none*, we find cases where *none* can be followed by an infinitive phrase (5 examples) or by a relative clause (14 examples). As an example of the infinitive phrase, consider the following nearby example:

2 Nephi 1:9
and there shall be none **to** molest them

Such an example suggests the possibility that the word *to* might be missing from the original manuscript for 2 Nephi 1:6; in other words, the text might have read “there shall be none **to** come into this land save they should be brought by the hand of the Lord”. Yet this suggested emendation seems at least as awkward as the original reading.

An example of “be none” followed by a relative clause occurs later on in the text:

Mormon 8:10
and there are none that do know the true God
save it be the disciples of Jesus

This example suggests that the relative pronoun *that* (or *which* or *who*) might be missing in 2 Nephi 1:6; in other words, the original reading in 2 Nephi 1:6 could perhaps be emended to “there shall be none **that** come into this land save they should be brought by the hand of the Lord”. This proposed reading seems much less awkward.

Nonetheless, there is one example in the text that suggests that the reading of the original manuscript for 2 Nephi 1:6 is actually correct:

Helaman 14:5

and behold there shall [*be* 1CGHKPS | ABDEFIJLMNOQRT] a new star arise
such an one as ye never have beheld

We do not have the original manuscript for Helaman 14:5, but we have two independent copies of that verse (namely, the printer’s manuscript and the 1830 edition); that is, this verse is in that portion of the text from Helaman 13 through Mormon where the original manuscript was used to set the 1830 edition. The 1830 edition here reads “and behold there shall a new star arise”, but the printer’s manuscript reads “and behold there shall **be** a new star arise”, an awkward phrase to be sure, but precisely parallel to 2 Nephi 1:6. Both of these passages have the same pattern, “there shall be <subject> <infinitive verb>”:

2 Nephi 1:6	there shall be none come
Helaman 14:5	there shall be a new star arise

The most probable explanation is that in Helaman 14:5 the original manuscript had the *be* and it was omitted by the 1830 typesetter. It seems unlikely that the unexpected *be* was accidentally added when copying from \mathcal{O} into \mathcal{P} . See the discussion under Helaman 14:5.

Summary: Restore the original reading in 2 Nephi 1:6 (“there shall **be** none come into this land”); although awkward and unusual, this reading is supported by the reading of \mathcal{P} in Helaman 14:5 (“there shall **be** a new star arise”).

■ 2 Nephi 1:6

there shall be none come into this land

*save they [should 0A | should >js shall 1 | shall BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] be brought
by the hand of the Lord*

In his editing for the 1837 edition, Joseph Smith frequently changed the historically past-tense (or subjunctive) modal verbs *might*, *would*, and *should* to their historically present-tense (or indicative) forms *may*, *will*, and *shall*. As noted under 1 Nephi 3:19, Joseph Smith’s apparent motivation was to avoid the modern-day tendency to interpret the past-tense modals as conditional, hypothetical, or subjective. Such editing, however, has been sporadically applied to the Book of Mormon text. In virtually every case the original past-tense modal will work, and there are still examples in the text of that usage. In general, such past-tense modals should be restored. For a complete discussion of these historically past-tense modals, see MODAL VERBS in volume 3.

Summary: Restore the historically past-tense modal forms *might*, *would*, and *should* whenever the earliest textual sources support their occurrence.

■ 2 Nephi 1:8

*and behold it is wisdom that
this land should be kept as yet from the knowledge of other nations
for behold many nations would overrun [this 0 | the 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST] land*

Oliver Cowdery accidentally miscopied *this* as *the*. The demonstrative pronoun clearly improves the reading of the text. Moreover, it agrees with the previous use in the verse of *this land* in “behold it is wisdom that **this land** should be kept as yet from the knowledge of other nations”. Another example of the tendency to replace “this land” with “the land” is found later on in the text:

Mosiah 1:10
and the people of Mosiah
which dwell in [*this* 1PS | *the* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOQRT] land

Here the 1830 typesetter is the one responsible for replacing *this* with *the*.

Summary: Restore in 2 Nephi 1:8 the reading of \mathcal{O} , with its original demonstrative *this* (“many nations would overrun **this** land”).

■ 2 Nephi 1:10

*and having been brought [01ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST | up MQ]
by his infinite goodness into this precious land of promise*

The 1905 LDS edition accidentally added the preposition *up* after the verb *brought*. The 1911 edition continued it, but the 1920 edition removed it. Clearly, this intrusive *up* is an error since the text refers to being “brought . . . into this precious land of promise”. The additional *up* implies some kind of change in elevation, which is inappropriate in this context since Lehi is referring to people being brought across the ocean. Compare this usage with the following passage later on in the same chapter:

2 Nephi 1:24
and who hath been an instrument in the hands of God
in **bringing** us forth **into** the land of promise

Undoubtedly, the high expectation of the phrase “brought up” led to the 1905 typesetting error.

Summary: Maintain in 2 Nephi 1:10 the reading “brought by his infinite goodness into this precious land of promise”; the addition of the preposition *up* in the 1905 LDS edition was a simple typo.

■ 2 Nephi 1:14

awake and [arise 01ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOQRT | rise GHKPS] from the dust

The earliest textual sources have the verb *arise* rather than the related verb *rise*. The 1858 Wright edition accidentally introduced this variant, and it has continued in the RLDS text. Elsewhere the text consistently uses the phraseology “arise from the dust”, never “rise from the dust”:

2 Nephi 1:21	arise from the dust
2 Nephi 1:23	and arise from the dust
Moroni 10:31	and awake and arise from the dust

The first two examples are close by. And except for the initial *and*, the last example is identical to 2 Nephi 1:14. Thus the earliest reading in 2 Nephi 1:14 is undoubtedly correct.

Summary: Maintain the verb form *arise* rather than *rise* in 2 Nephi 1:14; the phraseology “arise from the dust” occurs elsewhere in the text, including two more times in 2 Nephi 1.

■ 2 Nephi 1:17

for I have feared

[*least* 0 | *lest* > *least* 1 | *lest* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]

for the hardness of your hearts

[*least* 0 | *least* >js NULL 1 | *lest* A | BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]

the Lord your God should come out in the fullness of his wrath upon you

In his editing of this passage for the 1837 edition, Joseph Smith removed the redundant use of the subordinate conjunction *lest* by deleting its second occurrence. There are no other examples of this kind of redundancy in the text. Even so, this repetition reminds one of the repeated subordinate conjunction *that*, which is found quite often in the original text of the Book of Mormon and which has not always been edited out. (For further discussion, see 1 Nephi 10:2–3 as well as THAT in volume 3.) In fact, there are examples of the repeated *that* where the intervening text is a prepositional phrase (just like the intervening prepositional phrase “for the hardness of your hearts” here in 2 Nephi 1:17):

Alma 12:22

and thus we see

that by his fall

[*that* >js NULL 1 | *that* A | BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]

all mankind became a lost and a fallen people

Alma 30:49

and I say

[*that* 0ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST | *that* >js NULL 1] in the name of God

[*that* 01A | BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] ye shall be struck dumb

Alma 50:3

and he caused

that upon those works of timbers

[*that* >js NULL 1 | *that* A | BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]

there should be a frame of pickets built upon the timbers round about

Joseph Smith, in his editing for the 1837 edition, removed these three examples of the repeated *that*, just as he removed the single example of the repeated *lest*. These parallels suggest that the repeated *lest* in 2 Nephi 1:17 is intended and should be accepted in the critical text.

Summary: Accept the example of the redundant *lest* in 2 Nephi 1:17, even though it is the only instance of the repeated *lest* in the text of the Book of Mormon; its use here seems to be intended since its usage is like cases of the repeated *that*.

■ 2 Nephi 1:18

and ye are visited by sword and by famine

and [NULL >+ are 0 | are 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST] hated

and are led according to the will and captivity of the devil

In the original manuscript, Oliver Cowdery initially omitted the *are* before *hated*, but somewhat later he supralinearly inserted it (the level of ink flow is heavier). It appears that Oliver dipped his quill before inserting the *are*. The previous and following clauses both have *are*, and it is expected for the middle conjunct as well (“are visited . . . and are hated . . . and are led”). The most reasonable assumption is that Oliver caught his omission and corrected it as a result of having read back the text to Joseph Smith.

Elsewhere the text shows that when more than two predicates are conjoined, such repetitions of the verb are expected, as in the following example:

Mosiah 8:21

yea they **are** as a wild flock which fleeth from the shepherd and scattereth
and **are** driven and **are** devoured by the beasts of the forest

Summary: For 2 Nephi 1:18, maintain the corrected text in \mathcal{O} (“and ye are visited by sword and by famine and **are** hated and are led according to the will and captivity of the devil”).

■ 2 Nephi 1:20

and he hath said that

[in so much > in as much 0 | inasmuch 1ABCDEFGHIJLMNOQ | Inasmuch HJKPRST]

as ye shall keep my commandments

ye shall prosper in the land

but inasmuch as ye will not keep his commandments

ye shall be cut off from his presence

The Book of Mormon text uses both *insomuch* and *inasmuch*. Here in 2 Nephi 1:20, Oliver Cowdery initially wrote *insomuch* in \mathcal{O} , then immediately corrected the word to *inasmuch*. Undoubtedly, *inasmuch* is correct since it is repeated in the second, negative half of the promise (“but **inasmuch** as ye will not keep his commandments / ye shall be cut off from his presence”). Elsewhere in the text, whenever the Lord’s promise to Lehi (and also to Nephi and to others later on) is quoted, *inasmuch* is always the connector (18 times), never *insomuch*:

1 Nephi 2:20	and inasmuch as ye shall keep my commandments
1 Nephi 4:14	inasmuch as thy seed shall keep my commandments
2 Nephi 1:9	inasmuch as they . . . shall keep his commandments

2 Nephi 4:4	inasmuch as ye shall keep my commandments
2 Nephi 4:4	and inasmuch as ye will not keep my commandments
Jarom 1:9	inasmuch as ye will keep my commandments
Omni 1:6	inasmuch as ye will not keep my commandments
Alma 9:13	inasmuch as ye shall keep my commandments
Alma 9:13	inasmuch as ye will not keep my commandments
Alma 9:14	inasmuch as the Lamanites have not kept the commandments of God
Alma 36:1	inasmuch as ye shall keep the commandments of God
Alma 36:30	inasmuch as ye shall keep the commandments of God
Alma 36:30	inasmuch as ye will not keep the commandments of God
Alma 38:1	inasmuch as ye shall keep the commandments of God
Alma 38:1	and inasmuch as ye will not keep the commandments of God
Alma 50:20	and inasmuch as they shall keep my commandments
Alma 50:20	inasmuch as they will not keep my commandments
3 Nephi 5:22	and inasmuch as the children of Lehi hath kept his commandments

We should also note that in five verses we have a pair of *inasmuch*-clauses, and in each case, just as with 2 Nephi 1:20, the second clause is a negated version of the first clause: namely, 2 Nephi 4:4, Alma 9:13, Alma 36:30, Alma 38:1, and Alma 50:20. And for each pair of clauses, we always get *inasmuch*. Thus the initial appearance in \mathcal{C} of *insomuch* in 2 Nephi 1:20 is anomalous.

The last example in the above list actually shows textual variation between *inasmuch* and *insomuch*:

3 Nephi 5:22
and [*in as much* 1 | *insomuch* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
as the children of Lehi hath kept his commandments
he hath blessed them and prospered them according to his word

In this case, internal evidence suggests that *inasmuch* is the correct reading and that *insomuch* was accidentally introduced by the 1830 typesetter (see the discussion under 3 Nephi 5:22). There is another example that shows a typesetter (here the one for the 1874 RLDS edition) accidentally replacing *inasmuch* with *insomuch*:

Helaman 11:25
receiving daily an addition to their numbers
[*in as much* 1 | *inasmuch* ABCDEFGIJKLMNOPQRST | *insomuch* HK]
as there were dissenters that went forth unto them

Finally, there is one additional case where *insomuch* could be an error for *inasmuch*. For discussion, see 2 Nephi 9:15.

Summary: Maintain the use of *inasmuch* found in the Lord's promise to Lehi, here in 2 Nephi 1:20 and numerous other places in the text.

■ 2 Nephi 1:20

and he hath said that
 inasmuch as ye shall keep my commandments
 ye shall prosper in the land
 but inasmuch as ye will not
 [NULL > keep his commandments > keep my commandments 0 |
 keep my commandments 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST]
 ye shall be cut off from [his > my 0 | my 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST] presence

Here the originally dictated text in \mathcal{O} shows a shift from *my* to *his*. In the first *inasmuch*-clause, Lehi directly quotes the words of the Lord, but in the second *inasmuch*-clause, Lehi shifts to his own words. Oliver Cowdery had some difficulty writing down the second clause. The transcript of \mathcal{O} shows two levels of correction:

2 Nephi 1:20 (combining lines 4 and 5 on page 48 of \mathcal{O} ; *from* is not extant)

my
 keep <his>^ commandments my
 but in as much as ye will not ^ ye shall be cut off from <hi^s> presance

Initially, Oliver got ahead of himself and wrote the second clause with an ellipsis: “but in as much as ye will not / ye shall be cut off from his presance”. He then corrected what he had just written (the level of ink flow is unchanged) by supralinearly inserting the missing “keep his commandments”. But then somewhat later Oliver apparently realized that in going from the first to the second *inasmuch*-clause, the text had shifted from first person to third person, so he crossed out both instances of *his* and supralinearly inserted *my*, thus making the second clause into a direct quote. The original manuscript here is severely damaged, and it is difficult to determine whether the two supralinear *my*’s were written with heavier ink flow. (The crossouts of the two *his*’s do not appear to have been done with particularly heavier ink flow.) The important point here is that Oliver’s initial supralinear correction (“keep his commandments”) would probably never have occurred unless Joseph Smith had actually dictated *his* both times. In other words, the initial correction implies that the original text for the second clause read “but inasmuch as ye will not keep **his** commandments / ye shall be cut off from **his** presence”.

This promise of the Lord’s that by keeping the commandments one would prosper is found throughout the Book of Mormon. Initially, the Lord’s promise is given in a direct quote and is stated positively:

1 Nephi 2:19–20 (Nephi quoting the Lord)
 and it came to pass that the Lord spake unto me saying . . .
 and inasmuch as ye shall keep **my** commandments
 ye shall prosper and shall be led to a land of promise

1 Nephi 4:14 (Nephi quoting the Lord)
 I remembered the words of the Lord
 which he spake unto me in the wilderness saying that
 inasmuch as thy seed shall keep **my** commandments
 they shall prosper in the land of promise

The first time the promise is referred to in 2 Nephi, it is still positively stated but now indirectly:

2 Nephi 1:9 (Lehi to his sons)
wherefore I Lehi have obtained a promise that
inasmuch as they which the Lord God shall bring out of the land of Jerusalem
shall keep **his** commandments
they shall prosper upon the face of this land

Later on in 2 Nephi 1, we get the first occurrence of the promise in a negative form. Yet this passage also includes the positive form of the promise. In the earliest form of the text, the initial positive statement of the promise is a direct quote, while the negative statement of the promise is indirect:

2 Nephi 1:20 (Lehi to his sons)
and he hath said that
inasmuch as ye shall keep **my** commandments
ye shall prosper in the land
but inasmuch as ye will not keep **his** commandments
ye shall be cut off from **his** presence

It is as if the Lord gave only the positive form of the promise and that the negative form of the promise was formulated by Lehi himself. Yet the next reference to the promise (in 2 Nephi 4) includes both the negative and positive forms, and in this instance both are direct quotes:

2 Nephi 4:4 (Lehi to Laman's children)
for the Lord God hath said that
inasmuch as ye shall keep **my** commandments
ye shall prosper in the land
and inasmuch as ye will not keep **my** commandments
ye shall be cut off from **my** presence

Oliver Cowdery's editing of 2 Nephi 1:20 makes the text conform to the language of 2 Nephi 4:4.

Elsewhere we have five additional passages where the promise occurs in both a positive and a negative form. In two cases, both forms are directly quoted:

Alma 9:13 (Alma to the people of Ammonihah, quoting the Lord's words to Lehi)
behold do ye not remember the words
which he spake unto Lehi saying that
inasmuch as ye shall keep **my** commandments
ye shall prosper in the land
and again it is said that
inasmuch as ye will not keep **my** commandments
ye shall be cut off from the presence of the Lord

Alma 50:19–20 (Mormon's commentary, quoting the Lord's words to Lehi)
yea we can behold that his words are verified even at this time
which he spake unto Lehi saying . . .
and inasmuch as they shall keep **my** commandments
they shall prosper in the land
but remember inasmuch as they will not keep **my** commandments
they shall be cut off from the presence of the Lord

In two cases, both forms of the promise are indirectly quoted:

Alma 36:30 (Alma to Helaman)

for ye had ought to know as I do know that
 inasmuch as ye shall keep the commandments of God
 ye shall prosper in the land
 and ye had ought to know also that
 inasmuch as ye will not keep the commandments of God
 ye shall be cut off from **his** presence

Alma 38:1 (Alma to Shiblon)

for I say unto you even as I said unto Helaman that
 inasmuch as ye shall keep the commandments of God
 ye shall prosper in the land
 and inasmuch as ye will not keep the commandments of God
 ye shall be cut off from **his** presence

Finally, in one case we get precisely the same construction as the original text in 2 Nephi 1:20—namely, the positive form of the promise is directly quoted and then the negative form of the promise is indirectly quoted:

Alma 37:13 (Alma to Helaman)

and he saith
 if ye will keep **my** commandments
 ye shall prosper in the land
 but if ye keep not **his** commandments
 ye shall be cut off from **his** presence

In fact, in the 1953 RLDS edition for this last example, the two occurrences of the possessive pronoun *his* were edited to *my*, just like Oliver Cowdery's editing of 2 Nephi 1:20. Clearly, there has been a strong tendency to remove the shifting from a direct quote to an indirect one. For further discussion, see Alma 37:13.

To complete this analysis, I list a number of single references to the Lord's promise to Lehi elsewhere in the text; most are positive and are indirect quotes:

□ *positive and direct:*

Jarom 1:9 (Jarom quoting the Lord)

but the word of the Lord was verified
 which he spake unto our fathers saying that
 inasmuch as ye will keep **my** commandments
 ye shall prosper in the land

□ *negative and direct:*

Omni 1:6 (Amaron quoting the Lord)

yea he would not suffer that the words should not be verified
 which he spake unto our fathers saying that
 inasmuch as ye will not keep **my** commandments
 ye shall not prosper in the land

□ *positive and indirect:*

Mosiah 1:7 (king Benjamin to his sons)
 and I would that ye should keep the commandments of God
 that ye may prosper in the land
 according to the promises which the Lord made unto our fathers

Mosiah 2:22 (king Benjamin to his people)
 and he hath promised you that
 if ye would keep **his** commandments
 ye should prosper in the land

Mosiah 2:22 (king Benjamin to his people)
 therefore if ye do keep **his** commandments
 he doth bless you and prosper you

Alma 36:1 (Alma to Helaman)
 for I swear unto you that
 inasmuch as ye shall keep the commandments of God
 ye shall prosper in the land

Alma 48:15 (Mormon's commentary)
 or in other words
 if they were faithful in keeping the commandments of God
 that he would prosper them in the land

Alma 48:25 (Mormon's commentary)
 for the promises of the Lord were
 if they should keep the commandments
 they should prosper in the land

3 Nephi 5:22 (Mormon's commentary)
 and inasmuch as the children of Lehi hath kept **his** commandments
 he hath blessed them and prospered them according to his word

Summary: Restore in 2 Nephi 1:20 the original text that Oliver Cowdery wrote down in the original manuscript (“but inasmuch as ye will not keep **his** commandments / ye shall be cut off from **his** presence”); the shift from a direct quote to an indirect one is also found in Alma 37:13.

■ **2 Nephi 1:23**

shake off the chains

[NULL >+ *with* 0 | *with* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST] *which ye are bound*

Oliver Cowdery, as he was taking down Joseph Smith's dictation for 2 Nephi 1:23, seems to have accidentally omitted the preposition *with*. Later he supralinearly inserted the *with* with heavier ink flow. Undoubtedly, the *with* is necessary, but the question here is whether the *with* should have been inserted at the beginning of the relative clause (“shake off the chains **with** which ye are bound”) or at the end of the relative clause (“shake off the chains which ye are bound **with**”). A relative clause can end in *with*, as in the following example:

Alma 31:28 (G is extant)

and all their precious things which they are ornamented **with**

However, when the relative clause refers to being bound, the preposition always appears at the beginning of the relative clause. Besides the case here in 2 Nephi 1:23, we have these three examples:

1 Nephi 7:17

yea even give me strength
that I may burst these bands **with** which I am bound

2 Nephi 1:13

and shake off the awful chains **by** which ye are bound

Alma 14:26

and they brake the cords **with** which they were bound

These examples support the placing of *with* at the beginning of the relative clause in 2 Nephi 1:23.

For this leaf of G, Oliver Cowdery's scribal corrections were generally made with heavier ink flow, and all seem to be necessary. Although these corrections could be due to later editing, a more likely explanation is that they were made when Oliver read back the text to Joseph Smith. An earlier example is found in 2 Nephi 1:18, where Oliver supralinearly inserted *are* with heavier ink flow (see the discussion there). Another example is found later on near the end of this chapter when the object pronoun *it* was initially omitted:

2 Nephi 1:27

but behold it was not him
but it was the Spirit of the Lord which was in him
which opened his mouth to utterance
that he could not shut [NULL >+ *it* 0 | *it* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST]

All three cases of omission (of *are* in verse 18, *with* in verse 23, and *it* in verse 27) seem to be due to scribal error.

Summary: Maintain the corrected reading in G for 2 Nephi 1:23 (“shake off the chains **with** which ye are bound”); in other relative clauses involving *bound*, the preposition *with* comes at the beginning rather than at the end of the relative clause (1 Nephi 7:17 and Alma 14:26).

■ 2 Nephi 1:24

*rebel no more against your brother
whose **views** have been glorious*

The use here of the word *views* seems strange. Readers probably suspect that the word as used here means ‘spiritual visions’. Because of the visual and semantic similarity of *views* and *visions*, we need to consider the possibility that this unusual use of *views* is an error for *visions*. Although the original manuscript is extant here, this particular leaf is highly damaged. The word appears to be *views* rather than *visions*, but one cannot be absolutely sure. Moreover, this word occurs at the end of the line in the original manuscript, a place where Oliver Cowdery frequently misread

↻ when copying into ℘. Of course, if an error were made, one would think that the tendency would have been for the strange *views* to have been replaced by the expected *visions* rather than the other way around.

Elsewhere in the Book of Mormon, there are ten occurrences of the singular *vision*, plus these three occurrences of the plural *visions*:

1 Nephi 1:16

for he hath written many things
which he saw in **visions** and in dreams

2 Nephi 4:23

and he hath given me knowledge by **visions** in the nighttime

Alma 30:28

by their traditions and their dreams and their whims
and their **visions** and their pretended mysteries

Nonetheless, *views* is also used with the apparent meaning of ‘spiritual visions’:

Mosiah 5:3

and we ourselves also
through the infinite goodness of God and the manifestations of his Spirit
have great **views** of that which is to come
and were it expedient we could prophesy of all things

Although the Oxford English Dictionary does not include the meaning of ‘spiritual vision’ for *view*, the fact that the Book of Mormon has at least two independent occurrences of *views* with the apparent meaning ‘spiritual visions’ suggests that *views* is indeed the intended word rather than a scribal error for *visions* (even though they look somewhat similar). In addition, there are no scribal corrections of *view* to *vision* (or vice versa) that would suggest that the scribes tended to mix up these two words.

Summary: Follow the earliest textual sources in determining whether a passage should read *view* or *vision*; in both 2 Nephi 1:24 and Mosiah 5:3, the earliest reading supports *views*, even though the apparent meaning of ‘spiritual visions’ seems unusual.

■ 2 Nephi 1:24

and who hath kept the commandments from the time

[01 | *that* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *we left Jerusalem*

Here the 1830 typesetter added the relative pronoun *that*, probably accidentally. Elsewhere in the Book of Mormon text, when *the time* is followed by *Jerusalem* within a few words, *that* occurs 11 times but is omitted 6 times:

1 Nephi 10:4 from the time **that** my father left Jerusalem

1 Nephi 19:8 from the time my father left Jerusalem

2 Nephi 5:28 from the time we left Jerusalem

2 Nephi 25:4	from the time that I came out from Jerusalem
2 Nephi 25:19	from the time that my father left Jerusalem
Jacob 1:1	from the time that Lehi left Jerusalem
Enos 1:25	from the time that our father Lehi left Jerusalem
Mosiah 1:6	from the time they left Jerusalem
Mosiah 2:34	to the time our father Lehi left Jerusalem
Mosiah 6:4	from the time that Lehi left Jerusalem
Mosiah 28:20	from the time that Lehi left Jerusalem
Mosiah 29:46	from the time Lehi left Jerusalem
Alma 18:36	to the time that their father Lehi left Jerusalem
Alma 18:38	from the time that Lehi left Jerusalem
Alma 28:2	from the time Lehi left Jerusalem
3 Nephi 1:1	from the time that Lehi left Jerusalem
3 Nephi 5:15	from the time that Lehi left Jerusalem

One of these examples involves manuscript variation:

Jacob 1:1
 from the time
 [NULL >+ *that* 1 | *that* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] Lehi left Jerusalem

Since either reading is possible for Jacob 1:1, there was no strong motivation for Oliver Cowdery to have emended the text here. Rather, the correction in Jacob 1:1 (with somewhat heavier ink) is probably the result of Oliver's proofing of \mathcal{P} against \mathcal{C} . For more discussion, see Jacob 1:1.

So there is nothing wrong with the earliest reading in 2 Nephi 1:24 (for which the relative pronoun *that* is lacking). This instance gives us a seventh example without the *that*.

Summary: Remove the intrusive relative pronoun *that* in 2 Nephi 1:24; in the Book of Mormon text, we have instances of sentences both with and without *that* after the prepositional phrases “from the time” and “to the time”; for this reason we follow the earliest textual sources in determining whether or not *that* occurs in this context.

■ 2 Nephi 1:26

*and that which ye call anger was the truth according to that which is in God
 which he could not [constrain 0A | constrain >js restrain 1 | restrain BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
 manifesting boldly concerning your iniquities*

Here in his editing for the 1837 edition, Joseph Smith changed the word *constrain* to *restrain*. In the original text of the Book of Mormon there were no occurrences of the word *restrain*. Joseph Smith also changed two other examples of *constrain* to *restrain*:

Ether 12:2
 for he could not be [*constrained* 1A | *restrained* BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
 because of the Spirit of the Lord which was in him

Ether 13:31
 and there was none
 to [*constrain* 1A | *restrain* BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] them

The obvious meaning of the word *constrain* in these three cases is ‘to prevent or to stop’ rather than the expected ‘to force’. According to the Oxford English Dictionary, one of the meanings of *constrain* is ‘to **restrain** within bounds, to limit’ (see definition 8d), which is essentially the meaning of *constrain* in these three Book of Mormon examples. All the other meanings of *constrain* in the Book of Mormon text have the meaning of ‘to force’, and thus Joseph Smith did not change any of these other examples to *restrain*. The critical text will restore the original cases of *constrain* that have the meaning ‘to prevent or to stop’.

Summary: Restore the original *constrain* in the three places where Joseph Smith emended *constrain* to *restrain* (here in 2 Nephi 1:26 as well as in Ether 12:2 and Ether 13:31).

■ 2 Nephi 1:27

but behold it was not [*him* 01ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPS | *he* HKRT]
but it was the Spirit of the Lord which was in him
which opened his mouth to utterance

Here editors have replaced the object form *him* with the subject form *he*. The first RLDS edition (in 1874) made this change, but then the 1908 RLDS edition reverted to the *him* of the printer’s manuscript. The LDS text made the grammatical change in the 1920 edition. From a grammatical perspective, *him* is perfectly acceptable in colloquial speech and informal writing, while the use of the subject form *he* is an artificiality promoted not as much by language use as by language prescriptivists. For further discussion of this point, see *it’s me* and, more generally, *me* in Merriam-Webster’s Dictionary of English Usage.

There are a few other places in the text where the subject complement pronoun has been edited from the object form to the subject form:

Alma 1:8
 and it was [*him* 1A | *he* BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
 [*that* 1A | *who* BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] was an instrument
 in the hands of God
 in delivering the people of Limhi out of bondage

Alma 39:15
 it is [*him* 0A | *him* >js *he* 1 | *he* BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
 that surely shall come to take away the sins of the world

Alma 46:27
 and now who knoweth but what the remnant of the seed of Joseph
 which shall perish as his garment
 are those which have dissented from us
 yea and even it shall be [*us* 01ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPS | *ourselves* RT]
 if we do not stand fast in the faith of Christ

Mormon 8:16

and blessed be [*him* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPS | *he* RT]
that shall bring this thing to light

The earliest text prefers the subject form of the pronoun in subject complements. One could argue that these few cases of the object form are due to scribal errors or are the result of Joseph Smith's own dictation. Nonetheless, there is no scribal evidence (such as false starts or immediate corrections) in the manuscripts to support such an interpretation. Nor did the 1830 typesetter ever correct these supposed errors. In other words, there is no evidence in the initial transmission of the text (from Joseph Smith's dictation to the 1830 edition) that these nonstandard forms were unacceptable. Only in subsequent editions do we find editors consciously correcting the subject complement pronouns. (Yet in some of these cases, the RLDS text has maintained the nonstandard object pronoun in subject complements.) The critical text will, of course, restore the occasional use of the object form in subject complements, when supported by the earliest textual sources. For a complete discussion, including examples of the subject form of the pronoun in subject complements, see SUBJECT COMPLEMENT in volume 3.

One interesting aspect of the original text for 2 Nephi 1:27 is that the original use of *him* provides a contrastive parallelism with the *him* at the end of the following main clause:

2 Nephi 1:27

but behold it was not **him**
but it was the Spirit of the Lord which was in **him**
which opened his mouth to utterance

The change to *he* cancels the phonetic parallelism between the final words of these two lines. A similar parallelism is found in the example from Alma 46:27 (listed above), where the object pronoun *us* is repeated ("which have dissented from **us** / yea and even it shall be **us**"); the 1920 replacement of *us* with *ourselves* breaks the word parallelism between those two lines.

Summary: Maintain the object form *him* as the subject complement pronoun in 2 Nephi 1:27; such usage is common in colloquial English.

■ 2 Nephi 1:32

*the Lord hath [covenanted > consecrated 1 | consecrated ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST] this land
for the security of thy seed with the seed of my son*

Here we see Oliver Cowdery's tendency to replace *consecrate* with *covenant*. In this instance, he caught his error, but an earlier error in this chapter has persisted in the text:

2 Nephi 1:5

yea the Lord hath [*concecrated* 0 | *covenanted* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST]
this land unto me and to my children forever

As discussed under 2 Nephi 1:5, lands are consecrated, not covenanted.

Summary: Maintain the corrected reading in \mathfrak{P} for 2 Nephi 1:32 ("the Lord hath **consecrated** this land").

2 Nephi 2

■ 2 Nephi 2:10

*and because of the intercession for all
all men [cometh >js come 1 | cometh A | come BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] unto God*

As is frequent in the original text of the Book of Mormon, the biblical inflectional ending *-eth* has been extended to the third person plural. Most of these extensions have been edited out of the text. For further discussion, see the example of *rebelleth* in the 1 Nephi preface, plus the general discussion under INFLECTIONAL ENDINGS in volume 3.

Summary: Maintain the extended use of *-eth* in the third person plural; such usage is characteristic of the original text.

■ 2 Nephi 2:10–11

*wherefore the ends of the law which the Holy One hath given
unto the inflicting of the punishment which is affixed
which punishment that is affixed is in opposition to that of the happiness
which is affixed to answer the ends of the atonement
[1 |; ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQS | — RT]
for it must needs be that there is an opposition in all things*

David Calabro has suggested (personal communication) that this sentence fragment may be the result of a loss of the verb *are* just before the preposition *unto* (“wherefore the ends of the law . . . **are unto** the inflicting of the punishment”). The original manuscript is not extant here, so we cannot be sure about the reading. The editors for the 1920 LDS edition dealt with this sentence fragment by specifically acknowledging it when they placed a dash at the end of the sentence fragment. Of course, the original text has numerous examples of such fragments, especially in long, complex sentences, as in the following example:

Enos 1:1–2

behold it came to pass that
I Enos knowing my father that he was a just man
for he taught me in his language
and also in the nurture and admonition of the Lord
—and blessed be the name of my God for it—
and I will tell you of the wrestle which I had before God . . .

For further discussion, see Enos 1:1–2. For some other examples of sentence fragments in the original manuscript, see 1 Nephi 8:7 and 1 Nephi 13:30. Since the sentence fragment in 2 Nephi 2:10 is characteristic of other sentence fragments in the text, it is probably safest to assume that this fragment represents the original text.

Here in 2 Nephi 2:10, the scribe for both \mathcal{O} and \mathcal{P} was Oliver Cowdery. Yet elsewhere in the manuscripts, we have no examples of Oliver Cowdery ever accidentally dropping the verb form *are*. It is true that the unknown scribe 2 of \mathcal{P} twice omitted the verb form *are*, but in both instances Oliver Cowdery restored it when he proofed \mathcal{P} against \mathcal{O} :

3 Nephi 20:16
 then shall ye
 which [*are* 0ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST | §2 NULL > §1 *are* 1] a remnant
 of the house of Jacob
 go forth among them

3 Nephi 27:30
 for none of them [§2 NULL > §1 *are* 1 | *are* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST] lost

For the first example, the original manuscript is extant and reads *are*. In the second case, the 1830 edition has the *are*, which implies that \mathcal{O} did too since both \mathcal{P} and the 1830 edition are firsthand copies of \mathcal{O} for all of 3 Nephi.

Summary: Maintain in 2 Nephi 2:10 the sentence fragment found in the earliest textual source (the printer’s manuscript); such fragments are found elsewhere in the text.

■ 2 Nephi 2:11

*for it must needs be that there is an opposition in all things
 if not so my first born in the wilderness
 righteousness could not be brought to pass neither wickedness
 neither **holiness** nor **misery** neither good nor bad
 wherefore all things must needs be a compound in one
 wherefore if it should be one body it must needs remain as dead
 having no life neither death nor corruption nor incorruption
happiness nor **misery** neither sense nor insensibility*

Corbin T. Volluz has suggested (personal communication) that the phrase “neither holiness nor misery” may be an error for “neither happiness nor misery”. The text here shows no variance with respect to the word *holiness*, but the original manuscript is not extant. When we look elsewhere in the text (including later on in this same verse), *misery* is always opposed to *happiness* (nine times), never *holiness*:

2 Nephi 2:11	happiness nor misery
2 Nephi 2:13	no righteousness nor happiness . . . no punishment nor misery
Alma 3:26	eternal happiness or eternal misery
Alma 40:15	this state of happiness and this state of misery
Alma 40:15	to happiness or misery

Alma 40:17	to happiness or misery
Alma 40:21	in happiness or in misery
Alma 41:4	raised to endless happiness . . . or to endless misery
Mormon 8:38	greater is the value of an endless happiness than that misery which never dies

The word *happiness* is much more reasonable as the opposing member for both occurrences of *misery* in 2 Nephi 2:11; *happiness* is an opposite to *misery*, but *holiness* is not, except by some kind of conjectured inference (perhaps only those who are holy are happy).

Orthographically, *holiness* and *happiness* are similar, so it is quite possible that the original manuscript (which is not extant here) read *happiness* and was accidentally copied as *holiness*. In fact, this error would have been facilitated if *happiness* was actually spelled in \mathcal{O} as *hapiness* (that is, with only one *p*). Although elsewhere Oliver Cowdery consistently spelled *happiness* with two *p*'s (15 times in extant portions of \mathcal{O} , 26 times in \mathcal{P}), he did occasionally spell *happy* as *hapy* (twice in \mathcal{P} : Mosiah 2:41 and Alma 56:11); his six other spellings of *happy* are correct (three in extant portions of \mathcal{O} , three in \mathcal{P}). Related evidence comes from Oliver's spellings of the similar-sounding word *happen*. Out of 18 occurrences (17 of *happened*, 1 of *happen*), he spelled *happened* eight times with one *p* (three times in extant portions of \mathcal{O} , five times in \mathcal{P}). So if Oliver Cowdery wrote *happiness* as *hapiness*, then the chances are even higher of the word *happiness* being mis-copied as *holiness*. Often Oliver Cowdery's *a*'s look like *o*'s, and his *p* has a high ascender, which means that the *p* of *hapiness* could have easily been misread as an *l*.

Summary: Emend “neither holiness nor misery” in 2 Nephi 2:11 to “neither happiness nor misery” in accord with all other pairs of *happiness* and *misery* in the text.

■ 2 Nephi 2:13

and if ye shall say there is no law
ye shall also say there is no sin

[& 1 | ABCDEFGIJLMNOQRT | And HKPS] if ye shall say there is no sin
ye shall also say there is no righteousness

and if there be no righteousness
there be no happiness

and if there be no righteousness nor happiness
there be no punishment nor misery

and if these things are not
there is no God

and if there is no God
we are not / neither the earth

In this verse we have a sequence of six logically connected and parallel *if*-clauses, where each one is connected to the previous clause by the same coordinating conjunction, *and*. Unfortunately,

the 1830 typesetter accidentally dropped the second of these *and*'s, thus disturbing the systematic cadence and parallelism of the original text. The 1874 RLDS edition restored the *and*, but without access to the printer's manuscript.

Summary: Restore the missing *and* in 2 Nephi 2:13 (“and if ye shall say there is no sin”).

■ 2 Nephi 2:14

*and now my [Son 1 | sons ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRT | son PS]
I speak unto you these things for your profit and learning
for there is a God and he hath created all things*

Here the 1830 typesetter changed *son* to *sons*, possibly by accident. As a result, the text now has Lehi addressing all his sons rather than Jacob alone. From the 1908 edition on, the RLDS text has had the singular *son* (in accord with the reading of the printer's manuscript).

It is quite possible that Oliver Cowdery accidentally dropped the plural *s* as he copied from \mathcal{O} into \mathcal{P} . Or he may have missed the *s* when he wrote down Joseph Smith's dictation in \mathcal{O} (which is not extant here). Either *son* or *sons* is possible, although the contextual evidence favors the use of the plural *sons*. The larger discourse begins in 2 Nephi 2:1, with Lehi addressing only one son, Jacob. In his introductory words, Lehi acknowledges Jacob's spirituality and states that Jacob already knows that God exists:

2 Nephi 2:1–4

and now Jacob I speak unto you
thou art my first born in the days of my tribulation in the wilderness
and behold in thy childhood thou hast suffered afflictions and much sorrow
because of the rudeness of thy brethren
nevertheless Jacob my first born in the wilderness
thou knowest the greatness of God
and he shall consecrate thine afflictions for thy gain . . .

wherefore I know that thou art redeemed
because of the righteousness of thy Redeemer
for thou hast beheld that in the fullness of time
he cometh to bring salvation unto men
and thou hast beheld in thy youth his glory
wherefore thou art blessed
even as they unto whom he shall minister in the flesh

By verse 11, Lehi is still only addressing Jacob:

2 Nephi 2:11

if not so my first born in the wilderness
righteousness could not be brought to pass

But obviously, all of Lehi's sons are listening in. And as Lehi continues his discourse on “opposition in all things” (found in verses 11–13), he extends his remarks to all his sons, so that when we get to verse 14, Lehi is trying to convince all his sons, not particularly Jacob, that God exists:

2 Nephi 2:14 (1830 text)
and now **my sons**
I speak unto you these things for your profit and learning
for there is a God and he hath created all things

We should also note that prior to verse 14 Lehi consistently refers to Jacob as “my first born in the wilderness” (that is, first born after leaving Jerusalem), not as “my son”:

2 Nephi 2:1
and now **Jacob** I speak unto you
thou art **my first born** in the days of my tribulation **in the wilderness**

2 Nephi 2:2
nevertheless **Jacob my first born in the wilderness**
thou knowest the greatness of God

2 Nephi 2:11
if not so **my first born in the wilderness**
righteousness could not be brought to pass

The intervening discourse (on the need for the atonement, from verses 14 through 27) seems to apply to all the sons, not just Jacob. In verse 27 of the following citation, Lehi refers to the great Mediator of all men and about choosing between eternal life and death. Then after addressing all his sons at the beginning of verse 28 (“and now my sons”), he repeats the reference to the great Mediator and about choosing between eternal life and eternal death:

2 Nephi 2:27–28
and they are free to choose liberty and eternal life
through the great Mediator of all men
or to choose captivity and death
according to the captivity and power of the devil
for he seeketh that all men might be miserable like unto himself

and now my sons I would that
ye should look to the great Mediator
and hearken unto his great commandments
and be faithful unto his words and choose eternal life
according to the will of his Holy Spirit

Verse 14 is very similar to verse 28 since both begin, it would appear, with the phrase “and now my sons” and each repeats information stated just before (in verses 13 and 27):

2 Nephi 2:13–14 (1830 text)
and if these things are not
there is no God
and if there is no God
we are not / neither the earth
for there could have been no creation of things
neither to act nor to be acted upon
wherefore all things must have vanished away

and now my sons I speak unto you these things
 for your profit and learning
 for there is a God
 and he hath created all things
 both the heavens and the earth and all things that in them is
 both things to act and things to be acted upon

This correlation suggests that at least the last part of verse 13 is addressed to all of Lehi's sons.

Of course, one could argue that the plural *sons* in verse 28 is also an error for *son*, but this supposition seems highly unlikely given the explicit plural reference to "all my sons" two verses later:

2 Nephi 2:30
 I have spoken these few words unto you **all my sons**
 in the last days of my probation

It would seem that "these few words" of Lehi's began as early as verse 11 and went through to the end of the chapter (that is, through verse 30). Consequently, the singular *son* in \mathcal{D} for verse 14 is probably a scribal error for *sons*.

The scribes frequently mixed up singular and plural noun forms in the manuscripts. There are two examples involving *son* and *sons*, and both involve the phrase "my son(s)":

Mosiah 29:7 (Hyrum Smith in \mathcal{D})
 and who knoweth but what
 my [*Sons* > % *Son* 1 | *son* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
 to whom the kingdom doth belong
 should turn to be angry
 and draw away a part of this people after **him**

Alma 41:14 (Oliver Cowdery in \mathcal{C})
 therefore my [*Sons* > *Son* > *Sons* 0 | *Son* 1 | *son* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
 see that ye are merciful unto your brethren

In both of these instances, the correct reading is in the singular, but the larger context involves several sons. In the first example, Mosiah is specifically speaking of Aaron as the heir to the kingship, but of course Mosiah has four sons, all of which are frequently referred to in the text. In the second example, Alma is speaking specifically to his third son, Corianton, but earlier he had been speaking with the other two sons, Helaman and Shiblon. And in these personal discourses, Alma sometimes refers to these two other sons. The same potential situation for confusion occurs here in 2 Nephi 2, where Lehi is speaking first with Jacob but then turns to speak to all of his sons. So it is not surprising that confusion about the number of sons involved can occur when trying to interpret the phrase "my son(s)". Here in 2 Nephi 2:14, the context argues that Lehi has already turned to address all his sons; thus the phrase should read "my sons".

Summary: Analysis of Lehi's discourse argues that somewhere between verses 11 and 14 of 2 Nephi 2, Lehi turned to speak to all his sons and not just Jacob; thus the 1830 reading *sons*, even if accidental, probably represents the original text in 2 Nephi 2:14.

■ 2 Nephi 2:14

*and he hath created all things
both the heavens and the earth
and all things that in them [is 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPS | are RT]*

The language of this verse is clearly derived from the Ten Commandments:

Exodus 20:11 (King James Bible)
for *in* six days the LORD made heaven and earth
the sea and all that in them *is*

Part of this language is repeated in the New Testament:

Acts 4:24 (King James Bible)
Lord thou *art* God
which hast made heaven and earth
and the sea and all that in them *is*

In the Hebrew for Exodus 20:11, the passage can be literally translated as “and all that in them”. In the King James translation, the verb *is* is in italics, which means that there is no *be* verb in the original Hebrew. The *all* can be interpreted as a singular with the meaning ‘everything’. Interestingly, the original Greek for Acts 4:24 agrees with the (Greek) Septuagint version of Exodus 20:11 and can be literally translated as “and all things in them”; there is no relative pronoun or *be* verb in the Greek, and the original word *all* has been made explicitly plural (equivalent to *all things*). But the King James translators chose to follow their own translation of Exodus 20:11 for Acts 4:24: “and all that in them *is*” (which is based on the original Hebrew of Exodus 20:11). Typically, New Testament authors quoted from the Greek version of the Hebrew Bible (the Septuagint), not the original Hebrew version. The King James translators apparently wanted to make sure that the New Testament citation followed the familiar language of the Ten Commandments, so they adopted William Tyndale’s original translation for Acts 4:24 (which dates back to 1526). Note, however, that the 1611 translators neglected to put the *is* in italics! Here the main point, as far as the Book of Mormon text is concerned, is that in both King James passages the *be* verb is in the singular (“and all that in them **is**”).

