

# Mosiah 17

## ■ Mosiah 17:2

*but there was one among them  
whose name was Alma*

□ NULL

1\*

□ *he also being a descendant of Nephi  
and he was a young man*

1<sup>c</sup>ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST

*and he believed the words  
which Abinadi had spoken*

There are no similar words or phrases here that could have led Oliver Cowdery to visually skip this part of the text. Instead, his eye seems to have skipped down past an entire line of  $\mathcal{O}$  as he initially copied from  $\mathcal{O}$  into  $\mathcal{P}$ . Later, probably while proofing  $\mathcal{P}$  against  $\mathcal{O}$ , he discovered his error and supplied the text that he had originally omitted (the supralinear insertion is in heavier ink). Clearly, the passage would have read perfectly fine without the added text; thus there was no motivation to insert this line of text except that it was the reading of the original manuscript.

**Summary:** Accept the corrected reading in Mosiah 17:2 that seems to involve an entire line of  $\mathcal{O}$  that Oliver Cowdery initially skipped as he copied from  $\mathcal{O}$  into  $\mathcal{P}$ .

## ■ Mosiah 17:2

*for he knew concerning the iniquity*

*which Abinadi had [spoken > NULL 1 | ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST] testified against them*

Here Oliver Cowdery initially wrote *had spoken* in  $\mathcal{P}$ ; then he immediately crossed out the *spoken* and wrote inline *testified*. Thus  $\mathcal{O}$  must have read *had testified*. Note, in particular, the similar language in Alma 8:25: “yea and to **testify** against them concerning their iniquities”. Since either *spoken* or *testified* will work here in Mosiah 17:2, there would have been no motivation to emend *spoken* to *testified* except that  $\mathcal{O}$  read *testified*.

**Summary:** Accept Oliver Cowdery’s immediate correction in Mosiah 17:2: “concerning the iniquity which Abinadi had **testified** against them”.

■ **Mosiah 17:7**

*we have found an [acquisition 1 | accusation ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] against thee  
and thou art worthy of death*

Oliver Cowdery wrote *acquisition* in the printer's manuscript, an error for the phonetically and orthographically similar *accusation*. This error probably occurred early in the transmission of the text, either as Joseph Smith dictated the text or as Oliver copied it from  $\mathcal{O}$  into  $\mathcal{P}$ . The 1830 typesetter corrected the text to the obviously correct *accusation*. The word *acquisition* occurs nowhere in the scriptures, but *accusation* does (ten times in the King James Bible). In fact, the phraseology in Mosiah 17:7 parallels a passage in the King James Bible that describes an attempt to accuse Jesus of breaking the law:

Luke 6:7

and the scribes and Pharisees watched him  
whether he would heal on the sabbath day  
that they might **find an accusation against him**

It should also be noted that there is no meaning for *acquisition* in the Oxford English Dictionary that would work for the context here in Mosiah 17:7.

**Summary:** Retain the 1830 typesetter's correction of *acquisition* to the obviously correct *accusation* in Mosiah 17:7.

■ **Mosiah 17:8**

*for thou [hast 1AFGHIJKLMNOPQRST | has BCDE] said that  
God himself should come down among the children of men*

In this passage the 1837 edition accidentally set *thou has* instead of *thou hast*. What is interesting here is that this typo continued in the next three editions, showing the difficulty that editors and typesetters have sometimes had in recognizing a violation of the archaic biblical style. The critical text will, of course, maintain the original *thou hast* here in Mosiah 17:8. For further discussion, see under INFLECTIONAL ENDINGS in volume 3.

**Summary:** Maintain in Mosiah 17:8 the biblically styled *thou hast*, the earliest reading.

■ **Mosiah 17:8**

*and now for this cause thou shalt be put to death  
unless thou wilt recall all the words  
which thou hast spoken **evil** concerning me and my people*

The Book of Mormon text consistently reads *evil* here, yet *evil* is not the direct object for the verb phrase *hast spoken*. Instead, the relative pronoun *which* is the direct object. The word *evil* is actually functioning as an adverb here and is equivalent to *evilly*. The Oxford English Dictionary explains that *evil* is historically an adverb in the phrase "to speak evil of" (see definition 1b under the adverb *evil*). The King James Bible has four instances where *evil* is clearly adverbial rather than nominal:

Roman 14:16	let not then your good be <b>evil spoken of</b>
1 Corinthians 10:30	why am I <b>evil spoken of</b> for that for which I give thanks
1 Peter 4:14	on their part he is <b>evil spoken of</b>
2 Peter 2:2	by reason of whom the way of truth shall be <b>evil spoken of</b>

In all these instance, *evil* precedes the verb form *spoken*, thus assuring an adverbial interpretation for *evil*.