This particular phraseology from Exodus 20:11 and Acts 4:24 is frequently used in the Book of Mormon text. In addition to the example in 2 Nephi 2:14, we have these five examples (of which the Mosiah verse is a direct quote from Exodus 20:11):

Mosiah 13:19
for in six days the Lord made heaven and earth
and the sea and **all** that in them **is**

Alma 11:39
yea he *is* the very eternal Father of heaven and earth
and **all things** which in them [*is* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPS | *are* RT]

3 Nephi 9:15
I created the heavens and the earth
and **all things** that in them [*is* >]s *are* 1 | *is* A | *are* BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]

Mormon 9:11

and it is that same God
 which created the heavens and the earth
 and **all things** that in them [*is* >*js are* 1 | *is* A | *are* BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]

Ether 4:7

saith Jesus Christ the Son of God
 the Father of the heavens and of the earth
 and **all things** that in them [*is* >*js are* 1 | *is* A | *are* BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]

We notice that in the Book of Mormon text, only one of the six passages has retained the original singular verb form *is* (namely, the one in Mosiah that explicitly cites Exodus 20:11). For the other five, the singular *is* has been edited to the plural *are* since each of these has the plural *all things* as the antecedent for the relative pronoun, either *that* or *which*. (Also note that the literal Mosiah quote is the only one that retains the reference to the sea.) In addition, the five paraphrastic examples replace the *all* with *all things*, as if each one were following the Greek (Septuagint) version of Exodus 20:11. Actually, this expansion in the Book of Mormon examples is just a natural extension of the original meaning rather than the result of some special access to the Septuagint. Otherwise, these five passages continue to follow the literalistic King James translation of Exodus 20:11: the phrase “that/which in them is” retains not only the relative clause construction but also the unnatural placement (for English) of *in them* before the verb *is*.

In any event, the five paraphrastic Book of Mormon examples show subject-verb disagreement between the antecedent *all things* and the main verb *is* (“all things that/which in them is”). The singular *is* in 2 Nephi 2:14 and in Alma 11:39 was changed to the plural *are* in the 1920 LDS edition. Joseph Smith changed the three others in his editing for the 1837 edition. (For a complete discussion of such editing, see SUBJECT-VERB AGREEMENT in volume 3.) Of course, in all five cases the critical text will restore the original singular *is* since this is how the earliest textual sources read. Furthermore, such usage is in agreement with the biblical language of the King James Bible.

Summary: Maintain the singular verb form *is* in all six citations (or near citations) in the Book of Mormon of the language in Exodus 20:11 (“and all that in them is”); the earliest text consistently has the *is*, which agrees with the singular found in the King James Bible.

■ 2 Nephi 2:15–16

*it must needs be that there was an opposition
 even the forbidden fruit in opposition to the tree of life
 the **one** being sweet and the **other** bitter
 wherefore the Lord God gave unto man that he should act for himself
 wherefore man could not act for himself
 save it should be that he were enticed by the one or the other*

If one interprets this passage as a strict parallelism, it implies that the forbidden fruit was sweet while the tree of life was bitter. This seems strange because elsewhere in the text, *sweet* lines up with positives, *bitter* with negatives:

2 Nephi 15:20 (Isaiah 5:20)

woe unto them that call **evil good** and **good evil**
that put **darkness** for **light** and **light** for **darkness**
that put **bitter** for **sweet** and **sweet** for **bitter**

Alma 36:21

yea I say unto you my son
that there can be nothing so exquisite and so **bitter** as was my **pains**
yea and again I say unto you my son
that on the other hand there can be nothing so exquisite and **sweet** as was my **joy**

In the first example, we have the words *evil*, *darkness*, and *bitter* opposed to *good*, *light*, and *sweet*. In the second example, the words *bitter* and *pains* are set against *sweet* and *joy*.

As far as 2 Nephi 2:15 is concerned, readers would normally assume that the tree of life was sweet and the forbidden fruit was bitter. One could imagine switching the word order; there are two possible emendations:

- *switch the noun phrases:*
even the **tree of life** in opposition to **the forbidden fruit**
the one being sweet and the other bitter
- *switch the adjectives:*
even the forbidden fruit in opposition to the tree of life
the one being **bitter** and the other **sweet**

These two emendations presume that the order of reference must be preserved. Ultimately, the question is whether *one* and *other* necessarily maintain order. There is only one example for which the order is clearly maintained:

Alma 41:4–5

raised to endless happiness to inherit the kingdom of God
or to endless misery to inherit the kingdom of the devil
the **one** on **one** hand the **other** on the **other**
the **one** restored to happiness according to his desires of happiness
or to good according to his desires of good
and the **other** to evil according to his desires of evil

Yet this passage continues by using *other* a second time, but this time in reference to the first of the pair (that is, in reference to righteousness and happiness):

Alma 41:5–6

for as he has desired to do evil all the day long
even so shall he have his reward of evil when the night cometh
and so it is on the **other** hand
if he hath repented of his sins and desired righteousness until the end of his days
even so shall he be rewarded unto righteousness

Another example of a reversal is in a Matthew quotation:

3 Nephi 13:24 (Matthew 6:24)

no man can serve two masters
for either he will hate the **one** and love the **other**
or else he will hold to the **one** and despise the **other**

In this last example, we see that “the one” is followed by “the other”, even if the referent switches. One could therefore interpret 2 Nephi 2:15 so that “the one” refers to the tree of life and “the other” refers to the forbidden fruit, thus preserving the use of *sweet* with positives and *bitter* with negatives.

It should also be noted here that for all other uses of “(the) one . . . (the) other”, no specific order is implied or even necessary. In all these instances, we get simply a contrast or an unordered opposition:

1 Nephi 12:2

I beheld multitudes gathered together to battle **one** against the **other**

1 Nephi 14:7

a work which shall be everlasting either on the **one** hand or on the **other**
either to the convincing of them unto peace and life eternal
or unto the deliverance of them to the hardness of their hearts

1 Nephi 14:10

behold there is save it be two churches
the **one** is the church of the Lamb of God
and the **other** is the church of the devil

2 Nephi 2:16

wherefore man could not act for himself
save it should be that he were enticed by the **one** or the **other**

2 Nephi 9:12

and the bodies and the spirits of men will be restored **one** to the **other**

2 Nephi 26:28

but all men are privileged the **one** like unto the **other**

2 Nephi 28:3

the churches which are built up and not unto the Lord
when the **one** shall say unto the **other**
behold I / I am the Lord's
and the **other** shall say
I / I am the Lord's

Jacob 2:21

and the **one** being is as precious in his sight as the **other**

Alma 32:20

behold I say unto you that
it is on the **one** hand even as it is on the **other**

Alma 52:31

they were surrounded by the Nephites
by the men of Moroni on **one** hand and the men of Lehi on the **other**

Helaman 7:23

I will not shew unto the wicked of my strength
to **one** more than the **other**
save it be unto those who repenteth of their sins

3 Nephi 26:5

if they be good to the resurrection of everlasting life
and if they be evil to the resurrection of damnation
being on a parallel the **one** on the **one** hand and the **other** on the **other** hand
according to the mercy and the justice and the holiness which is in Christ

Moroni 8:15

for awful is the wickedness to suppose that
God saveth **one** child because of baptism
and the **other** must perish because he hath no baptism

Summary: Maintain the original order in 2 Nephi 2:15, but interpret “the one” as referring to the tree of life and “the other” as referring to the forbidden fruit; usage elsewhere suggests that referents for “the one” and “the other” can be reversed.

■ 2 Nephi 2:16

wherefore the Lord God gave unto man that he should act for himself

wherefore man could not act for himself

save it should be that he [were 1A | was BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] enticed by the one or the other

The original text here has an historical use of the subjunctive *were*. In earlier English, the subjunctive was generally used in any conditional statement, as here in 2 Nephi 2:16. In modern standard English, we expect the subjunctive *were* whenever the conditional statement is contrary to fact (as in “if I were a rich man”, which implies that I am **not** a rich man). But if the conditional statement is not contrary to fact, we normally expect the indicative *was* (as in “if he was there, I didn’t see him”). For additional discussion regarding the more extensive use of the subjunctive in earlier English, see pages 171–173 of Charles Barber, *Early Modern English* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 1997).

In this passage in 2 Nephi 2:16, the conditional statement is definitely not contrary to fact. The previous sentence states that “the Lord God gave unto man that he should act for himself”, so in modern English we expect the indicative *was* in the subsequent conditional clause (“save it should be that he **was** enticed by the one or the other”). The 1837 edition implemented this change to *was*, but the critical text will restore the original subjunctive *were*.

Here is another Book of Mormon example of *were* being used in a non-contrary-to-fact conditional statement:

3 Nephi 8:1

and there was not any man
 which could do a miracle in the name of Jesus
 save he **were** cleansed every whit from his iniquity

Similar examples are found in the King James Bible:

Exodus 21:2–3

if thou buy an Hebrew servant six years he shall serve
 and in the seventh he shall go out free for nothing
 if he came in by himself he shall go out by himself
 if he **were** married then his wife shall go out with him

Hebrews 5:8

though he **were** a son
 yet learned he obedience by the things which he suffered

For further discussion regarding the subjunctive usage in the Book of Mormon, see MOOD in volume 3.

Summary: Restore the original use of the subjunctive *were* in 2 Nephi 2:16.

■ 2 Nephi 2:18

and because that he had fallen from heaven and had become miserable forever
 [& > NULL 1 | ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
he sought also the misery of all mankind
wherefore he saith unto Eve . . .

Oliver Cowdery’s deletion of & in the printer’s manuscript is definitely an immediate correction. First, the level of ink flow is the same. Second, Oliver first tried to overwrite the ampersand with *he*, but he only overwrote with the first half of the initial *h*, then simply crossed out the whole partially corrected ampersand and wrote the *he* inline immediately to the right of the crossout. The original manuscript is not extant here, but it seems highly probable that Ⓞ didn’t have an ampersand. Oliver may have expected an additional *and* simply because *and* (written as &) had already occurred twice in the immediately preceding clause (written in Ⓞ as “& because that he had fallen from heaven & had become miserable forever”).

Summary: Accept Oliver Cowdery’s crossout of the additional ampersand in 2 Nephi 2:18; the nature of the crossout argues that *and* was not in the original manuscript.

■ 2 Nephi 2:19

and after that Adam and Eve had partaken of the forbidden fruit they were driven out
 [from 1A | of BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *the garden of Eden to till the earth*

This change in the preposition first appeared in the 1837 edition; it may be the result of Joseph Smith’s editing for that edition, although this change was not marked by him in the printer’s

manuscript. For modern readers, the phrase “out from” is definitely more awkward than “out of”. Nonetheless, the corresponding account in the King James Bible uses the preposition *from*:

Genesis 3:23

therefore the LORD God sent him forth **from** the garden of Eden
to till the ground from whence he was taken

A parallel citation in the Book of Mormon also has *from*:

Alma 42:2

for behold after the Lord God sent our first parents forth
from the garden of Eden
to till the ground from whence he was taken

Of course, substituting *of* in place of *from* would not work as well here in Alma 42:2 (or in Genesis 3:23) since the preceding word is *forth* rather than *out*.

There are occurrences of the phrase “out from” which have not been replaced in the Book of Mormon text by the much more frequent “out of”. Consider these examples where *of* could replace *from*:

2 Nephi 9:9	to be shut out from the presence of our God
2 Nephi 25:4	I came out from Jerusalem with my father
2 Nephi 30:4	how that we came out from Jerusalem
Jacob 7:26	we being . . . wanderers cast out from Jerusalem
Omni 1:15	the people of Zarahemla came out from Jerusalem
3 Nephi 7:22	and as many as had devils cast out from them

The general lack of textual change in these examples of “out from” suggests that there is nothing wrong with this expression and that it should be restored in 2 Nephi 2:19. In fact, the 1837 change may well be a typo rather than the result of conscious editing. (For another example where *out from* was accidentally set as *out of*, see 1 Nephi 3:13.)

Summary: Restore the original reading “out from” in 2 Nephi 2:19; there are quite a few examples of “out from” elsewhere in the text.

■ 2 Nephi 2:21

*for he gave [commandment 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST | commandments J]
that all men must repent*

The variant *commandments* in the 1888 LDS large-print edition makes one wonder if the singular *commandment* is an error—perhaps an *s* is missing or perhaps *commandment* should be immediately preceded by the indefinite article *a*. Actually the phrase “to give commandment” without any intervening word between the verb *give* and the singular direct object *commandment* occurs elsewhere in the scriptures. We have five examples of this precise construction in the King James Bible (such as “and Moses gave commandment” in Exodus 36:6). In the Book of Mormon, we have three more examples:

1 Nephi 6:6

wherefore I shall **give commandment** unto my seed
that they shall not occupy these plates with things
which are not of worth unto the children of men

2 Nephi 3:7

and unto him will I **give commandment**
that he shall do a work for the fruit of thy loins

3 Nephi 4:6

therefore Giddianhi **gave commandment** unto his armies
that in this year they should go up to battle against the Nephites

Summary: Maintain the singular *commandment* in the phrase “he gave commandment” (in 2 Nephi 2:21); the phrase “to give commandment” is found in various places in the King James Bible and in the Book of Mormon.

■ 2 Nephi 2:22

*and now behold if **Adam** had not transgressed
he would not have fallen
but **he** would have remained in the garden of Eden*

In this verse, Adam is referred to in the singular, yet both the preceding and the following text refer to both Adam and Eve:

2 Nephi 2:19–20

and after that **Adam and Eve** had partaken of the forbidden fruit
they were driven out from the garden of Eden to till the earth
and **they** have brought forth children yea even the family of all the earth

2 Nephi 2:22–23

and **they** must have remained forever and had no end
and **they** would have had no children
wherefore **they** would have remained in a state of innocence
having no joy for **they** knew no misery
doing no good for **they** knew no sin

The use of the pronoun *they* in 2 Nephi 2:22–23 is especially egregious since *they* refers to Adam and Eve, yet the preceding text (at the beginning of verse 22) refers only to *Adam*. One could perhaps propose rewriting the beginning of verse 22 in the plural:

2 Nephi 2:22 (possible emendation to the plural)

and now behold if **Adam and Eve** had not transgressed
they would not have fallen
but **they** would have remained in the garden of Eden

Of course, it is extremely doubtful here that we have a primitive error in the earliest text for the beginning of verse 22. The switch to *Adam* and the singular pronoun *he* seems to be just as intentional as the surrounding use of *Adam and Eve* and the plural pronoun *they*.

In a personal communication (8 November 2003), Kelly Taylor points out that the switch to *Adam* at the beginning of verse 22 may be explained as a generic reference to Adam and Eve. Consider the following examples of pronoun shifting in the account of the creation of Adam and Eve in the King James Bible:

Genesis 1:26–27

and God said let us make **man** in our image after our likeness
and let **them** have dominion . . .
so God created **man** in his *own* image
in the image of God created he **him**
male and female created he **them**

Genesis 5:1–2

- (1) this *is* the book of the generations of **Adam** [ʾādām]
- (2) in the day that God created **man** [ʾādām]
in the likeness of God made he **him**
male and female created he **them**
- (3) and blessed **them** and called **their** name **Adam** [ʾādām]
in the day when **they** were created

The second passage is especially noteworthy. Here the Hebrew text uses *ʾādām* three times (numbered as 1, 2, and 3) to refer to generic man (meaning ‘human being’, not ‘male’). The King James Bible translates only the second occurrence as *man*. In the two other cases, the King James text has *Adam*. The last example is particularly relevant since in this instance *Adam* is directly used to refer to both Adam and Eve (“male and female”). In the same way, the Book of Mormon text can be said to use *Adam* alone at the beginning of 2 Nephi 2:22 to refer to both Adam and Eve.

Summary: Maintain the use of *Adam* and the singular pronoun *he* at the beginning of 2 Nephi 2:22; the usage here refers to both Adam and Eve and parallels the use of *Adam* in Genesis 5:1–2.

■ 2 Nephi 2:22

*and all things which were created must have remained
in the same state
[1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPS | in RT] which they were
after that they were created*

Here in 2 Nephi 2:22, the printer’s manuscript has the relative clause “which they were”, which seems incomplete. The original manuscript is not extant here, but the *in* could have been accidentally lost when Oliver Cowdery copied from \mathcal{O} into \mathcal{P} . We do have an example elsewhere in the text where *in* occurs both at the head of a relative clause and at the beginning of a preceding prepositional phrase:

Helaman 5:21

and it came to pass that they were taken by an army of the Lamanites
and cast into prison
yea even **in** that same prison
in which Ammon and his brethren were cast by the servants of Limhi

The editing of 2 Nephi 2:22 for the 1920 LDS edition is therefore consistent with the language in Helaman 5:21.

Another editing possibility would be to add the *in* to the end of the relative clause, so the text in 2 Nephi 2:22 would read “all things . . . must have remained in the same state which they were **in**”. There is some evidence to support this second possibility. First, in two other places the Book of Mormon text has the word *state* followed by a relative clause where the relative pronoun *which* directly follows a prepositional phrase. In both instances, the required preposition comes after the verb in the relative clause, not before the *which*:

1 Nephi 13:32

neither will the Lord God suffer that
the Gentiles shall forever remain **in** that **state** of awful wickedness
which thou beholdest that they are **in**

Alma 12:24

therefore this life became a probationary state
a time to prepare to meet God
a time to prepare for that endless **state**
which has been spoken **of** by us

The first of these two examples suggests that whenever the relative clause means ‘to be in some place or state’, the *in* comes at the end of the relative clause after the *be* verb. Here is one other example:

3 Nephi 1:25

they soon became converted
and were convinced of the error
which they **were in**

In four cases, the preposition *in* occurs redundantly, both at the beginning and at the end of the relative clause. All four relative clauses have *whatsoever* as the relative pronoun and refer to geographical place:

Alma 21:22 (☉ is not extant for this verse)

and he also declared unto them
that they might have the liberty of worshipping the Lord their God
according to their desires
in whatsoever place they were **in**
if it were in the land which was under the reign of king Lamoni

Alma 23:1 (☉ is extant for only the third *in*; the second *in* is conjectured)
 that they should not lay their hands on Ammon or Aaron or Omner or Himni
 nor neither of their brethren which should go forth preaching the word of God
in whatsoever place they should be [*in* 0 | 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST]
in any part of their land

[See the discussion under Alma 23:1; also see volume 1 for the transcription of ☉ and the associated note.]

Alma 26:37 (☉ is extant for both *in*'s)
 now my brethren
 we see that God is mindful of every people
 [*in* 01ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPS | CGHKRT] whatsoever land they may be *in*
 yea he numbereth his people

Alma 34:38 (☉ is extant for all four *in*'s)
 that ye humble yourselves even to the dust and worship God
in whatsoever place ye may be *in*
in spirit and *in* truth

In the first and fourth cases, the text has retained the redundancy. In the second case, it seems that Oliver Cowdery accidentally dropped the redundant *in* as he copied the text from ☉ into ☐, probably because the immediately following text also began with an *in* (“in any part of their land”). Note in Alma 34:38 that Oliver was able to keep all the *in*'s (“*in* whatsoever place ye may be *in* / *in* spirit and *in* truth”). Finally, in the third case, the 1840 edition removed the preposition at the beginning of the relative clause, thus leaving the preposition at the end. The 1908 RLDS text restored the first *in*. On the other hand, the 1920 LDS edition removed it (perhaps by reference to the 1840 edition); the deletion is explicitly marked in the committee copy for the 1920 edition.

All of these examples show that the original text never allowed the main verb *be* to end a relative clause with the meaning ‘to be in some place or state’. Perhaps there is something too abrupt about the ending of a relative clause like “in which they were”. And in four cases the preposition *in* occurred at the end even when it had already occurred at the beginning of the relative clause. We should note that in most of these cases there seems to be no attempt to follow the prescriptive grammatical rule of never ending a sentence or clause with a preposition. The Book of Mormon text is full of such examples (including those listed above). This artificial rule is absolutely incorrect for the English language. (For a thorough discussion, see *preposition at end* in Merriam-Webster’s Dictionary of English Usage.)

Thus in 2 Nephi 2:22 the earliest reading (“in the same state which they were”) definitely sounds inappropriate. Based on usage elsewhere in the text, the preposition *in* should occur at the end of this relative clause rather than at the beginning.

Summary: Emend 2 Nephi 2:22 so that the relative clause ends in the preposition *in* (“which they were *in*”); examples elsewhere in the earliest text argue that relative clauses with the meaning ‘to be in some place or state’ never end with the main verb *be*.

■ 2 Nephi 2:26

*and the Messiah cometh in the fullness of time
that he [might >js may 1 | might A | may BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] redeem
the children of men from the fall*

In modern English we tend to interpret *might* as a conditional modal that expresses possibility but not necessity (as in “he might do it”). Thus the use of *might* in 2 Nephi 2:26 tends to suggest that the redemption from the fall might be conditional, and consequently Joseph Smith replaced the *might* with *may* in his editing for the 1837 edition. In earlier English, *might* did not have the conditional sense that it does in modern-day English. And the Book of Mormon has numerous examples of such modal usage without any of the conditional implications. For a previous example, see 1 Nephi 3:19; for a complete discussion, see MODAL VERBS in volume 3.

Summary: Restore the original use of the historically past-tense subjunctive *might* in 2 Nephi 2:26.

■ 2 Nephi 2:26

*and because that they are redeemed from the fall
they have become free forever knowing good from evil
to act for themselves and not to be acted upon
save it be by the punishment
of the [Law >jg Law <underlined> 1 | law ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRT | Lord PS]
at the great and last day*

The 1830 compositor underlined *Law* in pencil (on line 35 of page 51 in \mathcal{P}), which appears to be an indication that he considered this word to be problematic. But he did not directly specify what was wrong with the word, and the 1830 edition has *law*. On the next page of the printer’s manuscript (page 52, line 13), the word *Lord* in 2 Nephi 3:2 was also underlined in pencil by the 1830 compositor (“& may the Lord consecrate also unto thee this land”). Again there is no corresponding change for this word in the 1830 edition. But it appears that the editors for the 1908 RLDS edition interpreted these two underlinings as having some connection with each other and decided that the underlined word *Law* on page 51 of \mathcal{P} should be changed to *Lord*.

The original manuscript is not extant here. When we look at the rest of the Book of Mormon text, we discover that there are no occurrences of the phrase “punishment of the Lord”, but there are none of “punishment of the law” either. Even so, there are passages that show a close juxtaposition of *law* and *punishment*, including the following that pertain to God’s law:

2 Nephi 9:25

wherefore he hath given a law
and where there is no law given
there is no punishment

Mosiah 2:33

for he receiveth for his wages an everlasting punishment
having transgressed the law of God

Alma 42:17–18

how could there be a law save there was a punishment
 now there was a punishment affixed
 and a just law given which brought remorse of conscience unto man

Alma 42:22

but there is a law given and a punishment affixed . . .
 and the law inflicteth the punishment

So there is really nothing conceptually wrong with the phrase “punishment of the law”, and there is no reason to accept any emendation to the word *law* in 2 Nephi 2:26, especially given that Lehi’s whole discourse in 2 Nephi 2 is on the necessity of law in God’s plan.

There is one other place nearby where the 1830 compositor underlined a word: namely, *me* on line 31 on page 55 in \mathcal{P} , and again without any explanation:

2 Nephi 4:26

if the Lord in his condescension unto the children of men hath visited
 [*me* >jg *me* <underlined> 1 | *men* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRT | *me* PS]
 in so much mercy
 why should my heart weep

But in this instance, the 1830 compositor made a change when he typeset this word. He set the *me* as *men*, thus confirming that underlining means some kind of change. For further discussion of this example (and why *men* is incorrect), see 2 Nephi 4:26.

Summary: Maintain the reading of the printer’s manuscript (“punishment of the law”) since it makes perfectly good sense, especially in the context of Lehi’s discourse on the necessity of the law; the 1830 compositor underlined the word *Law* in \mathcal{P} , which the editors for the 1908 RLDS edition apparently interpreted as meaning that *Law* should be emended to *Lord*.

■ 2 Nephi 2:27

and all things are given them

which [is >js are 1 | is A | are BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] expedient unto man

Here we have another case of subject-verb disagreement in the original text (“all things . . . which **is** expedient”). For the 1837 edition, Joseph Smith edited the singular *is* to the plural *are*. The critical text will follow the earliest reading, even if it is ungrammatical for standard English. See the discussion under 1 Nephi 17:30 as well as the more general discussion under SUBJECT-VERB AGREEMENT in volume 3.

Summary: In accord with the reading of the earliest text, restore in 2 Nephi 2:27 the singular *is* in the relative clause “which is expedient”, even if its antecedent (“all things”) is in the plural.

■ 2 Nephi 2:27

*and they are free to choose liberty and eternal life
through the great [mediator 1 | mediation ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRS | Mediator T] of all men
or to choose captivity and death*

The 1830 typesetter accidentally misread the word *mediator* in \mathcal{D} as *mediation*. This incorrect reading was perpetuated in the LDS text until the 1981 edition, but the word *mediation* continues in the RLDS text. The following verse repeats the word *mediator* and implies that the 1830 typesetter's change in verse 27 was not due to editing but instead to his misreading of the copy-text:

2 Nephi 2:28
and now my sons
I would that ye should look to
the great [*mediator* 1A | *Mediator* BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
and hearken unto his great commandments

In the earliest textual sources (in this case, the printer's manuscript), both verses refer to "the great Mediator". The word *mediation* occurs nowhere in the text, while the word *mediator* occurs nowhere else except here in 2 Nephi 2:27–28. However, *mediator* does occur fairly frequently in the King James Bible (seven times in the New Testament epistles), but *mediation* is not found at all in the biblical text.

Summary: Maintain both occurrences of the original reading "the great Mediator" in 2 Nephi 2:27–28; the 1830 change of the first *mediator* to *mediation* is apparently the result of the 1830 compositor misreading his copy.

2 Nephi 3

■ 2 Nephi 3:12

*wherefore the fruit of [my 1A | thy BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] loins shall write
and the fruit of the loins of Judah shall write*

■ 2 Nephi 3:14

*for this promise of which I have obtained of the Lord
of the fruit of [thy 1ABCDGHKPS | my EFIJLMNOQRT] loins shall be fulfilled*

These two verses are a part of a long passage in which Joseph of Egypt first quotes the Lord (verses 7–13), then continues in his own words (verses 14–15). In two places the pronominal *my* and *thy* seem to be mixed up. In verse 12 (where Joseph is still quoting the Lord), the earliest text (here the printer's manuscript) has *my loins* instead of what we expect, *thy loins*. Otherwise in this long quotation (verses 7–13) there are seven examples of *thy loins*:

2 Nephi 3:7

yea Joseph truly said
thus saith the Lord unto me
a choice seer will I raise up out of the fruit of **thy loins**
and he shall be esteemed highly among the fruit of **thy loins**
and unto him will I give commandment
that he shall do a work for the fruit of **thy loins** his brethren

2 Nephi 3:11

but a seer will I raise up out of the fruit of **thy loins**
and unto him will I give power
to bring forth my word unto the seed of **thy loins**

2 Nephi 3:12 (earliest extant text, the reading in \mathcal{P})

wherefore the fruit of *my loins* shall write
and the fruit of the loins of Judah shall write
and that which shall be written by the fruit of **thy loins**
and also that which shall be written by the fruit of the loins of Judah
shall grow together unto the confounding of false doctrines
and laying down of contentions and establishing peace
among the fruit of **thy loins**

The exceptional case of *my loins* in verse 12 (set above in italics rather than bold) violates the contrastive parallelism in verse 12. We expect two matching pairs of *thy loins* and *the loins of Judah*; thus the use of *my loins* in the first matching pair seems wholly inappropriate:

2 Nephi 3:12 (earliest extant text, the reading in \mathcal{P})
 wherefore the fruit of *my loins* shall write
 and the fruit of **the loins of Judah** shall write
 and that which shall be written by the fruit of **thy loins**
 and also that which shall be written by the fruit of **the loins of Judah**
 shall grow together

Thus in the 1837 edition, this one exceptional occurrence of *my loins* within the long quotation of the Lord's words (verses 7–13) was replaced by *thy loins*.

The difficulty of the larger passage is further complicated in verse 14 by the single occurrence of *thy loins* after the Lord's quote has ended. Joseph's own words are now being quoted, yet the earliest text (once more the printer's manuscript) has the anomalous *thy loins* in verse 14, as if the Lord is still being quoted:

2 Nephi 3:14 (earliest extant text, the reading in \mathcal{P})
 and thus prophesied Joseph saying
 behold that seer will the Lord bless
 and they that seek to destroy him shall be confounded
 for this promise of which I have obtained of the Lord of the fruit of *thy loins*
 shall be fulfilled

This apparent anomaly motivated Orson Pratt, in his editing for the 1849 LDS edition, to change *thy loins* in verse 14 to *my loins*. This reading has been maintained in all subsequent LDS editions, but the RLDS editions have retained the earlier *thy loins*.

It is difficult to see how these two inconsistent readings could somehow be reinterpreted as sudden, brief switches in who's being quoted. In verse 12 we would have to assume that for the first part of the verse Joseph was suddenly quoting himself ("wherefore the fruit of **my loins** shall write"), but then equally as suddenly Joseph would switch back to quoting the Lord ("and that which shall be written by the fruit of **thy loins**"). Or in verse 14 we would have to assume a quote shift within the same clause: "for this promise of which I have obtained of the Lord of the fruit of **thy loins** shall be fulfilled". It should be noted here that the 1966 RLDS edition (which uses quote marks) does not set apart the phrase "of the fruit of thy loins" as a quote within a quote, although it should have if the editors of that edition had fully disambiguated this use of *thy loins*. (The 1966 RLDS edition represents a thorough modernization of the biblical language of the Book of Mormon. Its many changes precluded it from being included in the computerized collation. For further discussion of this edition and the kinds of changes it introduced into the text, see volume 3.)

This kind of quote shifting seems very much out of place, especially since Joseph's quotation of the Lord's words are both opened and closed by the clause "saith the Lord":

2 Nephi 3:7 thus saith the Lord unto me . . .
 2 Nephi 3:13 . . . saith the Lord

A similar framing of a quotation is found when Joseph's own words are directly quoted:

2 Nephi 3:14 and thus prophesied Joseph saying . . .
 2 Nephi 3:16 . . . yea thus prophesied Joseph

From a narrative point of view, the two mix-ups of *thy loins* and *my loins* are clearly inappropriate.

Further support for emending the text in these two places comes from manuscript errors that show the mixing up of the possessive pronouns *my* and *thy*. We have five examples of the scribes mixing up *my* and *thy*. And four of the examples occurred as Oliver Cowdery copied the text from \mathcal{C} into \mathcal{P} . Of particular interest here is the occurrence of preceding pronominal forms (set in bold) that may have primed the scribe to initially write the wrong form of *my* or *thy*:

1 Nephi 13:11 (scribe 2 of \mathcal{C})

and it came to pass that the angel saith unto **me**
 behold the wrath of God is upon
 the seed of [*my* > % *thy* 0 | *thy* 1 ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] brethren

1 Nephi 20:8–9 (Oliver Cowdery in \mathcal{P})

yea from that time **thine** ear was not opened
 for I knew that **thou** wouldst deal very treacherously
 and wast called a transgressor
 from [*the* 0 ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST | *thy* > js *the* 1] womb
 nevertheless for [*my* 0 ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST | *thy* > *my* 1] name's sake
 will I defer mine anger

[Also notice here how Oliver Cowdery wrote *thy womb*
 in \mathcal{P} rather than *the womb*, again under the influence of
 the preceding occurrences of *thine* and *thou*.]

2 Nephi 8:16 (Oliver Cowdery in \mathcal{P})

and I have put my words in **thy** mouth
 and hath covered **thee** in the shadow
 of [*mine* 0 ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST | *thy* > *mine* 1] hand

Mosiah 20:15 (Oliver Cowdery in \mathcal{P})

therefore in **my** anger
 I did cause **my** people to come up to war
 against [*my* > *thy* 1 | *thy* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] people

Mosiah 20:24 (Oliver Cowdery in \mathcal{P})

and I swear unto you with an oath
 that **my** people shall not slay
 [*my* > *thy* 1 | *thy* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] people

In the last two examples, the noun phrase *my people* prompted the repetition of the same phrase.

Looking once more at our two passages in 2 Nephi 3:12, 14, we see the possibility of priming (although the effect in the second case appears to be marginal):

2 Nephi 3:11–12 (earliest extant text, the reading in \mathcal{P})

and not to the bringing forth **my** word only
 saith the Lord
 but to the convincing them of **my** word
 which shall have already gone forth among them
 wherefore the fruit of *my loins* shall write

2 Nephi 3:13–14 (earliest extant text, the reading in \mathcal{D})
 and out of weakness he shall be made strong
 in that day when my work shall commence among all my people
 unto the restoring **thee** O house of Israel
 saith the Lord
 and thus prophesied Joseph saying
 behold that seer will the Lord bless
 and they that seek to destroy him shall be confounded
 for this promise of which I have obtained of the Lord
 of the fruit of *thy loins*
 shall be fulfilled

In the second case, the many occurrences of *thy loins* in the quotation of the Lord's words (verses 7–13) was probably the main reason for the repetition of *thy loins* in verse 14. The preceding single word *thee* in verse 13 seems too isolated to have accounted for the *thy* in verse 14.

We do not have the original manuscript for 2 Nephi 3, but the evidence from scribal errors suggests that the two anomalous cases (*of my loins* in verse 12 and *thy loins* in verse 14) are scribal errors. The edited versions of these two phrases appear to reflect the reading of the original text (and maybe even the original manuscript).

Summary: Maintain the two edited readings in 2 Nephi 3 that make the use of *my loins* and *thy loins* consistent with who is being quoted: *thy loins* in verse 12 (the Lord is speaking to Joseph of Egypt) and *my loins* in verse 14 (Joseph of Egypt is speaking); scribal errors and internal consistency argue for these two emendations.

■ 2 Nephi 3:14

for this promise
 [of 1ABCDEFGHIKPS | FIJLMNOQRT] *which I have obtained of the Lord*
of the fruit of my loins
shall be fulfilled

The use of *of* after *promise* appears to be unnecessary, almost as if it occurs in anticipation of the many following *of*'s (“**of** the Lord **of** the fruit **of** my loins”). The 1852 LDS edition dropped this seemingly extra *of*, but the RLDS text has retained it.

In a phrase like “promise of X”, the preposition *of* can either mean ‘from’ or ‘regarding’, as in the following two examples from this same chapter:

2 Nephi 3:5 (*of* means ‘from’)
 wherefore Joseph truly saw our day
 and he obtained a promise **of** the Lord
 that out of the fruit of his loins
 the Lord God would raise up a righteous branch unto the house of Israel

2 Nephi 3:16 (*of* means ‘regarding’)
 yea thus prophesied Joseph
 I am sure of this thing
 even as I am sure of the promise **of** Moses
 for the Lord hath said unto me
 I will preserve thy seed forever

[2 Nephi 3:9–10 discusses the Lord’s promise regarding Moses.]

From these examples we may deduce that 2 Nephi 3:14 should be interpreted as meaning ‘for this promise / which I have obtained **from** the Lord **regarding** the fruit of my loins / shall be fulfilled’.

The problem with the extra *of* that heads the relative clause (“this promise **of** which I have obtained”) is that it seems disconnected from the rest of the relative clause. In similar passages in the text (six of them), the relative pronoun *which* acts alone as the complement of the verb *obtain*, as in this nearby example:

2 Nephi 1:3
 and he also spake unto them concerning the land of promise
which they had **obtained**

A reading with an extra *of* (“the land of promise **of** which they had obtained”) would seem anomalous; we expect only “X obtains Y”, not “X obtains **of** Y”.

There are two possibilities regarding the additional *of* that heads the relative clause in 2 Nephi 3:14: the extra *of* was accidentally added during the early transmission of the text; or the extra *of* is actually intended, even though it seems superfluous or distracting to English readers.

The first possibility (of accidentally adding the *of*) could have occurred at various stages in the transmission: Joseph Smith could have added the *of* when he read off the text, or Oliver Cowdery could have added it either when he took down Joseph’s dictation or when he copied from \mathcal{O} into \mathcal{P} (the original manuscript is not extant here). There is minor evidence elsewhere in the manuscripts for this kind of error. Consider the following two instances where Oliver, as he copied from \mathcal{O} into \mathcal{P} , initially added an unnecessary *of* at the head of a relative clause. In both cases, Oliver corrected his error in \mathcal{P} :

Jacob 5:71 (Oliver Cowdery in \mathcal{P})
 ye shall have joy in the fruit
 [*of* > NULL 1 | ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] which I shall lay up unto myself

3 Nephi 4:1 (Oliver Cowdery in \mathcal{P})
 and began to take possession of all the lands
 which had been deserted by the Nephites
 and the cities
 [*of* >+ NULL 1 | ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] which had been left desolates

On the other hand, there is also evidence for the second possibility (namely, the *of* is intended). There are a couple of examples in the earliest text that have an extra *of* that seems intended, even though it appears to be unnecessary:

Alma 51:14

he was exceeding wroth because of the stubbornness of those people
 [of 0A | of >js NULL 1 | BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] whom he had labored
 with so much diligence to preserve

Alma 58:3

yea and it became expedient that we should employ our men
 to the maintaining those parts of the land
 [of the 01ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPS | RT] which we had retained
 of our possessions

In the first instance, Joseph Smith removed the extra *of* in his editing for the 1837 edition. In the second instance, the 1920 LDS edition omitted not only the extra *of* but also the definite article *the*. The RLDS text has retained the original *of the which*, showing that the use of the extra *of* in Alma 58:3 is not egregious. Nor does the earliest text for Alma 51:14 sound particularly objectionable. We can probably make the same claim for the earliest text in 2 Nephi 3:14 since there the RLDS text has also retained the extra *of*. Of course, all three of these cases could be examples of the *of* being accidentally added during the early transmission of the text. But given the tendency for the text to maintain these extra *of*'s, the critical text will follow the evidence of the earliest textual sources, thus restoring the *of* in 2 Nephi 3:14, Alma 51:14, and Alma 58:3.

Summary: Restore the original *of* at the head of the relative clause in 2 Nephi 3:14 (“this promise of which I have obtained of the Lord”); similar examples of this usage in the earliest text are found in Alma 51:14 and Alma 58:3, although it is possible that all three of these examples are due to scribal error.

■ 2 Nephi 3:17

and I will make [one 1 | ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] a spokesman for him

The 1830 typesetter skipped the word *one*, perhaps accidentally or possibly because he considered it unnecessary or awkward. Nonetheless, there is no overwhelming grammatical reason for deleting *one*; it seems to mean ‘someone’ in this context.

Related to this use of *one* is a nearby correction that Oliver Cowdery made in the printer’s manuscript:

2 Nephi 3:18

and I will make
 [one > for 1 | for ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] him a spokesman

Oliver’s correction here appears to be immediate. This additional *one* in 2 Nephi 3:18 appears to be the result of a visual copying error. Oliver was copying from the original manuscript, which would have had “& I will make” in two contiguous lines (verses 17 and 18). When he started copying the second “& I will make”, Oliver’s eye strayed up one line so that he started to write “& I will make **one** a spokesman for him” when he should have written “& I will make for him a spokesman”. He caught his error, deleted the *one*, supralinearly wrote the *for*, and then continued the rest of the

sentence inline. This visual error argues that the word *one* was indeed in the previous line of the original manuscript and that the 1830 typesetter made an error when he deleted it.

Summary: The original manuscript probably read “and I will make **one** a spokesman for him”; the 1830 typesetter omitted the *one*, perhaps accidentally.

■ 2 Nephi 3:18

and the Lord said unto me

also

[1 |, ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQS | : RT]

I will raise up one unto the fruit of thy loins

In typesetting this passage, the 1830 compositor decided that the word *also* should go with the preceding clause (“and the Lord said unto me **also**”), not with the following clause (“**also** I will raise up . . .”). He placed a comma after the *also* (which was replaced by a colon in the LDS text beginning with the 1920 edition). Just before, in verse 16, we have a reference to what the Lord has already promised:

2 Nephi 3:16

for the Lord hath said unto me

I will preserve thy seed forever

So it is not surprising that verse 18 has “and the Lord said unto me also”. Nonetheless, there is the possibility that one could interpret the *also* as belonging to the following clause (namely, “also I will raise up one unto the fruit of thy loins”). In verse 17, we have the Lord’s word to Joseph of Egypt that “I will raise up a Moses”. So at the beginning of verse 18, the Lord says that “also I will raise up one unto the fruit of thy loins”—in other words, there will be a second seer, one for the descendants of Joseph.

In most cases, we can find clear evidence for placing *also* either at the end of the preceding clause or at the beginning of the following clause. For instance, as a result of a following subordinate conjunction *that*, the *also* must be interpreted as belonging to the preceding verb *say*:

1 Nephi 17:14

yea and the Lord said **also**

that after ye have arriven to the promised land . . .

Mosiah 13:35

yea and have they not said **also**

that he should bring to pass the resurrection of the dead

On the other hand, there are numerous examples of *also* preceded by the conjunction *and*, thus showing that a clause can begin with an *also* right before the subject. Here I list all the examples where the subject of the clause is a pronoun:

1 Nephi 19:21

and also he did shew unto many concerning us

Jacob 4:5

and also we worship the Father in his name

Jacob 7:5	and also I had heard the voice of the Lord
Mosiah 2:35	and behold also they spake that which was commanded them
Mosiah 4:16	and also ye yourselves will succor those
Mosiah 5:2	and also we know of their surety and truth
Mosiah 8:10	and behold also they have brought breastplates
Alma 31:16	and also thou hast made it known unto us
Alma 32:3	and also they were poor in heart
Alma 34:7	and also he hath appealed unto Moses
Alma 43:19	and also they were dressed with thick clothing
Helaman 5:34	yea and also they were immovable
Helaman 9:20	and also we will grant unto thee thy life
Helaman 11:22	and also they had peace in the seventy and eighth year
Ether 2:19	and also we shall perish
Ether 6:7	and also they were tight like unto the ark of Noah

It turns out that there is only one clear case where such a clause doesn't have the connective *and*, and this example is in a quotation from the King James Bible:

2 Nephi 16:8 (Isaiah 6:8)

also I heard the voice of the Lord saying
whom shall I send and who will go for us

Besides here in 2 Nephi 3:18, there are two other cases of possible ambiguity:

Alma 9:4

and they saith
also
[1 |, ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQS | : RT]
we will not believe thy words

Alma 47:34

and they all testified unto her
that the king was slain by his own servants
and they said
[01CFGHIJKLMNOPQRST |, ABDE]
also
[01 |, ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQS | : RT]
they have fled
does not this testify against them

For these two cases, the context favors assigning the *also* to the end of the preceding clause rather than at the beginning of the following clause. (For discussion, see Alma 9:4 and Alma 47:34.)

This systematicity suggests that in the Book of Mormon text proper (that is, excluding biblical quotations) the adverbial *also* does not begin clauses. With respect to the case here in 2 Nephi 3:18, we should note that when *also* follows an *unto* prepositional phrase at the end of a clause, the *also* is always attached to that clause, not to the following one:

Alma 9:34

and it came to pass that Amulek went and stood forth
and began to preach **unto them also**
and now the words of Amulek are not all written

Alma 17:10–11

and it came to pass that the Lord did visit them with his Spirit
and said unto them
be comforted
and they were comforted
and the Lord said **unto them also**
go forth among the Lamanites thy brethren and establish my word

Alma 30:21

and it came to pass that he came over into the land of Gideon
and began to preach **unto them also**
and here he did not have much success

Helaman 13:7

and behold an angel of the Lord hath declared it unto me
and he did bring glad tidings to my soul
and behold I was sent unto you to declare it **unto you also**
that ye might have glad tidings

Note, in particular, that Alma 17:11 is virtually identical to 2 Nephi 3:18 with respect to the initial clause: “and the Lord said unto <pronoun> also”. Nor is the Lord telling the sons of Mosiah (in Alma 17:11) to “**also** go forth among the Lamanites”, as if they had already been preaching among some other people. These few examples provide additional support for the decision of the 1830 typesetter to assign *also* to the end of the preceding clause in 2 Nephi 3:18.

Summary: Although the context allows the word *also* to be assigned to the following clause in 2 Nephi 3:18 (“also I will raise up one unto the fruit of thy loins”), usage elsewhere supports assigning the *also* to the end of the preceding clause (“and the Lord said unto me also”); all the printed editions have correctly placed the *also* at the end of the preceding clause.

■ 2 Nephi 3:18

and the Lord said unto me also
*I will **raise up** unto the fruit of thy loins*
and I will make for him a spokesman

The text here clearly seems to be missing its direct object (“I will raise up X unto the fruit of thy loins”). In every other case where there is some reference to raising up a prophet, a seer, or Moses, the direct object is there:

1 Nephi 10:4

yea even six hundred years from the time that my father left Jerusalem
a prophet would the Lord God raise up among the Jews
yea even a Messiah or in other words a Savior of the world

1 Nephi 22:20

and the Lord will surely prepare a way for his people
unto the fulfilling of the words of Moses
which he spake saying
a prophet shall the Lord your God raise up unto you like unto me
him shall ye hear in all things whatsoever he shall say unto you

2 Nephi 3:6

for Joseph truly testified saying
a seer shall the Lord my God raise up
which shall be a choice seer
unto the fruit of my loins

2 Nephi 3:7

yea Joseph truly said
thus saith the Lord unto me
a choice seer will I raise up
out of the fruit of thy loins

2 Nephi 3:9

and he shall be great like unto **Moses**
whom I have said I would raise up unto you
to deliver my people O house of Israel

2 Nephi 3:10

and **Moses** will I raise up
to deliver thy people out of the land of Egypt

2 Nephi 3:11

but **a seer** will I raise up
out of the fruit of thy loins

2 Nephi 3:17

and the Lord hath said
I will raise up **a Moses**
and I will give power unto him in a rod
and I will give judgment unto him in writing
yet I will not loose his tongue that he shall speak much
for I will not make him mighty in speaking
but I will write unto him my law by the finger of mine own hand
and I will make one a spokesman for him

3 Nephi 20:23

behold I am he of whom Moses spake saying
a prophet shall the Lord your God raise up unto you
of your brethren
like unto me
him shall ye hear in all things whatsoever he shall say unto you

The phraseology in these passages derives from Moses’s prophecy in Deuteronomy, as given in the King James Bible:

Deuteronomy 18:15

the LORD thy God will raise up unto thee **a prophet**
from the midst of thee
of thy brethren
like unto me
unto him ye shall hearken

Deuteronomy 18:18

I will raise them up **a prophet**
from among their brethren
like unto thee

In particular, the language in 1 Nephi 22:20 and 3 Nephi 20:23 seems especially close to Deuteronomy 18:15—much of the phraseology is virtually identical. In fact, as David Calabro points out (personal communication), the language in the case of 3 Nephi 20:23 agrees word for word with the King James version of Acts 3:22, which derives from Moses’s statement in Deuteronomy 18:15:

Acts 3:22

for Moses truly said unto the fathers
a prophet shall the Lord your God raise up unto you
of your brethren
like unto me
him shall ye hear in all things whatsoever he shall say unto you

1 Nephi 22:20 differs from Acts 3:22 only in that it lacks the phrase “of your brethren”.

Verses 11 and 17 of 2 Nephi 3 show considerable similarity with the first and second clauses of 2 Nephi 3:18, except that the first clause in 2 Nephi 3:18 seems to be missing its direct object:

2 Nephi 3:18

I will raise up ____
unto the fruit of thy loins

2 Nephi 3:11

but a seer will I raise up
out of the fruit of thy loins

2 Nephi 3:17

and I will make
for him a spokesman

and I will make one
a spokesman for him

In addition, the second clause in 2 Nephi 3:18 uses the pronoun *him*, but there is no referent for *him*. On the other hand, in 2 Nephi 3:17 the referent for *him* occurs in the first clause of that verse (“I will raise up a Moses”). Moses’s spokesman was, of course, his brother Aaron.

Thus usage elsewhere in the text argues that 2 Nephi 3:18 should be emended. The first question is, what was the original direct object? There are several specific noun phrases that could serve as the direct object in 2 Nephi 3:18:

a prophet	1 Nephi 10:4, 1 Nephi 22:20, 3 Nephi 20:23
a seer	2 Nephi 3:6, 11
a Moses	2 Nephi 3:17

The possibility that the missing direct object in 2 Nephi 3:18 is *a Moses* was originally proposed by Robert T. Baer (personal communication, 14 June 1989). His proposed emendation brought to my attention this problem of the missing direct object.

Although *a Moses* is used in the previous verse, it is not used generically in that verse; instead, *a Moses* in 2 Nephi 3:17 specifically refers to Moses himself, not some future Moses-like prophet. (Note, for instance, the reference in 2 Nephi 3:17 to the power in Moses's rod and the Lord's giving of the Ten Commandments by his own finger; see Exodus 4:17 and Exodus 31:18.) But in 2 Nephi 3:18, the text is referring to some other leader—not Moses, but obviously one who will be like Moses. Generic extensions of proper nouns (such as in the modern-day expression “he’s an Einstein”, meaning ‘he is a genius like Einstein’) are not found in the Book of Mormon text.

The noun phrase *a prophet* is less likely than *a seer* since the noun phrase *a seer* is the one used in 2 Nephi 3 (verses 6, 7, and 11). The phrase *a prophet* is found only in other books within the text, 1 Nephi and 3 Nephi.

Finally, if one of these three noun phrases were to be accidentally lost when copying from \mathcal{O} into \mathcal{P} , the most probable noun phrase would have been *a seer*. It is the shortest of the three, and it has no ascenders and descenders, only small letters of x-height.

An even more promising possibility is that the direct object is a pronoun, not a full noun phrase like *a seer*. And the best candidate for such an emendation would be the indefinite pronoun *one*: “I will raise up **one** unto the fruit of thy loins”. This single word would be more easily lost since it is shorter and less semantically prominent than *a seer*. Like *a seer*, the pronominal *one* has no ascenders or descenders. But unlike *a seer*, *one* is only a single word.

Let us also consider a number of supporting arguments for *one* as the emendation. First, the pronoun *one* can be used in contexts similar to this one. In the following passage, the original verb was an intransitive use of *raise* (equivalent to *rise* in standard English), with *one* acting as the head of the semantic subject. Even so, the pronoun *one* occurs right after the verb *raise up* since the subject is delayed (with *there* acting as filler for the initial subject position):

2 Nephi 3:24
and there shall [*raise* 1ABCDEGHPS | *rise* FIJKLMNOQRT] up
one mighty among them
which shall do much good

(For further discussion of *raise* as an intransitive verb, see 2 Nephi 3:24 as well as RAISE in volume 3.) We also have the following transitive example in the King James Bible where the pronominal *one* acts as the direct object and also follows the verb *raise up*:

Isaiah 41:25
I have raised up *one* from the north

So the use of *one* in 2 Nephi 3:18 is possible, even though this pronoun does not occur as the direct object in any of the nine examples (listed at the beginning of this discussion) involving the transitive verb *raise up*.

As a second argument, we have examples of Oliver Cowdery accidentally omitting the pronoun *one*. In each case, the resulting text did not make much sense and Oliver quickly corrected his error (the *one* is always supralinearly inserted, but the level of ink flow is unchanged):

1 Nephi 12:2 (Oliver Cowdery's initial error in \mathcal{P})
 I beheld multitudes gathered together to battle
 [*one* 0ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST | NULL > *one* 1] against the other

1 Nephi 18:6 (Oliver Cowdery's initial error in \mathcal{C})
 we did go down into the ship with all our loading
 and our seeds and whatsoever things we had brought with us
 every [NULL > *one* 0 | *one* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST] according to his age

Ether 14:10 (Oliver Cowdery's initial error in \mathcal{P})
 and it came to pass that
 [NULL > *one* 1 | *one* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST] of the secret combinations
 murdered him in a secret pass

Thus there is clear evidence that occasionally Oliver had difficulty copying down *one* in both \mathcal{C} and \mathcal{P} .

Finally, there is the error involving *one* that Oliver Cowdery made in 2 Nephi 3:18:

2 Nephi 3:18
 and I will make
 [*one* > *for* 1 | *for* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST] him a spokesman

The initial writing of the pronoun *one* was undoubtedly influenced by the nearly identical phraseology in the previous verse:

2 Nephi 3:17 (earliest extant text, the reading in \mathcal{P})
 and I will make **one** a spokesman for him

Yet the intrusive *one* later in verse 18 may have also been primed by the *one* that I am proposing followed *raised up* only a few words before in the same verse. In other words, we have two *one*'s that could have influenced this error later on in verse 18:

2 Nephi 3:17–18 (conjectured original text, but including the initial error in \mathcal{P})
 and I will make **one** a spokesman for him
 and the Lord said unto me also
 I will raise up **one** unto the fruit of thy loins
 and I will make [*one* > *for* 1] him a spokesman

Of course, this third argument for *one* is not conclusive since the preceding “and I will make **one** a spokesman for him” in verse 17 is alone sufficient to have caused Oliver Cowdery in verse 18 to have initially written “and I will make one”.

Taken all together, these additional arguments provide support for *one* as the direct object for the phrasal verb *raise up* in 2 Nephi 3:18. Of course, *a seer* also remains a possibility.

Now let us turn to the second question: where should the direct object be placed? Thus far I have assumed that the missing direct object (either *one* or *a seer*) should come after the phrasal verb *raise up*. There are two other reasonable positions for the direct object: (1) at the very beginning of the sentence or (2) between the verb *raise* and its adverbial particle *up*.

With respect to the first alternative, if the direct object came at the beginning of the clause (as in seven of the eight possible examples listed at the beginning of this discussion), then the

finite verb should have come before the subject (as in all seven of those examples), thus “a seer will I raise up”. Note especially the three examples in 2 Nephi 3 that involve *a seer*; each has the inverted word order characteristic of fronted direct objects in English, with the modal verb *shall* or *will* coming before the subject:

2 Nephi 3:6	a seer shall the Lord my God raise up
2 Nephi 3:7	a choice seer will I raise up
2 Nephi 3:11	but a seer will I raise up

Since in 2 Nephi 3:18 the word order is “I will raise up”, it is very unlikely that the direct object came at the beginning of the sentence. The awkward word order of “a seer I will raise up” is uncharacteristic of Book of Mormon language. Similarly, the other possibility (“**one** I will raise up”) is extremely awkward, if not impossible.

Now let us turn to the second alternative, where the direct object would come between *raise* and *up*. For this position, we would normally expect the direct object to be a personal pronoun, as in the following three examples for which “raising up” refers to the resurrection:

Alma 26:7	and he will raise them up at the last day
Alma 36:28	he will raise me up at the last day
3 Nephi 20:26	the Father having raised me up unto you first

When we get a direct object that represents new information (such as a noun phrase), we expect that direct object to come after the entire phrasal verb, which means after the adverbial *up*, not before:

1 Nephi 7:1	that they might raise up seed unto the Lord
1 Nephi 17:37	and he raiseth up a righteous nation
1 Nephi 21:6	to raise up the tribes of Jacob (quoting Isaiah 49:6)
1 Nephi 22:7	the Lord God will raise up a mighty nation
2 Nephi 3:5	the Lord God would raise up a righteous branch
2 Nephi 3:17	I will raise up a Moses
Jacob 2:25	I might raise up unto me a righteous branch
Jacob 2:30	if I will . . . raise up seed unto me
Ether 1:43	and raise up unto me . . . a great nation

All these examples suggest that the missing direct object in 2 Nephi 3:18 should come after *raise up*. This conclusion also applies to *one* as well as to *a seer* since *one* would function in this passage as an indefinite pronoun carrying some new information. We also recall the word order of Isaiah 41:25 (“I have raised up **one** from the north”).

As David Calabro points out (personal communication), this example from Isaiah 41:25 could also be used as evidence that the earliest text in 2 Nephi 3:18 is actually correct. In the original Hebrew, the direct object for the transitive verb *raised up* is left unstated. The King James translators added the word *one*; thus the use of italics in the King James text shows that *one* was not in the original Hebrew. Also note that in the King James Bible the following lines use the pronoun *he* to refer to this unstated *one* (although in the Hebrew the pronoun *he* is not explicitly stated but is clearly understood from the verb form alone):

Isaiah 41:25

I have raised up *one* from the north
 and **he** shall come
 from the rising of the sun shall **he** call upon my name
 and **he** shall come upon princes as *upon* mortar
 and as the potter treadeth clay

The King James usage parallels the proposed text for 2 Nephi 3:18 (which has the *one* followed by the object pronoun form *him*):

2 Nephi 3:18 (most probable emendation)

I will raise up **one** unto the fruit of thy loins
 and I will make for **him** a spokesman

Thus we could interpret the earliest extant reading in the Book of Mormon (where the *one* is left unstated) as a literal Hebraism. If such a Hebraism is accepted for the Book of Mormon text, then inserting *one* could be taken as a revision of the text that would facilitate the reader's understanding.

Given all this evidence, the most plausible solution in my opinion is that there was a *one* in the original text for 2 Nephi 3:18 and that it was accidentally lost in the early transmission of the text. Evidence from consistent usage elsewhere in the text as well as scribal errors argues that the original text had *one* after the phrasal verb *raise up*.

Summary: Emend 2 Nephi 3:18 to read “I will raise up **one** unto the fruit of thy loins”; the indefinite pronoun *one* is the most probable choice for the missing direct object, although *a seer* is also possible; in either case, the conjectured direct object should be placed after *raise up*.

■ 2 Nephi 3:19–20

*and it shall be as if the fruit of thy loins had cried unto them from the dust
 for I know their faith
 and they shall cry from the dust
 yea even repentance
 unto [their 1ABCDGHIJKLMNOPQRST | thy E | thy > their F] brethren*

Here in verse 20, the 1849 LDS edition replaced *their* with *thy*, probably accidentally. The preceding “thy loins” in verse 19 was undoubtedly the cause of the change. The first printing of the subsequent 1852 edition was set from the 1849 edition, with the result that it continued the 1849 reading of “thy brethren”. This change was reversed (probably by reference to the 1840 edition) when the 1852 stereotyped plates were revised for the second printing of that edition.

Summary: Maintain the original reading “unto **their** brethren” in 2 Nephi 3:20.

■ 2 Nephi 3:20

*and they shall cry from the dust
yea even repentance unto their brethren
even [that 1A| BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] after many generations have gone by them*

The subordinate conjunction *that* was removed here in the editing for the 1837 edition, probably because it leads the reader to expect a main clause after the following *after*-clause. Elsewhere, whenever the text has *even that*, the following clause is a main clause and stands on its own. The text has 17 examples, including this nearby one:

1 Nephi 19:20
for behold I have workings in the spirit which doth weary me
even that all my joints are weak

In other words, “all my joints are weak” is not a subordinate clause like “after many generations have gone by them”. On the other hand, there are three examples of *even* followed by a prepositional phrase headed by *after*, such as “and even after all this / they shall consider him as a man” in Mosiah 3:9 (for the two other examples, see Helaman 8:18 and Ether 3:17). But there are no other examples of “even (that) after <clause>”—that is, both the original and the edited constructions in 2 Nephi 3:20 are unique. Despite the uniqueness of the earliest reading, it seems that the *that* is intended, however awkward it may sound to modern-day readers.

Summary: Restore the *that* which appears in the earliest text for 2 Nephi 3:20 (“even **that** after many generations have gone by them”).

■ 2 Nephi 3:20

*and it shall come to pass that **their cry shall go**
even according to the simpleness of their words*

One wonders here if perhaps the word *forth* is missing from the end of “their cry shall go”. Elsewhere in the text, we always have *forth* when referring to a cry being broadcast to the people (although there are only two examples):

3 Nephi 20:41
and then shall a cry **go forth**
depart ye depart ye

Ether 14:18
yea a cry went **forth** throughout the land
who can stand before the army of Shiz

The original manuscript is not extant in 2 Nephi 3:20, but it seems quite plausible that it read “their cry shall go forth”. The adverb *forth* could have been accidentally lost when the text was copied into the printer’s manuscript.

There are two cases in the manuscripts where the adverb *forth* was dropped while the scribe was copying the text into the printer’s manuscript; in the first case, the error was caught, but not in the second:

Alma 20:28 (Oliver Cowdery, immediate correction in \mathcal{D})
 therefore the brethren of Ammon was brought
 [NULL > *forth* 1 | *forth* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] out of prison

Alma 47:22 (Oliver Cowdery, from \mathcal{C} into \mathcal{D} : *forth* lost)
 and they went [*up* >% *forth* 0 | 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST]
 and bowed themselves before the king

Thus there is both internal and external evidence that *forth* is missing from 2 Nephi 3:20 and that this verse should be emended to read “their cry shall go **forth** even according to the simpleness of their words”.

Summary: Emend 2 Nephi 3:20 to read “their cry shall go **forth**” since otherwise we expect *forth* when referring to a cry being broadcast to the people; in addition, we have clear evidence that Oliver Cowdery sometimes dropped *forth* when copying into the printer’s manuscript.

■ 2 Nephi 3:20–21

*and it shall come to pass that their cry shall go forth
 even according to the simpleness of their words*
 [1 | . ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]

because of their faith
 [1RT | , ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQS]
*their words shall proceed forth out of my mouth unto their brethren
 which are the fruit of thy loins*

Here we may wonder whether the phrase “because of their faith” should belong to the preceding or the following clause. The 1830 typesetter attached this phrase to the following clause by placing a period after “the simpleness of their words”. All subsequent editions have followed this punctuation.

As already discussed under 1 Nephi 18:17–18, there are a few cases where we need to examine whether a *because-of* phrase should begin a sentence. Here in 2 Nephi 3:20–21, the *because-of* phrase seems most appropriately to be identified with the following clause because of the proximity of the connection (“because of their faith their words shall proceed forth”). If the *because-of* clause is attached to the preceding clause, then we would have the reading “their cry shall go forth . . . because of their faith”, with the intervening “even according to the simpleness of their words” interrupting the connection between the main clause and the *because-of* phrase. Since the current punctuation works well enough, there is no good reason to emend the punctuation and thereby create a rather awkward construction.

Summary: Maintain the current punctuation in 2 Nephi 3:20–21; the *because-of* clause appears to be attached to the following clause, not the preceding one.

■ 2 Nephi 3:24

*and there shall [raise 1ABCDEGHPS | rise FIJKLMNOQRT] up one mighty among them
which shall do much good*

There are a number of places where the original text had the verb *raise* for the intransitive verb *rise*. In accord with modern English usage, this example of *raise* was edited to *rise* in the 1852 LDS edition; since then, *rise* has continued in the LDS text. But the RLDS text has never implemented this grammatical change. There are at least three other examples of original intransitive *raise*, none of which have ever been edited to *rise* in any edition:

2 Nephi 10:11

and there shall be no kings upon the land
which shall **raise** up unto the Gentiles

Helaman 1:8

for he had **raised** up in rebellion
and sought to destroy the liberty of the people

Ether 15:31

Shiz **raised** upon his hands and fell

See each passage for discussion of these intransitive uses of *raise*. For a fourth possible example, see 2 Nephi 10:14.

Beyond its use in the Book of Mormon text, intransitive uses of *raise* are found in current English. According to the Oxford English Dictionary (see definition 37 under the verb *raise*), the intransitive use of *raise* dates as far back as the 1400s; although now obsolete in British English, it still occurs in American English. Merriam-Webster's Dictionary of English Usage explains (under *raise*, *rise*) that in standard English *raise* is supposed to be only transitive. However, numerous examples show that *raise* has been used intransitively, even up to our own time (not only dialectally, but even sometimes in edited English). The OED gives the following citations of its use in the decades right before the translation of the Book of Mormon:

George Washington (1785)

The Water having **raised**, . . . I could form no accurate judgment of the progress.

John Hanson Beadle (1808)

Should the accused person or persons **raise up** with arms in his or their hands.

T. Forsyth (1819)

As the Mississippi was **raising**, the current was very strong.

The critical text will always restore intransitive uses of *raise*, providing they are supported by the earliest textual sources.

Summary: Restore the original intransitive use of *raise* in 2 Nephi 3:24 (“and there shall raise up one mighty among them”).

2 Nephi 4

■ 2 Nephi 4:3

behold my sons and my daughters

which are the sons and [the 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQPRT | s] daughters of my first born

Here we have a case where the repeated *the* in a conjunctive noun phrase was accidentally deleted in the 1953 RLDS edition. The same construction is found later in verse 9, yet there the repeated *the* has been maintained in all the editions:

2 Nephi 4:9 (all textual sources except \mathcal{O} , which is not extant here)

behold my sons and my daughters

which are the sons and **the** daughters of my second son

In both 2 Nephi 4:3 and 2 Nephi 4:9, the phrase “the sons and the daughters” parallels an immediately preceding “my sons and my daughters” (which also repeats the determiner).

It is true that the nonrepeating conjunctive noun phrase “the sons and daughters” occurs three times in this chapter, but each time the reference is to “the sons and daughters of X”, where X is a name (*Laman* or *Lemuel*). In these instances, there is no parallelism with a preceding “my sons and my daughters” or “his sons and his daughters”:

2 Nephi 4:8 (two occurrences)

and it came to pass that after my father had made an end of speaking

to **the sons and daughters** of Laman

he caused **the sons and daughters** of Lemuel to be brought before him

2 Nephi 4:9

behold I leave unto you the same blessing

which I left unto **the sons and daughters** of Laman

For other examples of the repeated *the*, see under CONJUNCTIVE REPETITION in volume 3.

Summary: Maintain the repeated *the* in 2 Nephi 4:3 (“the sons and **the** daughters of my first born”).

■ 2 Nephi 4:5

for behold I know that if ye are brought up

in the [right >js NULL 1 | right A | BCDEFGHIJKLMNQPQRST] way that ye should go

ye will not depart from it

Joseph Smith deleted the word *right* probably because it seemed obvious that “the way that ye should go” is “the right way”. The phrase “the right way(s)” occurs quite frequently in the rest of

the Book of Mormon text (ten times), including the following four cases with a similar kind of redundancy:

- 1 Nephi 13:27
and all this have they done that they might pervert **the right ways** of the Lord
- 1 Nephi 22:14
and that great whore which hath perverted **the right ways** of the Lord
- 2 Nephi 28:15
and all they that commit whoredoms
and pervert **the right way** of the Lord
woe woe woe be unto them
- Jacob 7:7
and ye have led away much of this people
that they pervert **the right way** of God

One could argue that the phrase “the right way(s) of the Lord (or God)” is also redundant: there is no “wrong way of the Lord (or God)”, so *right* could be deleted here as well, to give “the way(s) of the Lord (or God)”.

But another possibility is that original phrase “the right way” in 2 Nephi 4:5 should be interpreted as meaning ‘the straight way’ rather than ‘the correct way’. Under this interpretation, the adjective *right* is descriptive rather than defining, which means that *right* is nonrestrictive rather than restrictive in its modification of *way*. In other words, the expression “in the right way that ye should go” is simply saying that the way one should go is the straight way. Given this more specific interpretation for “the right way(s)”, we can see that each of these five examples involve deviation from the straight way:

- | | |
|---------------|---|
| 1 Nephi 13:27 | that they might pervert the right ways of the Lord |
| 1 Nephi 22:14 | which hath perverted the rights ways of the Lord |
| 2 Nephi 4:5 | ye will not depart from it |
| 2 Nephi 28:15 | and pervert the right way of the Lord |
| Jacob 7:7 | that they pervert the right way of God |

Historically, the verb *pervert* meant ‘to turn aside from’ and was commonly used with this sense in Early Modern English (see the examples under definition 2 for the verb *pervert* in the Oxford English Dictionary).

The six other occurrences in the Book of Mormon of “the right way(s)” can also be interpreted as ‘the straight way(s)’:

- 2 Nephi 25:28–29 (three occurrences)
for they are sufficient to teach any man **the right way**
for **the right way** is to believe in Christ and deny him not . . .
and now behold I say unto you that
the **right way** is to believe in Christ and deny him not
- Jacob 7:7
and keep not the law of Moses which is **the right way**

Mormon 9:20

and the reason why he ceaseth to do miracles among the children of men
is because that they dwindle in unbelief and depart from **the right way**

Moroni 6:4

and their names were taken that they might be remembered
and nourished by the good word of God
to keep them in **the right way**

The last two examples can also be interpreted as dealing with deviation from the straight way (“and **depart** from the right way” and “to **keep** them **in** the right way”).

Historically, the English word *right* frequently had the meaning ‘straight’. In fact, the first meaning listed for the adjective *right* in the OED is ‘straight, not bent, curved, or crooked in any way’. This same meaning underlies all but one example of “right way(s)” in the King James Bible. Here I give a fairly literal translation of the original Hebrew (for the Old Testament quotes) and the Greek (for the New Testament quotes):

PASSAGE	KING JAMES BIBLE	LITERAL TRANSLATION
Genesis 24:48	in the right way	in the true way
1 Samuel 12:23	the good and the right way	in the good and the straight way
Ezra 8:21	a right way	a straight way
Psalms 107:7	by the right way	by the straight way
Acts 13:10	the right ways of the Lord	the straight ways of the Lord
2 Peter 2:15	the right way	the straight way

The example from Genesis (‘the true way’) could be considered as equivalent to ‘the correct way’, but in all the other examples (three in Hebrew and two in Greek), the original meaning of “right way(s)” is ‘straight way(s)’. Thus in five out of six cases, the King James translators intended “right way(s)” to be the translation for ‘straight way(s)’.

Like most uses of “right way(s)” in the King James Bible, all 11 cases in the Book of Mormon can be interpreted as meaning ‘straight way(s)’. Moreover, if the original *right* in 2 Nephi 4:3 is nonrestrictive in its use, then there is no redundancy, even if we decide that “the right way” means ‘the correct way’. Of course, the original text here clearly reads “the right way that ye should go”, and the critical text will restore the word *right* despite the difficulty it gives modern English readers.

Summary: Restore “the right way” in 2 Nephi 4:5; here the word *right* should be interpreted as descriptive rather than defining; in the King James Bible, the phrase “right way(s)” is the usual translation of what is literally ‘straight way(s)”; this interpretation applies to all 11 cases of “the right way(s)” in the Book of Mormon.

■ 2 Nephi 4:5

*for behold I know that if ye are brought up
in the right way [that >js NULL 1 | that A | BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] ye should go
ye will not depart from it*

In his editing for the 1837 edition, Joseph Smith removed the relative pronoun *that* in this verse. The phrase “way that” does occur in the King James Bible, as in the following two cases which parallel the original text of 2 Nephi 4:5:

1 Samuel 9:6

peradventure he can shew us our way **that** we should go

Isaiah 48:17

which leadeth thee by the way **that** thou shouldest go

In modern English, the *that* could be deleted from both of these biblical instances.

Joseph Smith’s editing here in 2 Nephi 4:5 can be considered a question of style rather than grammatical usage. For further discussion regarding the deletion of the relative pronoun *that* in the Book of Mormon text, see under WHICH in volume 3.

Summary: Restore the relative pronoun *that* in 2 Nephi 4:5; the original *that* follows more closely the King James biblical style.

■ 2 Nephi 4:9

*behold [the > my 1 | my ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] sons
and [the > my 1 | my ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] daughters
which are the sons and the daughters of my second son*

When copying from \mathcal{O} into \mathcal{P} , Oliver Cowdery initially wrote “the sons and the daughters” after *behold*. The occurrence twice of the definite article *the* is undoubtedly the result of anticipating the immediately following relative clause (“which are **the** sons and **the** daughters of my second son”). Oliver’s two corrections of *the* to *my* appear to be nearly immediate; although supralinearly inserted, there is no change in the level of ink flow. Oliver’s corrected text in \mathcal{P} undoubtedly follows the reading of the original manuscript (which is not extant here). Note, in particular, the precise parallelism of this passage with the one in verse 3 (“behold **my** sons and **my** daughters which are **the** sons and **the** daughters of my first born”).

Summary: Maintain in 2 Nephi 4:9 the corrected text in \mathcal{P} (“behold **my** sons and **my** daughters”).

■ 2 Nephi 4:10

*and it came to pass that
[NULL > when 1 | when ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] my father
[NULL >- had 1 | had ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] made an end of speaking unto them
behold [it came to pass that >js NULL 1 | it came to pass that A | BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
he spake unto the sons of Ishmael*

Here we have an example of removing an extra occurrence of the clause “it came to pass” (and its accompanying *that*). The passage begins with that same clause, but the intervening *when*-clause does not describe anything new as happening. Thus the second occurrence of “it came to pass” in the same sentence is redundant and was therefore deleted by Joseph Smith in his editing for the second edition. A similar example has already been discussed under 1 Nephi 10:17. For a complete list of this kind of editing, see COME TO PASS in volume 3.

Joseph Smith did not always edit out this kind of redundancy, as in the following complex construction:

The Words of Mormon 1:15–16

and it came to pass that

after there had been false Christs and their mouths had been shut

and they punished according to their crimes

and after there had been false prophets and false preachers and teachers

among the people

and all these having been punished according to their crimes

and after there having been much contentions and many dissensions

away unto the Lamanites

behold it came to pass that king Benjamin

with the assistance of the holy prophets which were among his people . . .

In this instance, the long intervening series of subordinate *after*-clauses makes the repetition of “it came to pass” less noticeable.

Here in 2 Nephi 4:10, when Oliver Cowdery initially copied this passage from \mathcal{C} into \mathcal{D} , he momentarily skipped the *when* and the perfect auxiliary verb *had*. Oliver quickly corrected his error and supralinearly inserted the two missing words (with no change in the level of ink flow for *when* and only a slightly weaker ink flow for *had*). Nearby, however, the text uses *after* rather than *when* whenever Lehi “makes an end of speaking”:

2 Nephi 4:3

wherefore **after** my father **had made an end of speaking**

concerning the prophecies of Joseph

he called the children of Laman his sons and his daughters

2 Nephi 4:8

and it came to pass that

after my father **had made an end of speaking**

to the sons and daughters of Laman

he caused the sons and daughters of Lemuel to be brought before him

2 Nephi 4:11

and **after** that he **had made an end of speaking** unto them

he spake unto Sam

The use of *when* in verse 10 therefore differs from the surrounding instances of *after* and suggests the possibility that *when* could be an error for *after*. Nonetheless, there are references elsewhere in the text to “making an end of speaking” where the subordinate conjunction is *when*:

Mosiah 4:1

and now it came to pass that
when king Benjamin **had made an end of speaking** the words
 which had been delivered unto him by the angel of the Lord
 that he cast his eyes round about on the multitude

Mosiah 8:19

and now **when** Ammon **had made an end of speaking** these words
 the king rejoiced exceedingly

Mosiah 25:14

and now it came to pass that
when Mosiah **had made an end of speaking** and reading to the people
 he desired that Alma should also speak to the people

Alma 12:19

now it came to pass that
when Alma **had made an end of speaking** these words
 the people began to be more astonished

Alma 44:10

and now **when** Zerahemnah **had made an end of speaking** these words
 Moroni returned the sword

The most reasonable assumption is that the *when* in 2 Nephi 4:10 was the reading of the original manuscript. Also note that in all these subordinate clauses headed by *when* and *after*, we have the past-tense perfect auxiliary *had* (“had made an end of speaking”). Thus the addition in \mathcal{P} of *had* in 2 Nephi 4:10 is also supported by these examples.

Summary: Restore here in 2 Nephi 4:10 as elsewhere the redundant clause “it came to pass that” (which Joseph Smith deleted for the 1837 edition); maintain the *when* and *had* that Oliver Cowdery initially missed when he copied the text into \mathcal{P} .

■ 2 Nephi 4:11

*for thou [shalt 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST | shall F] inherit the land
 like unto thy brother Nephi*

The history of the text shows some variation in the ending for the modal verb *shall*. When the subject is the second-person *thou*, we have cases of both *shalt* and *shall*. In this instance, the 1852 edition accidentally replaced *shalt* with *shall*, probably because in modern English speakers expect modals to take an invariant form (*shall* in this case). For discussion of the modal form *will* (and its related *wilt*), see 1 Nephi 1:14. For a complete listing of the textual variation between “thou shalt” and “thou shall”, see INFLECTIONAL ENDINGS in volume 3.

Summary: Here in 2 Nephi 4:11, the earliest textual sources support “thou shalt”, the expected biblical usage.

■ 2 Nephi 4:12

and it came to pass that

[*after Lehi >js my Father after Lehi 1 | after Lehi A | after my father Lehi BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST*]

had spake unto all his household

according to the feelings of his heart and the Spirit of the Lord which was in him

he waxed old and it came to pass that he died and was buried

Joseph Smith emended the text here by adding “my father” to Lehi’s name (although in Ø he supralinearly inserted the phrase in the wrong place—namely, before the subordinate conjunction *after*). It is possible that the original text had “my father” (the original manuscript is not extant here) and that somehow this noun phrase was accidentally lost. As far as we can tell, Joseph Smith did not use Ø to restore readings in his editing for the 1837 edition. (Such a use of Ø is found in his early editing for the 1840 edition.) So the change here in 2 Nephi 4:12 appears to be due to Joseph’s expectation that Nephi would use “my father” when stating the name *Lehi*.

Earlier in the text, Nephi always uses “my father” whenever Lehi’s name is explicitly stated (nine times); there is also one occurrence where Nephi writes “our father Lehi” (in 2 Nephi 1:1). It should be noted that *Lehi* is used without “my father” in the prefaces to 1 Nephi and 2 Nephi, but these prefaces are basically written in third person, not first person. Similarly, Nephi consistently uses “my mother” when he explicitly states the name *Sariah* (three times, excluding the one occurrence in the 1 Nephi preface).

But there is one thing different here in 2 Nephi 4:12. In this verse, Nephi ends up announcing the death of his father, which may explain why Nephi refers to Lehi without the expected “my father” or “our father”. It may very well be that after a parent dies, family members can refer to them by name only, but while living they are always identified as one’s parent (thus “my father Lehi” or “my mother Sariah”). In other words, after one’s death this honorific addition may no longer be necessary. Such a difference may explain why Jacob, the brother of Nephi, does not add “my father” or “our father” at the start of the book of Jacob; by this time Lehi has been dead for some years:

Jacob 1:1

for behold it came to pass that

fifty and five years had passed away from the time that **Lehi** left Jerusalem

wherefore Nephi gave me Jacob a commandment

concerning these small plates upon which these things are engraven

Of course, Jacob can still directly refer to his relationship with his father (as in Jacob 2:34: “these commandments was given to our father Lehi”), but it was no longer necessary. The fact that Jacob 1:1 uses *Lehi* without “my father” or “our father” suggests that the original usage in 2 Nephi 4:12 may be intended.

Of course, the use of *Lehi* without “my father” in 2 Nephi 4:12 is technically premature since Lehi was still alive when he spoke to all his household. But in anticipation of announcing Lehi’s death later in the verse, Nephi may have been led to drop the identification of Lehi as his father. David Calabro also points out (personal communication) that the question of whether Lehi is living is determined within the narrative itself, not when it was actually written by Nephi. Later in 2 Nephi 5:27–34, Nephi explains that the small plates of Nephi were written after Lehi’s death.

Even so, within the narrative itself, Lehi is alive until 2 Nephi 4:12, and thus the use of the phrase “my father Lehi” is necessary prior to that point.

Summary: Restore in 2 Nephi 4:12 the use of *Lehi* without “my father”; after the death of Lehi, family members could apparently refer to him simply by name (as in Jacob 1:1).

■ 2 Nephi 4:13–14

*and it came to pass that not many days after his death
Laman and Lemuel and the sons of Ishmael were angry with me
because of the admonitions of the Lord
for I Nephi was constrained to speak unto them
according to [the >js his 1 | the A | his BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] word*

In his editing for the 1837 edition, Joseph Smith emended “according to the word” to “according to his word”. Since the previous sentence refers to “the admonitions of the Lord”, it is obvious that “according to the word” means ‘according to the word that I Nephi received’.

The unmodified phrase “the word” is frequently used in the Book of Mormon to refer to ‘the word of the Lord’, especially in contexts referring to preaching, declaring, and teaching the gospel. In the following examples, “the word” alone means ‘the gospel’:

Enos 1:26 (“declaring the word”, plus 9 other examples)
that I must preach and prophesy unto this people
and **declare the word** according to the truth which is in Christ

Mosiah 28:6 (“preaching the word”, plus 16 other examples)
and it came to pass that king Mosiah went and inquired of the Lord
if he should let his sons go up among the Lamanites to **preach the word**

Alma 38:15 (“teaching the word”, plus 2 other examples)
now go my son
and **teach the word** unto this people

Furthermore, one of the 17 examples of “preaching the word” has been consciously emended to “preaching the word of God”:

Alma 17:8 (Oliver Cowdery’s correction in \mathcal{P} in pencil)
and thus they departed into the wilderness
with their numbers which they had selected
to go up to the land of Nephi to preach
the word [NULL >p of God 1 | of God ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
unto the Lamanites

On the other hand, there is a nearby example where it seems that Oliver Cowdery momentarily omitted “of God” when he copied “the word of God” from \mathcal{O} into \mathcal{P} :

Alma 17:12 (Oliver Cowdery's correction in \mathcal{D} without any change in ink flow)
and it came to pass that the hearts of the sons of Mosiah . . .
took courage to go forth unto the Lamanites to declare unto them
the word [NULL > *of God* 1 | *of God* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]

Thus there has been a tendency in the manuscripts to both add and drop the phrase “of God” after “the word”.

Of course, in 2 Nephi 4:14 Nephi is not referring to the gospel. Instead, he is referring to the specific word that the Lord gave him in admonishing Laman, Lemuel, and the sons of Ishmael. Elsewhere in the text there are a few examples where the phrase “the word” is used alone to refer to a specific message from the Lord:

Jacob 2:11

for behold as I inquired of the Lord
thus came **the word** unto me saying
Jacob get thou up into the temple on the morrow
and declare the word which I shall give thee unto this people

Mosiah 25:21

every church having their priests and their teachers
and every priest **preaching the word**
according as it was delivered to him by the mouth of Alma

Alma 8:29

and **the word** came to Alma saying
go and also say unto my servant Amulek . . .

3 Nephi 1:21

and it came to pass also that a new star did appear
according to **the word**

3 Nephi 1:25

but it came to pass that they soon became converted
and were convinced of the error which they were in
for it was made known unto them
that the law was not yet fulfilled
and that it must be fulfilled in every whit
yea **the word** came unto them that it must be fulfilled
yea that one jot nor tittle should not pass away
till it should all be fulfilled

These examples refer to the word of the Lord coming either to a prophet or from a prophet to the people. Thus there is nothing inappropriate in 2 Nephi 4:14 about Nephi using only “the word” to say that the Lord revealed what he, Nephi, should speak.

Summary: In accord with the earliest text in 2 Nephi 4:14, restore the original phraseology “according to the word”; the phrase “the word” can be used alone to refer to ‘the word of the Lord’ (that is, to either the gospel in general or to a specific revelation from the Lord).

■ 2 Nephi 4:15

*and upon these I write the things of my soul
and many of the scriptures which are engraven upon the plates of brass
for my soul delighteth in the scriptures
and my heart pondereth them
and writeth them for the learning and the profit of my children*

This passage shows a striking semantic oddity. In conjoining the predicates, the text ends up saying that “my heart . . . writeth them”, which seems implausible. We expect something like “I write them” (as in “I write the things of my soul” found at the beginning of the verse). But the use of *writeth* rather than *write* complicates the issue and implies that the original subject is actually *my heart* rather than an *I* that might have been dropped from the original text.

The following verse repeats the conjoined use of “my soul delighteth” and “my heart pondereth”:

2 Nephi 4:16

behold **my soul delighteth** in the things of the Lord
and **my heart pondereth** continually upon the things
which I have seen and heard

The parallelism between verses 15 and 16 (both have “my soul delighteth” and “my heart pondereth”) suggests that the last predicate in verse 15 (“and writeth them”) should be considered separate. In verse 15, Nephi seems to have added “and writeth them” as an attempt to return to his earlier thought at the beginning of the verse (“and upon these I write the things of my soul and many of the scriptures”). Thus one could argue that Nephi meant to say “I write them” rather than “my heart writeth them”.

In fact, one could argue that the original text in verse 15 actually read “and I writeth them”. The *-(e)th* ending can occur with the subject pronoun *I*. For instance, the earliest text has examples of “I saith” in the historical present. (See the discussion under 1 Nephi 11:3 and more generally under HISTORICAL PRESENT in volume 3.) More significantly, there are a couple of other examples in the earliest text where the subject pronoun *I* occurred with a verb ending in *-eth*:

Jacob 2:28

for I the Lord God [*delighteth* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPS | *delight* RT]
in the chastity of women

Mormon 8:3

and I even [*I* 1A | BCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST]
[*remaineth* >js *remain* 1 | *remaineth* A | *remain* BCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST] alone
to write the sad tale of the destruction of my people

In the first of these, the proximity of the third-person appositive “the Lord God” facilitates the use of the third person singular ending *-eth*. But the second example (“I even I remaineth alone”) shows that the verb with the *-eth* ending can immediately follow the subject pronoun *I*. The *-eth* ending serves as a marker of the biblical style, and therefore “I writeth” is a possibility. In neither of these other examples is there a nearer verb with the *-eth* ending that could have triggered its extension. But in the case of 2 Nephi 4:15, the use of “I writeth” could have been facilitated by the fact that the two preceding verbs (*delighteth* and *pondereth*) end in *-eth*. In any

event, “I writeth” is a distinct possibility for the original text here. For further discussion of the *-(e)th* ending, see INFLECTIONAL ENDINGS in volume 3.

There is also manuscript evidence that Oliver Cowdery sometimes accidentally omitted the subject pronoun *I*:

1 Nephi 18:2 (*I* in \mathcal{O} , omitted in \mathcal{P})

now I Nephi did not work the timbers
after the manner which was learned by men
neither did [*I* 0ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST | 1] build the ship
after the manner of men

2 Nephi 1:1 (*I* initially omitted in \mathcal{O} , then later added with weaker ink flow
and slightly above the line; *I* also initially omitted in \mathcal{P})

and now it came to pass
after [NULL >- *I* 0 | NULL > *I* 1 | *I* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST] Nephi
had made an end of teaching my brethren . . .

Ether 8:10 (*I* initially omitted in \mathcal{P} , then added supralinearly with no change
in the level of ink flow)

and behold I am fair and I will dance before him
and [NULL > *I* 1 | *I* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST] will please him

Moroni 10:8 (*I* initially omitted in \mathcal{P} , then somewhat later added supralinearly
with slightly heavier ink flow)

and again [NULL >+ *I* 1 | *I* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST] exhort you my brethren
that ye deny not the gifts of God

Thus we have clear evidence from scribal errors that the original text in 2 Nephi 4:15 could have read “and I writeth them”. The standard “and I write them” is also possible, but in going from “and I write them” to “and writeth them”, there would then have to be two textual changes (the loss of the *I* and the addition of the *-eth* ending).

On the other hand, David Calabro points out (personal communication) that poetic license may actually allow expressions such as “my heart writeth them”. Very often in the scriptures, the heart is treated as if it is equivalent to the soul or the mind. Such metaphorical usage is to be expected in Nephi’s poetic expression here in 2 Nephi 4:15–35 (frequently referred to as the psalm of Nephi). Not only do we have these two instances in 2 Nephi 4:15–16 of “my heart pondereth” (something we expect more of the mind), but there are also poetic expressions in the psalm of Nephi that allow the heart to speak and to physically communicate in other ways:

2 Nephi 4:17 my heart **exclaimeth**: O wretched man that I am
2 Nephi 4:19 my heart **groaneth** because of my sins
2 Nephi 4:26 why should my heart **weep**

If the heart may speak and otherwise physically express itself, perhaps such expression can be poetically extended to include the writing down of that expression. In other words, the expression “my heart . . . writeth them” is possible. And the fact that the verb form is *writeth* suggests

that *my heart* is the subject, while use of the intervening “pondereth them and” allows the reader to make the metaphorical jump from pondering to writing.

Since the use of “my heart pondereth them and writeth them” can be explained as an instance of poetic language, the critical text will accept this difficult reading. It should be pointed out that this difficult reading is found in every one of the textual sources; the fact that no edition has ever removed this difficulty suggests that the supposed difficulty arises only when we consider the immediate juxtaposition of “my heart” and “writeth them”.

Summary: Despite its difficulty, the current reading in 2 Nephi 4:15 (“and my heart pondereth them and **writeth** them”) is an acceptable extension of Nephi’s poetic expression; there is some possibility that the original text had *I* before *writeth*, but without additional evidence, it is safer to accept the unanimous reading of all the textual sources.

■ 2 Nephi 4:15

*and my heart pondereth them and writeth them
for the learning and [the 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST | K] profit of my children*

This passage has an example of the repeated *the* in the conjoined noun phrase “the learning and **the** profit of my children”. The 1892 RLDS edition accidentally dropped the second *the*, but it was restored in the subsequent RLDS edition (1908). For other examples of the tendency for the text to omit the repeated *the*, see under CONJUNCTIVE REPETITION in volume 3.

Although the *the* is repeated here, we do not get such repetition when the determiner is a possessive pronoun (such as *our* and *your*):

1 Nephi 19:23
for I did liken all scriptures unto us
that it might be for **our** profit and learning

2 Nephi 2:14
and now my sons
I speak unto you these things for **your** profit and learning

Note also that the word order is different; in these two examples, *profit* comes before *learning*.

Summary: Maintain the repeated *the* in 2 Nephi 4:15 (“for the learning and **the** profit of my children”).

■ 2 Nephi 4:17

*nevertheless
— [notwithstanding >js NULL 1 | notwithstanding ART | BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQS]
the great goodness of the Lord in shewing me his great and marvelous works—
my heart exclaimeth
O wretched man that I am*

Here in 2 Nephi 4:17, Joseph Smith deleted *notwithstanding*, probably because he didn’t like the potential double negation of “nevertheless notwithstanding”. Nonetheless, this editing created a

disconnected sentence fragment (“nevertheless the great goodness of the Lord in shewing me his great and marvelous works”). Thus the 1920 LDS edition restored the *notwithstanding*, undoubtedly by reference to the 1830 edition. Clearly, the *notwithstanding* is needed.

Elsewhere in the text, there are other examples where the two negative connectors *nevertheless* and *notwithstanding* occur within the same clause:

3 Nephi 11:3

nevertheless

— **and notwithstanding** it being a small voice—
it did pierce them that did hear to the center

4 Nephi 1:31

nevertheless

— **and notwithstanding** all these miracles—
the people did harden their hearts and did seek to kill them

These two examples suggest the possibility that “nevertheless notwithstanding” in 2 Nephi 4:17 might have originally had an *and* between the two negative connectors. Nonetheless, even without the *and*, the earliest text in 2 Nephi 4:17 seems reasonable enough, and there are only two examples with the *and*, not enough to support further emendation.

Summary: Maintain in 2 Nephi 4:17 the combined “nevertheless notwithstanding”; Joseph Smith’s deletion of the *notwithstanding* led to a sentence fragment, which was corrected in the 1920 LDS edition by restoring the *notwithstanding*.

■ 2 Nephi 4:17

yea my heart sorroweth

because of [mine >+ my 1 | my ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] flesh

In the King James Bible, the possessive pronoun forms *mine* and *thine* appear before words beginning with a vowel. (The indefinite article *an* is the last remnant of this alternation in standard English.) Here Oliver Cowdery initially wrote “mine flesh”, but later he corrected it to “my flesh” by crossing out the *mine* and supralinearly inserting the correct *my*. The ink flow for the correction is heavier and darker; the quill itself appears to be broader, suggesting that the change occurred considerably later (with either a different quill or the same quill now worn dull). Oliver made a similar kind of correction of *iniquity* to *iniquities* in the next line (see the discussion immediately below). Since there is no grammatical reason to change the singular *iniquity* to the plural *iniquities*, we may deduce that both that change and the preceding change of *mine* to *my* were probably the result of proofing \mathfrak{P} against \mathfrak{O} . Thus we may assume that the original manuscript (although not extant here) read “my flesh”.

Oliver Cowdery’s original error in \mathfrak{P} was probably caused by the *mine* of “mine iniquities” in the parallel sentence that immediately follows:

2 Nephi 4:17–18

yea my heart sorroweth because of **my** flesh
my soul grieveth because of **mine** iniquities

Elsewhere the text has only “my flesh” (nine times), including three more here in 2 Nephi 4:

2 Nephi 4:21	even unto the consuming of my flesh
2 Nephi 4:26	and my flesh waste away
2 Nephi 4:27	because of my flesh

We also have evidence that Oliver Cowdery tended to accidentally write *mine* when prompted by a nearby *mine*, as in the following example when once more a parallel construction is involved (“Sam **mine** elder brother” followed by “Jacob and Joseph **my** younger brethren”):

2 Nephi 5:6
 wherefore it came to pass that
 I Nephi did take my family
 and also Zoram and his family
 and Sam **mine** elder brother and his family
 and Jacob and Joseph
 [*mine* > *my* 1 | *my* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] younger brethren
 and also my sisters
 and all they which would go with me

Thus internal consistency and manuscript evidence support interpreting the initial “mine flesh” of 2 Nephi 4:17 as a scribal slip, influenced by the following “mine iniquities”. For further discussion of *my* versus *mine* (and *thy* versus *thine*), see POSSESSIVE PRONOUNS in volume 3.

Summary: Maintain in 2 Nephi 4:17 Oliver Cowdery’s correction in \mathcal{D} of “mine flesh” to “my flesh”; all other evidence in the text suggests that *my*, not *mine*, is the correct form before *flesh*.

■ 2 Nephi 4:17

my soul grieveth
because of mine [*iniquity* >+ *iniquities* 1 | *iniquities* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]

Oliver Cowdery’s correction in \mathcal{D} of *iniquity* to *iniquities* is just like the previous one of *mine* to *my*. The *y* of *iniquity* is crossed out and the correct *ies* is supralinearly inserted, with darker and heavier ink flow from a broader or duller quill.

Either the singular or plural will work here in 2 Nephi 4:17. In fact, if we consider all examples in the text of a possessive pronoun preceding *iniquity* or *iniquities*, it is very clear that either singular or plural is possible (even though the plural is almost twice as frequent):

my iniquity	0	my iniquities	1
mine iniquity	0	mine iniquities	1
thine iniquity	1	thine iniquities	4
his iniquity	2	his iniquities	4
our iniquity	2	our iniquities	6
your iniquity	5	your iniquities	16
their iniquity	25	their iniquities	30

In all, we have 35 occurrences of the singular and 62 of the plural. There was therefore no grammatical motivation in 2 Nephi 4:17 for Oliver Cowdery to have emended “mine iniquity” to

“mine iniquities”. Most probably, his correction in \mathcal{P} was simply to make the text agree with the reading in \mathcal{O} .

Summary: Maintain in 2 Nephi 4:17 the plural “mine iniquities”, the corrected reading in \mathcal{P} .

■ 2 Nephi 4:18

*I am encompassed about because of the temptations and the sins
which [doth 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPS | do RT] so easily beset me*

As already noted, the original text of the Book of Mormon has numerous examples of the *-(e)th* inflectional ending occurring with a third person plural subject. Here we have an example of *doth* where standard biblical style requires *do* since the antecedent of the relative pronoun *which* is plural (“the temptations and the sins”). The 1920 LDS edition made the grammatical change, but the RLDS text has retained the original *doth*. For further discussion and other examples, see INFLECTIONAL ENDINGS in volume 3.

Summary: Restore the original *doth* in 2 Nephi 4:18; even though the antecedent of *which* is plural, the original text has many examples of plural subjects taking verbs with the *-(e)th* ending.

■ 2 Nephi 4:24–25

*and by day have I waxed bold in mighty prayer before him
yea my voice have I sent [upon 1A | up on BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] high
and angels came down and ministered unto me
and upon the wings of his Spirit hath my body been carried away
upon exceeding high mountains*

In this passage we have two cases where the original spelling *upon* should be reinterpreted as two words, *up on*—namely, “sent **up on** high” in verse 24 and “carried away **up on** exceeding high mountains” in verse 25. During the dictation of the text, the spelling of common words was decided by the scribe of \mathcal{O} (here apparently Oliver Cowdery). The correct interpretation of *upon* (and *up on*) must be determined by the context.

The 1837 change in verse 24 of *upon* to *up on* appears to be correct. Although there are no corresponding examples in the Book of Mormon itself, the phrase “up on high” is found seven times in the King James Bible:

2 Samuel 22:49	thou also hast lifted me up on high
2 Samuel 23:1	and the man <i>who was</i> raised up on high
1 Chronicles 14:2	for his kingdom was lifted up on high
Job 5:11	to set up on high those that be low
Psalms 69:29	let thy salvation O God set me up on high
Ezekiel 31:4	the deep set him up on high
Ephesians 4:8	when he ascended up on high

The other Book of Mormon example (in 2 Nephi 4:25) should also be spelled as two words (“carried away **up on** exceeding high mountains”). Both these sentences in verses 24–25 are parallelistic and describe first an upward motion (represented by *up*), then a final stationary destination (represented by *on*).

There are at least a couple of other places in the text where an original *upon* should read as two words, *up on*:

Alma 1:15 (☉ not extant; all other textual sources read *upon*)
and they carried him **up on** the top of the hill Manti

Ether 3:1 (☉ not extant; all other textual sources read *upon*)
and he did carry them in his hands **up on** the top of the mount

As with the two examples in 2 Nephi 4:24–25, we have motion upwards that ends in a final stationary destination.

There is also the possibility that one or more of these four cases of *upon* may have originally read as *up upon*, as exemplified by the textual history of the following example:

Alma 2:15
and it came to pass that
the Amlicites came [*up* 1A | BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] **upon** the hill Amnihu

For discussion of cases where *up upon* may be a possible emendation for *upon*, see Alma 2:15.

Summary: Retain in 2 Nephi 4:24 the 1837 change replacing *upon* with *up on*; emend the following three additional cases of *upon* (all of which involve motion upwards to a stationary destination): 2 Nephi 4:25 (“carried away **up on** exceeding high mountains”), Alma 1:15 (“they carried him **up on** the top of the hill Manti”), and Ether 3:1 (“he did carry them in his hands **up on** the top of the mount”).

■ 2 Nephi 4:26

*O then if I have seen so great things
if the Lord in his condescension unto [me > the 1 | the ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] children of men
hath visited [me >jg me <underlined> 1 | men ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOQRT | me PS] in so much mercy
why should my heart weep*

The 1830 compositor underlined *me* in the printer’s manuscript, probably to indicate an error (see the discussion of *law* versus *Lord* in 2 Nephi 2:26). He set the type to read *men*, but this is undoubtedly an error. The 1908 RLDS edition restored the original *me*.

Here the psalm of Nephi refers to Nephi’s own personal witness (as in the preceding clause “if I have seen so great things”). And Nephi did see the Lord, which would be a specific example of the Lord’s general condescension to the children of men. Note that Oliver Cowdery initially wrote “unto me” in *Ø* (when he was copying “unto the children of men”), which implies that Oliver at least interpreted the *me* of “hath visited me” as standing for *me* and not *men*. In any event, the 1830 typesetter’s emendation is totally unnecessary and weakens the personal aspect of Nephi’s psalm.

Summary: Restore in 2 Nephi 4:26 the reading of the printer’s manuscript, “the Lord in his condescension unto the children of men hath visited **me**”.

■ 2 Nephi 4:33

wilt thou make my path [*strait* 01 | *straight* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *before me*

As discussed under 1 Nephi 10:8 (“and make his paths straight”), the correct spelling in this expression is *straight*, not *strait*. For complete discussion, see 1 Nephi 8:20; for a listing of all the spellings of *strait* and *straight*, see STRAIT in volume 3.

■ 2 Nephi 4:33

but that thou [*wouldst* 01AEFHJKLMNOPQRST | *wouldest* BCDG] *clear my way before me*

The 1837 edition replaced the standard biblical “thou wouldst” with “thou wouldest”. This edition occasionally changed other cases of *wouldst* and *shouldst* to *wouldest* and *shouldest*:

2 Nephi 8:12	[<i>shouldst</i> 1AGHKLMNPQRST <i>shouldest</i> BCDEFIJNO]
Alma 30:47	[<i>shouldst</i> 01AIJLMNOPQRST <i>shouldest</i> BCDEFGHK]
Alma 30:55	[<i>wouldst</i> 01AFIJLMNOQRT <i>wouldest</i> BCDEGHKPS]

Joseph Smith marked none of these changes in the printer’s manuscript (in his editing for the 1837 edition). And the clear majority of instances of *shouldst* and *wouldst* were left unchanged in the 1837 edition (13 other cases). So these few cases where the inflectional ending *-st* was replaced by *-est* were apparently due to a tendency (perhaps unconscious) on the part of the 1837 typesetter. Of course, in all these cases, the earliest reading will be maintained in the critical text. For a complete listing of *shouldst* and *wouldst*, see the discussion under 1 Nephi 20:5.

Summary: Follow the earliest textual sources in determining whether *should* and *would* should take the inflectional ending *-st* or *-est* when the subject pronoun is *thou*.

■ 2 Nephi 4:33

but that thou wouldst clear my way
before [NULL >+ *me* 0 | *me* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNPQRST]

In the original manuscript, Oliver Cowdery initially wrote “clear my way before”, then later (with heavier ink flow) inserted *me* supralinearly. Since the expression “clear one’s way before” is possible in English, one wonders here if the *me* was consciously added later on by Oliver. Another possibility is that the correction was made when Oliver read back the text to Joseph Smith and it was discovered then that the *me* was missing. The ink flow for the originally written line of text in \mathcal{C} is quite weak; thus it is not surprising that Oliver might have redipped his quill before supralinearly inserting the *me*.

There are no other examples in the Book of Mormon of the expression “to clear one’s way before (one)”. In expressions involving “preparing the way before”, the Book of Mormon text always has an object pronoun following the *before*:

1 Nephi 11:27

and I also beheld the prophet which should prepare the way before **him**

1 Nephi 17:13

and I will prepare the way before **you**

3 Nephi 24:1 (quoting Malachi 3:1)

and he shall prepare the way before **me**

There is one further factor to consider: in 2 Nephi 4:33 the corrected text repeats the reference to the first person (“clear **my** way before **me**”). Such a redundancy is not found in any of the three instances of “prepare **the** way before X” (where X is a personal pronoun), but we do get this kind of redundancy in the King James version of the synoptic Gospels when they cite Malachi 3:1:

Matthew 11:10 (identically in Mark 1:2 and Luke 7:27)

behold I send my messenger before thy face
which shall prepare **thy** way before **thee**

Based on this internal evidence, the unique expression “clear my way before me” in 2 Nephi 4:33 appears perfectly acceptable. The most reasonable assumption here is that the correction in \mathcal{C} represents Oliver Cowdery’s attempt to get Joseph Smith’s dictation down accurately rather than as an attempt to edit the text.

Summary: Maintain in 2 Nephi 4:33 the corrected text in \mathcal{C} (“but that thou wouldst clear my way before **me**”); the use of the pronoun after *before* is consistent with other usage in the text.

■ 2 Nephi 4:35

*therefore I will lift [up 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST | H] my voice unto thee
yea I will cry unto thee
my God the rock of my righteousness*

The 1874 RLDS edition accidentally dropped the adverb *up* here in 2 Nephi 4:35. Its loss seemed obvious since the 1892 RLDS edition put it back, which is unusual since this second RLDS edition almost never intentionally deviates from its copy-text, the first RLDS edition (1874).

The expression “to lift up one’s voice (or voices)” is very common in the King James Bible, occurring 36 times, including 18 occurrences where the following predicate has the verb *cry* or *weep*, as in Genesis 39:15: “I lifted up my voice and cried”. (Note the similarity of this biblical expression to the Book of Mormon text here in 2 Nephi 4:35: “I will **lift up** my voice unto thee / yea I will **cry** unto thee”.) On the other hand, the King James Bible has no occurrences of the expression “to lift one’s voice”.

The Book of Mormon also favors the use of the *up* (eight times, of which five are quotes from Isaiah), but it also has two occurrences without the *up*:

Mosiah 24:22 (all textual sources except \mathcal{C} , which is not extant here)

and they gave thanks to God
yea all their men and all their women and all their children that could speak
lifted their voices in the praises of their God

Helaman 5:36 (all textual sources except \mathcal{C} , which is not extant here)
and they were in the attitude
as if talking or **lifting their voices** to some being which they beheld

So the lack of the *up* is possible in the Book of Mormon text. Nonetheless, the earliest textual sources clearly have the *up* in 2 Nephi 4:35.

Summary: Maintain the use of *up* in “I will lift up my voice unto thee” in 2 Nephi 4:35.

■ 2 Nephi 4:35

therefore I will lift up my voice unto thee

[NULL >- *yea* 1 | *yea* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *I will cry unto thee*

my God the rock of my righteousness

Oliver Cowdery initially omitted the *yea* here in 2 Nephi 4:35, but he restored it somewhat later, perhaps while proofing \mathcal{D} against \mathcal{C} . (The *yea* was supralinearly inserted with a sharper quill; thus the correction is not immediate.) Nonetheless, there is no strong need for the *yea* here, which means that there was no motivation for Oliver to have added the *yea* on his own. Of course, the use of *yea* is common throughout Nephi’s psalm; counting this occurrence, *yea* occurs nine times in just 21 mostly short verses (from verse 15 through verse 35).

Summary: Maintain each *yea* throughout the psalm of Nephi (2 Nephi 4:15–35), including the one in verse 35 that was inserted later in \mathcal{D} .

2 Nephi 5

■ 2 Nephi 5:3

*we will not [that he shall >js have him to 1 | that he shall A | have him to BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
be our ruler*

Here Joseph Smith removed the awkward syntax of “we will not that he shall be our ruler” by replacing the *that*-clause with an infinitive clause. Yet elsewhere he left two parallel examples unchanged:

1 Nephi 18:10

we will not that our younger brother shall be a ruler over us

Helaman 12:6

and they will not that he should be their guide

The parallelism between 1 Nephi 18:10 and 2 Nephi 5:3 is very striking:

we will not that our younger brother **shall be a ruler** over us
we will not that he **shall be our ruler**

Joseph’s editing in 2 Nephi 5:3 was stylistically motivated and was never consistently applied. (For a related kind of stylistic editing, see 2 Nephi 5:15, 17.)

Summary: Restore the original *that*-clause in 2 Nephi 5:3 (“we will not that he shall be our ruler”).

■ 2 Nephi 5:4

now I do not write upon these plates

all the [words 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQPRT | word s] which they murmured against me

The 1953 RLDS edition accidentally replaced the plural *words* with *word*. This reading in the singular is obviously quite unexpected, especially since elsewhere the text has only “all the words” (18 times), never “all the word”. For a similar typo in the 1953 RLDS edition, see 2 Nephi 6:1.

Summary: Maintain the plural “all the words” in 2 Nephi 5:4.

■ 2 Nephi 5:6

wherefore it came to pass that I Nephi did take my family
 and also Zoram and his family
 and Sam mine elder brother and his family
 and Jacob and Joseph
 [*mine* > *my* 1 | *my* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] younger brethren
 and also my sisters
 and all they which would go with me

The *mine* that Oliver Cowdery initially wrote in \mathcal{P} (“mine younger brethren”) was a simple scribal error influenced by the preceding “and Sam **mine** elder brother and his family”. Oliver quickly corrected his error (the level of ink flow is unchanged). In the Book of Mormon text, when *mine* occurs attributively in a noun phrase, the following word (whether adjective or noun) is always vowel-initial or *h*-initial. (The initial *h* was often silent in the language of the King James Bible, which means that originally in Early Modern English the attributive *mine* occurred only when the following word began with a vowel.) For further discussion regarding *mine* versus *my* (and *thine* versus *thy*), see POSSESSIVE PRONOUNS in volume 3.

Summary: Maintain the use of *my* before *younger* in “my younger brethren”; in attributive position, *mine* can occur only when the following word begins with a vowel or an originally silent *h*.

■ 2 Nephi 5:9

and all they which were with me
 did take [*it* >]s NULL 1 | *it* A | BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] upon them
 to call themselves the people of Nephi

Although Joseph Smith deleted the *it* here, he left all other instances of the expletive *it* in the phrase “to take **it** upon one(self) to do something”:

1 Nephi 16:37

behold let us slay our father and also our brother Nephi
 who hath taken **it** upon him
 to be our ruler and our teacher

Jacob 1:8

wherefore I Jacob take **it** upon me
 to fulfill the commandment of my brother Nephi

Alma 39:10

and I command you to take **it** upon you
 to counsel your elder brothers in your undertakings

Helaman 5:4

and he yielded up the judgment seat
 and took **it** upon him
 to preach the word of God all the remainder of his days

There is only one example of this construction for which the expletive *it* is not found in the manuscripts:

Alma 62:44 (☉ is extant)
 and Helaman did take upon him again
 to preach unto the people the word of God

It is quite possible that the text in Alma 62:44 is in error, that the pronoun *it* was accidentally dropped as Oliver Cowdery took down Joseph Smith's dictation. For discussion of this possibility, see Alma 62:44.

There is one other possible example of this construction with *it*, but here the following clause begins with *and* rather than *to*:

Alma 39:9 (☉ is partially extant)
 O remember and take **it** upon you
and cross yourself in these things

In this instance, there seems to be no referent for the pronoun *it*. The original manuscript is not extant for the *and* here; thus it is possible that the *and* (written as &) after *you* in the printer's manuscript is in error. A reading with *to* would provide the appropriate referent for the pronoun *it*: "and take **it** upon you **to** cross yourself in these things". For discussion of this possible emendation, see Alma 39:9.

Summary: Restore the original *it* in 2 Nephi 5:9 ("all they which were with me did take **it** upon them to call themselves the people of Nephi"); all other examples in the text of this construction have been left unedited.

■ 2 Nephi 5:11

*for we did sow seed
 and we did reap **again** in abundance*

Stephen L. Carr has suggested (personal communication, 2 September 2003) that this passage is an error for "and we did reap **grain** in abundance". His argument is that (1) *again* does not make sense, but *grain* does; and (2) if *again* was pronounced as /əgeɪn/ rather than as /əgɛn/ (the current American pronunciation), the phonetic similarity would be quite close and could have led the scribe of ☉ (here apparently Oliver Cowdery) to have misheard /greɪn/ as /əgeɪn/. The original manuscript is not extant here but probably read *again*, although it is possible that ☉ read *grain* and that Oliver Cowdery misread *grain* as *again* when he copied ☉ into ☐.

Historically, the word *again* has two pronunciations, /əgeɪn/ and /əgɛn/ (see the Oxford English Dictionary under *again* for discussion of the historical development of the two pronunciations). Scribal misspellings in the Book of Mormon manuscripts imply that *again* was pronounced /əgeɪn/ rather than as its historical alternative /əgɛn/. First, there are a few examples where the scribe wrote the word as two words ("a gain"):

scribe 2 of \mathcal{C}	a gain	1 Nephi 3:31 1 Nephi 4:11 1 Nephi 15:16
scribe 3 of \mathcal{C}	a gain	1 Nephi 11:30
Oliver Cowdery in \mathcal{D}	a gain > again	Alma 18:28

This two-word spelling implies that the *gain* portion of *again* was being pronounced identically to the word *gain* and that the initial schwa was being interpreted as equivalent in spelling to the indefinite article *a*.

Second, there is manuscript evidence that sometimes the initial schwa itself was dropped in pronunciation, thus giving the spelling *gain* for *again*. This misspelling provides additional evidence that the stressed syllable of *again* was pronounced /gein/:

Oliver Cowdery in \mathcal{C}	gain	Alma 41:14
scribe 2 of \mathcal{D}	gain > again	Alma 9:1 Alma 11:34 3 Nephi 20:3

Scribe 2 of \mathcal{D} always caught this error (three times), but Oliver Cowdery did not correct his single error. Of course, in the vast majority of cases, *again* was spelled correctly. Significantly, there are no misspellings in the manuscripts like *agen* that would support the /ægɛn/ pronunciation.

We also find that the scribes made the same kind of spelling errors for the historically related word *against*, which implies that Joseph Smith and his scribes pronounced *against* (like *again*) with the full /ei/ vowel (and sometimes without the initial schwa) rather than with the alternative (and modern-day American) pronunciation /ægɛnst/:

scribe 2 of \mathcal{C}	a gainst	1 Nephi 12:19
scribe 2 of \mathcal{D}	gainst	Alma 2:14

The one-syllable pronunciation *gainst* for *against* has long existed in colloquially spoken English (with the written form *'gainst* appearing chiefly in poetry, according to the OED).

Despite all this secondary evidence regarding the pronunciation of *again*, it should be pointed out that there is not one explicit example in the manuscripts (or, for that matter, in the transmission of the text through the printed editions) of *again* and *grain* ever being mixed up, either phonetically in the original manuscript or visually in later transmissions of the text. Of course, these two words normally occur in such different contexts that mix-ups are highly unlikely, except possibly here in 2 Nephi 5:11.

Although there are no specific examples in the text of “reaping grain”, there are passages that use semantically related verbs to refer to grain production: “raising grain” (seven times), “bringing forth grain” (two times), and “yielding forth grain” (one time). And two of these examples refer to “raising grain abundantly”:

Mosiah 21:16

and it came to pass that they began to prosper by degrees in the land
and began to **raise grain** more **abundantly**

Helaman 6:12

they did **raise grain** in **abundance**

Obviously, if one can “raise grain in abundance”, one can also “reap grain in abundance”.

The text in 2 Nephi 5:11 splits the process of raising grain into two stages: sowing the seed and then reaping at harvest time. This division of labor is found elsewhere in the Book of Mormon (although the two instances in the Mosiah passage are figurative):

Mosiah 7:30–31

if my people shall **sow** filthiness
they shall **reap** the chaff thereof in the whirlwind . . .
if my people shall **sow** filthiness
they shall **reap** the east wind

3 Nephi 13:26 (quoting Matthew 6:26)

behold the fowls of the air
for they **sow** not
neither do they **reap** nor gather into barns

Ether 10:25

and they did make all manner of tools to till the earth
both to plow and to **sow**
to **reap** and to hoe and also to thrash

Thus the possibility of first “sowing seed” and then “reaping grain” is perfectly acceptable.

On the other hand, there is something unexpected about the use of the word *again* in the current text for 2 Nephi 5:11. In the earliest text, there are 480 occurrences of the adverb *again*, of which the large majority modify the main verb in the clause and mean ‘once more’. Obviously, the current text for 2 Nephi 5:11 does not intend to say that the reaping was repeated but the sowing was not. Nonetheless, Don Brugger points out (personal communication) that the use of *again* in 2 Nephi 5:11 could refer back to the initial settlement of the people of Lehi just after their arrival in the promised land:

1 Nephi 18:24

and it came to pass that we did begin to till the earth
and we began to plant seeds
yea we did put all our seeds into the earth
which we had brought from the land of Jerusalem
and it came to pass that they did grow exceedingly
wherefore we were blessed in abundance

This earlier passage suggests that the people of Lehi’s first harvest had been abundant. By the time of 2 Nephi 5:11, Lehi had died and Nephi and his followers had been forced to find a new settlement. Once more the people planted seeds, with the result that they “did reap again in

abundance”. Thus by connecting 2 Nephi 5:11 to 1 Nephi 18:24, the word *again* can take on the meaning ‘once more’.

One could perhaps interpret the *again* in 2 Nephi 5:11 as meaning ‘in addition’, something like ‘for we did sow seed and in addition we did reap in abundance’. Under this interpretation, the *again* would now be more of a narrative connector, much like the sentence-initial expression “and again” that is found at least 50 times elsewhere in the text (the exact number depends on how we analyze the syntax), as in the following extended example:

Moroni 10:9 –16

for behold
 to one is given by the Spirit of God
 that he may teach the word of wisdom
 and to another that he may teach the word of knowledge by the same Spirit
 and to another exceeding great faith
 and to another the gifts of healing by the same Spirit
and again to another that he may work mighty miracles
and again to another that he may prophesy concerning all things
and again to another the beholding of angels and ministering spirits
and again to another all kinds of tongues
and again to another the interpretation of languages
 and of divers kinds of tongues

One problem with applying this interpretation to 2 Nephi 5:11 is that *again* should come at the beginning of the clause (“**and again** we did reap in abundance”) rather than after the main verb (“**and** we did reap **again** in abundance”).

Another possibility would be to interpret *again* as meaning ‘in return’, something like ‘and in return we did reap in abundance’. The OED lists this meaning (under definition 2) as obsolete or archaic, which would explain why modern readers might find its use in 2 Nephi 5:11 strange. Elsewhere in the Book of Mormon text, there is one example of *again* with this meaning:

3 Nephi 6:13

some were lifted up in pride and others were exceeding humble
 some did return railing for railing
 while others would receive railing and persecution and all manner of afflictions
 and would not turn and revile **again**
 but were humble and penitent before God

Such usage is also found in the King James Bible:

Luke 6:35

but love ye your enemies and do good and lend
 hoping for nothing **again**

Thus *again* is possible in 2 Nephi 5:11, given the archaic meaning ‘in return’.

Obviously, the suggested emendation here of *grain* for *again* makes perfectly good sense. On the other hand, there are at least two possible interpretations for *again* that also make sense—either the archaic meaning ‘in return’ or the standard meaning ‘once more’ if we connect 2 Nephi 5:11

with the earlier 1 Nephi 18:24. Given the fact that there is no explicit textual evidence for mixing up *grain* and *again*, the critical text will retain *again*, the earliest extant reading in 2 Nephi 5:11.

Summary: Retain the current reading in 2 Nephi 5:11 (“for we did sow seed and we did reap **again** in abundance”) since *again* can be assigned an appropriate meaning; nonetheless, the proposed conjectural emendation of *grain* instead of *again* remains a distinct possibility.

■ 2 Nephi 5:12

*and I Nephi had also brought the records
which were engraven upon the plates of brass
and also the ball or [the 0 | 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST] compass
which was prepared for my father by the hand of the Lord*

The repeated *the* in the conjunctive noun phrase “the ball or **the** compass” was accidentally removed by Oliver Cowdery when he copied from \mathcal{O} into \mathcal{P} . Virtually everywhere else Oliver faithfully copied such repeated *the*’s from \mathcal{O} into \mathcal{P} . This kind of repetition is characteristic of the Book of Mormon text and could be considered a Hebraism when the determiner is the definite article *the*. English typically avoids such repetition. For further discussion, see CONJUNCTIVE REPETITION in volume 3.

Summary: Restore in 2 Nephi 5:12 the reading of \mathcal{O} , which has the repeated *the* in the conjunctive phrase “the ball or **the** compass”.

■ 2 Nephi 5:15

*and I did teach my people
[that they should 0A | that they should >js to 1 | to BCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST] build buildings
and [that they should 0A | that they should >js to 1 | to BCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST] work
in all manner of wood . . .*

■ 2 Nephi 5:17

*and it came to pass that I Nephi did cause my people
[that they should >js to 1 | that they should A | to BCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST] be industrious
and [that they should >js to 1 | that they should A | to BCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST] labor
with their hands*

In 2 Nephi 5:15, 17, Joseph Smith replaced four *that*-clauses with infinitive clauses. A nearby example of this same kind of stylistic editing is found in 2 Nephi 5:3. Besides the awkwardness of the original construction for modern English readers, Joseph may have also been reacting to the modal verb *should*, which could be misinterpreted as being conditional (that is, Nephi’s people should do these things, but they weren’t required to).

Elsewhere Joseph Smith removed this particular kind of awkwardness only occasionally. One other example of this kind of editing (involving the verb *forbid*) is found near the end of the text:

Mormon 1:17

but I did remain among them
but I were forbidden
[*that I should* >js to 1 | *that I should* A | to BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] preach
unto them

Elsewhere in the text, we have numerous unedited examples like the original text in 2 Nephi 5:15, 17—namely, examples where the verb *teach* or *cause* is followed by a noun phrase and then the words “that they should”:

- *to teach someone that they should do something*

2 Nephi 33:10

for they are the words of Christ
and he hath given them unto me
and they teach all men **that they should** do good

Mosiah 10:17 (three conjoined *that*-clauses)

and thus they have taught their children **that they should** hate them
and **that they should** murder them
and **that they should** rob and plunder them

Mosiah 12:37

and have ye taught this people **that they should** do all these things

Mosiah 13:25

have ye taught this people **that they should** observe to do all these things

Mosiah 24:6

but they taught them **that they should** keep their record

4 Nephi 1:38

and they did teach their children **that they should** not believe

- *to cause someone that they should do something*

Mosiah 6:7

and king Mosiah did cause his people **that they should** till the earth

Alma 21:3 (two conjoined *that*-clauses)

therefore they did cause the Lamanites **that they should** harden their hearts
that they should wax stronger in wickedness and their abominations

Alma 60:17

and they are murdering our people with the sword . . .
and also carrying them away captive
causing them **that they should** suffer all manner of afflictions

3 Nephi 2:3

and Satan did go about leading away the hearts of the people tempting them
and causing them **that they should** do great wickedness in the land

Mormon 3:5

I did cause my people **that they should** gather themselves together
at the land Desolation

Ether 9:33 (two conjoined *that*-clauses)

the Lord did cause the serpents **that they should** pursue them no more
but **that they should** hedge up the way

The examples with conjoined *that*-clauses especially show that there is nothing difficult about the conjoined *that*-clauses that were originally in 2 Nephi 5:15, 17.

Summary: Restore the four original *that*-clauses in 2 Nephi 5:15, 17; usage elsewhere strongly supports this kind of construction, however awkward it might be considered.

■ 2 Nephi 5:18

*nevertheless I did [do >js NULL 1 | do A | BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] for them
according to that which was in my power*

As already discussed under 1 Nephi 2:14, Joseph Smith sometimes removed the auxiliary *do* when it was immediately followed by the main verb *do*. Here is one more example. The critical text will restore all these cases of archaic English. For a complete list, see DO AUXILIARY in volume 3. Such usage is found in the biblical style, which dates from Early Modern English.

Summary: Restore the use of *did do* here in 2 Nephi 5:18 (“I did do for them”), the reading of the original text.

■ 2 Nephi 5:19

*wherefore I had been their ruler and their teacher
according to the [commandments 1ABCDEFGHIJLMNOQRT | commandment KPS] of the Lord
until the time that they sought to take away my life*

The 1892 RLDS edition changed the plural *commandments* to the singular. This edition is basically a reset copy of the first RLDS edition (dating from 1874), with very little conscious editing. The 1892 change here was probably accidental. Nonetheless, the 1908 RLDS edition retained the singular *commandment*, perhaps intentionally.

Nephi intends to say here that he had ruled over his older brothers Laman and Lemuel because the Lord had commanded him to do so. This reading seems to derive from the Lord’s words to Nephi early on in 1 Nephi:

1 Nephi 2:22

and inasmuch as thou shalt keep my commandments
thou shalt be made **a ruler and a teacher** over thy brethren

Technically speaking, in 1 Nephi 2:22 the Lord isn’t commanding Nephi to be a ruler and a leader over his brethren; he is simply declaring that this will happen provided Nephi keeps the

commandments. However, there may have been other situations where the Lord specifically commanded Nephi to take the lead over his brothers. Most of the events in 1 Nephi presume as much.

The earliest text has examples of both singular and plural in the phrase “commandment(s) of the Lord”, with the plural dominating (27 of *commandments* and 7 of *commandment*), so either singular or plural is possible. The plural is used more generally and can even be used when only one commandment may be involved:

2 Nephi 5:31
 wherefore I Nephi
 to be obedient to the **commandments** of the Lord
 went and made these plates upon which I have engraven these things

On the other hand, the singular “commandment of the Lord” is indeed restricted to cases where a single commandment is at issue. We have also seen that Oliver Cowdery sometimes changed cases of the singular *commandment* to the plural (in 1 Nephi 3:16 and 1 Nephi 4:34), but here in 2 Nephi 5:19 the RLDS text made the change in the opposite direction.

Since the plural is possible here in 2 Nephi 5:19, we will let the earliest textual reading stand (“according to the commandments of the Lord”). Of course, this passage could be an additional example of where Oliver Cowdery emended a singular *commandment* to the plural.

Summary: Maintain the plural usage *commandments* in 2 Nephi 5:19, the earliest extant reading of the text.

■ 2 Nephi 5:19

*wherefore I had been their ruler and their teacher
 according to the commandments of the Lord
 until the time [that >]s NULL 1 | that A | BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
 they sought to take away my life*

The expression “until the time” directly precedes a clause nine times in the Book of Mormon text. In all cases but two, the earliest textual sources have the subordinate conjunction *that* between “until the time” and the clause immediately following. Besides this example from 2 Nephi 5:19, we have the following six examples with the *that*:

Mosiah 8:2
 and he caused that Ammon should stand up before the multitude
 and rehearse unto them all that had happened unto their brethren
 from the time that Zeniff went up out of the land
 even **until the time that** he himself came up out of the land

Mosiah 9 preface
 An account of his people
 from the time they left the land of Zarahemla
until the time that they were delivered out of the hands of the Lamanites

Mosiah 21:22

and it came to pass that there was no more disturbance
between the Lamanites and the people of Limhi
even **until the time that** Ammon and his brethren came into the land

Alma 25:15

they did look forward to the coming of Christ
considering that the law of Moses was a type of his coming
and believing that they must keep those outward performances
until the time that he should be revealed unto them

3 Nephi 26:3

and he did expound all things
even from the beginning
until the time that he should come in his glory

Moroni 10:3

that ye would remember how merciful the Lord hath been
unto the children of men
from the creation of Adam
even down **until the time that** ye shall receive these things

The two examples where the *that* is not in the earliest textual sources occur in the same passage:

Mosiah 25:5–6

yea he read the records of the people of Zeniff
from the time they left the land of Zarahemla
until the time they returned again
and he also read the account of Alma and his brethren and all their afflictions
from the time they left the land of Zarahemla
until the time they returned again

Four of the above examples (all in the book of Mosiah) occur with a preceding “from the time” followed by a clause, and in one case the *that* is present:

Mosiah 8:2	from the time that Zeniff went up out of the land
Mosiah 9 preface	from the time they left the land of Zarahemla
Mosiah 25:5	from the time they left the land of Zarahemla
Mosiah 25:6	from the time they left the land of Zarahemla

Thus the choice of the *that* is optional; in each case we rely on the earliest textual sources to determine whether the *that* is there. For further discussion of the optionality of the subordinate conjunction *that*, see THAT in volume 3.

Joseph Smith removed the conjunction *that* in only the first of all these examples of “until the time” (in 2 Nephi 5:19). This editing is, of course, stylistic and was not continued.

Summary: Restore the original *that* which Joseph Smith deleted in 2 Nephi 5:19 (“until the time **that** they sought to take away my life”).

■ 2 Nephi 5:21

*wherefore as they were white and exceeding fair and delightsome
that they might not be enticing unto my people*
[*therefore* >js NULL 1 | *therefore* A | BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
the Lord God did cause a skin of blackness to come upon them

Joseph Smith removed the *therefore* here in 2 Nephi 5:21 because of the *wherefore* at the beginning of the same sentence. Joseph apparently viewed this repetition as an unnecessary redundancy. In a number of other places in the text, Joseph Smith removed this kind of repetition from a long extended sentence:

2 Nephi 6:11 (deletion of second *wherefore* marked by Joseph Smith in Ø)

wherefore after they are driven to and fro
—for thus saith the angel
many shall be afflicted in the flesh and shall not be suffered to perish
because of the prayers of the faithful—
[*wherefore* 0A | *wherefore* >js NULL 1 | BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
they shall be scattered and smitten and hated

The Words of Mormon 1:18 (deletion of second *wherefore* marked by Joseph Smith
in Ø; *they* also deleted)

wherefore with the help of these
king Benjamin
—by laboring with all the might of his body
and the faculty of his whole soul—
and also the prophets
[*wherefore* >js NULL 1 | *wherefore* A | BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
[*they* >js NULL 1 | *they* A | BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
did once more establish peace in the land

Alma 42:6 (deletion of second *therefore* marked by Joseph Smith in Ø)

therefore as they were cut off from the tree of life
[*therefore* 0A | *therefore* >js NULL 1 | BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
they should be cut off from the face of the earth

Alma 42:9 (deletion of second *therefore* not marked in Ø)

therefore as the soul could never die
and the fall had brought upon all mankind a spiritual death as well as a temporal
—that is / they were cut off from the presence of the Lord—
[*therefore* 01APS | BCDEFGHIJKLMNOQRT] it was expedient
that mankind should be reclaimed from this spiritual death

Even so, Joseph Smith left unchanged some cases of the repeated *wherefore* and *therefore*:

2 Nephi 2:18

wherefore he saith unto Eve
—yea even that old serpent which is the devil which is the father of all lies—
wherefore he saith
partake of the forbidden fruit and ye shall not die
but ye shall be as God knowing good and evil

3 Nephi 7:12

therefore Jacob
 seeing that their enemies were more numerous than they
 —he being the king of the band—
therefore he commanded his people
 that they should take their flight into the northernmost part of the land

In the original text, the repetition of *wherefore* or *therefore* serves an important narrative function—namely, to bring the reader back to the initially stated conditional clause that begins the sentence. In most instances, there is a long interruptive dependent clause or phrase between the repeated *wherefore*'s and *therefore*'s. For similar examples of this kind of usage, see 1 Nephi 11:1.

Summary: Restore all instances where a repetitive *wherefore* or *therefore* has been deleted from a long sentence, including 2 Nephi 5:21.

■ 2 Nephi 5:30

and thou shalt
 [engraven 0ABCDEF GHIJKLNPRST | ingraven 1 | engraven > engrave M | engrave OQ]
many things upon them which are good in my sight

■ 2 Nephi 5:32

and I [engravened 1A | engraved BCDEF GHIJKLMN OPQRST] that which is pleasing unto God

The earliest text favors the verb *engraven* rather than *engrave*, as in these two examples. As discussed under 1 Nephi 19:1, the earliest reading in 2 Nephi 5:32 (“and I **engravened** that which is pleasing unto God”) should be restored. In 2 Nephi 5:30, the original *engraven* was briefly replaced by *engrave* in a few LDS editions in the early 1900s but was restored in the 1920 edition.

Summary: Maintain the original verb form *engraven* in 2 Nephi 5:30 and its past-tense form *engravened* in 2 Nephi 5:32.

■ 2 Nephi 5:32

and if my people [be >js are 1 | be A | are BCDEF GHIJKLMN OPQRST] pleased with the things of God
they [NULL >js will 1 | A | will BCDEF GHIJKLMN OPQRST] be pleased with mine engravings
which are upon these plates

This example uses the subjunctive *be* form of the verb in both the conditional *if*-clause (“if my people be pleased”) and the following main clause (“they be pleased”). Modern English readers expect indicative verb forms, so Joseph Smith (in his editing for the 1837 edition) changed the *be* in the *if*-clause to *are* and added the modal verb *will* in the second clause. David Calabro points out (personal communication) that the original usage is tenseless and is purely conditional while Joseph Smith’s editing adds a sequencing in time to the conditional statement (the present-tense *are* followed by the future *will*).

A similar kind of tenseless conditional statement occurred in the original text of the title page for the Book of Mormon:

title page: second paragraph
and now if there **be** fault
it **be** the mistake of men

Here Joseph Smith edited both *be*'s to *are* (along with other changes in number). In both this instance and 2 Nephi 5:32, the original subjunctive uses are understandable even though they are nonstandard in today's English.

Summary: Restore the original subjunctive verb forms in 2 Nephi 5:32 (“and if my people **be** pleased with the things of God / they **be** pleased with mine engravings”).

2 Nephi 6

■ 2 Nephi 6:1

*The [words 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQPRT | word s] of Jacob the brother of Nephi
which he spake unto the people of Nephi*

The 1953 RLDS edition replaced the plural *words* with the singular *word* here in 2 Nephi 6:1. (This verse acts as a preface to Jacob’s discourse in 2 Nephi 6–10.) The same change also occurred in the previous chapter of the 1953 edition:

2 Nephi 5:4

now I do not write upon these plates
all the [words 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQPRT | word s]
which they murmured against me

As shown in the discussion for 2 Nephi 5:4, the phrase “all the word” never occurs in the Book of Mormon text. Nor is the phrase “the word of X” ever used in the text to introduce a direct quote of a person’s words. Instead, we always get “the words of X”:

Alma 7 preface

The **words** of Alma which he delivered to the people in Gideon
according to his own record

Alma 9 preface

The **words** of Alma and also the **words** of Amulek
which was declared unto the people which was in the land of Ammonihah

Moroni 2:1 (a preface)

The **words** of Christ which he spake unto his disciples
the twelve whom he had chosen
as he laid his hands upon them

More generally, the text prefers the plural *words* to refer to a person’s speech. For some discussion, see 1 Nephi 16:24.

Summary: Maintain the original plural *words* in 2 Nephi 6:1; the text always introduces the direct quote of a person’s discourse with “the words of X” rather than “the word of X”.

■ 2 Nephi 6:2

behold my beloved brethren

[*that* >js NULL 1 | *that* A | BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *I Jacob*

having been called of God and ordained after the manner of his holy order

and having been consecrated by my brother Nephi

unto whom ye look as a king or a protector and on whom ye depend for safety

behold ye know that I have spoken unto you exceeding many things

Normally the imperative *behold* is not followed by the subordinate conjunction *that*. Whenever the intervening vocative “my (beloved) brethren” comes between *behold* and a following declarative statement (22 times besides this example from 2 Nephi 6:2), we find no other instances where the declarative statement is introduced by the subordinate conjunction *that*. This finding suggests that the *that* in 2 Nephi 6:2 could be an error in the transmission of the text. On the other hand, there is one example where there is an intervening clause between *behold* and an occurrence of the subordinate conjunction *that*:

1 Nephi 22:15

for behold saith the prophet

[*that* 0A | *that* >js NULL 1 | BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] the time cometh speedily

that Satan shall have no more power over the hearts of the children of men

Moreover, as listed under 1 Nephi 22:15, there are three examples in the original text where the subordinate conjunction *that* directly follows the imperative *behold*:

Jacob 5:24 **behold that** I have nourished it also

Mosiah 4:5 for **behold that** if the knowledge of the goodness of God . . .

Moroni 8:22 for **behold that** all little children are alive in Christ

Of course, when *behold* is declarative rather than imperative, the subordinate conjunction *that* very frequently follows (as in Alma 32:8, “I behold **that** ye are lowly in heart”).

The use of the subordinate conjunction *that* in 2 Nephi 6:2 is difficult to understand, especially because of the vocative “my beloved brethren” that intervenes between the *behold* and the *that*. Nonetheless, the occurrence of the *that* seems intended, especially since there are these few examples in the text of “behold that <declarative sentence>”. Despite its awkwardness here in 2 Nephi 6:2, the *that* will be maintained in the critical text. For further discussion, see the verb *behold* under THAT in volume 3.

Summary: Restore the subordinate conjunction *that* in 2 Nephi 6:2 (“behold my beloved brethren that I Jacob having been called of God . . .”); the original text has a few examples of the imperative *behold* being followed by the subordinate conjunction *that*.

■ 2 Nephi 6:2

*behold my beloved brethren that I Jacob
having been called of God and ordained
after [NULL >+ the manner of 1 | the manner of ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] his holy order . . .*

When copying from \mathcal{C} into \mathcal{P} , Oliver Cowdery initially wrote “after his holy order”, then somewhat later inserted “the manner of” supralinearly, probably when he proofed \mathcal{P} against \mathcal{C} . (The level of ink flow for the first two words is slightly heavier, which suggests that he redipped his quill before correcting the text.)

Elsewhere, the text has examples of only the shorter “after God’s holy order”:

Alma 5:54	and do walk after the holy order of God
Alma 7:22	that ye may walk after the holy order of God
Alma 13:1	the Lord God ordained priests after his holy order
Alma 13:11	therefore they were called after this holy order
Alma 43:2	and they preached after the holy order of God
Ether 12:10	they of old were called after the holy order of God

Of course, the expression “after the manner of X” occurs frequently in the text (32 times), but there is only one case where this expression and “God’s holy order” are combined to give “after the manner of God’s holy order”—namely, here in 2 Nephi 6:2. Clearly, there would have been no motivation for Oliver Cowdery to have edited the text here by adding “the manner of”; thus the original manuscript undoubtedly read “after the manner of his holy order”.

Summary: Maintain the expanded phraseology “after the manner of his holy order” in 2 Nephi 6:2; Oliver Cowdery’s corrected reading in \mathcal{P} was undoubtedly the reading of \mathcal{C} .

■ 2 Nephi 6:4

*and they are the words which my brother
hath desired [me >]s NULL 1 | me A | BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
that I should speak unto you*

There are a number of alternative ways to express *desire*-clauses in the Book of Mormon. First, the following clause can be either a *that*-clause or an infinitive clause (which begins with *to*). Second, the verb *desire* can be directly followed by a noun phrase (usually a pronoun), by a prepositional phrase beginning with *of*, or by no complement at all. This gives six possibilities, with varying frequency in the text:

(1) to desire *of* X *that* X do something (5 examples):

Mosiah 28:1
they . . . desired **of him that he** would grant unto them
that they might . . . go up to the land of Nephi

- (2) to desire *of* X *to* do something (1 example):

Alma 16:5

they . . . desired **of him to** know whither the Lord would that they should go

[Note here that the implied subject of the verb *know* is *they*, not *he*.]

- (3) to desire X *that* X do something (11 examples, including 2 Nephi 6:4):

1 Nephi 3:24

we . . . desired **him that he** would give unto us the records

- (4) to desire X *to* do something (4 examples):

Alma 15:4

and he sent a message immediately unto them

desiring **them to** come unto him

- (5) to desire *that* X do something (41 examples, excluding 2 Nephi 6:4):

2 Nephi 1:16

and I desire **that ye** should remember to observe the statutes

- (6) desire *to* do something (35 examples):

1 Nephi 11:1

after I had desired **to** know the things that my father had seen . . .

Interestingly, Joseph Smith changed the structure in only one of the examples listed under (3). In other words, he did not delete the noun phrase complement in ten parallel examples, all equally non-English in style (at least from the point of view of speakers of modern English).

1 Nephi 3:24

we . . . desired **him that he** would give unto us the records

Alma 18:11

and I would desire **him that he** come in unto me

Alma 35:8

and the chief ruler of the Zoramites . . .

desiring **them that they** should cast out of their land

all those which came over from them into their land

Alma 43:23

and Moroni . . . desiring **him that he** should inquire of the Lord

Alma 47:33 (three occurrences)

she . . . desiring **him that he** would spare the people of the city

and she also desired **him that he** should come in unto her

and she also desired **him that he** should bring witnesses with him

Alma 52:10

and Moroni . . . desiring **him** that **he** would be faithful
in maintaining that quarter of the land

Alma 52:20

they . . . desiring **him** that **he** would come out with his armies

Ether 15:4

he . . . desiring **him** that **he** would spare the people

The only difference between these ten examples and the one in 2 Nephi 6:4 is that the pronoun in 2 Nephi 6:4 is the first person *me* rather than the third person *him* or *them*.

Summary: Restore in 2 Nephi 6:4 the original reading (“my brother hath desired **me** that I should speak unto you”); Joseph Smith removed the pronominal complement in only this example, leaving ten others unchanged.

■ 2 Nephi 6:4

*and they are the words which my brother hath desired me that I should speak unto you
and I speak [them 1APS | BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRT] unto you for your sakes*

The 1837 edition omitted the pronoun *them*, which refers to “the words” at the beginning of the passage. This deletion was not marked by Joseph Smith in the printer’s manuscript. This change could be an error that the 1837 typesetter introduced, especially since it was probably influenced by the preceding clause “I should speak unto you”, which is almost identical to the resulting 1837 clause “I speak unto you”. The 1908 RLDS edition restored the direct object *them* (in accord with the reading in \mathcal{P}).

This omission also makes a clear difference in meaning. The original text means that Jacob and Nephi have selected a specific text of Isaiah for the people’s benefit. When *them* is omitted, the text means that Jacob’s speaking to the people is generally for their benefit (which seems like an obvious truism).

Summary: Restore in 2 Nephi 6:4 the reading of the original text, “and I speak **them** unto you for your sakes”.

■ 2 Nephi 6:4

*and I speak them unto you for your sakes
that ye may learn and glorify the name of [your 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST | G] God*

The 1858 Wright edition accidentally dropped the *your* from the phrase “the name of your God”. The text has examples of both the shorter “the name of God” (three times) and the expanded form containing a possessive pronoun (seven times):

the name of God	Alma 7:4, Alma 19:12, Alma 30:49
the name of my God	Enos 1:1, Alma 26:36 (two times)
the name of your God	2 Nephi 6:4
the name of our God	Alma 26:8, Alma 57:35
the name of their God	3 Nephi 4:30

This variability argues that we should follow the earliest textual sources in determining the correct reading for “the name of (one’s) God”.

Summary: Maintain the original reading in 2 Nephi 6:4 (“the name of **your** God”); the text includes six other examples with the possessive pronoun before *God*.

■ 2 Nephi 6:6

behold I will lift [up 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST | HK] mine hand to the Gentiles

□ Isaiah 49:22 (King James Bible)

behold I will lift **up** mine hand to the Gentiles

The 1874 RLDS edition accidentally lost the adverbial *up*, but the 1908 RLDS edition restored it. The corresponding verse in Isaiah has the *up* (as does 1 Nephi 21:22, which also quotes Isaiah 49:22).

Summary: Maintain in 2 Nephi 6:6 the *up* in “I will lift up mine hand”.

■ 2 Nephi 6:6

*behold I will lift up mine hand [unto > to 1 | to ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] the Gentiles
and set up my standard to the people*

□ Isaiah 49:22 (King James Bible)

behold I will lift up mine hand **to** the Gentiles
and set up my standard to the people

Oliver Cowdery originally wrote *unto* in the printer’s manuscript, then crossed out the *un* (with no change in the level of ink flow). The original manuscript is not extant here. The King James Bible also reads *to*, as does the parallel quote of this verse in 1 Nephi 21:22. The phrase “unto the Gentiles” is much more common in the Book of Mormon text (37 occurrences) than the phrase “to the Gentiles” (5 occurrences), which probably explains why Oliver Cowdery initially wrote “unto the Gentiles”. Oliver’s correction in \mathcal{P} appears to be immediate.

Summary: Retain in 2 Nephi 6:6 the preposition *to* in “to the Gentiles”, which agrees with the *to* of Isaiah 49:22 and 1 Nephi 21:22.

■ 2 Nephi 6:7

*they shall bow down to thee with their **faces** towards the earth*

□ Isaiah 49:23 (King James Bible)

they shall bow down to thee with *their face* toward the earth

Here in 2 Nephi 6:7, the earliest source (the original manuscript) has the plural form *faces*, while the King James Bible reads *face*. This passage is also quoted in 1 Nephi 21:23; there the earliest textual source (also the original manuscript) has the singular *face*, just like the King James Bible:

1 Nephi 21:23

they shall bow down to thee with their **face** towards the earth

The Hebrew word for *face* (*ʿappayim*) is actually dual in number and originally meant ‘nostrils’. Ultimately, the word *ʿappayim* derives from *ʿap / ʿaf/*, meaning ‘nose’, just as the English word *nostril* derives from *nose*. (For the etymology of *nostril*, see under *nose-thirl* in the Oxford English Dictionary; for the etymology of *ʿappayim*, see under *ʿap* in William L. Holladay, *A Concise Hebrew and Aramaic Lexicon of the Old Testament* [Grand Rapids, Michigan: William B. Eerdmans, 1971].) In Hebrew, this dual form has been generalized to mean ‘face’. Since the word *ʿappayim* always takes the dual form, the context determines whether the singular ‘face’ or the plural ‘faces’ is intended. Obviously, here in Isaiah 49:23, *faces* is a perfectly good English translation of *ʿappayim* since the passage is in the plural (“**they** shall bow down to thee with **their** faces towards the earth”).

Of course, the change to the plural *faces* here in 2 Nephi 6:7 probably has nothing to do with the original Hebrew underlying Isaiah 49:23. Rather, *faces* may simply derive from what Joseph Smith or Oliver Cowdery would have expected as speakers of English. The change to the plural did not occur in 1 Nephi 21:23, which could indicate that the difference in 2 Nephi 6:7 may be an error in transmission. However, since *faces* will work in 2 Nephi 6:7, the safest solution is to follow the earliest textual sources, thus *face* in 1 Nephi 21:23 but *faces* in 2 Nephi 6:7.

Summary: Maintain the plural *faces* in 2 Nephi 6:7 and the singular *face* in 1 Nephi 21:23; in each instance, we follow the evidence of the earliest textual sources; the King James Bible (Isaiah 49:23) has the singular *face*, although the Hebrew can be translated as *faces*.

■ 2 Nephi 6:7

*they shall bow down to thee with their **faces** towards the earth*

□ Isaiah 49:23 (King James Bible)

they shall bow down to thee with *their face* toward the earth

The Book of Mormon text favors *towards* over *toward*, while the King James Bible has only *toward*. We see this favoring of *towards* even when the Book of Mormon quotes from Isaiah. This same verse is quoted in 1 Nephi 21, and there we also have *towards*:

1 Nephi 21:23

they shall bow down to thee with their face **towards** the earth

There is, however, one instance in an Isaiah quote where the earliest textual sources support *toward*. For discussion, see 2 Nephi 21:14.

As discussed under 1 Nephi 5:22, we let the earliest textual sources determine the correct reading for each instance of *toward(s)*. This procedure will be followed even if the passage disagrees with the reading of the King James Bible. For discussion of that specific issue, see 1 Nephi 21:23. Also see the general discussion under TOWARDS in volume 3.

Summary: Maintain the use of *towards* in 2 Nephi 6:7 (as well as in 1 Nephi 21:23); in both cases, the earliest textual sources read *towards*, the normal form in the Book of Mormon.

■ 2 Nephi 6:8

*and now I Jacob would speak somewhat
concerning these [words 0ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST | things > words 1]*

Oliver Cowdery tended to mix up *things* and *words*. Here the original manuscript clearly reads *words* (which, except for the *r*, is extant in \mathfrak{G}). Oliver initially wrote *things* in \mathfrak{P} but almost immediately caught his error, crossed *things* out, and supralinearly wrote the correct *words* (there is no change in the level of ink flow). In 1 Nephi 3, he made precisely the same kind of copying error and correction:

1 Nephi 3:28

wherefore Laman and Lemuel did speak
many hard [words 0ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST | things > words 1]
unto us their younger brothers

For other examples of this usage, see the list under 1 Nephi 3:28.

Summary: Maintain the use of *words* rather than *things* in 2 Nephi 6:8; Oliver Cowdery sometimes mixed up *words* and *things*.

■ 2 Nephi 6:8

*for behold the Lord hath shewn me
that they which [are > were 0 | were 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST] at Jerusalem
from whence we came
have been slain and carried away captive*

Earlier (in 2 Nephi 1:4) Lehi revealed that Jerusalem had been destroyed; thus the use of the past tense in 2 Nephi 6:8 is wholly appropriate. Oliver Cowdery initially wrote *are* in the original manuscript here, but this error may be the result of Oliver (or Joseph Smith, who was dictating the text) having gotten used to the present-tense phraseology in “they which **are** at Jerusalem”:

1 Nephi 19:13
 and as for they which **are** at Jerusalem
 saith the prophet
 they shall be scourged by all people

1 Nephi 19:20
 even that all my joints are weak
 for they which **are** at Jerusalem

1 Nephi 22:4
 and behold there are many
 which are already lost from the knowledge
 of they which **are** at Jerusalem

In 2 Nephi 6:8, the supralinear correction in \mathcal{O} to *were* is in Oliver Cowdery's hand and was written without any change in the level of ink flow; thus this correction appears to be immediate.

Summary: Maintain the use of the past-tense *were* in 2 Nephi 6:8; the past tense is appropriate at this point in the narrative since Jerusalem has now been destroyed.

■ 2 Nephi 6:11

*wherefore after they are driven to and fro
 for thus saith the angel
 many shall be afflicted in the flesh*

Here is an example of the historical present (the present-tense *saith*) that has never been removed from the text. Earlier in verse 9, Jacob explains that an angel has revealed to him these future events:

2 Nephi 6:9
 and after that he should manifest himself
 they should scourge him and crucify him
 according to the words of the angel which spake it unto me

Elsewhere in the text, instances of the historical present that report the message of an angel have been changed to the past tense (15 examples), including the following that specifically use the word *angel*:

1 Nephi 12:11	and the angel saith unto me
1 Nephi 13:2	and the angel saith unto me
1 Nephi 13:11	the angel saith unto me
1 Nephi 13:21	and the angel saith unto me
Mosiah 27:14	and again the angel saith
Alma 8:20	which an angel saith in a vision thou shalt receive

In his editing for the 1837 edition, Joseph Smith changed all 15 of these other examples of *saith* to *said*. For further discussion and examples of this editing, see HISTORICAL PRESENT in volume 3.

The probable reason for why the *saith* in 2 Nephi 6:11 has been left unedited is that the syntax of “thus saith the angel” parallels the ubiquitous expression “thus saith the Lord (God)”. Instances of this expression involving the Lord do not typically occur in the historical present, but instead refer to the eternally lasting word of God. The critical text will, of course, retain all instances of the historical present wherever they are found in the earliest textual sources. This instance in 2 Nephi 6:11 will therefore be retained. For another example where this kind of expression has escaped editing, see 1 Nephi 17:53, where “saith the Lord” has never been edited to “said the Lord”.

Summary: Maintain the historical present *saith* in 2 Nephi 6:11 (“for thus saith the angel”).

■ 2 Nephi 6:11

*wherefore after they are driven to and fro
—for thus saith the angel
many shall be afflicted in the flesh
and shall not be suffered to perish
because of the prayers of the faithful—
[wherefore 0A | wherefore >js NULL 1 | BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
they shall be scattered and smitten and hated*

The second *wherefore* in this long sentence was deleted by Joseph Smith in his editing for the 1837 edition. The original repetition of *wherefore* is helpful because it brings the reader back to the sentence-initial *wherefore* after a long intervening parenthetical clause. For additional examples of this kind of repetition, see under 2 Nephi 5:21. The critical text will restore the redundancy of the original text here in 2 Nephi 6:11.

Summary: Restore in 2 Nephi 6:11 the repeated *wherefore* that Joseph Smith deleted in his editing for the 1837 edition.

■ 2 Nephi 6:14

*and behold according to the words of the prophet
the Messiah will set himself again
[NULL > the second time 1 | the second time ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] to recover them*

As he copied from \mathcal{C} into \mathcal{D} , Oliver Cowdery initially wrote “the Messiah will set himself again to recover them”; then he supralinearly inserted the phrase “the second time”. The correction appears to be virtually immediate since there is no change in the level of ink flow. The original manuscript undoubtedly read “the Messiah will set himself again **the second time** to recover them”.

Jacob’s language here in verse 14 refers not to Isaiah 49:22–23 (which he just quoted in 2 Nephi 6:6–7), but to an Isaiah passage quoted later by Nephi:

Isaiah 11:11 (quoted in 2 Nephi 21:11)
the Lord shall **set** his hand **again the second time**
to recover the remnant of his people

This prophecy of Isaiah's is again referred to later on by both Nephi and Jacob:

2 Nephi 25:17

and the Lord will set his hand again the second time
to restore his people from their lost and fallen state

2 Nephi 29:1

that I may set my hand again the second time
to recover my people which are of the house of Israel

Jacob 6:2

and in the day that he shall set his hand
again the second time to recover his people
is the day yea even the last time
that the servants of the Lord shall go forth . . .

Thus in 2 Nephi 6:14, when Jacob says "according to the words of the prophet", he is undoubtedly referring to Isaiah (and the prophecy in Isaiah 11:11). For this reason we can be confident that the original manuscript had "the second time".

Summary: Maintain the phrase "the second time" that Oliver Cowdery supralinearly inserted in 2 Nephi 6:14; his correction here undoubtedly represents the reading of the original text, which paraphrases Isaiah 11:11.

■ 2 Nephi 6:14

and none will he destroy

that [believeth 1A | believe BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] in him

The original text here reads *believeth*. In the 1837 edition, the third person singular ending *-(e)th* was dropped. One reason may have been that Joseph Smith, the editor for that edition, viewed *none* as having a plural referent. And since the inflectional *-(e)th* ending should occur only with third person singular subjects, *believeth* was replaced by *believe*. In the original text, third person plural subjects frequently took the *-(e)th* ending. See the discussion regarding *rebelleth* in the 1 Nephi preface, plus the general discussion under INFLECTIONAL ENDINGS in volume 3.

In the original text, there are eight examples of *none* that take a verb ending in *-eth*. In three of the cases, there are other elements in the sentence that show that the *none* should be interpreted as a singular:

Alma 26:21 (*is* implies the singular)

there **is none** that **knoweth** these things

Alma 27:18 (*seeker* implies the singular)

behold this is joy which **none receiveth**
save it be the truly penitent and humble **seeker** of happiness

Moroni 10:25 (*not one* implies the singular)

for there shall be **none** that **doeth** good among you
no **not one**

In these cases, the *-(e)th* ending has remained unedited.

For three cases, the *none* could be interpreted as either singular or plural. In one of these cases, the *-(e)th* ending was deleted—namely, the instance here in 2 Nephi 6:14. For the two other cases of possible ambiguity, the *-(e)th* ending has been left unchanged:

1 Nephi 22:4

and whither they are **none** of us **knoweth**

2 Nephi 24:6 (quoting Isaiah 14:6)

he that ruled the nations in anger is persecuted
and **none hindereth**

In the last example, the fact that the King James Bible is being quoted may have prevented the *-(e)th* from being edited.

Finally, there are two cases where the *none* occurs in a plural context. In the first case, two occurrences of the *-(e)th* ending have been deleted; in the other case, the *-(e)th* ending has remained:

Mosiah 15:26 (*their* implies the plural)

for the Lord redeemeth **none** such
that [*rebeleth* >js *rebel* 1 | *rebelleth* A | *rebel* BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
against him
and [*dieth* >js *die* 1 | *dieth* A | *die* BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] in **their** sins

Helaman 13:19 (*their* implies the plural)

for **none hideth** up **their** treasures unto me
save it be the righteous

Thus the editing of *-(e)th* with respect to *none* has never been consistently carried out, probably because it is so difficult for English readers to notice the supposed grammatical violation, given that in the Book of Mormon the *-(e)th* ending acts more as a marker of the biblical style than as a third person singular ending. Of course, the critical text will in each of these cases maintain the original usage.

Over the last two centuries, some grammarians have claimed that *none* can be interpreted only as a singular. As noted under *none* in Merriam-Webster's Dictionary of English Usage, this claim is wholly untenable, both in earlier English and in current usage. And we can see from the examples listed above that the Book of Mormon text has examples of both singular and plural *none*. More striking perhaps are the following pairs of examples involving the *be* verb:

Moroni 7:44	none is acceptable before God
2 Nephi 26:28	none are forbidden
Alma 26:21	there is none that knoweth these things
Mormon 8:10	there are none that do know the true God
Ether 4:3	there is none save it be the Lamanites
Mormon 8:9	there are none save it be Lamanites and robbers

Clearly, the Book of Mormon text allows variation in number for *none*.

Summary: Restore the original inflectional ending in 2 Nephi 6:14 (“and none will he destroy that **believeth** in him”); the editing here implies that *none* was interpreted as a plural, but the singular is also possible.

■ **2 Nephi 6:15**

*and they that believe not in him shall be destroyed
both by fire and by [tempest 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST | tempests J]
and by earthquakes and by bloodsheds
and by pestilence and by famine*

The change in the 1888 LDS edition to the plural *tempests* is probably a typo. This change was probably caused by the immediately following plural *earthquakes*. The singular *tempest* works perfectly well since it is paired with the preceding singular *fire*. Elsewhere in the text, the word *tempest(s)* always agrees in number with the noun(s) conjoined with it, as in 1 Nephi 19:11 (“by **tempest** by **fire** and by smoke and vapor of darkness”). For a list of examples, see the discussion under 1 Nephi 19:11.

Summary: Retain the singular *tempest* in 2 Nephi 6:15, the reading of the earliest text.

■ **2 Nephi 6:17–18**

*for thus saith the Lord
I will contend with **them** that contendeth with thee
and I will feed them that oppress thee with their own flesh*

□ **Isaiah 49:25–26** (King James Bible)

for I will contend with **him** that contendeth with thee
and I will save thy children
and I will feed them that oppress thee with their own flesh

Here in 2 Nephi 6:17, we have the object pronoun *them*, but in the corresponding Isaiah passage in the King James Bible (Isaiah 49:25), the corresponding pronoun is the singular *him*. Yet when this same passage is quoted in 1 Nephi 21, *him* is also found there. The agreement of the King James *him* with 1 Nephi 21:25 (but disagreement with 2 Nephi 6:17) suggests the possibility that the *them* in 2 Nephi 6:17 is an error for *him*. Under 1 Nephi 10:18–19, I provide evidence that Oliver Cowdery sometimes mixed up *him* and *them* as he wrote down Joseph Smith’s dictation (due to the identical pronunciation of *him* and *them* as /əɪm/ in unstressed positions). That possibility could readily explain why 2 Nephi 6:17 reads *them* but 1 Nephi 21:25 reads *him* (in agreement with Isaiah 49:25).

On the other hand, there are significant textual differences between 1 Nephi 21:25–26 and 2 Nephi 6:17–18 that suggest that the *them* in 2 Nephi 6:17 could be right after all. When we compare these two passages alongside Isaiah 49:25–26, we find that 2 Nephi 6:17 has two extra clauses (listed below as 1 and 2) before the clause containing *them* and at the same time is missing the clause (listed below as 3) that immediately follows:

2 Nephi 6:17–18

and the prey of the terrible
shall be delivered(1) **for the mighty God shall
deliver his covenant people**(2) for **thus saith the Lord**
I will contend with **them**
that contendeth with theeand I will feed them
that oppress thee
with their own flesh

1 Nephi 21:25–26 (Isaiah 49:25–26)

and the prey of the terrible
shall be deliveredfor
I will contend with **him**
that contendeth with thee(3) **and I will save thy children**and I will feed them
that oppress thee
with their own flesh

The result is that 2 Nephi 6:17–18 ends up with a contiguous sequence of two parallel clauses:

I will contend with them that contendeth with thee
and **I will feed them that oppress thee with their own flesh**

The use of *them* in 2 Nephi 6:17 thus directly matches the *them* in the immediately following clause (in 2 Nephi 6:18, the next verse). On the other hand, the original Isaiah passage breaks up the sequence with the seemingly irrelevant “and I will save thy children”. Nonetheless, 1 Nephi 21:25–26 quotes Isaiah 49:25–26 precisely this way. It is as if there are two textual traditions for Isaiah 49:25–26. In any event, the resulting adjacent parallelism in the 2 Nephi 6:17–18 version suggests that the repetition of the *them* is intended.

One could argue that the use of the third person singular *contendeth* in 2 Nephi 6:17 rather than the third person plural *contend* implies an error (or at least a close reliance on the King James text for 2 Nephi 6:17)—that is to say, the verb form *contendeth* in the clause “that contendeth with thee” implies a singular referent like *him* rather than the plural *them*. But as we have already observed, the Book of Mormon text has many examples of the inflectional ending *-(e)th* occurring in the third person plural. See, in particular, 2 Nephi 7:2, which originally read “they **dieth** because of thirst”, not “they **die** because of thirst”. (The corresponding Isaiah passage has *dieth* but in a different syntactic context.) For further examples of this plural usage for the *-(e)th* ending, see the nearby discussion under 2 Nephi 6:14. Also see INFLECTIONAL ENDINGS in volume 3 for a complete list of examples.

We should also note that the missing clause at the end of 2 Nephi 6:17 (“and I will save thy children”) could be the result of the scribe’s eye skipping from one “and I will” to the next one:

(1) and I will (2) save thy children (3) and I will (4) feed them that oppress thee	→	(1) and I will (4) feed them that oppress thee
--	---	--

Such an error could have even occurred as Joseph Smith read off the text to his scribe. Nonetheless, as already noted, there appears to be some motivation for skipping “and I will save thy children”. The resulting increase in parallelism seems to be intended. In particular, the *them* in place of *him* works well in 2 Nephi 6:17 because of the *them* in the parallel clause that immediately follows

in verse 18. Based on this reasoning, the critical text will follow the earliest reading for 2 Nephi 6:17–18, despite its differences with 1 Nephi 21:25–26 (and Isaiah 49:25–26 in the King James Bible).

It should also be noted that for Isaiah 49:25, the original Hebrew of the standard text literally reads as “I will contend with thy contender” (that is, in the singular). The King James Bible translates *thy contender* as “him that contendeth with thee”. David Calabro points out (personal communication) that some Hebrew manuscripts as well as the Latin Vulgate (see the footnote in the *Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia*) read in the plural as *thy contenders*, which would then translate as “them that contend with thee”. Thus the plural reading is a distinct possibility, even with the intervening clause “and I will save thy children”.

Summary: Retain in 2 Nephi 6:17 the reading of the earliest textual source (the printer’s manuscript), which reads *them* rather than *him*; although *them* could be a mishearing of *him*, the plural *them* will work here because the immediately following parallel clause (in 2 Nephi 6:18) also has *them*.

2 Nephi 7

■ 2 Nephi 7:1

behold for your iniquities

have [ye 0ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST | you >+ ye 1] sold yourselves

□ Isaiah 50:1 (King James Bible)

behold for your iniquities

have **ye** sold yourselves

The original manuscript is extant here and has *ye* for the subject pronoun, in agreement with the King James Bible. While copying from \mathcal{C} into \mathcal{P} , Oliver Cowdery initially wrote *you* but later corrected it to *ye*, probably when he proofed \mathcal{P} against \mathcal{C} (the level of ink flow is somewhat heavier and the quill appears to be sharper). In the original text of the Book of Mormon, there are examples of both *ye* and *you* as the subject pronoun. The tendency has been to replace the archaic *ye* with the modern-day *you*. This kind of change has occurred quite a few times in the history of the text. For a complete listing, see YE in volume 3. In the critical text, we will let the earliest textual sources determine in each case whether the reading should be *ye* or *you*.

Summary: Maintain the subject pronoun *ye* here in 2 Nephi 7:1, the reading of the original manuscript.

■ 2 Nephi 7:1

and for your transgressions

[NULL >+ is 0 | is 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST] *your mother*

[NULL >+ is >+ NULL 0 | 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST] *put away*

□ Isaiah 50:1 (King James Bible)

and for your transgressions **is** your mother put away

Although \mathcal{C} is not fully extant here, the part that remains suggests that Oliver Cowdery initially wrote “for your transgressions your mother put away”—that is, without the verb *is*. The transcript of \mathcal{C} for this portion reads as follows (lines 18–19 on page 59 of \mathcal{C}):

```
(          )r your iniqu(i e)s have ye sold yourselves & fo(r          )
BEHOLD FO          TI          YOUR TRANSGRESSIONS
(          ) <is>
IS
(          ) Mother ^ put away wherefore when I came there was n(o          )
^ YOUR          MAN WHEN I CALLED
```

At this point in taking down Joseph Smith's dictation, Oliver finished writing one line of text and started writing a new line. This shift may have distracted him so that he ended up omitting the *is*. Somewhat later Oliver first corrected his error by supralinearly inserting the *is* after the subject *your mother*: "for your transgressions your mother **is** put away". This first correction is in heavier ink flow but appears to be based on Oliver's own idea of where the *is* belongs (which is the expected word order in modern English). Later, with very heavy ink flow (marked in the variant specification as ++), he crossed out this first *is* and (presumably) inserted the *is* in the correct place, before the *your* that would have been at the beginning of the line. (The different levels of ink flow for the first *is* and its subsequent crossout can be clearly viewed in color photographs of this fragment of \mathcal{O} ; the black-and-white ultraviolet photographs show little difference in the level of ink flow.) As can be seen from the transcript, the first part of the line is no longer extant. Presumably the second *is* was supralinearly inserted before the *your* or perhaps in the margin (directly in front of the *your*). Based on the heavy crossout of the first *is*, the second inserted *is* would have been written with the same heavy ink flow.

Several alternatives to this explanation are possible. One is that in the original Book of Mormon text the *is* was actually missing. Elsewhere in the Isaiah quotations, the italicized *is* of the King James Bible is sometimes missing in the earliest Book of Mormon text (for examples and discussion, see 2 Nephi 13:14). Of all the examples where the *is* is omitted in the original Book of Mormon text, the corresponding King James *is* is italicized. (Of course, not all italicized *is*'s are omitted in the Book of Mormon text.) For this particular example (2 Nephi 7:1), the corresponding *is* in the King James text (Isaiah 50:1) is not italicized. Thus the original (apparent) loss of the *is* here in 2 Nephi 7:1 seems to be accidental rather than intended.

Another possibility is that the first correction represents the original text but that the second correction was the result of consulting a King James Bible, which would have shown that the *is* should come before the subject *your mother*. The problem with this proposal is that there is no clear manuscript evidence elsewhere that an actual copy of the King James Bible was consulted in producing \mathcal{O} or in copying from \mathcal{O} into \mathcal{P} . Here in 2 Nephi 7:1, the second correction in \mathcal{O} clearly occurred before \mathcal{O} was copied into \mathcal{P} since \mathcal{P} itself has the final reading of \mathcal{O} (the same reading as the King James text) and without any correction. The first time we can see evidence of anyone actually consulting a King James Bible is when the printer's manuscript was in the hands of the 1830 compositor. (For the first possible example of the compositor using his Bible to correct the text, see 1 Nephi 20:8; for a clear example of such usage, see the insertion of *did excel* in 2 Nephi 20:10.)

The most reasonable explanation for the corrections in \mathcal{O} is that Oliver Cowdery's first correction was based on his own idea of where the *is* should go, while the second correction occurred when Oliver checked the text with Joseph Smith to make sure the verb was in the right place. On one other occasion, Oliver made, it would seem, another independent attempt at correcting an Isaiah quotation—and there he put the verb in the wrong place:

1 Nephi 21:20

the children which thou shalt have
 after thou hast lost the other
 shall again in thine ears [NULL >+ say 0 | say 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST]
 the place is too strait for me

Isaiah 49:20 (King James Bible)
 the children which thou shalt have
 after thou hast lost the other
 shall **say** again in thine ears
 the place *is* too strait for me

The level of ink flow for the correction here looks much like Oliver's first correction in 2 Nephi 7:1. For evidence that Oliver inserted the *say* in the wrong place in 1 Nephi 21:20, see the discussion there.

Summary: Maintain the placement of *is* right before *your mother* in 2 Nephi 7:1; Oliver Cowdery's final corrected reading in \mathcal{C} was copied into \mathcal{P} without further alteration and is identical to the word order found in Isaiah 50:1 of the King James Bible.

■ 2 Nephi 7:2

*wherefore when I [came 0BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST | come >]s came 1 | come A] there was no man
 when I called / yea there was none to answer*

□ Isaiah 50:2 (King James Bible)

wherefore when I **came** / *was there* no man
 when I called / *was there* none to answer

Here we see signs of Oliver Cowdery tiring as he copied from \mathcal{C} into \mathcal{P} . For the next few verses, Oliver created at least four accidental changes as he copied the text. Here in verse 2, it is obvious that the past-tense *came* is expected, especially given the following past-tense forms *was*, *called*, and *was*. Nonetheless, Oliver accidentally wrote *come*, and even the 1830 compositor set *come*. In his editing for the 1837 edition, Joseph Smith restored the *came*, but without reference to a King James Bible or the original manuscript since all the other accidental changes in 2 Nephi 7 (see verses 2, 4, and 5 below) were left uncorrected in the 1837 edition.

Summary: Maintain the past-tense *came* in 2 Nephi 7:2, which is the reading of the original manuscript as well as the King James text for Isaiah 50:2.

■ 2 Nephi 7:2

*behold at my rebuke I dry up the sea
 I make [the 0 | their 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST] rivers a wilderness
 and their fish to stink*

□ Isaiah 50:2 (King James Bible)

behold at my rebuke I dry up the sea
 I make **the** rivers a wilderness
 their fish stinketh

While copying from \mathcal{C} to \mathcal{P} , Oliver Cowdery replaced the determiner *the* with *their*, probably because of the proximity of the following "their fish". A large fragment from \mathcal{C} (found in the

Wilford Wood collection) shows that the original text read “the rivers”, in agreement with the King James text.

Sidney B. Sperry in *Our Book of Mormon* (Salt Lake City, Utah: Stevens and Wallis, 1947), pages 174–175, explains this textual difference as the result of losing a final *m* consonant in the original Hebrew written text (where the *m* stands for the third person plural pronominal ending *-ām*), thus leading to the standard (Masoretic) reading “the rivers” (and consequently the King James reading). Of course, given that \mathfrak{C} is extant for this portion of the text and reads “the rivers”, there is no need for this argument. Other minor differences between the King James Bible and the Book of Mormon quotations (especially in this part of the text) are often due to scribal errors that occurred while copying from \mathfrak{C} into \mathfrak{P} .

Summary: Restore “the rivers” in 2 Nephi 7:2, the reading of the original manuscript (and the King James Bible for Isaiah 50:2).

■ 2 Nephi 7:2

*I make the rivers a wilderness
and their fish to stink because the waters are dried up
and they [dieth 0 | dieth >+ die 1 | die ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] because of thirst*

□ Isaiah 50:2 (King James Bible)

I make the rivers a wilderness
their fish stinketh because *there is* no water
and **dieth** for thirst

The original *dieth* in the Book of Mormon text actually agrees with the King James reading. The Book of Mormon quotation introduces a simpler text but also the plural subject *they*, which requires *die* rather than *dieth* according to “standard” Early Modern English (which restricts the use of the inflectional ending *-(e)th* to the third person singular present).

One should note that the corresponding King James text has “their fish stinketh” rather than “their fish stink”; of course, the subject for the conjoined *dieth* is also “their fish”. Both these uses of the ending *-eth* imply that *fish* is grammatically singular and not plural, as indeed it is in the Hebrew (where *fish* is feminine singular, although semantically it is used as a collective plural).

In any event, Oliver Cowdery emended the printer’s manuscript to read *die* (by crossing out *dieth* and supralinearly inserting *die*). Oliver’s emendation is clearly a conscious decision since the ink flow is definitely heavier than all the rest of Oliver’s scribal corrections on this manuscript page (page 60 of \mathfrak{P}). For further discussion of this kind of editing, see under INFLECTION ENDINGS in volume 3.

Incidentally, when this same verse is cited in the current LDS Doctrine and Covenants, the two *-eth* endings are removed (the original 1835 edition had *stinketh* and *dieth*):

D&C 133:68 (1981 edition)
I make the rivers a wilderness
their fish **stink** and **die** for thirst

Also note that here in the Doctrine and Covenants, we have “the rivers” rather than “their rivers”; see the discussion above regarding “I make **the** rivers a wilderness”.

Summary: Maintain the nonstandard use of *-(e)th* in 2 Nephi 7:2 (“and they **dieth** because of thirst”); *Œ* as well as *Ɔ* originally read *dieth*, in agreement with the King James Bible’s “their fish **stinketh** . . . and **dieth** for thirst”.

■ 2 Nephi 7:3

I clothe the [heavens 1ABCDEFGHIJKLNPRST | heaven~s F | heaven MOQ] with blackness

□ Isaiah 50:3

I clothe the **heavens** with blackness

Here the typesetter for the 1905 LDS edition accidentally set the singular *heaven* instead of the plural *heavens*, the reading of the earliest extant source (the printer’s manuscript) as well as the corresponding King James text. This 1905 reading also appears in the 1907 LDS vest-pocket edition and the 1911 large-print Chicago edition. The 1920 LDS edition restored the original plural.

Summary: Maintain in 2 Nephi 7:3 the original plural “the heavens”, which agrees with the corresponding plural reading in the King James Bible.

■ 2 Nephi 7:3

and I make sackcloth their [covering 01ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQPRT | coverings S]

□ Isaiah 50:3 (King James Bible)

and I make sackcloth their **covering**

The 1953 RLDS edition added the plural *s* to the word *covering*; the original manuscript reads in the singular, as does the corresponding King James text. This example may very well be an accident since *sackcloth* is a singular (noncount) mass noun and readers would expect the associated *covering* to also be in the singular. Nonetheless, in a number of places, the 1953 RLDS edition introduced a plural noun in place of the singular (some of these changes are intentional):

2 Nephi 15:12	but they regard not the works of the Lord
2 Nephi 16:11	until the cities be wasted without inhabitants
2 Nephi 20:3	and what will ye do in the days of visitation
Mosiah 7:25	for if this people had not fallen into transgressions
Mosiah 11:27	that shall bring upon my people such great afflictions
Mosiah 15:29	thy watchmen shall lift up their voices
3 Nephi 20:16	as a lion among the beasts of the forests
3 Nephi 20:32	then shall their watchmen lift up their voices
3 Nephi 23:4	and according to the times and the will of the Father
Mormon 9:31	condemn me not because of mine imperfections

For each of these examples, all other textual sources read in the singular. For discussion, see each individual passage.

Summary: Maintain the singular *covering* in 2 Nephi 7:3, the reading of the printer's manuscript and the King James Bible.

■ **2 Nephi 7:4**

he [*wakeneth* 0 | *waketh* 1 ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *morning by morning*
he [*wakeneth* 0 | *waketh* 1 ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *mine ear to hear as the learned*

□ **Isaiah 50:4** (King James Bible)

he **wakeneth** morning by morning
 he **wakeneth** mine ear to hear as the learned

Again in 2 Nephi 7, Oliver Cowdery miscopied the original text, which in this instance is identical to the King James text. In this verse Oliver twice replaced the verb *waken* with the more common verb in English, *wake*. There are no other occurrences of the verb *waken* in the Book of Mormon text. There are examples, however, of the related verb *awaken* (5 times in the original text, but 11 times in the current LDS text and 9 times in the current RLDS text).

The source for the reading of the original manuscript is a large fragment in the Wilford Wood collection that clearly reads *wakeneth* for both instances.

Summary: Restore *wakeneth* (the reading of the original manuscript) both times in 2 Nephi 7:4, thus making the text here agree with the King James Bible.

■ **2 Nephi 7:5**

the Lord God
hath [*opened* 0CGHIJKLMNOPQRT | *appointed* 1ABDEPS | *appointed* > *opened* F] *mine ear*

□ **Isaiah 50:5** (King James Bible)

the Lord GOD hath **opened** mine ear

Here in 2 Nephi 7:5, as he copied from \mathcal{O} into \mathcal{P} , Oliver Cowdery misread *opened* as *appointed*, which creates a novel but not impossible reading. The evidence for the reading of the original manuscript is a large fragment in the Wilford Wood collection. The corresponding King James text has, of course, *opened*. Oliver must have been quite tired while copying this portion of the text in 2 Nephi 7 since he made several other accidental errors while copying this part of the original manuscript.

Joseph Smith restored the reading *opened* in the 1840 edition, by reference either to the King James Bible or to the original manuscript itself (which he used to restore a few other original readings in the 1840 edition). The photographs of the Wilford Wood fragments (taken in 1991) confirm that here in 2 Nephi 7:5 (and for quite a few other places in 2 Nephi 7), the original Book of Mormon text read like the King James text.

Incidentally, in Joseph Smith’s “New Translation” of the King James Bible, known as the Joseph Smith Translation (JST), the 1830 edition of the Book of Mormon was used to revise the King James text. As a result, Joseph Smith’s revisions include all these errors in 2 Nephi 7:2–5 that Oliver Cowdery accidentally introduced into the text as he copied from \mathfrak{C} into \mathfrak{P} :

ORIGINAL MANUSCRIPT	JOSEPH SMITH TRANSLATION
<i>King James Bible</i>	<i>1830 edition</i>
I make the rivers a wilderness	I make their rivers a wilderness
he wakeneth morning by morning	he waketh morning by morning
he wakeneth mine ear	he waketh mine ear
God hath opened mine ear	God hath appointed mine ear(s)

Summary: Maintain *opened* in 2 Nephi 7:5, the reading of the original manuscript as well as the King James Bible.

■ 2 Nephi 7:5

the Lord God hath opened mine ear
 [& 1 | *and* ABCDEFGIJLMNOPQRST | HK] *I was not rebellious*

□ Isaiah 50:5 (King James Bible)

the Lord GOD hath opened mine ear
and I was not rebellious

Here the 1874 RLDS edition accidentally dropped the *and* of the earliest text (and the King James Bible). The Isaiah quotations characteristically have fewer connective *and*’s than does the Book of Mormon text proper. Note, for instance, that the previous clause has no initial *and* (“the Lord God hath opened mine ear”). Thus it is not surprising that the relative lack of connective *and*’s in the Isaiah quotations might lead typesetters to accidentally omit some of the nearby legitimate *and*’s. The 1908 RLDS edition restored the *and* to the RLDS text.

Summary: Maintain the original *and* in 2 Nephi 7:5 (“and I was not rebellious”).

■ 2 Nephi 7:6

I gave my back to the smiter
and my cheeks to them that plucked off the hair

□ Isaiah 50:6 (King James Bible)

I gave my back to the **smitters**
 and my cheeks to them that plucked off the hair

All the extant Book of Mormon textual sources read *smiter*, but unfortunately the word *smiter* (or *smitters*, the reading of the King James Bible) is no longer extant in what remains of the original manuscript for 2 Nephi 7. Nearby extant portions of this page of \mathfrak{C} show that Oliver Cowdery

made quite a few copying errors in this part of the text (in fact, five accidental changes in the preceding four verses), so it is quite possible that the original manuscript here in verse 6 read *smiters* and that Oliver accidentally copied it into \mathcal{P} as *smiter*.

One of Oliver Cowdery's most common errors was to add or delete the plural *s*. We have, for instance, the following examples from the long Isaiah quotation later on in 2 Nephi where Oliver initially copied an original plural as a singular but then caught his error and corrected the manuscript. In two cases, the initial error was in \mathcal{P} ; in one case, it was in \mathcal{O} :

- 2 Nephi 13:14 (Isaiah 3:14 has *ancients*)
 the Lord will enter into judgment
 with the [*ancient* > *ancients* 1 | *ancients* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
 of his people
- 2 Nephi 15:12 (Isaiah 5:12 has *hands*)
 but they regard not the work of the Lord
 neither consider the operation
 of his [*hand* >+ *hands* 1 | *hands* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
- 2 Nephi 23:3 (Isaiah 13:3 has *ones*)
 I have commanded
 my sanctified [*one* > *ones* 0 | *ones* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST]
 I have also called my mighty ones

In certain cases, the Book of Mormon quotations of Isaiah seem to intentionally differ in number from the King James text. For an example of where the difference in number seems to be intentional, see the discussion regarding *captive* versus *captives* in 1 Nephi 21:24–25 (which quotes Isaiah 49:24–25). Here in 2 Nephi 7:6, on the other hand, there seems to be no motivation for changing *smiters* to *smiter*. Thus the chances are high that this change in number is accidental rather than intentional. In fact, the Hebrew text for Isaiah 50:6 definitely supports the plural *smiters*, which parallels the plural in the immediately following phrase, and can be more literally translated as follows:

my back I gave **to ones smiting**
 and **my cheeks** **to ones pulling** out [hair]

Thus we may assume that in 2 Nephi 7:6 the original text (and probably the original manuscript) read *smiters* and that the change to the singular occurred as Oliver Cowdery copied from \mathcal{O} to \mathcal{P} .

Summary: Emend 2 Nephi 7:6 to read in the plural (*smiters*), the reading in Isaiah 50:6 of the King James Bible; the plural agrees with the plural *them* later on in the verse; for this portion of text, Oliver Cowdery made numerous errors as he copied from \mathcal{O} into \mathcal{P} .

■ 2 Nephi 7:8

let [*him* > *us* 1 | *us* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] stand together

who is mine adversary

let him come near [NULL > *me* 1 | *me* 0ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST]

□ Isaiah 50:8 (King James Bible)

let us stand together

who is mine adversary

let him come near **to** me

This verse shows Oliver Cowdery’s continuing difficulties in copying from \mathcal{G} to \mathcal{P} in 2 Nephi 7. He initially wrote “let him”, then corrected the pronoun *him* to *us*. Here Oliver was probably influenced by the following “let him come near me”. Later on in this verse, he initially wrote “let him come near”, then added the *me* supralinearly.

With respect to the second correction, we note that the King James text has the preposition *to* after *near* (“near to me”). It is possible that Oliver Cowdery accidentally dropped this *to* as he copied from \mathcal{G} into \mathcal{P} . For this portion of the text, the original manuscript is not extant; the lacuna between extant words is so long that one cannot determine from the length of the lacuna whether the small word *to* was in \mathcal{G} or not.

Elsewhere the Book of Mormon text has examples of *near* with and without an additional preposition. Excluding the example here in 2 Nephi 7:8, we have the following statistics:

near X	27
near to X	3
near unto X	6

Correspondingly, we have the following statistics in the King James Bible:

near X	24
near to X	30
near unto X	36

In calculating these statistics, I excluded those cases where the *to* following *near* is the adverbial infinitive marker, as in “yea even they were **near to** be cast with sorrow into a watery grave” (1 Nephi 18:18).

Of course, modern-English readers expect no additional preposition after *near*. And the Book of Mormon text prefers that usage (at least 27 times), although there are examples of the two archaic usages (with *to* or *unto*) in the following nonbiblical passages:

1 Nephi 4:7	and as I came near unto the house of Laban
Mosiah 9:4	which was near to the land of our fathers
Alma 58:13	which was near to the city
Helaman 5:25	neither durst they come near unto them
Helaman 7:10	which tower was also near unto the garden gate
Ether 15:8	and Shiz also pitched his tents near unto them

The example from Alma 58:13 is particularly germane. As he copied from \mathcal{C} into \mathcal{P} , Oliver Cowdery initially wrote “which was near the city”, then later supralinearly inserted the preposition *to*. It appears that Oliver probably omitted the *to* because he was distracted when he wrote “which was near” at the end of the line in \mathcal{P} . Later he supralinearly inserted the *to* in heavier ink at the beginning of the following line in \mathcal{P} , probably when he proofed \mathcal{P} against \mathcal{C} . Although \mathcal{C} is not extant for this part of the line, there would have been no reason for Oliver to have added the unexpected *to* in \mathcal{P} except that the *to* must have been in \mathcal{C} . This example shows that Oliver could accidentally drop the *to* from “near to X”. Thus there is some evidence from scribal errors to support an original *to* in 2 Nephi 7:8.

There are four other places where the Book of Mormon text quotes biblical passages that use *near* as a preposition. In three of these cases, the Book of Mormon text follows the corresponding King James text with respect to any additional preposition; in fact, for these three biblical quotes, each example represents a different type:

BOOK OF MORMON	KING JAMES BIBLE
1 Nephi 20:16 come ye near unto me	Isaiah 48:16 come ye near unto me
3 Nephi 22:14 it shall not come near thee	Isaiah 54:14 it shall not come near thee
3 Nephi 24:5 I will come near to you	Malachi 3:5 I will come near to you

But in the fourth case, the Book of Mormon text adds the preposition *unto*:

2 Nephi 27:25 this people draw near unto me	Isaiah 29:13 this people draw near <i>me</i>
---	--

This last example suggests that the Book of Mormon text can indeed vary from the King James text with respect to prepositional usage after *near*.

Given the mixed evidence for 2 Nephi 7:8, it is probably safest to accept the current reading (“let him come near me”), which follows the earliest textual source (in this instance, the printer’s manuscript). Even though this reading is missing the *to* of the King James text, there is one other Book of Mormon biblical quote (in 2 Nephi 27:25) that alters the usage with respect to *near*. Of course, it is possible that Oliver Cowdery dropped the *to* in 2 Nephi 7:8 since we have evidence that for this part of the text, Oliver was quite tired as he copied from \mathcal{C} to \mathcal{P} .

Summary: Maintain in 2 Nephi 7:8 the reading of the earliest text sources (“let him come **near** me”); the corresponding King James text (Isaiah 50:8) has the preposition *to* (“let him come **near to** me”); although Oliver Cowdery may have dropped the *to* as he copied from \mathcal{C} to \mathcal{P} , there is one other biblical quote in the Book of Mormon text (in 2 Nephi 27:25) that shows that the use of a preposition after *near* can differ from the corresponding King James text.

■ 2 Nephi 7:11

behold all ye that [kindleth >js kindle 1 | kindleth A | kindle BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] fire

□ Isaiah 50:11 (King James Bible)

behold all ye that **kindle a** fire

Here the earliest textual source (the printer's manuscript) reads "all ye that kindleth fire". The original manuscript is not extant for this verse. The Book of Mormon text varies in two ways from the corresponding Isaiah passage in the King James Bible. First, the verb *kindle* takes the ending *-eth*. The Book of Mormon text allows the biblical inflectional ending *-(e)th* to be used for plural subjects; thus there is nothing inherently wrong with "all ye that kindleth fire". In his editing for the 1837 edition, Joseph Smith removed the *-eth* here in 2 Nephi 7:11. (For a complete discussion of this kind of editing, see under INFLECTIONAL ENDINGS in volume 3.) Nonetheless, when quoting the King James Bible, the tendency in the Book of Mormon is to follow the inflectional ending of the King James text, even in cases of textual differences that end up creating nonstandard usage. Thus in the original text for 2 Nephi 7:2, we have "**they dieth** because of thirst", which agrees with the *dieth* in Isaiah 50:2 ("and **dieth** for thirst"). A similar example involving a different nonstandard inflectional ending is found in 3 Nephi 12:23:

BOOK OF MORMON

3 Nephi 12:23

if **ye** shall come unto me
or shall desire to come unto me
and **rememberest** that . . .

KING JAMES BIBLE

Matthew 5:23

if **thou** bring thy gift to the altar
and there **rememberest** that . . .

Here the Book of Mormon text has the subject pronoun *ye* instead of the singular *thou*, yet the Book of Mormon retains the *rememberest* of the King James text, despite the ungrammaticality of "ye rememberest".

The second change here in 2 Nephi 7:11 involves the indefinite article *a*, which is found in the King James text but is missing in the Book of Mormon text. The corresponding Hebrew text has no indefinite article (since Hebrew has no indefinite article at all). So either translation (*a fire* or *fire*) is possible. Nonetheless, since Oliver Cowdery made so many copying errors in 2 Nephi 7, one wonders if he didn't also accidentally drop out the indefinite article *a* here as well.

In the manuscripts there are a few clear examples where Oliver Cowdery neglected to write (at least initially) the indefinite article *a*:

Jacob 4:1 (☉ not extant)

and I cannot write

but [NULL > a 1 | a ABCDEFIJLMNOQRT | GHKPS] little of my words

Alma 11:15 (☉ not extant)

therefore a shiblon

for [NULL > a 1 | ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] half a measure of barley

Alma 42:2 (*a* is weakly inserted in \mathfrak{G} but dropped in \mathfrak{P})
 and he placed at the east end of the garden of Eden cherubims
 and [NULL >- *a* 0] 1 | *a* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] flaming sword

Thus we have scribal evidence that Oliver could have dropped the indefinite article *a* before *fire* when he copied the text of 2 Nephi 7:11 into the printer’s manuscript. (For each of the three other examples listed above, there has been some persistent textual difficulty in maintaining the *a*. For discussion, see each passage.)

Although there are two changes in 2 Nephi 7:11 (the addition of the inflectional ending *-eth* and the loss of the indefinite article *a*), the most reasonable explanation for the different readings is that the Book of Mormon text involves a single misinterpretation: namely, when Joseph Smith dictated “kindle a fire”, Oliver Cowdery misinterpreted this phrase as the phonetically similar “kindleth fire”. Both readings have a schwa vowel /ə/, and the interdental voiceless fricative /θ/ is phonetically very close to the following labiodental voiceless fricative /f/:

kindle a fire	/kɪndələfɪr/
kindleth fire	/kɪndələθfɪr/

These are identical except for the intrusive (but acoustically weak) /θ/ that Oliver may have perceived before the phonetically similar /f/, especially since he was so used to hearing the biblical *-(e)th* ending as Joseph dictated. Under this interpretation, there is no need to separately account for two differences in the text (the adding of *-eth* and the loss of the *a*); both result from a single mishearing. Further, this error would have occurred as Oliver wrote down Joseph’s dictation, not when he copied the text from \mathfrak{G} into \mathfrak{P} . Even though \mathfrak{G} is not extant here, it probably read identically to \mathfrak{P} . It is more difficult to imagine how Oliver, when copying from \mathfrak{G} to \mathfrak{P} , could have misread “kindle a fire” as “kindleth fire”.

Summary: Emend the Book of Mormon reading in 2 Nephi 7:11 to agree with the corresponding King James reading in Isaiah 50:11 (“all ye that **kindle a** fire”); the earliest reading in the Book of Mormon (“kindleth fire”) is probably the result of Oliver Cowdery mishearing Joseph Smith’s dictated “kindle a fire”.

2 Nephi 8

■ 2 Nephi 8:1

*hearken [to 1 | unto ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] me
ye that follow after righteousness*

□ Isaiah 51:1 (King James Bible)

hearken **to** me
ye that follow after righteousness

The original manuscript is not extant here, but the printer’s manuscript reads *to*. The 1830 type-setter changed the *to* to *unto*, thus moving the Book of Mormon text further away from the King James text for Isaiah. The printer might have been influenced by the more frequent use of the phrase “hearken unto me”. See the nearby examples in 2 Nephi 8:4 and 2 Nephi 8:7, which read “hearken unto me” in both the Book of Mormon text and the corresponding Isaiah verses in the King James Bible. For further discussion of “hearken to” versus “hearken unto”, see 1 Nephi 16:3.

Summary: Restore in 2 Nephi 8:1 the preposition *to* (“hearken to me”), the reading of the printer’s manuscript as well as Isaiah 51:1 of the King James Bible.

■ 2 Nephi 8:4

*and I will make my judgment to rest
for a light [thing >js NULL 1 | thing A | BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
[NULL > of >js for 1 | of A | for BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] the people*

□ Isaiah 51:4 (King James Bible)

and I will make my judgment to rest
for **a light of** the people

The additional noun *thing* in the early Book of Mormon text seems to be an error based on the two different meanings of *light*, the adjective meaning ‘not heavy’ versus the noun referring to ‘something shining’. In the King James Bible, “a light thing” means either ‘something small’ or ‘something easy’, including the following cases:

1 Samuel 18:23

seemeth it to you **a light thing** to be a king’s son-in-law

1 Kings 16:31

as if it had been **a light thing** for him to walk in the sins of Jeroboam

2 Kings 3:18

and this is *but* a **light thing** in the sight of the LORD

2 Kings 20:10

it is a **light thing** for the shadow to go down ten degrees

Ezekiel 8:17

is it a **light thing** to the house of Judah

Especially important to the analysis of 2 Nephi 8:4 is the following example from Isaiah:

Isaiah 49:6

it is a **light thing** that thou shouldst be my servant
to raise up the tribes of Jacob and to restore the preserved of Israel

Except for the word *shouldst/shouldst*, this passage is quoted without change in the Book of Mormon:

1 Nephi 21:6

it is a **light thing** that thou shouldst be my servant
to raise up the tribes of Jacob and to restore the preserved of Israel

In all of these King James biblical passages having “a light thing”, the Hebrew equivalent is verbal rather than nominal and has the meaning ‘to be a small matter’ or ‘to be easy’. In each case, the corresponding Hebrew verb form has the consonants *n-q-l* (based on the root *q-l-l*).

On the other hand, in the King James examples of “a light to/of X” (where X is a group of people), *thing* is never used with *light*:

Isaiah 42:6

I the LORD have called thee in righteousness
and will hold thine hand and will keep thee
and give thee for a covenant of the people
for a **light of the Gentiles**

Isaiah 49:6

I will also give thee for a **light to the Gentiles**

Isaiah 51:4

and I will make my judgment to rest for a **light of the people**

In all three of these citations, the Hebrew word for *light* is the noun *’ōr* ‘light’, which always refers to shining rather than smallness or easiness.

Of particular importance here is the fact that Isaiah 49:6 contains both “a light thing” and “a light to X”:

Isaiah 49:6

it is a **light thing** that thou shouldst be my servant
to raise up the tribes of Jacob and to restore the preserved of Israel
I will also give thee for a **light to the Gentiles**
that thou mayest be my salvation unto the end of the earth

This example suggests that a possible source for “a light thing of the people”, the earliest reading in 2 Nephi 8:4 (quoting Isaiah 51:4), is the nearby passage in Isaiah 49:6 with its occurrence of “a light thing”. This connection, however, holds only for English with its homonymy of the two etymologically unrelated words, *light* ‘not heavy’ and *light* ‘something shining’. The source of the confusion cannot be traced to the original Hebrew because there both the words (*n-q-l* and *’ōr*) are completely different, both phonetically and orthographically. The error in 2 Nephi 8:4 seems possible only because the English word *light* has two different meanings.

The problem, then, is in accounting for the addition of *thing* to *light* in 2 Nephi 8:4. As already noted, the word *thing* may have been added under the influence of “a light thing” that was dictated earlier in 1 Nephi 21:6. The question is whether the additional *thing* was actually in the original text or added in the early transmission of the text by Joseph Smith or Oliver Cowdery. Unfortunately, \mathcal{O} is not extant for this verse. The printer’s manuscript does suggest that Oliver had some difficulty copying the text here in 2 Nephi 8:4. He initially wrote “a light thing the people” in \mathcal{P} , then supralinearly inserted the *of* (with no change in the level of ink flow, which suggests an immediate correction). The *of* was probably in \mathcal{O} .

In the manuscripts, there is no scribal evidence for the accidental addition of *thing* or *things*. We do have cases where *words* and *sayings* were accidentally replaced by *things* (1 Nephi 3:28 and 2 Nephi 6:8 for *words*, and Mosiah 13:25 and 3 Nephi 16:4 for *sayings*). There is one instance where scribe 2 of \mathcal{P} appears to have accidentally omitted *things* (see 3 Nephi 21:4). But there is no manuscript evidence for the addition of *thing* or *things* except possibly here in 2 Nephi 8:4.

When Joseph Smith came to editing this passage for the 1837 edition, he decided to delete the additional *thing*. He clearly did not like the 1830 reading “for a light thing of the people”. However, he did not simply restore the original King James text. Apparently, he didn’t like the *of* either, so in his editing for the 1837 edition, he changed the preposition *of* to *for* (“for a light **for** the people”). In the Hebrew the word *people* directly follows the noun *light*, which in English implies a genitive-like construction for the following word. The King James Bible ordinarily uses the preposition *of* in translating such cases, as in Isaiah 42:6 (“for a light **of** the Gentiles”). On the other hand, in Isaiah 49:6, the King James Bible translates the same exact phrase as “for a light **to** the Gentiles”. Joseph Smith’s preposition *for* in 2 Nephi 8:4 seems semantically equivalent to *to*. This additional editing suggests that when Joseph made these two editing changes (deleting *thing* and changing *to* to *for*), he did not necessarily consult a King James Bible, although he may have; both changes seem to be motivated by a simple desire to clean up a difficult reading. For evidence that suggests Joseph Smith may have used a King James Bible in his editing of 2 Nephi 6–8, see the discussion regarding “which have said” under 2 Nephi 8:23.

Ultimately, the addition of *thing* in 2 Nephi 8:4 seems to be an error influenced by the language in 1 Nephi 21:6 (Isaiah 49:6). Otherwise, there seems to be no motivation for the addition of *thing* in 2 Nephi 8:4. In his editing for the 1837 edition, Joseph Smith apparently thought that “a light thing” was incorrect. The critical text will emend 2 Nephi 8:4 so that it agrees with the original King James language in Isaiah 51:4 (“for a light of the people”).

Summary: Accept Joseph Smith’s removal of the anomalous word *thing* from the phrase “for a light **thing** of the people” (that is, the reading of the earliest text for 2 Nephi 8:4 is probably an error); the original preposition *of* should be maintained.

■ 2 Nephi 8:5

*and mine [arm 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST | arms HK] shall judge the people
the isles shall wait upon me and on mine arm shall they trust*

□ Isaiah 51:5 (King James Bible)

and mine **arms** shall judge the people
the isles shall wait upon me and on mine arm shall they trust

For this verse the earliest Book of Mormon text (with two singular occurrences of “mine arm”) is more consistent than the King James Bible and the Masoretic Hebrew text (both of which have a plural “mine arms” followed by a singular “mine arm”). The 1874 RLDS edition restored the King James plural “mine arms”, but this change is probably a typo since otherwise this first RLDS edition shows no evidence that the King James Bible was ever consulted in order to regularize the text for 1 Nephi 20–21, 2 Nephi 6–8, and 2 Nephi 12–24 (the major nearby Isaiah quotations).

The tendency to regularize to the singular is also manifested in the Great Isaiah Scroll found at Qumran (1QIsa^a), which reads “his **arm** will judge the peoples”. Even so, the corresponding verb for “will judge” is in the plural, thus showing that the original Hebrew read *arms*. In any event, the tendency to regularize to the singular *arm* is very strong here in Isaiah 51:5, even if it ends up creating an error in subject-verb agreement in the Hebrew text.

It is possible that as Joseph Smith dictated the text for 2 Nephi 8:5, the *s* was accidentally lost from the first *arms*. David Calabro points out (personal communication) that Oliver Cowdery would have had considerably difficulty in distinguishing between “mine arm shall” and “mine arms shall”; the final /z/ of *arms* and the initial /š/ of *shall* are both sibilants, so in this context only the most careful pronunciation could have distinguished the singular *arm* from the plural *arms*. Another contributing factor is that Joseph or Oliver may have expected “mine arm shall judge the people” rather than “mine arms shall judge the people”. Elsewhere in the Book of Mormon, there are five occurrences of “mine arm” (once more in 2 Nephi 8:5, twice in 2 Nephi 28:32, and once each in Jacob 2:25 and 3 Nephi 9:14) but none of “mine arms”.

The Book of Mormon text often regularizes co-occurring singulars and plurals (such as “captive . . . captive” in 1 Nephi 21:24–25 rather than the “captive . . . captives” of Isaiah 49:24–25). The same systematizing may have taken place here in 2 Nephi 8:5. In other words, the consistent use of “mine arm” in the earliest text could very well be intentional. For this reason, the critical text will retain both occurrences of the singular “mine arm”, the reading of the earliest textual sources, even though Oliver Cowdery may have misheard or misinterpreted an original “mine **arms** shall judge the people”.

Summary: Maintain the two occurrences of the singular “mine arm” in 2 Nephi 8:5; the singular “mine arm” works very well for both “mine arm shall judge the people” and “on mine arm shall they trust”; nonetheless, there is a distinct possibility that Oliver Cowdery misheard “mine arms shall” as “mine arm shall”.

■ 2 Nephi 8:9–10

awake awake

put on strength O arm of the Lord

awake as in the ancient days

art thou not [it 0APS | it >js he 1 | he BCDEFGHIJKLMNOQRT]

[that 0ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST | that >js who 1] hath cut Rahab and wounded the dragon

art thou not [it 1APS | he BCDEFGHIJKLMNOQRT]

[which >js who 1 | which APS | who BCDEFGHIJKLMNOQRT] hath dried the sea

□ Isaiah 51:9–10 (King James Bible)

awake awake

put on strength O arm of the LORD

awake as in the ancient days

in the generations of old

art thou not it

that hath cut Rahab *and* wounded the dragon

art thou not it

which hath dried the sea

In his editing of 2 Nephi 8:9–10 for the 1837 edition, Joseph Smith changed both occurrences of the pronoun *it* to *he*. The pronoun *it* refers to the “arm of the Lord”; the word for *arm* is grammatically feminine in Hebrew, with the result that the pronoun in Hebrew is literally *she*. However, in English, *arm* is referred to by *it*, thus the King James translation. Joseph Smith altered the pronoun to read *he*, which means that Joseph semantically reinterpreted the pronoun as referring to the Lord himself, thus the use of the masculine pronoun. The critical text will, of course, restore the original pronoun *it* in both cases.

Having changed both instances of the pronoun *it* to *he*, Joseph Smith also decided to edit the associated relative pronouns *that* and *which* to *who*. These two grammatical changes were marked in the printer’s manuscript, but the first change (of *that* to *who*) was never implemented in the 1837 edition (or in any subsequent edition), possibly because it was decided that the relative pronoun *that* was acceptable after all. But the second change (of *which* to *who*) does appear in the 1837 edition (and in all subsequent editions) since that edition generally replaced the archaic *which* (when it refers to persons) with *who*. In most instances, the 1837 editing left the relative pronoun *that* unchanged but not always. For further discussion, see under WHICH in volume 3.

Summary: Restore the original neuter pronoun *it* and the relative pronouns *that* and *which* in 2 Nephi 8:9–10 (“art thou not **it that** hath cut Rahab” and “art thou not **it which** hath dried the sea”).

■ 2 Nephi 8:10

*art thou not it
which hath dried [up >% NULL 0 | 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST] the sea
the waters of the great deep*

□ Isaiah 51:10 (King James Bible)

*art thou not it
which **hath dried** the sea
the waters of the great deep*

When referring to the drying up of bodies of water (including seas, brooks, rivers, floods, pools, and fountains), the King James Bible almost always translates the corresponding Hebrew verb for “to dry (up)” with the preposition *up* (25 times). Only once is the word translated without the *up*—namely, here in Isaiah 51:10.

Except for here in 2 Nephi 8:10, the Book of Mormon also consistently uses “to dry up” rather than “to dry”:

2 Nephi 7:2 (see Isaiah 50:2)

behold at my rebuke I **dry up** the sea
I make the rivers a wilderness and their fish to stink
because the waters are **dried up**

2 Nephi 15:13 (Isaiah 5:13)

and their honorable men are famished
and their multitude **dried up** with thirst

Helaman 12:16

and behold also
if he saith unto the waters of the great deep
be thou **dried up**
and it is done

Even though the second example of “to dry up” in 2 Nephi 7:2 is within an Isaiah passage, the actual wording is not an Isaiah quotation since here the King James “*there is no water*” is replaced by “the waters are dried up”.

All of this textual evidence suggests that “hath dried up” is what Oliver Cowdery would have expected in 2 Nephi 8:10, not simply “hath dried” (that is, without the *up*). Thus Oliver initially wrote “dried up the sea” in the original manuscript, then immediately erased the *up*. The final text shows once more the close connection between the Isaiah quotations in the Book of Mormon and the King James text itself.

Summary: Follow Oliver Cowdery’s immediate deletion of the intrusive *up* in 2 Nephi 8:10; his correction makes this clause fully agree with the corresponding King James text (“which hath dried the sea”) but differ from all other occurrences of the phrase “to dry (up)” in the Book of Mormon text.

■ 2 Nephi 8:11

*and everlasting joy and holiness shall be upon their **heads***

□ Isaiah 51:11 (King James Bible)

and everlasting joy *shall be* upon their **head**

Here the Book of Mormon text has the plural *heads*, while the King James Bible has the singular *head*. Since the context is plural (“upon **their** heads”), the use of *heads* in the Book of Mormon could very well be intended. This plural usage also occurs in the Great Isaiah Scroll found at Qumran (1QIsa^a). Of course, *heads* may be an error in the early transmission of the Book of Mormon text; but since the earliest reading clearly works, the critical text will maintain the plural *heads*.

Summary: Maintain in 2 Nephi 8:11 the plural *heads* (the earliest reading) since the context is plural (“upon their heads”).

■ 2 Nephi 8:12

behold who art thou

that thou [shouldst 1AGHKLMPQRST | shouldst BCDEFIJNO] be afraid of man

□ Isaiah 51:12 (King James Bible)

who *art* thou that thou **shouldest** be afraid of a man

As discussed under 1 Nephi 20:5, we will let the earliest textual sources determine whether the inflectional ending for the modal verbs *would* and *should* is *-est* or *-st*. Here in 2 Nephi 8:12, the earliest textual source (the printer’s manuscript) reads *shouldst* rather than *shouldest* (the corresponding King James form of the modal verb).

■ 2 Nephi 8:12

*behold who art thou that thou shouldst be afraid of **man***

[which 01A | who BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] shall die

and of the son of man

[which 01A | who BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] shall be made like unto grass

□ Isaiah 51:12 (King James Bible)

who *art* thou that thou shouldest be afraid of **a man**

that shall die

and of the son of man

which shall be made *as* grass

Here in 2 Nephi 8:12, the Book of Mormon text has simply “afraid of man”, while the King James Bible has “afraid of a man”. Since there is no indefinite article in Hebrew, the use of the *a* in an English translation is a question of interpretation. The use of *man* alone offers a better parallel with

the following “the son of **man**” since it does not read “the son of **a man**” in the King James text. Of course, it is also quite possible that the indefinite article *a* was accidentally skipped during the initial transmission of the Book of Mormon text. But at least it was not dropped when \mathcal{O} was copied into \mathcal{P} since \mathcal{O} is extant here and reads “afraid of man”.

Related to this issue is the repeated occurrence of the relative pronoun *which* in this passage, unlike the King James text which first has *that* in italics (“*that* shall die”) and then *which*, also in italics (“*which* shall be made *as* grass”). Of course, either *which* or *that* is an appropriate translation. But the parallel use of the same relative pronoun *which* in the Book of Mormon text gives further support to the parallelism of *man* and *the son of man* in the same passage. (For further discussion regarding *which* versus *that*, see under WHICH in volume 3.)

Summary: Accept the reading of the original manuscript in 2 Nephi 8:12 (“afraid of man”); the omitted indefinite article *a* parallels the following “of the son of man”; the repetition of the relative pronoun *which* in the Book of Mormon text further increases the parallelism of this passage.

■ 2 Nephi 8:13–14

*because of the fury of the oppressor
as if he were ready to destroy
and where is the fury of the oppressor
[as if > NULL 0 | 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST] the captive exile hasteneth*

□ Isaiah 51:13–14 (King James Bible)

because of the fury of the oppressor
as if he were ready to destroy
and where *is* the fury of the oppressor
the captive exile hasteneth

Here we have an interesting error in the original manuscript that was immediately corrected by Oliver Cowdery. This error shows that the repetition of the preceding phrase “the fury of the oppressor” also triggered the repetition of “as if”. It is possible that this extra repetition was the result of Oliver keeping the first phrase in short-term memory. There are 10 words between the two occurrences of “the fury of the oppressor”, which would have required Oliver to have remembered 15 previous words. Another possibility is that Joseph Smith himself made this error while reading off the translation, especially if what he saw by means of the interpreters or the seer stone were the two occurrences of “the fury of the oppressor” one right above the other. Whatever the source of the error, the repeated “as if” was deleted, so the corrected reading is identical to the corresponding King James text.

Summary: Accept the reading “and where is the fury of the oppressor / the captive exile hasteneth”, which follows the King James text as well as the immediately corrected text in \mathcal{O} .

■ 2 Nephi 8:15

*but I am the Lord thy God
whose waves roared*

□ Isaiah 51:15 (King James Bible)

but I *am* the LORD thy God
that divided the sea
whose waves roared

In his article “Conjectural Emendation and the Text of the Book of Mormon”, in *Brigham Young University Studies* 18 (1978): 563–569, Stan Larson lists this example as a possible case where the current Book of Mormon text may be missing a part of the original text. Larson argues that the reference to the waves of the sea as the Lord’s waves doesn’t make sense. However, the Lord can control nature, so the waves of the sea can be considered his waves.

The original manuscript is extant here, and it clearly reads “God whose waves roared”. There is no sign of any insertion of the omitted phrase “that divided the sea”. In other words, this relative clause is missing from all the textual sources of the Book of Mormon.

It is perhaps worth noting that there are quite a few examples where some phrase or clause found in the Isaiah passages of the King James Bible is missing from the corresponding Book of Mormon text. Here are some of these omissions:

1 Nephi 20:10	but not with silver
1 Nephi 20:16	hear ye this
1 Nephi 21:7	and the Holy One of Israel and he shall choose thee
2 Nephi 6:17	and I will save thy children
2 Nephi 7:10	let him trust in the name of the Lord and stay upon his God
2 Nephi 8:1	ye that seek the Lord
2 Nephi 8:2	and increased him
2 Nephi 8:9	in the generations of old
2 Nephi 15:8	that lay field to field
2 Nephi 17:18	of the rivers
2 Nephi 19:4	as in the day of Midian
2 Nephi 19:15	and honorable
2 Nephi 20:23	the midst of
3 Nephi 22:9	nor rebuke thee

The Book of Mormon text also has numerous examples of additional phrases and clauses that are not found in the King James Bible. Given so many alterations of this nature, it is probably best not to emend any of these passages unless there is specific textual evidence for doing so. All of the omissions listed above may be intentional.

Summary: Unless there is information to the contrary, we accept cases of omitted phraseology in the biblical quotes in the Book of Mormon text; here in 2 Nephi 8:15, all the textual sources are missing the relative clause “that divided the sea” that occurs in Isaiah 51:15.

■ 2 Nephi 8:15–16

*but I am the Lord thy God
whose waves roared
the Lord of Hosts is **my** name
and I have put my words in thy mouth*

□ Isaiah 51:15–16 (King James Bible)

but I *am* the LORD thy God
that divided the sea whose waves roared
the LORD of Hosts *is* **his** name
and I have put my words in thy mouth

In the Book of Mormon text for 2 Nephi 8, verses 15–16 are consistently in the voice of the Lord (and in the first person), while in the King James Bible, a single clause is inexplicably in the third person (“the LORD of Hosts *is* **his** name). The Book of Mormon text smoothes out this wrinkle in the Isaiah text by replacing “his name” with “my name”. In fact, the Book of Mormon reading agrees with the Septuagint (Greek) and Vulgate (Latin) translations of the Hebrew for Isaiah 51:15; they both read “the Lord of Hosts is **my** name”.

It is quite possible that the Book of Mormon text and the Greek and Latin translations actually represent the original biblical text for Isaiah 51:15. The standard Hebrew text may be the result of a single word-final letter difference between *šəmi* ‘my name’ and *šəmo* ‘his name’—namely, a yod at the end of the first and a waw at the end of the second. These two letters are very similar in the standard square Hebrew script but considerably less so in the earlier paleo-Hebrew script.

Another factor that could have led to the *his* in the Hebrew text is that the expected biblical phraseology is “the Lord of Hosts is **his** name”. Except for possibly here in Isaiah 51:15, there are no occurrences in the biblical text of “the Lord of Hosts is **my** name”, but the reading with *his* occurs eight other times in the Hebrew Bible, five times in Jeremiah and three more times in Isaiah (here given in the King James translation):

Isaiah 47:4
as for our redeemer
the LORD of Hosts *is* **his** name
the Holy One of Israel

Isaiah 48:2
for they call themselves of the holy city
and stay themselves upon the God of Israel
the LORD of Hosts *is* **his** name

Isaiah 54:5
for thy Maker *is* thine husband
the LORD of Hosts *is* **his** name
and thy Redeemer the Holy One of Israel
the God of the whole earth shall he be called

The last two instances are also quoted in the Book of Mormon (in 1 Nephi 20:2 and 3 Nephi 22:5) and with the expected reading “his name”. In these other occurrences, the use of *his* is appropriate since it is the prophet who is speaking rather than the Lord. But in Isaiah 51:15, the speaker is the Lord himself, thus the appropriateness but uniqueness of “the Lord of Hosts is my name”.

Summary: Accept the use of *my* instead of *his* in 2 Nephi 8:15 (“the Lord of Hosts is **my** name”); the Lord is the speaker in this passage, so the use of *my* is wholly appropriate; the Hebrew text for Isaiah 51:15 has “his name”, but this reading is probably due to an early scribal error in the Hebrew.

■ 2 Nephi 8:16

and I have put my words in thy mouth
and [hath 01A | have BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] covered thee
in the shadow of mine hand

□ Isaiah 51:16 (King James Bible)

and I have put my words in thy mouth
 and **I have** covered thee in the shadow of mine hand

Here in 2 Nephi 8:16, the subject pronoun *I* is not repeated. In addition, the earliest Book of Mormon text has the verb form *hath* instead of the *have* of the corresponding Isaiah verse in the King James Bible. This nonstandard *hath* was edited to *have* in the 1837 edition.

The decision to use *hath* rather than the King James *have* seems to be related to the decision to delete the repeated subject pronoun *I*. As already noted, the inflectional ending *-(e)th* acts more as an indicator of the biblical style than as an ending restricted to the third person singular present. Even so, the sequence *I hath* seems odd for the Book of Mormon text. There are cases where the first person pronoun *I* takes the verb form *hath*, but only when there is some intervening text (as here in 2 Nephi 8:16). There are, for instance, two examples where the *I* and the *hath* are separated by an appositive:

2 Nephi 26:7
 for I **Nephi** [*hath* 1ABCDEFGHIKPS | *have* FIJLMNOQRT] seen it

2 Nephi 29:5
 for I **the Lord** [*hath* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNPQS | *have* ORT] not forgotten
 my people

These two instances of *hath* were later edited to *have* but only in the LDS text. For other examples of the use of the *-(e)th* ending with the first person singular present, see the discussion under 2 Nephi 4:15. For evidence regarding *-(e)th* as a marker of the biblical style, see INFLECTIONAL ENDINGS in volume 3.

Summary: Maintain the earliest text for 2 Nephi 8:16 (“and hath covered thee”), even though the corresponding *have* of the King James text is grammatically correct; the omission of the repeated subject pronoun *I* is intended since it permits the replacement of *have* with *hath*.

■ 2 Nephi 8:16

*and I have put my words in thy mouth
and hath covered thee in the shadow
of [mine 0ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST | thy > mine 1] hand*

□ Isaiah 51:16 (King James Bible)

and I have put my words in thy mouth
and I have covered thee in the shadow of **mine** hand

We see here the tendency for the scribe, Oliver Cowdery, to mix up the personal pronouns *thy* and *mine*. In copying from \mathcal{O} to \mathcal{P} , Oliver initially wrote “thy hand”, probably under the influence of the preceding *thy* and *thee* in the verse. He caught his error, crossed out the *thy* and supralinearly inserted *mine* (and with no change in the level of ink flow). The original manuscript is extant here and reads in agreement with the King James text. For a similar error later on in this chapter, see the discussion under 2 Nephi 8:22.

Summary: In 2 Nephi 8:16, maintain “mine hand”, the reading of \mathcal{O} ; this reading also agrees with the corresponding Isaiah passage in the King James Bible.

■ 2 Nephi 8:19–20

*these two **sons** are come unto thee
who shall be sorry for thee
thy desolation and destruction
and the famine and the sword
and by whom shall I comfort thee
thy sons have fainted **save these two**
they lie at the head of all the streets*

□ Isaiah 51:19–20 (King James Bible)

these two **things** are come unto thee
who shall be sorry for thee
desolation and destruction
and the famine and the sword
by whom shall I comfort thee
thy sons have fainted
they lie at the head of all the streets

John A. Tvedtnes (pages 87–88, “The Isaiah Variants in the Book of Mormon”, FARMS preliminary report, 1984) suggests that the *sons* in 2 Nephi 8:19 incorrectly replaced the *things* of the King James text under the influence of the several occurrences of the word *sons* in nearby verses:

2 Nephi 8:18

and none to guide her among all the **sons** she hath brought forth
neither that taketh her by the hand of all the **sons** she hath brought up

2 Nephi 8:20

thy **sons** have fainted save these two

Tvedtnes's argument is that "these two" in verse 19 does not refer to two sons but to the conjunct "desolation and destruction" (as well as to the following parallel conjunct, "the famine and the sword", which explains the cause of the desolation and destruction). Tvedtnes also argues that the *thy* before "desolation and destruction" in verse 19 of the Book of Mormon text is in error and should be removed. The resulting emended text, as recommended by Tvedtnes, would then agree with the King James text (and the underlying Hebrew text).

However, the Book of Mormon text for verse 20 has one additional phrase, "save these two", which makes explicit the connection between the *two sons* in verse 19 and the two exceptional sons in verse 20 that have not fainted:

2 Nephi 8:20

thy sons have fainted **save these two**
 they lie at the head of all the streets
 as a wild bull in a net
 they are full of the fury of the Lord
 the rebuke of thy God

Isaiah 51:20 (King James Bible)

thy sons have fainted
 they lie at the head of all the streets
 as a wild bull in a net
 they are full of the fury of the LORD
 the rebuke of thy God

Verse 20 manifests one additional difficulty in the Isaiah text: if the sons have fainted, then how can they be as "a wild bull . . . full of the fury of the Lord"? The Book of Mormon text explicitly deals with this problem by adding the additional phrase "save these two". In fact, it appears that verse 20 in the Book of Mormon variant connects Isaiah's prophecy to John's prophecy in Revelation 11 that describes the two prophets of God who will use incredible powers to hold back the armies of the nations that will surround the temple mount in Jerusalem prior to the second coming of Christ (see especially Revelation 11:5–6, which specifically refers to the powers of these two prophets). The additional phrase "save these two" in 2 Nephi 8:20 shows that the replacement in the preceding verse of the King James *things* with *sons* is fully intended and is not an error. Correspondingly, there is no reason to assume that the extra *thy* in verse 19 is an error.

Summary: Maintain the earliest text for 2 Nephi 8:19–20; the replacement of *things* with *sons* in the Book of Mormon text is intended since the next verse adds "save these two" after "thy sons have fainted"; the use of *thy* before "desolation and destruction" is perfectly acceptable since desolation and destruction (due to the famine and the sword) no longer need to be associated with the phrase "these two *things*" (the King James text).

■ 2 Nephi 8:21

*thou afflicted and drunken
and not with wine*

□ Isaiah 51:21 (King James Bible)

thou afflicted and drunken
but not with wine

Here the Book of Mormon text has *and* instead of the *but* of the King James Bible. As already noted in the discussion regarding *strait* versus *straight* in 1 Nephi 8:20, there has been considerable shifting between *and* and *but* in the Book of Mormon manuscripts as well as editions. So it is possible that here in 2 Nephi 8:21 we have an error, but it is equally possible that the change is intended. In this instance, either conjunction will work. The safest recourse, then, is to follow the earliest textual sources in determining whether the Book of Mormon text should read *and* or *but*. This same procedure will also be followed in the numerous cases where there is either an omitted or an added conjunction in the Book of Mormon text. Unless there is some variation within the history of the Book of Mormon text itself or some difficulty with the reading itself, such cases will not be discussed in this volume. For an example that does involve manuscript variance, see 2 Nephi 15:7.

Summary: Maintain the conjunction *and* in 2 Nephi 8:21, even though the corresponding Isaiah verse has *but*; in general, we assume that the conjunction found in the earliest textual sources for the Book of Mormon is intended unless there is some specific evidence for an error; simply finding a difference with the corresponding King James text is insufficient reason to emend the Book of Mormon text.

■ 2 Nephi 8:22

*thus saith thy Lord
the Lord and thy God pleadeth the cause
of [thy >+ his 1 | his ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] people
behold . . .*

□ Isaiah 51:22 (King James Bible)

thus saith thy Lord
the LORD and thy God *that* pleadeth the cause of **his** people
behold . . .

The printer's manuscript shows an initial copy error that seems to be based on the preceding use of *thy* in "thy Lord" and "thy God". The manuscript correction of the *thy* to *his* is in heavier ink flow, which suggests that the change was not immediate (but it could have been made later while proofing \mathcal{P} against \mathcal{O}). The original manuscript is not extant here, but it probably read *his*. The correction in \mathcal{P} makes the Book of Mormon text agree with the King James text of Isaiah, yet there is no clear evidence that a King James Bible was used by the scribes to proof either of the two Book of Mormon manuscripts.

Errors in selecting the correct possessive pronoun are quite common in the Book of Mormon manuscripts, as can be seen with the examples listed under 2 Nephi 3:12, 14. In a nearby example

here in chapter 8, Oliver Cowdery initially copied *mine* as *thy* in \mathcal{P} but then immediately corrected his error (see 2 Nephi 8:16). For that example, the original manuscript is extant.

Summary: Maintain in 2 Nephi 8:22 the corrected text in \mathcal{P} (“the cause of **his** people”); Oliver Cowdery initially wrote “the cause of **thy** people”, an error apparently deriving from the occurrence of “thy Lord” and “thy God” earlier in the sentence.

■ 2 Nephi 8:23

*but I will put it [unto 1 | into ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] the hand of them
that afflict thee*

□ Isaiah 51:23 (King James Bible)

but I will put it **into** the hand of them that afflict thee

The printer’s manuscript reads *unto* rather than the King James *into*. The 1830 typesetter restored the reading of the King James Bible, which is undoubtedly correct. The original manuscript is not extant here, but it could well have read *into* rather than *unto*. There appears to be no motivation for replacing *into* with *unto* in this verse of Isaiah, so the use of *unto* in \mathcal{P} is probably an error.

Oliver Cowdery frequently mixed up these two words, as is exemplified by numerous cases where he initially wrote *unto* in the manuscripts instead of the correct *into*:

1 Nephi 4:17 (in \mathcal{C})

[*unto* > *into* 0 | *into* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST] my hands

1 Nephi 4:36 (in \mathcal{P})

[*into* 0ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST | *unto* > *into* 1] the wilderness

1 Nephi 5:8 (in \mathcal{P})

[*into* 0ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST | *unto* > *into* 1] the wilderness

1 Nephi 18:8 (in \mathcal{C})

[*unto* > *into* 0 | *into* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST] the sea

2 Nephi 9:16 (in \mathcal{P})

[*unto* > *into* 1 | *into* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST] everlasting fire

Mosiah 17:9 (in \mathcal{P})

[*unto* >+ *into* 1 | *into* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST] your hands

Mosiah 22:12 (in \mathcal{P})

[*unto* > *into* 1 | *into* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST] the wilderness

Alma 46:31 (in \mathcal{C})

[*unto* >% *into* 0 | *into* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST] a covenant

Alma 54:12 (in \mathcal{P})

[*unto* > *into* 1 | *into* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST] your own land

3 Nephi 10:10 (in \mathcal{P})

[*unto* > *into* 1 | *into* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST] joy

(For a summarizing discussion of the mix-up of these two prepositions, see under 1 Nephi 7:2.)
The 1830 emendation of *unto* to *into* in 2 Nephi 8:23 is probably correct.

Summary: Follow in 2 Nephi 8:23 the 1830 compositor’s emendation, which restores the King James reading “**into** the hand of them that afflict thee”.

■ 2 Nephi 8:23

but I will put it into the hand of them that afflict thee
[*which* >js *who* 1 | *which* A | *who* BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
[*I* >js *have* 1 | *I* A | *have* BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *said to thy soul*
bow down that we may go over

□ Isaiah 51:23 (King James Bible)

but I will put it into the hand of them that afflict thee
which have said to thy soul
bow down that we may go over

Contextually, the original reading of the printer’s manuscript (“which **I said** to thy soul”) does not make much sense since quite obviously it is Israel’s afflicters, not the Lord, who said “bow down that we may go over”. Further, for this earliest reading in \mathcal{P} , there is no way to determine how the relative pronoun *which* connects into the following clause; the direct object of the verb *said* is the following direct quote (“bow down that we may go over”). Thus *which* ends up having no antecedent as well as being disconnected from its own relative clause.

The 1830 compositor set this anomalous phraseology, but Joseph Smith, in his editing for the 1837 edition, corrected the *I* to *have*. He may have made this correction by referencing a copy of the King James Bible. He also edited the *which* to *who*, showing that he correctly interpreted the original *which* as referring to people. For further discussion of the editing of *which* to *who*, see WHICH in volume 3.

The original manuscript is not extant for 2 Nephi 8:23. The accidental replacement of *have* with *I* seems quite impossible from a visual point of view, so it is doubtful that the *I* entered the text as Oliver Cowdery copied from \mathcal{C} into \mathcal{P} . A more reasonable possibility is that Oliver misinterpreted this passage as he wrote down Joseph Smith’s dictation in \mathcal{C} . In normal speech, the *h* of the helping verb *have* would have been silent; thus Joseph would have probably dictated “which have said” as /wɪç əv sɛd/. The voiced fricative /v/ could have been articulatorily assimilated and partially devoiced in the context of the following voiceless fricative /s/, thus making it more difficult for Oliver to hear the /v/ as distinct from the following /s/. Further, the schwa vowel /ə/ could have been interpreted as the initial part of the diphthong /ai/, which was frequently pronounced as /əi/ in earlier dialects of English (and is still pronounced this way in some dialects today). In other words, the rapid pronunciation of /wɪç əv sɛd/ could have been misinterpreted as “which I said”. In addition, the earlier dictation of the subject pronoun *I* (in the preceding clause “I will put it into the hand of them”) could have primed Oliver to mishear the /əv/ as *I*.

Summary: Follow Joseph Smith’s restoration of the King James phraseology “which have said” in 2 Nephi 8:23; the earliest textual source (“which I said”) seems to be the result of Oliver Cowdery mishearing “which have said” as he took down Joseph’s dictation.

■ **2 Nephi 8:24**

for henceforth

*there shall no [more 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST | harm J] come into thee
the uncircumcised and [the 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST | J] unclean*

□ **Isaiah 52:1** (King James Bible)

for henceforth there shall no **more** come into thee
the uncircumcised and **the** unclean

The typesetter for the 1888 LDS large-print edition made two typos here as he set the type. When he tried to set “there shall no more come into thee”, he seems to have been distracted by the expression “may no harm come unto us” (common in prayer language), and thus he ended up setting “there shall no harm come into thee”. In addition, he removed the repeated *the* in the following conjunct of nouns, thus producing “the uncircumcised and unclean”. For additional examples of the tendency to drop the repeated *the* in conjuncts, see the discussion under 1 Nephi 17:22 and, more generally, under CONJUNCTIVE REPETITION in volume 3.

The 1888 large-print edition was never used as a copy-text for any subsequent LDS edition; thus these two errors are limited to that edition. The last two verses here in 2 Nephi 8 (verses 24 and 25) are also quoted in 3 Nephi 20:36–37, but there without any significant variation from the King James reading.

Summary: Ignore in 2 Nephi 8:24 the two typos that appear in the 1888 LDS edition (“there shall no **harm** come into thee” and “the uncircumcised and unclean”); the earliest Book of Mormon text for this verse agrees fully with the corresponding King James text (in Isaiah 52:1).

2 Nephi 9

■ 2 Nephi 9:2

*when they shall be gathered home
to the [lands 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST | land κ] of their inheritance
and shall be established in all their lands of promise . . .*

Here the 1892 RLDS edition accidentally replaced the plural “the lands of their inheritance” with the singular “the land of their inheritance”. In addition to the use of the plural in “the lands of their inheritance” here in 2 Nephi 9:2, we also have the plural “all their lands of promise” in the following clause, which further shows that the plural use in “the lands of their inheritance” is no mistake.

Elsewhere the Book of Mormon typically refers to the house of Israel or the Jews as returning to “the lands of their inheritance”:

1 Nephi 22:12

wherefore he will bring them again out of captivity
and they shall be gathered together to the **lands** of their first inheritance

2 Nephi 6:11

nevertheless the Lord will be merciful unto them
that when they shall come to the knowledge of their Redeemer
they shall be gathered together again to the **lands** of their inheritance

2 Nephi 10:7

when the day cometh that they shall believe in me that I am Christ
then have I covenanted with their fathers
that they shall be restored in the flesh upon the earth
unto the **lands** of their inheritance

2 Nephi 10:8

and the nations of the Gentiles shall be great in the eyes of me
saith God
in carrying them forth to the **lands** of their inheritance

2 Nephi 25:11

and notwithstanding that they have been carried away
they shall return again and possess the land of Jerusalem
wherefore they shall be restored again
to the [lands 1APS | land BCDEFGHIJKLMNOQRT] of their inheritance

3 Nephi 29:1

then ye may know that the covenant which the Father hath made
with the children of Israel concerning their restoration
to the [*land* >+ *lands* 1 | *lands* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] of their inheritance
is already beginning to be fulfilled

The last two examples show the tendency in the text to replace the plural *lands* with the singular *land*. In 2 Nephi 25:11, beginning with the 1837 edition, the standard text has read “the land of their inheritance”, probably because of the preceding singular “the land of Jerusalem”. And in 3 Nephi 29:1, scribe 2 of \mathcal{P} initially wrote “the land of their inheritance” but later added the plural *s* supralinearly with somewhat heavier ink flow (the originally written *land* was at the end of the line in \mathcal{P}). The 1830 edition, set from \mathcal{C} for this part of the text, has the correct plural.

There are, of course, legitimate cases with the singular *land* that refer to the return of the house of Israel or the Jews:

1 Nephi 10:3

and after that they are brought back out of captivity
to possess again their **land** of inheritance

3 Nephi 20:33

then will the Father gather them together again
and give unto them Jerusalem for the **land** of their inheritance

3 Nephi 20:46

and then shall Jerusalem be inhabited again with my people
and it shall be the **land** of their inheritance

3 Nephi 21:28

and then shall the work commence with the Father
among all nations in preparing the way
whereby his people may be gathered home to the **land** of their inheritance

Mormon 5:14

that the Father may bring about through his most Beloved
his great and eternal purpose
in the restoring the Jews or all the house of Israel to the **land** of their inheritance
which the Lord their God hath given them unto the fulfilling of his covenant

Unlike the example in 2 Nephi 25:11, the two examples in 3 Nephi 20 require the singular because of the reference to the specific land of Jerusalem.

The phrase “land(s) of one’s inheritance” is also used to refer to the lands of other peoples. For another example of where the plural *lands* was replaced by the singular *land*, see Alma 54:13.

Summary: Retain the plural “the lands of their inheritance” whenever it is supported by the earliest textual sources, as here in 2 Nephi 9:2.

■ 2 Nephi 9:4

*for I know that
[thou hast >js ye have 1 | thou hast A | ye have BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] searched much
many of you
to know of things to come*

Here we have another example where the original text has the singular pronoun *thou* instead of the expected plural *ye* (or *you*). Note that the following appositive “many of you” uses the plural pronoun *you*. The pronoun *thou* is often used in the original text as a marker of the biblical style rather than as a strictly singular pronoun, and the critical text will restore such examples despite their nonstandard character. For earlier examples in the text, see 1 Nephi 3:29 and 1 Nephi 7:8. Also see the discussion under THOU in volume 3.

Summary: Restore the singular “thou hast searched much / many of you”, the reading of the original text in 2 Nephi 9:4.

■ 2 Nephi 9:5

*yea [& 1 | and A | BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] I know
that ye know that in the body he shall shew himself
unto they at Jerusalem from whence we came*

The phrase “yea and” is very frequent in the Book of Mormon text. There are, for instance, quite a few cases of “yea and I” followed by some form of the verb *know*:

1 Nephi 4:11	yea and I also knew
1 Nephi 5:5	yea and I know
1 Nephi 5:8	yea and I also know
The Words of Mormon 1:4	yea and I also know
Alma 29:5	yea and I know
Alma 30:52	yea and I always knew
Alma 38:4	yea and I also knew

Thus there is nothing unusual about the original occurrence of “yea and I know” in 2 Nephi 9:5. The dropping out of the *and* in the 1837 edition appears to be simply a typo and not due to Joseph Smith’s editing.

Summary: Restore the earliest reading “yea and” in 2 Nephi 9:5 (“**yea and I** know that ye know that in the body he shall shew himself unto they at Jerusalem”).

■ 2 Nephi 9:5

*yea and I know that ye know that
in the body he shall shew himself unto they at Jerusalem from whence we came
for it is expedient that **it** should be among them
for it behooveth the great Creator that he suffereth himself
to become subject unto man in the flesh*

One wonders here if the pronoun *it* in the clause “it should be among them” might be a mistake for *he*. This pronoun is both preceded and followed by *it* (“for **it** is expedient . . . for **it** behooveth”), which might have led an original *he* to be replaced by *it* during the early transmission of the text (∅ is not extant here). We note how the passage says that “**he** shall shew himself” and “**he** suffereth himself”, which could imply that the original text read “it is expedient that **he** should be among them”. On the other hand, perhaps the pronoun *it* refers to his appearance in this life—thus “it is expedient that **it** should be among them” (the earliest extant reading).

We have independent evidence that *it* and *he* were sometimes mixed up in the early transmission of the text:

Helaman 13:18

whoso shall hide up treasures in the earth
shall find them again no more
because of the great curse of the land
save [*it* 1 | *he* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] be a righteous man

This passage is in that part of the text where the 1830 compositor set the type from the original manuscript rather than from the printer’s manuscript. We cannot be sure how the original manuscript read here. If it read “save it be”, then the 1830 compositor accidentally replaced *it* with *he*. But if ∅ read “save he be”, then Oliver Cowdery accidentally replaced the *he* with *it* in ∅. In either case, this example shows that mix-ups between *it* and *he* do occur. For discussion of this passage, see Helaman 13:18.

Elsewhere the text has examples referring to both events and individuals as “being among people”. Here are two examples, one for each possibility:

2 Nephi 27:11 (referring to events happening among mankind)

and **all things** shall be revealed unto the children of men
which ever **hath been among** the children of men
and which ever **will be**
even unto the end of the earth

3 Nephi 20:16 (referring to the seed of Lehi being among the Gentiles)

and **ye shall be among them**
as a lion among the beasts of the forest

The critical text will maintain the *it* of the earliest text since it can be interpreted as referring to Christ’s appearance “in the body” to the Jewish people.

Summary: Maintain in 2 Nephi 9:5 the pronoun *it*, the reading of the earliest extant source (the printer’s manuscript); the reference for *it* can be taken as Christ’s physical appearance in this life.

■ 2 Nephi 9:6

*and because [man 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNPQRST | men 0] became fallen
they were cut off from the presence of the Lord*

The 1907 LDS vest-pocket edition has the plural *men* instead of the singular *man*. The use of *man* here means ‘mankind’, which nonetheless has a plural referent as shown by the plural pronoun *they* in the following main clause. There are other examples of the singular *man* taking a plural pronoun. The following example is one that has never been edited:

Alma 42:6
and **man** became lost forever
yea **they** became fallen **man**

Summary: Retain in 2 Nephi 9:6 the singular *man* and its plural pronoun *they*.

■ 2 Nephi 9:7

*and if so
this flesh must have [laid 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQPRT | lain s] down to rot
and to crumble to its mother earth to rise no more*

Strict prescriptivists of English grammar attempt to distinguish between intransitive and transitive forms of the verbs *lie* and *lay*:

intransitive	<i>lie, lay, have lain</i>
transitive	<i>lay, laid, have laid</i>

Probably very few English speakers consistently make this distinction, despite all the attempts of prescriptivists to enforce this purported rule. (Consider, for instance, the universally spoken but supposedly incorrect “Let’s go **lay** out this afternoon”, referring to getting a suntan.) If one wants to follow this artificial distinction, then *laid* should be replaced by *lain* here in 2 Nephi 9:7 (as in fact was done in the 1953 RLDS edition).

There are two examples in the history of the text where the infinitive form *lay* has been edited to *lie*. Joseph Smith was responsible for both these instances of editing:

Omni 1:30
and I am about to [*lay* >js *lie* 1 | *lay* A | *lie* BCDEFGHIJKLMNPQRST] down
in my grave

Alma 24:23
but that they would [*lay* 0A | *lay* >js *lie* 1 | *lie* BCDEFGHIJKLMNPQRST] down
and perish

In these two cases, as with 2 Nephi 9:7, the original text used the verb *lay* intransitively. For all three cases, the critical text will retain the original usage. For further discussion of this issue, see *lay, lie* in Merriam-Webster’s Dictionary of English Usage. Also see LAY as well as PAST PARTICIPLE in volume 3 of the critical text.

Summary: Maintain the normal but supposedly nonstandard *laid* in 2 Nephi 9:7 (“this flesh must have laid down to rot”); similarly, intransitive uses of the verb *lay* will be restored in Omni 1:30 and Alma 24:23.

■ 2 Nephi 9:11–12

*this death of which I have spoken
which is the temporal
shall deliver up its dead
which [death 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST | K] is the grave*

*and this death of which I have spoken
which is the spiritual death
shall deliver up its dead
which spiritual death is hell*

The 1892 RLDS edition accidentally dropped the word *death* in the relative clause at the end of verse 11. The result is not at all felicitous. The 1908 RLDS edition restored the original reading (“which death is the grave”). The original reading parallels the relative clause at the end of the next sentence (“which spiritual death is hell”).

The close parallelism between these two sentences suggests the possibility that there might be errors in this passage. For instance, the first sentence reads “which is the temporal”, which may be an error for “which is the temporal **death**” in light of the parallel relative clause in the second sentence that reads “which is the spiritual **death**”. Or perhaps the relative clause at the end of verse 11 should read “which **temporal** death is the grave”, given that the last relative clause in the second sentence reads “which **spiritual** death is hell”. We could thus complete the parallelism by emending the text to read as follows:

2 Nephi 9:11–12 (with expanded parallelism)
this death of which I have spoken
which is the temporal **death**
shall deliver up its dead
which **temporal** death is the grave
and this death of which I have spoken
which is the spiritual death
shall deliver up its dead
which spiritual death is hell

Nonetheless, the earliest text, despite its cases of ellipsis, is acceptable, while the missing *death* in the 1892 RLDS edition is not. Thus the critical text will here follow the earliest reading. Book of Mormon passages have varying degrees of parallelism. But without specific evidence of an error, there is no need to emend a passage simply because we want to increase its parallelism.

Summary: For 2 Nephi 9:11–12, we accept the earliest attested reading rather than expand the text to increase the parallelism; the omission of the word *death* in the 1892 RLDS edition is clearly a typo.

■ 2 Nephi 9:11–12

*this death of which I have spoken which is the temporal
shall deliver up its dead which death is the grave
and this death of which I have spoken which is the spiritual death
shall deliver up its dead which spiritual death is hell
wherefore death and hell must deliver up [its 1A | their BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] dead
and hell must deliver up its captive spirits
and the grave must deliver up its captive bodies*

For the 1837 edition, the phrase “death and hell” was interpreted as equivalent to the grave and hell, thus distinguishing between the two different deaths (physical death and spiritual death). This interpretation is supported by the immediately following parallelism: “and hell must deliver up its captive spirits and the grave must deliver up its captive bodies”. Since there are two different deaths, the 1837 editor (probably Joseph Smith) decided to change the possessive pronoun *its* to *their* (although the change is not marked in \mathcal{P}). Earlier in this passage, there are two occurrences of “its dead”, but for each of these two other cases, only a single death is being referred to:

2 Nephi 9:11–12

this death of which I have spoken which is the temporal
shall deliver up **its dead** which death is the grave
and this death of which I have spoken which is the spiritual death
shall deliver up **its dead** which spiritual death is hell

But even earlier (in the preceding verse 10), Jacob refers to both the physical and spiritual deaths (“death and hell”) as a single monster:

2 Nephi 9:10

O how great the goodness of our God
who prepareth a way for our escape
from the grasp of **this awful monster**
yea **that monster death and hell**
which I call the death of the body and also the death of the spirit

Thus the subsequent use in verse 12 of the pronoun *its* to refer to “death and hell” is completely acceptable:

2 Nephi 9:12

wherefore **death and hell** must deliver up **its** dead

Combining both verses 10 and 12, we could say that “the monster death and hell must deliver up its dead”. In other words, sometimes Jacob refers to “death and hell” as a unit and sometimes he splits up this unity by referring separately to the two deaths, physical death and spiritual death.

Another way to interpret “death and hell” in 2 Nephi 9:12 is as a distributed plural, which means that the basic meaning of this clause is ‘death and hell must **each** deliver up its dead’. For further examples of the distributed plural in the Book of Mormon, see the discussion for the following verse (2 Nephi 9:13) regarding the clause “and the spirit and the body **is** restored to **itself** again”.

Summary: Restore the singular *its* in 2 Nephi 9:12 since earlier in 2 Nephi 9:10 the text treats the monster “death and hell” as a unit; another possible interpretation is to treat “death and hell” as a distributed plural.

■ 2 Nephi 9:13

*the paradise of God must deliver up the spirits of the righteous
and the grave deliver up the [body 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQPRT | bodies s] of the righteous
and the spirit and the body is restored to itself again*

The original manuscript is not extant here. But the reading *bodies* seems more reasonable than the reading with the singular *body*. Verse 12 consistently uses the plural *bodies* and *spirits*:

2 Nephi 9:12

and hell must deliver up its captive **spirits**
and the grave must deliver up its captive **bodies**
and the **bodies** and the **spirits** of men will be restored one to the other

Similarly, the beginning of verse 13 refers to the plural *spirits* (“the spirits of the righteous”) but then suddenly and inexplicably refers to “the body of the righteous”. The word *righteous* refers to a plurality; thus we expect “the bodies of the righteous” as well as “the spirits of the righteous”. The following clause does use the singular for both *spirit* and *body*, which suggests that “the body of the righteous” was an error introduced by this immediately following conjunct of singular nouns (“the spirit and the body”). The 1953 RLDS edition correctly emended the text here to read *bodies*. We also have the following example in support of this emendation:

Alma 40:20

but behold I give it as my opinion
that the **souls** and the **bodies** are reunited **of the righteous**
at the resurrection of Christ and his ascension into heaven

Even though the verb phrase “are reunited” intervenes, the text here definitely refers to ‘the souls and the bodies of the righteous’, just like in the emended text for 2 Nephi 9:13.

Alison Coutts (personal communication) has brought up a question regarding the syntax of the third clause listed above (“and the spirit and the body is restored to itself again”). Here two singulars, *spirit* and *body*, are conjoined to form a plural subject, yet the verb is in the singular (*is*) and the following reflexive pronoun is also in the singular (*itself*). In this instance, we have what can be called a distributed plural, which basically means that ‘the spirit and the body is **each** restored to itself again’. In modern English we expect something like “the spirit and the body **are** restored to **themselves** again”, yet this clause in 2 Nephi 9:13 has never been edited in this manner at any time in the history of the text. Usage elsewhere in the text shows this same kind of distributed plurality with respect to *spirit* and *body* (as also with respect to *limb* and *joint*):

Alma 11:43

the **spirit** and the **body** shall be reunited again in **its** perfect form
both **limb** and **joint** shall be restored to **its** proper frame

In both of clauses, the modal verb *shall* does not show number, but the use of the singular *its* maintains the individual distinctiveness of each conjunct in the subject. Nor has either of these uses of *its* ever been changed to *their* in the history of the text. The singular usage in 2 Nephi 9:13 (especially the *is*) may seem odd, yet it appears to be fully intended.

Another possible example of distributed plurality is found in the previous verse: “wherefore **death and hell** must deliver up **its** dead” (2 Nephi 9:12). For that example, the *its* was edited to *their*, unlike the examples listed here.

Summary: Follow the 1953 RLDS emendation in 2 Nephi 9:13 so that the plural *bodies* occurs with the plural *spirits* (“the paradise of God must deliver up the **spirits** of the righteous and the grave deliver up the **bodies** of the righteous”); the distributed usage in the following clause should also be maintained (“and the spirit and the body **is** restored to **itself** again”).

■ 2 Nephi 9:14

*wherefore we shall have a perfect knowledge
of [all 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST | HK] our guilt and our uncleanness and our nakedness*

The 1874 RLDS edition accidentally omitted the *all* before the first conjunct, “our guilt”. The 1908 RLDS edition restored the *all* (since it is found in \mathcal{P}). A similar typo in the 1874 edition is found later in the book of Alma:

Alma 20:29
nevertheless they were patient
in [all 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST | HK] their sufferings

There is, of course, nothing inappropriate about the phrase “all our guilt”. Another example of this phrase is found in Alma 11:43 (“and we shall . . . have a bright recollection of **all** our guilt”).

Summary: Maintain the *all* of “all our guilt” in 2 Nephi 9:14.

■ 2 Nephi 9:15

*and it shall come to pass that
when all men shall have passed from this first death unto life
insomuch as they have become immortal
they must appear before the judgment seat of the Holy One of Israel*

One wonders here if perhaps the phrase “insomuch as” is an error for “inasmuch as”. The original manuscript is not extant, and we have independent evidence in the textual history for *inasmuch* being accidentally replaced by *insomuch*:

2 Nephi 1:20 (Oliver Cowdery initially wrote *insomuch* in \mathcal{C})
and he hath said that
[in so much > in as much 0 | inasmuch 1ABCDEFGHIJLMNOQ | Inasmuch HJKPRST] as
ye shall keep my commandments
ye shall prosper in the land

Helaman 11:25 (typo in the 1874 RLDS edition)
 and then they would retreat back into the mountains
 and into the wilderness and secret places
 hiding themselves that they could not be discovered
 receiving daily an addition to their numbers
 [*in as much* 1 | *inasmuch* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST | *insomuch* HK] as
 there were dissenters that went forth unto them

3 Nephi 5:22 (typo in the 1830 edition, here set from \mathcal{O})
 and [*in as much* 1 | *insomuch* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] as
 the children of Lehi hath kept his commandments
 he hath blessed them

(See especially the discussion under 2 Nephi 1:20 and 3 Nephi 5:22.) In all three cases, “inasmuch as” was accidentally replaced by “insomuch as”. There is no evidence for any textual changes in the opposite direction. This difference may be due to the higher frequency of *insomuch*; counting the example from 2 Nephi 9:15, the earliest text has 180 occurrences of *insomuch* but only 32 of *inasmuch*.

We obtain the following syntactic and semantic generalizations when we compare *insomuch* and *inasmuch*:

- (1) *insomuch* is almost always followed by *that* (178 out of 180 times), while *inasmuch* is always followed by *as* (all 32 times);
- (2) excluding 2 Nephi 9:15, *insomuch*-clauses always follow a main clause (179 times), while *inasmuch*-clauses typically precede a main clause (28 out of 32 times);
- (3) *insomuch* always introduces a subordinate resultive clause and has the meaning ‘with the result that’ (all 180 times), while *inasmuch* means ‘on condition that’ or ‘to the degree that’ or ‘since’.

When we consider the case of 2 Nephi 9:15, the construction is unusual in that *insomuch* is immediately followed by *as* rather than the expected *that*. Nonetheless, the earliest text has an example of “insomuch as if”, which must have seemed strange to Joseph Smith since he decided to edit the *as if* to *that* for the 1837 edition:

1 Nephi 17:47
 behold I am full of the Spirit of God
 insomuch [*as if* 0A | *as if* >js *that* 1 | *that* BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
 my frame [*had* 0A | *had* >js *has* 1 | *has* BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] no strength

Nonetheless, the original text did apparently read “insomuch as if”; the earliest text here is not an error for “insomuch that” (see the discussion under 1 Nephi 17:47). The connector *insomuch* can therefore be followed by *that* or *as*, although *that* is clearly preferred.

The passage here in 2 Nephi 9:15 basically states that after being resurrected, all mankind must be returned to God’s presence to be judged. Two passages in Mormon support this necessary connection between becoming immortal and being judged:

Mormon 6:21

and the day soon cometh that your mortal must put on immortality
 and these bodies which are now moldering in corruption
 must soon become incorruptible bodies
 and then ye **must** stand before the judgment seat of Christ
 to be judged according to your works

Mormon 7:6

and he bringeth to pass the resurrection of the dead
 whereby man **must** be raised to stand before his judgment seat

Notice the use of the obligatory modal *must* in these two passages in Mormon, just as in 2 Nephi 9:15 (“they **must** appear before the judgment seat of the Holy One of Israel”).

Summary: Maintain in 2 Nephi 9:15 the phrase “insomuch as”, the reading of the earliest text; the original text in 1 Nephi 17:47 supports the use of that phraseology.

■ 2 Nephi 9:16

and assuredly as the Lord liveth
—for the Lord God hath spoken it
and it is his eternal word which cannot pass away—
that *they which are righteous shall be righteous still*
and they which are filthy shall be filthy still

In this example from 2 Nephi 9:16, the subordinate conjunction *that* follows the parenthetical expression, which in the above citation is set off by dashes (the editions have used commas). One could argue that by using dashes in the printed text, this passage could read without the *that*:

2 Nephi 9:16 (editorially revised)
 and assuredly as the Lord liveth
 —for the Lord God hath spoken it
 and it is his eternal word which cannot pass away—
 they which are righteous shall be righteous still
 and they which are filthy shall be filthy still

But in this complex construction, the original *that*-clause actually stands for the pronoun *it* that is used twice in the preceding parenthetical statement (“for the Lord God hath spoken **it** and **it** is his eternal word which cannot pass away”). In other words, the reader expects the *that* because of the preceding “hath spoken it”. It is true that by setting off the parenthetical statement with dashes, one could then remove the *that*, thus preventing a sentence fragment. But the resulting construction would be more difficult to process. The critical text will, of course, retain the original use of the *that*, just as it has read throughout the history of the text.

Summary: Maintain the occurrence of the *that* after the parenthetical statement in 2 Nephi 9:16; this subordinate conjunction helps the reader interpret the *that*-clause as referring to the preceding pronoun *it*, found twice within that parenthetical statement.

■ 2 Nephi 9:16

and they shall go away [unto > into 1 | into ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] everlasting fire prepared for them

This correction in \mathcal{P} of *unto* to *into* appears to be an immediate one and reflects an apparent restoration of the reading of the original manuscript (which is no longer extant here); the level of ink flow is unchanged.

The use of *into* in the context of the phrase “everlasting fire” is supported in one other place in the text:

Mosiah 26:27

and they shall depart

[*unto* >% *into* 1 | *into* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] everlasting fire prepared for the devil and his angels

In the printer’s manuscript for Mosiah 26:27, the unknown scribe 2 initially wrote *unto*, then erased the *u* and overwrote it with *i*. Erasure is a clear indication of an immediate correction and is strong evidence that the original manuscript read *into* in Mosiah 26:27. This same phraseology is found in Matthew 25:41 (“depart from me ye cursed **into** everlasting fire prepared for the devil and his angels”).

Summary: Retain *into*, the immediately corrected reading of the printer’s manuscript for 2 Nephi 9:16.

■ 2 Nephi 9:16

and their torment is

[NULL >]s as 1 | A | as BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] a lake of fire and brimstone

Here Joseph Smith added *as* to make the text reflect a less literal interpretation for the “lake of fire and brimstone”. This emendation makes the passage parallel to two other passages that use *as* to specifically refer to the metaphorical nature of the lake of fire and brimstone:

Mosiah 3:27 (\mathcal{G} not extant)

and their torment **is as** a lake of fire and brimstone

Alma 12:17 (\mathcal{G} not extant)

then is the time when their torments shall **be as** a lake of fire and brimstone

We do not have the original manuscript for 2 Nephi 9:16, so it is possible that *as* was accidentally dropped in the early transmission of the text. Obviously, the phraseology is virtually the same for all three passages.

In support of this emendation, there are a number of cases where the scribes dropped *as* in the manuscripts. The following examples show the scribe (Oliver Cowdery, except in one case) initially omitting an *as* as he copied from \mathcal{G} into \mathcal{P} :

1 Nephi 8:34

for [*as* 0ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST | NULL > *as* 1] many as heeded them
had fallen away

2 Nephi 30:2

for behold I say unto you
as many of the Gentiles
[NULL >+ *as* 1 | *as* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST] will repent
are the covenant people of the Lord

The Words of Mormon 1:4

yea and I also know that as many things
[NULL > *as* 1 | *as* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST] have been prophesied
concerning us down to this day
has been fulfilled

Alma 17:27

therefore [NULL > *as* 1 | *as* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST]
Ammon and the servants of the king were driving forth
their flocks to this place of water
behold a certain number of the Lamanites . . .

Alma 37:44

for behold it is [NULL > *as* 1 | *as* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST] easy
to give heed to the word of Christ
which will point to you a straight course to eternal bliss
as it was for our fathers to give heed to this compass

3 Nephi 20:24 (scribe 2 of \mathcal{P} accidentally omitted the *as*; Oliver Cowdery corrected \mathcal{P}
when proofing against \mathcal{C})

yea and all the prophets from Samuel and those that follow after
as many [§2 NULL > §1 *as* 1 | *as* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST] have spoken
have testified of me

It should be noted that, like 2 Nephi 9:16, one of the above passages (Alma 37:44) involves omitting an *as* after a form of the verb *be*.

On the other hand, there are several examples in the text that directly equate “the lake of fire and brimstone” with “endless torment”:

2 Nephi 9:19

for he delivereth his saints from that awful monster
the devil and death and hell
and that lake of fire and brimstone
which is endless torment

2 Nephi 9:26

for the atonement satisfieth the demands of his justice
 upon all those who hath not the law given to them
 that they are delivered from that awful monster
 death and hell and the devil
 and the lake of fire and brimstone
 which **is** endless torment

2 Nephi 28:23

yea they are grasped with death and hell and the devil
 and all that have been seized therewith
 must stand before the throne of God
 and be judged according to their works
 from whence they must go into the place prepared for them
 even a lake of fire and brimstone
 which **is** endless torment

Jacob 6:10

and according to the power of justice
 —for justice cannot be denied—
 that ye must go away into that lake of fire and brimstone
 whose flames are unquenchable
 and whose smoke ascendeth up forever and ever
 which lake of fire and brimstone **is** endless torment

David Calabro points out (personal communication) that in each of these examples the simile comes first (“the lake of fire and brimstone is endless torment”):

2 Nephi 9:19	and that lake of fire and brimstone which is endless torment
2 Nephi 9:26	and the lake of fire and brimstone which is endless torment
2 Nephi 28:23	even a lake of fire and brimstone which is endless torment
Jacob 6:10	which lake of fire and brimstone is endless torment

The use of *as* for any of these would seem odd (“the lake of fire and brimstone is **as** endless torment”). On the other hand, in the examples that have *as*, the simile comes second (“their torment is **as** a lake of fire and brimstone”):

2 Nephi 9:16	and their torment is (as) a lake of fire and brimstone
Mosiah 3:27	and their torment is as a lake of fire and brimstone
Alma 12:17	when their torments shall be as a lake of fire and brimstone

The very close parallelism of these three examples strongly argues for Joseph Smith’s emendation in the first one and further suggests that the *as* may have been accidentally omitted in the early transmission of the text.

Nonetheless, there is an important connection between 2 Nephi 9:16 and the four examples which state that “the lake of fire and brimstone **is** endless torment”: all five are found on the small plates. In fact, for four of them, the writer is Jacob (and three of them are in this same chapter, 2 Nephi 9); Nephi is the author of the other one (in 2 Nephi 28:23). And for every one of

these cases, Jacob and Nephi specifically treat “the lake of fire and brimstone” as a real entity. There is no hint that they might think this lake is metaphorical. On the other hand, the two examples that use *as* are found in Mormon’s abridgment of the large plates, with king Benjamin speaking in Mosiah 3:27 and Alma in Alma 12:17. In other words, Jacob himself prefers a literal interpretation for “the lake of fire and brimstone”. Thus the earliest reading in 2 Nephi 9:16 is perfectly acceptable, given Jacob’s language elsewhere. For this reason, the critical text will restore the earliest reading in 2 Nephi 9:16 without the *as*, even though the possibility remains that an original *as* may have been lost during the early transmission of the text.

Summary: Maintain in 2 Nephi 9:16 the earliest text, which lacks the *as* after *is* (“and their torment is a lake of fire and brimstone”); Joseph Smith’s addition of the word *as* parallels the language found in Mormon’s abridgment of the large plates (Mosiah 3:27 and Alma 12:17), but in the small plates Jacob (as well as Nephi) refers to the lake of fire and brimstone as actually existing.

■ 2 Nephi 9:16

and their torment is a lake of fire and brimstone
 whose [*flames* 1ABCDEGHKPS | *flame* FIJLMNOQRT] *ascendeth up forever and ever*
 and [*hath* 1A | *has* BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *no end*

The editors of the 1852 LDS edition realized that (in the biblical language of Early Modern English) verbs ending in *-(e)th* (such as *ascendeth*) should take third person singular subjects, so *flames* was edited to *flame*. But in the original Book of Mormon text, the *-(e)th* ending is frequently used with plural subjects, so that an alternative editorial decision would have been to keep the plural *flames* and change the verb to *ascend* (and also change the following verb to *have*).

In two other instances, the earliest text also had *flames* and once more the associated verb form was *ascendeth*, so the plural *flames* was changed to *flame* in favor of the singular:

Mosiah 2:38
 which is like an unquenchable fire
 whose [*flames* 1ABCDEGHKPS | *flame* FIJLMNOQRT] *ascendeth up*
 forever and ever

Alma 12:17
 then is the time
 when their torments shall be as a lake of fire and brimstone
 whose [*flames* 1ABCDEGHKPS | *flame* FIJLMNOQRT] *ascendeth up*
 forever and ever

Again both of these changes in number were implemented by the editors of the 1852 LDS edition. These two examples could have also been edited to read “flames ascend”. Of course, the critical text will restore the original “flames ascendeth” in all three cases. For further discussion, see INFLECTIONAL ENDINGS in volume 3.

The plural use of *flames* in this context of the “lake of fire and brimstone” is in fact expected, as in the following two examples where the verb is the plural *are*:

Jacob 6:10

ye must go away into that lake of fire and brimstone
whose **flames are** unquenchable

Mosiah 3:27

and their torment is as a lake of fire and brimstone
whose **flames are** unquenchable

Summary: Restore the original “flames ascendeth” in 2 Nephi 9:16, Mosiah 2:38, and Alma 12:17; two other passages use the plural *flames*, not the singular *flame*, to refer to the lake of fire and brimstone (“whose **flames are** unquenchable”, in Jacob 6:10 and Mosiah 3:27).

■ 2 Nephi 9:19

*for he delivereth his saints from that awful monster
the devil and death and hell
and [that 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMOPQRST | the N] lake of fire and brimstone*

The 1906 LDS large-print edition accidentally changed the determiner *that* to *the*, but this error was restricted to this single edition. The use of *that* to refer to the “lake of fire and brimstone” is perfectly acceptable since it was just referred to in verse 16 (“their torment is a lake of fire and brimstone”). Similarly, the *that* of “that awful monster” (also here in verse 19) is appropriate since earlier (in verse 10) death and hell was referred to as an awful monster.

Summary: Maintain in 2 Nephi 9:19 the use of the determiner *that* (“that lake of fire and brimstone”).

■ 2 Nephi 9:20

*and there is not any thing
save he [know >js knows 1 | know A | knows BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] it*

The original text here uses the subjunctive form *know* rather than the indicative *knows* (or *knoweth*). In his editing for the 1837 edition, Joseph Smith added the *s* to *know*.

Elsewhere the text has examples of both the subjunctive and the indicative in subordinate clauses headed by *save*. There is one clear example with the pronoun *he* that takes a subjunctive form of the verb *be*:

3 Nephi 8:1

and there was not any man
which could do a miracle in the name of Jesus
save he **were** cleansed every whit from his iniquity

It is possible, of course, that in writing down the text for 2 Nephi 9:20, Oliver Cowdery accidentally dropped the *s* for *knows*. We see an example of this kind of error later on in the small plates:

Omni 1:25

for there is nothing which is good
save it [*come > comes 1 | comes* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] from the Lord

The original manuscript is not extant here, but most probably it read “save it comes”. In the printer’s manuscript, Oliver Cowdery corrected his initial *come* to *comes* by immediately inserting the *s* after writing *come* (there is no change in the level of ink flow).

Nonetheless, there are a few examples with subjunctive forms for verbs other than *be*, although for the following instances the subordinate conjunction here is *if* rather than *save*:

Mosiah 26:29	and if he confess his sins before thee and me
Helaman 12:14	yea if he say unto the earth thou shalt go back
Helaman 13:26	if a prophet come among you

Thus the subjunctive form *know* in 2 Nephi 9:16 appears to be possible, which means that the critical text will restore *know* to the text even though it may be an error. For additional discussion and examples, see MOOD in volume 3.

Summary: Restore the original subjunctive form *know* in 2 Nephi 9:20 (“and there is not any thing save he know it”).

■ 2 Nephi 9:22

*and he suffereth this that the resurrection might pass upon all men
that all might stand before him at the great **and** judgment day*

The question here is whether there should be an *and* separating *great* and *judgment*. All the existing textual sources for 2 Nephi 9:22 have the *and*, although the original manuscript is not extant here. There are many examples in the text of *great* conjoined with an adjective, with both conjuncts modifying *day*. And in all these examples, *day* refers to a day of judgment (including a day of physical destruction):

great and last day	2 Nephi 2:26 2 Nephi 33:12 The Words of Mormon 1:11 Helaman 12:25 3 Nephi 26:4 Mormon 9:6
great and dreadful day	Alma 45:14 3 Nephi 25:5 (quoting Malachi 4:5)
great and terrible day	3 Nephi 8:24 3 Nephi 8:25
great and coming day	3 Nephi 28:31

Consider, in particular, the example “great and last day”. Here *last day* acts more as a unit, much like a compound noun, than as an adjective and a noun. In a similar way, the noun *judgment* modifies *day*, with the result that *judgment day* (like *last day*) acts as a unit. For this reason, the phrase “great and judgment day” parallels “great and last day” and should be retained.

There is another example of this type of conjunctive usage in the original text:

Helaman 9:10

and it came to pass that on the morrow
the people did assemble themselves together
to mourn and to fast at the burial
of the great [& 1 | *and* A | BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] chief judge
which had been slain

The 1837 edition deleted the conjunction *and* in Helaman 9:10, yet even here the original text is like “great and judgment day” and “great and last day”. The adjective *chief* can occur only in attributive position (as in *chief judge*), not as a subject complement for *judge* (thus the impossible “the judge was chief”). Thus *chief judge* acts as a compound noun, just like *judgment day* and *last day*. For that reason, the original text in Helaman 9:10 is undoubtedly correct, even though it may seem strange to modern readers. (For further discussion, see Helaman 9:10.)

Summary: Maintain in 2 Nephi 9:22 the *and* in “the great and judgment day”; the usage parallels that of “the/that great and last day” (found six times in the text) as well as “the great and chief judge” (the original text in Helaman 9:10); in all of these cases, *great* is conjoined with a compound noun that acts as a unit (*judgment day*, *last day*, or *chief judge*).

■ 2 Nephi 9:28

wherefore their wisdom is foolishness and it profiteth them not
[*wherefore* >js *and* 1 | *Wherefore* A | *And* BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *they shall perish*

Joseph Smith replaced the second *wherefore* with *and*, perhaps because the second *wherefore* came too closely after the first one. We have already seen examples of Joseph deleting repeated *wherefore*'s within a single sentence. For examples involving subordinate clauses, see 1 Nephi 11:1 and 1 Nephi 13:34. But here in 2 Nephi 9:28, both occurrences of *wherefore* are found within separate sentences. This type of editing is virtually nonexistent elsewhere in the text. The original and current texts both retain numerous examples of closely occurring sequences of *wherefore* in separate sentences, such as the following examples in 2 Nephi:

2 Nephi 2:11

wherefore all things must needs be a compound in one
wherefore if it should be one body it must needs remain as dead

2 Nephi 2:12

wherefore it must needs have been created for a thing of naught
wherefore there would have been no purpose in the end of its creation
wherefore this thing must needs destroy the wisdom of God

2 Nephi 32:3

wherefore they speak the words of Christ
wherefore I said unto you: feast upon the words of Christ

These examples all have a single independent clause between each pair of *wherefore*'s, while here in 2 Nephi 9:28 there are two conjoined independent clauses between the pair of *wherefore*'s ("their wisdom is foolishness **and** it profiteth them not"). So in these three other passages, the *wherefore*'s are syntactically closer than in the one passage Joseph Smith decided to edit. The change here in 2 Nephi 9:28 seems to be idiosyncratic. The critical text will, of course, restore the original *wherefore* that was edited to *and*.

Summary: Restore the original repeated use of *wherefore* in 2 Nephi 9:28.

■ 2 Nephi 9:28–29

*when they are learned they think they are wise
and they hearken not*

*unto the [councils >% council 1 | counsel ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] of God
for they set it aside . . .*

but to be learned is good if it so be that

they hearken unto the [councils 1 | counsels ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] of God

We do not have the original manuscript for these two verses, but the printer's manuscript shows that for the first example Oliver Cowdery initially copied the text as *councils* (a typical misspelling of his for *counsels*); Oliver immediately caught his error in the number and erased the final *s*, giving the singular. The occurrence of the pronoun *it* in the next clause further supports the use of the singular ("for they set **it** aside"). If the original manuscript read as *council* (that is, *counsel*), then one could interpret this correction in \mathcal{P} as showing a tendency on Oliver's part to write the plural rather than the singular. In the next verse, Oliver writes *councils* once more (that is, *counsels*), but this time there is no correction in the number. The parallel use of the same basic expression—"they hearken (not) unto the counsel(s) of God"—could be used to argue that both cases of *counsel(s)* should be in the singular. The tendency for Oliver to incorrectly write the plural in the first case supports the possibility of error in the second case.

On the other hand, one could interpret the change in verse 28 of the plural *councils* to the singular *council* as a case of editing—namely, Oliver noticed the following *it* and before the ink was fully dry, he erased the *s* from off the end of *councils*. If so, one could argue that the text in verse 28 actually intended to have the plural *councils* (or *counsels* in standard orthography), even though the plural was contradicted by the following *it*. Under this interpretation, the plural *councils* in verse 29 (standing for *counsels*) would be perfectly acceptable. Obviously, no easy solution is apparent.

Elsewhere in the text there are references to God's *counsels* (that is, in the plural):

¹ Nephi 19:7 (\mathcal{C} extant)

they do set him at naught
and hearken not to the voice of his **counsels**

Helaman 12:5 (\mathcal{C} not extant)

and how slow are they to remember the Lord their God
and to give ear unto his **counsels**

Helaman 12:6 (☞ not extant)

notwithstanding his great goodness and his mercy towards them
they do set at naught his **counsels**

But there is also one reference to God's *counsel* (that is, in the singular):

2 Nephi 28:30 (☞ not extant)

for behold thus saith the Lord God
I will give unto the children of men line upon line
and precept upon precept
here a little and there a little
and blessed are they that hearken unto my precepts
and lend an ear unto my **counsel**

Note in particular that both Helaman 12:5 and 2 Nephi 28:30 refer to giving or lending an ear to God's counsel(s). It appears that either singular or plural is possible.

We should also note that the Doctrine and Covenants has three examples of the plural "counsels of God", all in a single revelation that was given during the time Joseph Smith was translating the Book of Mormon:

D&C 3:4	if he . . . sets at naught the counsels of God
D&C 3:7	although men set at naught the counsels of God
D&C 3:12–13	a wicked man who has set at naught the counsels of God

This revelation dates from July 1828, after Joseph Smith had finished dictating the first 116 pages of the original manuscript. The language of the Lord's early revelations to Joseph during the time of the Book of Mormon translation shows that the plural *counsels* is perfectly acceptable.

This competition between *counsel* and *counsels* is also found when the text refers to the counsel(s) of individuals. The following two passages in 2 Nephi 27–28 have the same basic phraseology except that one is in the singular and the other in the plural:

2 Nephi 27:27

and woe unto them
that seek deep to hide their **counsel** from the Lord
and their works are in the dark

2 Nephi 28:9

yea and there shall be many
which . . . shall seek deep to hide their **counsels** from the Lord
and their works shall be in the dark

Once more, parallelism suggests the possibility of error, but it is difficult to tell whether the singular *counsel* in 2 Nephi 27:27 should be edited to *counsels* or the plural *counsels* in 2 Nephi 28:9 should be edited to *counsel*. We have the same problem in 2 Nephi 9:28–29. The easiest solution is to accept the earliest textual sources and allow variation between singular and plural. And usage elsewhere shows that we can have either *counsel* or *counsels*.

Summary: Following the variant usage throughout the text, we use the earliest textual sources to determine whether we have *counsel* or *counsels*; this results in singular/plural variation for *counsel(s)* in 2 Nephi 9:28–29 and similarly for 2 Nephi 27:27 and 2 Nephi 28:9.

■ 2 Nephi 9:29

but to be learned is good

if [*it so be that* >js NULL 1 | *it so be that* A | BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]

they hearken unto the counsels of God

In his editing for the 1837 edition, Joseph Smith reduced the conditional clause “if it so be that” to simply *if*. Such stylistic editing was obviously not necessary. The original text had 39 occurrences of this longer phrase, of which two instances have been deleted because of redundancy (see the discussion under 1 Nephi 14:1–2). None of the other examples of “if it so be that” have been deleted from the text, including the following instances that are similar in construction to 2 Nephi 9:29:

1 Nephi 10:18

and the way is prepared for all men from the foundation of the world
if it so be that they repent and come unto him

1 Nephi 14:6

therefore woe be unto the Gentiles
if it so be that they harden their hearts against the Lamb of God

1 Nephi 17:13

and I will prepare the way before you
if it so be that ye shall keep my commandments

1 Nephi 22:28

but behold all nations kindreds tongues and people
shall dwell safely in the Holy One of Israel
if it so be that they will repent

Mosiah 13:9

and then it matters not whither I go
if it so be that I am saved

The critical text will therefore restore the full *if*-clause in 2 Nephi 9:29.

Summary: Restore the full clausal phrase “if it so be that” in 2 Nephi 9:29; the reduction of this clause for the 1837 edition to simply *if* appears to be based on stylistic considerations.

■ 2 Nephi 9:30

*for because that they are rich they despise the poor
and they persecute the meek and their hearts are upon their treasures
wherefore their treasure is their [God 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPS | god T]*

Throughout the history of the text, the printed editions of the Book of Mormon have varied regarding the question of whether *god* should be capitalized when referring to a god other than the true God:

Helaman 9:41 (how some people viewed Nephi)

behold he is a [God 1IJKLMNOQ | god ABCDEFGHKPRST]
for except he was a [God 1IJKLMNOQ | god ABCDEFGHKPRST]
he could not know of all things

3 Nephi 3:2 (how Giddianhi, the governor of the band of robbers, viewed God)

yea ye do stand well as if ye were supported
by the hand of a [God 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPS | god RT]
in the defense of your liberty

Mormon 9:10 (how some people view God)

and now if ye have imagined up unto yourselves
a [God 1L | god ABCDEFGHIJKMNOPQRST] which doth vary
and in him there is a shadow of changing
then have ye imagined up unto yourselves
a [God 1L | god ABCDEFGHIJKMNOPQRST] which is not
a [God 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOQRT | god PS] of miracles

In each instance, the critical text will follow the standard practice of not capitalizing *god* when it refers to a false god. Nonetheless, some of these examples are rather complex, and therefore each one will be considered on its own grounds. Here in 2 Nephi 9:30, the word *god* refers to treasure, not to the true God; thus the decision of the editors of the 1981 LDS edition to remove the capitalization is appropriate.

Summary: Maintain in 2 Nephi 9:30 the lowercase *god* of the 1981 LDS edition; the god referred to here is treasure rather than the true God.

■ 2 Nephi 9:40

*I know that the words of truth are hard against all uncleanness
but the righteous fear [it >js them 1 | it A | them BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPS | not
for they love the truth and are not shaken*

Joseph Smith changed the pronoun *it* to *them* for the 1837 edition, probably because he interpreted the antecedent of *it* as the plural noun phrase “the words of truth”. Nonetheless, the singular pronoun is correct since the actual antecedent of *it* is the singular noun phrase “the truth” rather than “the words of truth”. The following clause confirms this interpretation: “for they love **the truth** and are not shaken”.

A similar example of the antecedent for a singular pronoun being the noun in a postmodifying prepositional phrase is found in the three-witness statement (although technically speaking, the witness statements are not a part of the Book of Mormon text proper):

three-witness statement
 which is a record of the people of Nephi
 and also of the Lamanites [*his* 1A | *their* BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] brethren

In this case, the original antecedent for *his* was *Nephi*, not “the people of Nephi”. Joseph Smith was probably responsible for the 1837 change of the possessive pronoun *his* to *their* in the three-witness statement, just as he was in 2 Nephi 9:40 for the change of *it* to *them*.

Summary: Restore the original singular pronoun *it* in 2 Nephi 9:40 since its apparent antecedent is the singular noun phrase “the truth”.

■ 2 Nephi 9:41

*O then my beloved brethren
 come unto the Lord the Holy One [of Israel > NULL 1 | ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]*

Usually the phrase “the Holy One” is followed by “of Israel” (40 times in the Book of Mormon), especially in the small plates. Here in \mathcal{P} , Oliver Cowdery initially wrote “the Holy One of Israel”, then immediately crossed out “of Israel”. The original manuscript is not extant here but probably read without the additional prepositional phrase.

The extended phraseology “the Holy One of Israel” is linked to Isaiah, which is quoted extensively in the small plates. There is only one occurrence of the longer phraseology elsewhere in the Book of Mormon text (namely, in 3 Nephi 22:5)—and that one instance is a quote from Isaiah 54:5. Besides this case of the shorter “the Holy One” in 2 Nephi 9:41, there is one other occurrence in the small plates:

2 Nephi 2:10
 wherefore the ends of the law which **the Holy One** hath given
 unto the inflicting of the punishment which is affixed . . .

All other examples of the “the Holy One” are found outside the small plates:

Alma 5:52	the Holy One hath spoken it
Alma 5:53	can ye . . . trample the Holy One under your feet
Helaman 12:2	they . . . do trample under their feet the Holy One
Mormon 9:14	then cometh the judgment of the Holy One upon them

Thus “the Holy One of Israel” dominates the small plates, and “the Holy One” dominates the rest of the text. Nonetheless, either phraseology is possible in both parts of the text. For each occurrence, therefore, we follow the reading of the earliest textual sources. Here in 2 Nephi 9:41, Oliver Cowdery’s initial error resulted from his expectation of the longer phraseology; if \mathcal{O} had read

“the Holy One of Israel”, there would have been no motivation for Oliver to have deleted from \mathcal{P} the additional “of Israel”.

Summary: Maintain in 2 Nephi 9:41 the corrected text of \mathcal{P} , “the Holy One”—that is, without the “of Israel” that Oliver Cowdery initially added when he copied the text from \mathcal{C} into \mathcal{P} .

■ 2 Nephi 9:41

remember that his paths are [righteousness 1APS | righteous BCDEFGHIJKLMNOQRT]

The 1837 edition introduced the reading *righteous*. This may reflect editing by Joseph Smith or perhaps an error on the part of the 1837 typesetter. Speakers of English expect “his paths are righteous”, and that may be the reason the text was changed, whether intentionally or accidentally, here in 2 Nephi 9:41. The 1908 RLDS edition restored the reading of the printer’s manuscript (“his paths are righteousness”).

The King James Bible refers to both “the paths of righteousness” (Psalm 23:3) and “the paths of the righteous” (Proverbs 2:20). If we expand our search to include *way(s)* as well as *path(s)*, we find that the Book of Mormon has similar examples with both *righteousness* and *righteous*:

□ *righteousness*

1 Nephi 16:5	the paths of righteousness
Mosiah 29:23	the ways of all righteousness
Alma 5:37	the ways of righteousness
Alma 7:4	the way of his righteousness
Alma 7:19	the paths of righteousness
Helaman 6:31	the way of righteousness

□ *righteous*

Alma 10:18	the ways of the righteous
------------	---------------------------

But in all of these examples, the word *righteousness* or *righteous* is found in a prepositional phrase headed by *of*. In 2 Nephi 9:41, the word *righteousness* (or *righteous*) is a subject complement: “his paths are righteous(ness)”. Although there are no other examples that use *path(s)* in this manner, there is one with *way(s)*:

2 Nephi 1:19	for his ways are righteousness forever
--------------	--

This example clearly shows that the original usage in 2 Nephi 9:41 (“his paths are righteousness”) is fully acceptable.

Summary: Maintain *righteousness*, the reading of the earliest text in 2 Nephi 9:41 (“his paths are righteousness”); the expression “his ways are righteousness” in 2 Nephi 1:19 supports *righteousness* as the correct reading in 2 Nephi 9:41.

■ 2 Nephi 9:41

behold the way for man is narrow

but it lieth in a [strait 1 | straight ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] course before him

This example provides further support for the analysis of *strait/straight* described under 1 Nephi 8:20. There it was argued that for most cases referring to paths, ways, and courses, the correct word is *straight* and not *strait*, with the result that the phrase “straight and narrow course” is not a redundancy. This example from 2 Nephi 9:41 provides clear support for this interpretation since the sentence would not make sense if *strait* ‘narrow’ were used, for then the conjunction *but* would seem completely inappropriate (“the way for man is narrow **but** it lieth in a narrow course before him”). All printed editions have maintained the correct spelling *straight* here in 2 Nephi 9:41. For a complete discussion, see 1 Nephi 8:20 or STRAIT in volume 3.

Summary: Maintain the spelling *straight* in 2 Nephi 9:41 since the conjunction *but* requires *straight* ‘not crooked’ rather than *strait* ‘narrow’.

■ 2 Nephi 9:45

come unto that God

[who 1BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST | which A] is the rock of your salvation

The normal tendency in the editing of the text has been to replace *which* with *who* whenever the referent for *which* is a person. In this instance, the earliest extant text (here the printer’s manuscript) reads *who*, but the 1830 compositor accidentally set *which*, perhaps because he had become used to setting *which* for persons (in accord with the biblical style). The 1837 edition restored the *who* here, either by reference to \mathcal{P} or in accord with Joseph Smith’s typical replacement of *which* with *who* for that edition (providing the *which* referred to a person).

There are clear examples of the relative pronoun *who* in the original text, even though *which* dominates. As an example of this variation, consider the following example from this same chapter:

2 Nephi 9:26

and they are restored to that God

who gave them breath

which is the Holy One of Israel

Consequently, we let the earliest textual sources determine in each instance whether the relative pronoun should be *who* or *which*. Here in 2 Nephi 9:45, the earliest extant reading is *who*. For further discussion, see under WHICH in volume 3.

Summary: Maintain the relative pronoun *who* in 2 Nephi 9:45 since the earliest textual source (the printer’s manuscript) reads this way.

■ 2 Nephi 9:46

*holy holy are thy judgments O Lord God Almighty
but I know my guilt
I transgressed thy law and my transgressions are mine
and the devil [hath 1AIIJLMNOPQRST | had BCDEFGHK] obtained me
that I am a prey to his awful misery*

The 1837 edition accidentally replaced the present-tense *hath* with the past-tense *had*, perhaps because of the influence of the preceding past-tense *transgressed*. The words here represent the sinful soul at the day of judgment. These words are therefore in the present-tense except for the reference to transgressions during one’s life. The present-tense *hath* agrees with the present-tense *am* found in the following subordinate clause (“that I **am** a prey to his awful misery”) as well as with the preceding present-tense *are* (“and my transgressions **are** mine”). The 1879 LDS edition restored the original *hath* (perhaps by reference to the 1830 edition); the 1908 RLDS edition most probably used the printer’s manuscript to restore the *hath*.

Summary: Maintain the original present-tense *hath* in 2 Nephi 9:46; this passage refers to the words that the guilty soul will say on the day of judgment, so the past-tense *had* is inappropriate.

■ 2 Nephi 9:50

*come ye to the waters
and he that hath no money come buy and eat
[ye > yea 1 | yea ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] come buy wine and milk
without money and without price*

□ Isaiah 55:1 (King James Bible)

come ye to the waters
and he that hath no money come **ye** buy and eat
yea come buy wine and milk
without money and without price

Here in 2 Nephi 9:50 there is one difference between the Book of Mormon text and the corresponding Isaiah passage: the *ye* that occurs after the second *come* in the King James text is missing from the Book of Mormon text. It is possible that this *ye* did occur in the original manuscript, but unfortunately \mathcal{O} is no longer extant here. In fact, when Oliver Cowdery copied from \mathcal{O} into \mathcal{P} , the following *yea* was initially spelled as *ye* (but was then immediately corrected to *yea*). One could view this temporary error as the result of Oliver having just read *ye* (“come ye buy and eat”), which pronoun he had nonetheless accidentally omitted in his copying. (However, this same scribal initial error of *ye* for *yea* was made in 3 Nephi 1:3 when Oliver copied *yea* into \mathcal{P} , yet for that passage there was no nearby *ye* to prompt such an error.)

No separate word for the subject pronoun *ye* occurs in the Hebrew original, so the addition of the two *ye*’s in the King James Bible is due to the Early Modern English translators. The Hebrew verb ending provides the evidence that the imperative is second person plural, so the *ye*’s

are not set in italics in the King James Bible. Nonetheless, the imperative in English does not need to state the implied subject *you* (or *ye* in Early Modern English). In fact, for the third case of *come*, the King James translators did not supply the *ye*. Thus one could view the lack of *ye* after the second *come* in the Book of Mormon text as increasing the parallelism with the immediately following (third) *come*, which heads a clause beginning with “come buy”, just like the second *come*: “**come buy** and eat / yea **come buy** wine and milk”. Note, in particular, that the repeated “come buy” is connected to the preceding “come buy” by the connector *yea*, which suggests that we should expect some parallelism in the text. Consequently, both instances of “come buy” can lack the overt subject pronoun *ye*.

Since it is difficult to choose between these two possible explanations for why the second *ye* is missing in 2 Nephi 9:50, it is probably best to assume that there is no error in the Book of Mormon text.

Summary: Maintain the current (and earliest) text for 2 Nephi 9:50, which identically quotes Isaiah 55:1 except for a single missing *ye*; omitting the *ye* increases the parallelism at the end of the verse.

■ 2 Nephi 9:51

hearken diligently unto me

[& 1 | *and* ABDEFIJLMNOPQRST | CGHK] *remember the words which I have spoken*

Although this change was introduced into the 1840 edition, it is probably a typo and not due to Joseph Smith’s editing for that edition. There is no good grammatical reason to delete the *and* here, nor did Joseph do this kind of editing for the 1840 edition (or for the 1837 edition). The 1908 RLDS edition restored the *and*, undoubtedly by reference to the printer’s manuscript. The LDS text, which derives from the 1837 edition through the 1841 British edition, has always maintained the *and*.

Summary: Maintain the conjunction *and* in 2 Nephi 9:51, the original (and current) reading of the text.

2 Nephi 10

■ 2 Nephi 10:3

it must needs be expedient that Christ

—for in the last night the angel spake unto me that this should be his name—

[that he >jg NULL 1| ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] should come among the Jews

When Oliver Cowdery copied this passage into the printer’s manuscript, he originally wrote “that he” after the complex parenthetical clause. Later, these two words were crossed out. The quill used for the crossout was considerably broader than the original quill that Oliver used to write the text; the ink appears to be darker, and the flow of ink was so heavy that the crossout ended up being badly smeared. It is difficult to determine who made the crossout, but it is clear that it is secondary.

The grammatical motivation for deleting the “that he” is very strong. Before the parenthetical clause, the text reads “it must needs be expedient **that Christ**”, so the use of “that he” after the parenthetical clause is redundant. Yet “that he” serves the useful purpose of bringing the reader back to the original subject. The edited text is grammatically correct, but it is excessively complex and forces the reader to virtually reread the entire sentence to recover the subject. The earlier text thus permits an easier flowing text and definitely represents the original text.

The 1830 typesetter is probably responsible for omitting the redundant “that he” in the 1830 edition; and he may have been the one who actually crossed it out in the printer’s manuscript. The ink for this crossout is like the ink used in adding *thus* in the next line (see the discussion below for that variant). Multispectral imaging of the supralinearly inserted *thus* suggests that it was not Joseph Smith (in his editing for the 1837 edition) who was responsible for inserting the *thus*. From this we can deduce that Joseph did not cross out the “that he” either.

Interestingly, we have conclusive evidence that the 1830 typesetter later removed a similar redundancy after another parenthetical clause:

Ether 9:8

and now the brother of him that suffered death

—and his name was Nimrah—

[& he 0|& he >jg NULL 1| ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] was angry

with his father

For Ether 9:8, the original manuscript is extant and agrees with what Oliver Cowdery originally copied into \mathcal{D} (that is, both \mathcal{C} and \mathcal{D} read “and he”). Just as in 2 Nephi 10:3, the redundant subject *he* and its preceding conjunction (*and* here in Ether 9:8) are crossed out. For Ether 9:8, we can be

sure that it was the 1830 typesetter who crossed out the “and he” in \mathcal{P} : the crossout is in pencil and matches the other pencil marks that he made on this page of the printer’s manuscript.

Summary: Despite its redundancy, restore the earliest reading in 2 Nephi 10:3 (“**that he** should come among the Jews”); the deletion of the “that he” is most probably the result of the 1830 typesetter attempting to eliminate the redundancy of the text.

■ 2 Nephi 10:3

and they shall crucify him

[1 | : ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQS | - RT]

for [NULL > jg thus 1 | thus ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *it behooveth our God*

[1 | ; ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQS | , RT]

and there is none other nation on earth that would crucify their God

In the printer’s manuscript, the word *thus* is supralinearly inserted with heavier and darker ink flow. The quill is considerably duller than the one Oliver Cowdery used to write the text here in \mathcal{P} . Based on multispectral imaging of the added *thus*, the ink for this correction appears to be different than the ink Joseph Smith used to edit this page of \mathcal{P} for the 1837 edition. There are two nearby corrections on this page of \mathcal{P} that were made by this unknown hand (it may be the 1830 compositor)—namely, the crossout in the previous line of “that he” (see the discussion above) and an attempt to correct the spelling *Priests crafts* three lines below (where the corrector ended up accidentally deleting the *s* in *Priests* that came before the *t* rather than after). These three corrections are found in lines 15, 16, and 19 on page 66 of \mathcal{P} .

Like the deletion of “that he” earlier in this verse, the insertion of the *thus* appears to be due to editing. Originally, the clause “for it behooveth our God” is parenthetical and states that God considered it necessary that the Savior be crucified. The *thus* implies that somehow the crucifixion itself caused God to consider it necessary. Usage elsewhere involving *behooveth* shows that the *thus* is not required. Earlier in this two-part discourse, Jacob explains why the crucifixion was necessary:

2 Nephi 9:5

yea and I know that ye know that
in the body he shall shew himself unto they at Jerusalem from whence we came
for it is expedient that it should be among them
for it behooveth the great Creator that he suffereth himself
to become subject unto man in the flesh and die for all men
that all men might become subject unto him

In 2 Nephi 10:3, Jacob reminds his listeners that the Lord himself requires the crucifixion. Even though the Jews in Jerusalem will crucify the Savior, the atonement is necessary and ordained by God himself. The insertion of the *thus* in 2 Nephi 10:3 is totally gratuitous and unnecessary.

One possible reason for adding the *thus* is that the reader expects the phrase “it behooveth X” to be followed by a *that*-clause. But here in 2 Nephi 10:3, there is no following *that*-clause, and so it appears that the clause “for it behooveth our God” is stranded. And indeed it is: the clause is parenthetical.

Elsewhere there are two other examples in the text of “it behooveth”:

Helaman 14:15

for behold he surely must die that salvation may come
yea it behooveth him and cometh expedient
that he dieth to bring to pass the resurrection of the dead
that thereby men may be brought into the presence of the Lord

3 Nephi 21:5–6

therefore when these works
and the work which shall be wrought among you hereafter
shall come forth from the Gentiles unto your seed
which shall dwindle in unbelief because of iniquity
for thus it behooveth the Father that it should come forth from the Gentiles
that he may shew forth his power unto the Gentiles

In both these examples, there is a logical connection with the previous clause, thus the connectors *yea* and *for thus*.

There are two examples of the verb *behoove* in the King James Bible, and both also refer to the atonement:

Luke 24:45–46

then opened he their understanding
that they might understand the scriptures
and said unto them
thus it is written
and thus it behooved Christ
to suffer and to rise from the dead the third day

Hebrews 2:16–17

for verily he took not on *him the nature of angels*
but he took on *him* the seed of Abraham
wherefore in all things **it behooved him** to be made like unto *his* brethren
that he might be a merciful and faithful high priest in things *pertaining* to God
to make reconciliation for the sins of the people

In both of these cases, there is a logical relationship with the preceding clause, thus the use of the connectors *and thus* and *wherefore*. But in 2 Nephi 10:3, the clause involving *behoove* is parenthetical and should not be connected by *thus*. The clause should probably be punctuated with surrounding dashes in order to clearly show its parenthetical nature.

Summary: Remove in 2 Nephi 10:3 the intrusive *thus* that the 1830 compositor or some other corrector added; the original clause (“for it behooveth our God”) is parenthetical and should not be directly connected with the preceding clause by the use of *thus*.

■ 2 Nephi 10:4–5

*for should the mighty miracles be wrought among other nations
they would repent and know that he **be** their God
but because of priestcrafts and iniquities
they at Jerusalem will stiffen their necks against him that he **be** crucified*

In this passage we have two striking examples of subjunctive usage in the Book of Mormon text (“that he **be** their God” and “that he **be** crucified”). These verb forms have never been edited to the indicative. A similar example is found in Helaman 9:2 (“that he **be** dead”). Of course, the critical text will maintain such examples of the subjunctive. For further discussion, see MOOD in volume 3.

Summary: Maintain the subjunctive in the phrase “that he be” found in 2 Nephi 10:4, 2 Nephi 10:5, and Helaman 9:2.

■ 2 Nephi 10:6

*wherefore because of their iniquities /
destructions famines [*pestilences* 1ABCDEFGHIJLMNOQRT | *pestilence* HKPS]
and [*bloodsheds* 1ABCDEG HKPS | *bloodsheds* > *bloodshed* F | *bloodshed* IJLMNOQRT]
shall come upon them*

The tendency in the text has been to replace the plural nouns *pestilences* and *bloodsheds* with their singular forms (the forms that speakers of English expect). In this particular verse, the 1874 RLDS edition introduced the singular *pestilence* into the RLDS text, which has retained it ever since. This change may have been intentional or accidental. In the second case, the 1852 LDS edition introduced the singular *bloodshed* into the LDS text. This change first appeared in the second printing of the 1852 edition and required changes in the stereotyped plates, a demanding and exacting process which shows that this change was fully intended.

In conjoined constructions, the plural forms *bloodsheds* and *pestilences* have tended to be replaced by their singular forms, but the result is not systematic. Out of seven cases of original *bloodsheds*, three show the tendency to replace the plural with the singular (each marked below with an asterisk):

2 Nephi 1:12

there shall be [*bloodsheds* 01ACDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST | *bloodsheds* B]
and great visitations among them

2 Nephi 6:15

and they that believe not in him shall be destroyed
both by fire and by tempest
and by earthquakes and by **bloodsheds**
and by pestilence and by famine

* 2 Nephi 10:6 (change in 1852^c)

destructions famines pestilences
and [*bloodsheds* 1ABCDEG HKPS | *bloodsheds* > *bloodshed* F |
bloodshed IJLMNOQRT]
shall come upon them

- * Jacob 7:24 (change in 1852^c and 1874 RLDS)
 for they delighted in wars
 and [*bloodsheds* 1ABCDEG | *bloodsheds* > *bloodshed* F |
bloodshed HIJKLMNQRST]

Alma 35:15
 now Alma being grieved for the iniquity of his people
 yea for the wars and the [*bloodsheds* 0ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST |
blood sheds > *bloodsheds* 1]
 and the contentions which were among them

Alma 62:39
 and thus they had had wars and **bloodsheds** and famine and affliction
 for the space of many years

- * Helaman 6:17 (change in 1902 and 1905)
 they had not been stirred up to anger
 to wars nor to [*bloodsheds* 1ABCDEFGHIJKNOPS | *bloodshed* LMQRT]

On the other hand, there are eight cases of original singular *bloodshed* in conjoined constructions (Omni 1:3, Omni 1:24, Mosiah 29:36, Alma 45:11, Alma 55:19, Alma 62:35, Mormon 8:8, and Ether 14:21). There is a possibility that the example of *bloodshed* in Mosiah 29:36 may have originally read in the plural; for discussion, see that passage.

The example in Alma 45:11 is the only one that has shown any tendency to replace the singular with the plural, yet this one example is the result of Oliver Cowdery momentarily misreading \mathcal{O} while copying from \mathcal{O} into \mathcal{P} :

Alma 45:11
 yea and then shall they see wars and pestilences
 yea famine and [*blood shed* 0 | *bloodsheds* >% *bloodshed* 1 |
bloodshed ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST]

In the original manuscript, *bloodshed* occurs at the end of the line and is followed by an extra ink stroke that could be misread as a defective *s*. When Oliver Cowdery copied *bloodshed* into the printer's manuscript, he initially wrote *bloodsheds*, apparently because of the extra ink stroke. Then upon closer examination, he seems to have decided that the extra ink stroke in \mathcal{O} was not an *s*, so he erased from \mathcal{P} the final *s* in *bloodsheds*.

Out of four cases of original *pestilences*, two show the loss of the plural (each marked below with an asterisk):

- * 2 Nephi 10:6 (change in 1874 RLDS)
 destructions famines
 [*pestilences* 1ABCDEFGHIJLMNOQRT | *pestilence* HKPS] and bloodsheds
 shall come upon them

Alma 45:11
 yea and then shall they see wars and **pestilences**
 yea famine and bloodshed

* Helaman 12:3 (change in 1905)

yea except he doth visit them with death and with terror and with famine
and with all manner of [*pestilences* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLNOPS | *pestilence* MQRT]
they will not remember him

Ether 11:7

wherefore there began to be wars and contentions in all the land
and also many famines and **pestilences**

On the other hand, there are seven cases of original singular *pestilence* in conjoined constructions (2 Nephi 6:15, Mosiah 12:4, Alma 10:22, Alma 10:23, Helaman 10:6, Helaman 11:15, and Helaman 13:9). None of these have ever been changed to the plural.

For both *bloodshed(s)* and *pestilence(s)*, the changes have been sporadic and usually towards replacing the plural with the singular. And the changes are found in both the LDS and RLDS textual traditions. The critical text will, in each case, follow the reading of the earliest textual sources, thus maintaining the plural *pestilences* and *bloodsheds* here in 2 Nephi 10:6.

Summary: In accord with the earliest sources, restore the plural *pestilences* and *bloodsheds* in 2 Nephi 10:6.

■ 2 Nephi 10:9

wherefore the promises of the Lord

[*is* >js *are* 1 | *are* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *great unto the Gentiles*
for he hath spoken it

The earliest text has a plural head noun (*promises*) and a singular verb form (*is*). The 1830 compositor replaced the *is* with *are*. In his editing for the 1837 edition, Joseph Smith marked the change in Ø. The same kind of editing is found later on in this chapter, although in this instance the 1830 compositor set the *is* of the printer's manuscript:

2 Nephi 10:21

but great [*is* >js *are* 1 | *is* A | *are* BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
the promises of the Lord unto they which are upon the isles of the sea

These specific examples of subject-verb disagreement appear only here in 2 Nephi 10. Elsewhere we always get the correct plural form of the verb *be* when the subject is “the promises of the Lord”:

Alma 3:17

and these **were** the promises of the Lord unto Nephi and to his seed

Alma 9:24

for behold the promises of the Lord **are** extended to the Lamanites

Alma 17:15

notwithstanding the promises of the Lord **were** extended unto them
on the conditions of repentance

Alma 48:25

for the [*promisee* > *promises* >js *promisess* 1 |
promise ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] of the Lord
 [were 01A | was BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
 if they should keep his commandments
 they should prosper in the land

The last example shows that the original plural *promises* in \mathcal{P} was accidentally misread by the 1830 typesetter as the singular *promise*, which ultimately led to changing the plural *were* to *was* in the 1837 edition. Oliver Cowdery’s copying of the text into \mathcal{P} involves a correction: he initially wrote *promisee* (a slip of the pen) but then overwrote the second *e* with an *s*. Later, Joseph Smith inserted an *s* at the end of *promises* just to make sure that the word would be read in the plural. In any event, the original text in Alma 48:25 definitely read in the plural for both the subject and the *be* verb (“the promises of the Lord were”), but the 1837 edition ended up with the singular for both the subject and the *be* verb (“the promise of the Lord was”). For further discussion, see Alma 48:25.

This regular use of the plural form of the *be* verb elsewhere in the text for “the promises of the Lord” suggests that we should at least consider the possibility that the original text in 2 Nephi 10:9 and 2 Nephi 10:21 had a singular *promise* but that in the early transmission of the text (\mathcal{C} is not extant here) the singular was replaced by the plural *promises*. Besides these two examples in 2 Nephi 10 and the four from the book of Alma (listed above), the text has two occurrences of the singular “promise of the Lord” (2 Nephi 3:5 and Mosiah 7:32) and four more occurrences of the plural “promises of the Lord” (Alma 28:11, Alma 28:12, Helaman 15:12, and 4 Nephi 1:49) as well as two occurrences of “the promises which the Lord (had) made” (Mosiah 1:7 and 4 Nephi 1:11). Only the example in Alma 48:25 shows any variation between singular and plural *promise(s)*. The odds are that the two instances of *promises* in 2 Nephi 10 did not involve any variation in number for the noun itself.

We should note that for only the two examples in 2 Nephi 10 is the verb *be* a linking verb that takes an adjective as its subject complement (namely, *great*). This systematic difference may provide some explanation for the difference in subject-verb agreement. (For discussion, see SUBJECT-VERB AGREEMENT in volume 3.) In any event, the critical text will restore these two cases in 2 Nephi 10 where *is* is the verb for the plural “the promises of the Lord”.

Summary: Restore the use of the singular *is* with the plural “the promises of the Lord” in 2 Nephi 10:9 and 2 Nephi 10:21; these two instances of “the promises of the Lord” are probably not errors for the singular “the promise of the Lord”.

■ 2 Nephi 10:10

this land

[*saith* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPS | *said* QRT] *God*

shall be a land of thine inheritance

This change from *saith* to *said* undoubtedly represents a typo by the typesetter for the 1911 LDS edition. This past-tense *said* has continued in the LDS text. The surrounding text, however, uses *saith* rather than *said*:

verse 7	thus saith the Lord God
verse 8	saith God
verse 13	saith God
verse 16	saith our God
verse 18	thus saith our God
verse 19	saith God unto me
verse 19	saith God

The general expression “saith God” is correct throughout this chapter since the text continually refers to various promises from the Lord that represent his eternally lasting word. Prophetic statements are normally given in the present tense, as in “thus saith the Lord God”.

Summary: Restore in 2 Nephi 10:10 the present-tense *saith*, the reading of the original text; the text here refers to a promise of the Lord’s that holds throughout time.

■ 2 Nephi 10:11

and this land shall be a land of liberty unto the Gentiles

and there shall be no [King >+ Kings 1 | kings ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] upon the land

which shall raise up unto the Gentiles

In copying from \mathcal{O} to \mathcal{P} , Oliver Cowdery initially wrote “and there shall be no king upon the land”, but then shortly thereafter he corrected the singular *king* by inserting an *s* at the end of *king*. The level of ink flow is only slightly heavier, which suggests that Oliver might have dipped his quill prior to correcting \mathcal{P} . The original manuscript is not extant here; but since either reading (*king* or *kings*) will work, it is probably best to assume that the original text was in the plural and that Oliver corrected \mathcal{P} to agree with \mathcal{O} .

Summary: Maintain the plural *kings* in 2 Nephi 10:11; although the plural is the corrected reading in \mathcal{P} , the correction appears to be nearly immediate; \mathcal{O} itself probably read in the plural.

■ 2 Nephi 10:11

and there shall be no kings upon the land

*which shall **raise** up unto the Gentiles*

This verse seems to be referring to kings who might **rise** up. The verb *rise* (as well as *arise*) is used elsewhere to refer to rulers rising (up) in power:

2 Nephi 3:24

and there shall [*raise* 1ABCDEGHPS | *rise* FIJKLMNOQRT] **up**
one mighty among them

Ether 11:15

and there **arose** a mighty man among them in iniquity

Ether 11:17

and it came to pass that there **arose** another mighty man

Ether 13:15

for there were many which **rose up** who were mighty men

Ether 13:23

and it came to pass that there **arose up** Shared

Ether 14:3

behold there **arose** the brother of Shared

The example from 2 Nephi 3:24 shows that the original text can have the intransitive *raise* rather than the standard *rise*. The use of *raise up* here in 2 Nephi 10:11 appears to be used intransitively and is equivalent to 'rise up':

2 Nephi 10:11 (equivalent meaning)

and there shall be no kings upon the land
which shall **rise up** unto the Gentiles

There are three other cases in the text where *raise* is used intransitively: 2 Nephi 10:14, Helaman 1:8, and Ether 15:31 (see the discussion under each of these).

Of course, the verb *raise up* is used transitively when it refers to the Lord raising up a prophet or seer. Like 2 Nephi 10:11, each of the following examples has a prepositional phrase headed by *unto*:

1 Nephi 22:20 (compare with Deuteronomy 18:15)

a prophet shall the Lord your God **raise up unto** you like unto me

2 Nephi 3:9

and he shall be great like unto Moses
whom I have said I would **raise up unto** you

The transitive *raise up* is also used to refer to raising up people (or producing offspring), again with the preposition *unto*, as in the following examples:

1 Nephi 7:1

but that his sons should take daughters to wife
that they might **raise up** seed **unto** the Lord

2 Nephi 3:5

and he obtained a promise of the Lord
that out of the fruit of his loins
the Lord God would **raise up** a righteous branch
unto the house of Israel

Jacob 2:25

that I might **raise up unto** me a righteous branch
from the fruit of the loins of Joseph

Jacob 2:30

for if I will
saith the Lord of Hosts
raise up seed **unto** me
I will command my people

Ether 1:43

and there will I bless thee and thy seed
and **raise up unto** me
of thy seed and the seed of thy brother and they which shall go with thee
a great nation

Ether 1:43

and there shall be none greater than the nation
which I will **raise up unto** me of thy seed
upon all the face of the earth

The raising up of prophets and seers seems to belong here with these passages that refer to the raising up of people. On the other hand, if kings rise up, they will rise up on their own. In the Book of Mormon at least, kings are not raised up by the Lord or “unto the Lord”.

As discussed under 2 Nephi 3:24, the intransitive use of *raise* is common in American dialectal speech. Its original use here in 2 Nephi 10:11 will be maintained, although the standard edited text could replace *raise* with *rise*.

Summary: Interpret the earliest text for 2 Nephi 10:11 as a case of intransitive *raise*, which implies that *raise* could be edited to the standard *rise* in the current text; the critical text will maintain the original intransitive *raise* (“and there shall be no kings upon the land which shall raise up unto the Gentiles”).

■ 2 Nephi 10:14

*for he that **raiseth up** a king against me shall perish
for I the Lord the king of heaven will be their king*

This passage is related to 2 Nephi 10:11, which precedes it by only a few verses. There the verb *raise* is used intransitively as an equivalent to the intransitive verb *rise*: “and there shall be no kings upon the land which shall **raise up** unto the Gentiles”. The intransitive use of *raise* in verse 11 suggests that the verb form *raiseth* here in verse 14 should also be interpreted intransitively (as equivalent to *riseth*). The other possibility, of course, is that the verb form *raiseth* in “he that raiseth up a king” should be interpreted as a transitive verb, which is what we expect in standard English. In other words, the question here is: Who is going to perish? Is it a “king maker”, the person who raises up **someone else** to be a king? Or is it the person who raises himself up to be a king—that is, the person who rises up **as** a king?

The transitive interpretation seems odd since elsewhere in the Book of Mormon no one raises up someone else to be a king, not even the Lord. A person can, of course, raise himself up as a person of importance:

Helaman 9:16

and then he might declare it unto us
that he might convert us unto his faith
that he might **raise himself**
to be a great man chosen of God and a prophet

And new leaders can rise up:

Ether 11:15	and there arose a mighty man among them in iniquity
Ether 11:17	and it came to pass that there arose another mighty man
Ether 13:15	for there were many which rose up who were mighty men
Ether 13:23	and it came to pass that there arose up Shared
Ether 14:3	behold there arose the brother of Shared

The Lord raises up prophets (like Moses), seers (like Joseph Smith), and the Messiah. (See the examples given under 2 Nephi 3:18.)

Semantically, the intransitive interpretation for 2 Nephi 10:14 seems more appropriate than the transitive one. The syntax may seem unexpected, but not incomprehensible, to modern English readers—even when *riseth* replaces *raiseth* (“he that riseth up a king against me”). We expect an *as* before *a king*: “he that riseth up **as** a king against me”. The example listed above from Helaman 9:16 (“he might raise himself to be a great man”) expresses the same idea but uses the transitive reflexive *raise himself* rather than the intransitive *rise*. (This example also uses the infinitive clause “to be a great man” rather than a bare noun phrase such as “a great man”.) Still, even with the verb *rise*, speakers of English are familiar with examples of this syntactic form (such as “the next morning he rose up a new man”).

The critical text will maintain the earliest text here in 2 Nephi 10:14 (“for he that **raiseth** up a king against me shall perish”). This decision, of course, does not solve the potential ambiguity. The most likely interpretation is “for he that riseth up as a king against me shall perish”; in other words, in this verse, *raiseth* is being used intransitively and the noun phrase “a king” acts as an essive (with the meaning ‘as a king’). This interpretation agrees with the usage earlier in verse 11 (“and there shall be no kings upon the land which shall **raise** up unto the Gentiles”).

Summary: The original reading in 2 Nephi 10:14 (“he that **raiseth** up **a king** against me shall perish”) apparently means ‘he that **riseth** up **as a king** against me shall perish’, which could serve as a possible revision for this verse in the standard text; the critical text will maintain the original reading with its intransitive *raiseth* and its essive noun phrase *a king*.

■ 2 Nephi 10:14

*for I the Lord the king of heaven will be their king
and I will be a light [unto 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST | upon s] them forever*

The 1953 RLDS edition reads “upon them” rather than the correct “unto them”. Elsewhere in the text, we always get “light (un)to X”, never “light upon X” (where X refers to people). There are five other occurrences of “light unto X”, including one more that quotes the Lord:

3 Nephi 15:12
and ye are a light **unto** this people

These occurrences of “light unto X” recall the language of Isaiah:

Isaiah 49:6 (quoted in 1 Nephi 21:6)
I will also give thee for a light **to** the Gentiles

Although the preposition in the Isaiah quote is *to*, the *unto* used elsewhere in the Book of Mormon for this expression is semantically equivalent, unlike *upon*.

Summary: Maintain the original preposition *unto* in 2 Nephi 10:14 (“I will be a light unto them forever”).

■ 2 Nephi 10:15

*wherefore for this cause that my covenants
[may 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNPQRST | o] be fulfilled . . .*

The 1907 LDS vest-pocket edition accidentally dropped the modal verb *may*. Since that edition was never used as a copy-text, this error was never transmitted into any later LDS edition.

The loss of the modal led to an awkward subjunctive construction (“that my covenants be fulfilled”). Elsewhere, whenever we have “for this cause” (or “for the very cause”), the following *that*-clause always takes a modal auxiliary verb:

1 Nephi 4:17	for this cause that I might obtain the records
1 Nephi 4:36	for this cause that the Jews might not know
1 Nephi 15:17	for the very cause that he shall be rejected
Alma 9:25	and now for this cause that ye may not be destroyed
Helaman 12:22	therefore for this cause that men might be saved
3 Nephi 21:6	for this cause . . . that they may repent

Note that in two instances the modal auxiliary is *may*, just as here in 2 Nephi 10:15.

Summary: Maintain the original modal auxiliary *may* in 2 Nephi 10:15 (“for this cause that my covenants **may** be fulfilled”).

■ 2 Nephi 10:21

but great is the promises of the Lord

*unto [they >js those 1 | they ABCDEFGHIJLN | them HKOQRT | they > them M | those PS]
[which >js who 1 | which A | who BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] are upon the isles of the sea*

■ 2 Nephi 10:22

and now behold the Lord remembereth

*all [they >js these 1 | they ABCDEFGHIJKLNOQ | they > them M | those PS | them RT]
[which >js who 1 | which A | who BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] have been broken off
wherefore he remembereth us also*

For both cases of *they* in 2 Nephi 10:21–22, Joseph Smith’s editing for the 1837 edition, as indicated on the printer’s manuscript, was not implemented in that edition. In the first example, Joseph overwrote the *ey* of *they* with *ose*. In the second example, he overwrote only the *y* of *they* with *se*. In the first case, the intended change was obviously *they* to *those*. In the second case, the stated change is *they* to *these*, but it is quite possible that Joseph Smith’s intended change was actually *they* to *those* since there are no other occurrences of “all these who” in the current Book of Mormon text—but there are 56 of “all those who” (most of which were created as a result of Joseph Smith’s editing for the 1837 edition). Nonetheless, “all these who” could still work since Jacob has just been discussing those of scattered Israel who are upon the isles of the sea.

In accord with Joseph Smith’s corrections in \mathcal{P} , the editors for the 1908 RLDS edition implemented those changes. Interestingly, they interpreted the second change as the same as the first one (namely, of *they* to *those*). The editing in the LDS text has been different. In the LDS text, both cases of original *they* were replaced by *them* in the third printing (in 1907) of the 1905 Chicago edition, but the second of these changes was not followed by the subsequent 1911 large-print Chicago edition. The 1920 edition ended up making sure both changes of *they* to *them* were implemented in the text. For further discussion, see PRONOMINAL DETERMINERS in volume 3.

Note, by the way, that in his editing of \mathcal{P} for the 1837 edition, Joseph Smith changed the two instances of *which* to *who*. But unlike the editing of the two pronouns *they*, the edited relative pronoun *who* was implemented both times in the 1837 edition. Of course, the critical text will restore both instances of the original “they which” here in 2 Nephi 10:21–22.

Summary: Restore the two original instances of “they which” in 2 Nephi 10:21–22.

■ 2 Nephi 10:22

and now behold the Lord remembereth all they

which [are > have been 1 | have been ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] broken off

In copying from \mathcal{G} to \mathcal{P} , Oliver Cowdery initially wrote “which are broken off”. Perhaps he was influenced by the occurrence of “they which **are** upon the isles of the sea” in the preceding verse (2 Nephi 10:21). Or perhaps he had gotten used to the phraseology “are broken off”, which occurred twice in 1 Nephi 21:1 as “all ye that are broken off”. In any event, here in 2 Nephi 10:22

Oliver quickly corrected his error in \mathcal{P} by crossing out the *are* and supralinearly inserting *have been* (the level of ink flow is unchanged). Although \mathcal{C} is not extant here, it undoubtedly read the same as the corrected text in \mathcal{P} , especially since either reading will work.

Summary: Accept in 2 Nephi 10:22 Oliver Cowdery’s change in \mathcal{P} of *are* to *have been*, an almost immediate correction to the probable reading of the original manuscript.

■ 2 Nephi 10:22

*and now behold the Lord remembereth all they which have been broken off
wherefore he remembereth [us 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST | them K] also*

The 1892 RLDS edition accidentally replaced the pronoun *us* with *them*, probably because the preceding clause uses the pronoun *they*. The 1908 RLDS edition reverted to the correct *us*. The original text here intends to say that the descendants of Lehi are among those who are broken off and that they will be remembered because **all** those who have been broken off will be remembered. The incorrect use of *them* simply ends up creating an impossible redundancy (with the meaning ‘the Lord remembers all those who have been broken off; therefore he also remembers all of them’).

Summary: Maintain the original pronoun *us* in 2 Nephi 10:22; the accidental replacement of *us* with *them* in the 1892 RLDS edition created a difficult reading.

■ 2 Nephi 10:23

*and remember that ye are free to act for yourselves
to choose [this 1 | the ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST] way of everlasting death
or the way of eternal life*

Jacob’s discourse is split into two separate parts, given on separate days (originally chapters V–VI and chapter VII, now 2 Nephi 6–9 and 2 Nephi 10 in the LDS text). At the end of the first part, Jacob explains that “on the morrow I will declare unto you the remainder of my words” (2 Nephi 9:54). Then near the end of the second part of this discourse (in 2 Nephi 10:23), Jacob suddenly refers to “this way of everlasting death” (according to the reading in \mathcal{P}). But his discussion of the everlasting spiritual death came in the first part of his discourse (in 2 Nephi 9:15–19) and on the previous day; thus his use of *this* when referring to the way of everlasting death here in 2 Nephi 10:23 seems out of place. This difficulty undoubtedly motivated the 1830 typesetter to change the *this* to *the*. And we should also note the resulting parallelism in the 1830 typesetter’s emendation: “**the** way of everlasting death and **the** way of eternal life”; the parallelism is clearly weakened by the conjoining of “this way” with “the way”. Jacob’s language elsewhere in this discourse shows a high degree of parallelism, as in the following example that also deals with death and eternal life:

2 Nephi 9:39
to be carnally minded is death
and to be spiritually minded is life eternal

We do not have the original manuscript for 2 Nephi 10:23, but it is possible that the original text actually read *the*. This kind of error (of *this* replacing *the*) is typical of Oliver Cowdery's manuscript work, as exemplified by the following examples:

- Alma 50:28 (*this* corrected to *the* by erasure in \mathcal{O})
 [*this* >% *the* 0 | *the* 1 ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] people of Morianton
- Alma 52:10 (*this* corrected to *the* by erasure in \mathcal{O})
 that quarter of [*this* >% *the* 0 | *the* 1 ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] land
- Alma 56:17 (*the* in \mathcal{O} miscopied as *this* in \mathcal{P})
 [*the* 0 | *this* 1 ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] little force which I brought with me
- Helaman 13:15 (*this* corrected to *the* in \mathcal{P} without change in the level of ink flow)
 [*this* > *the* 1 | *the* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] city of Gideon

In three cases Oliver caught his error and immediately corrected it, but in one case (in Alma 56:17) he didn't. Thus it is very possible here in 2 Nephi 10:23 that Oliver could have also miscopied an original “**the** way of everlasting death” in \mathcal{O} as “**this** way of everlasting death” in \mathcal{P} .

It should also be noted that nowhere else in the text do we get the demonstratives *this* or *that* as the determiner for *way*. Of course, there are many examples with *the* as the determiner for *way* (79 times in the earliest textual sources). In particular, we also have *the* as the determiner for *way* in two passages that contrast the way of life and the way of death:

- 3 Nephi 14:13–14 (identical to Matthew 7:13–14)
 enter ye in at the strait gate
 for wide is the gate and broad is **the way** that leadeth to **destruction**
 and many there be which go in thereat
 because strait is the gate and narrow is **the way** which leadeth unto **life**
 and few there be that find it
- 3 Nephi 27:33
 enter ye in at the strait gate
 for strait is the gate and narrow is **the way** that leads to **life**
 and few there be that find it
 but wide is the gate and broad **the way** which leads to **death**
 and many there be that traveleth therein
 until the night cometh wherein no man can work

The first passage directly quotes from the Sermon on the Mount and uses the word *destruction* instead of *death*. But the second passage is more paraphrastic and specifically associates the words *life* and *death* with *the way*.

Overall, the emendation made by the 1830 compositor seems to be appropriate on several counts, especially since scribal evidence shows that Oliver Cowdery sometimes accidentally wrote *this* in place of *the*.

Summary: Accept the text in 2 Nephi 10:23 as emended by the 1830 typesetter: “**the** way of everlasting death or **the** way of eternal life”.

[THIS PAGE LEFT INTENTIONALLY BLANK]