Such an adverbial interpretation of *evil* seems required in Mosiah 17:8. Here the critical text will retain the correct adverbial form *evil*, but with the understanding that it means ‘evilly’ and does not function as the direct object for *hast spoken*. In the original Book of Mormon text, the verb *speak* frequently takes adverb forms without the *-ly* ending, such as “I have spoken **plain**” (2 Nephi 25:20) and “it speaketh **harsh** against sin” (2 Nephi 33:5). See those passages for further discussion.

**Summary:** Maintain in Mosiah 17:8 the adverbial use of *evil* in the relative clause “which thou hast spoken **evil** concerning me and my people”; such usage without the *-ly* ending is fairly common in the original text of the Book of Mormon.

■ **Mosiah 17:9**

*and that ye may know of their surety  
I have suffered myself that I have fallen  
[unto >+ into 1 | into ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] your hands*

Here Oliver Cowdery initially wrote “unto your hands” in Ø; then somewhat later (with heavier and uneven ink flow) he corrected the *unto* to *into*. His correction probably occurred when he proofed Ø against Ø. The text has many examples of “to fall **into** one’s hands” (27 times, including here in Mosiah 17:9) but none of “to fall **unto** one’s hands”.

The tendency to mix up *into* and *unto* is fairly frequent in the manuscripts. For a list of ten cases where Oliver Cowdery initially wrote *unto* instead of the correct *into*, see under 2 Nephi 8:23.

**Summary:** Maintain in Mosiah 17:9 the corrected reading “I have fallen **into** your hands”; the text consistently supports the use of *into* rather than *unto* in the expression “to fall **into** one’s hands”.

■ **Mosiah 17:9–10**

*I will not recall the words  
which I have spoken unto you concerning this people  
for they are true  
and that ye may know of their surety  
I have suffered myself that I have fallen into your hands  
yea and [NULL >]g I 1 | I ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] will suffer even unto death*

Here in the printer’s manuscript, the subject pronoun *I* was inserted in pencil. The *I* is written quite lightly and rather awkwardly, as is also the insert mark. This *I* seems to have been inserted in the printer’s shop by either John Gilbert (the 1830 compositor) or Oliver Cowdery. Penciled

corrections in  $\mathcal{P}$  seem to have originated in the printer's shop (for additional discussion regarding secondary editing in pencil, see under Mosiah 11:23). Irrespective of who made the emendation in  $\mathcal{P}$ , it does appear that this change was made without reference to the original manuscript. It is quite possible that the original manuscript had an *I* that was accidentally deleted while copying from  $\mathcal{O}$  into  $\mathcal{P}$ .

The first question to ask here is whether the Book of Mormon text has other examples of *yea and* followed by a complete predicate but without restating the original subject. In fact, there are quite a few examples, and for each example there is always tense or modal agreement between the conjoined predicates:

1 Nephi 13:5 (present tense)

behold the formation of a church  
 which is most abominable above all other churches  
**which slayeth** the saints of God  
**yea and tortureth** them and **bindeth** them down  
 and **yoketh** them with a yoke of iron  
 and **bringeth** them down into captivity

Mosiah 12:2 (modal verb *shall*)

it shall come to pass that  
**this generation** because of their iniquities **shall** be brought into bondage  
 and **shall** be smitten on the cheek  
**yea and shall** be driven by men and **shall** be slain

Alma 1:6 (past tense)

and **he began** to be lifted up in the pride of his heart  
 and to wear very costly apparel  
**yea and even began** to establish a church after the manner of his preaching

Alma 44:18 (past tense)

yea behold **they were** pierced and smitten  
**yea and did** fall exceeding fast before the swords of the Nephites

Alma 48:24 (past tense)

nevertheless they could not suffer to lay down their lives  
 that their wives and their children should be massacred  
 by the barbarous cruelty of those **who was** once their brethren  
**yea and had** dissented from their church and **had** left them  
 and **had** gone to destroy them by joining the Lamanites

Alma 57:31 (modal verb *will*)

and behold **they will** fall upon them  
**yea and will** destroy our people

Helaman 4:14 (past tense)

but behold Moronihah did preach many things unto the people  
 because of their iniquity  
 and also **Nephi and Lehi** which were the sons of Helaman  
**did** preach many things unto the people  
**yea and did** prophesy many things unto them concerning their iniquities  
 and what should come unto them if they did not repent of their sins

Moreover, in all these examples the clause following the *yea and* seems to work perfectly well without the subject. There is no difficulty in processing the sentence or in recovering the subject.

On the other hand, the example from Mosiah 17:10 seems particularly difficult to process—and for a couple of reasons. First, the preceding clause is in the present perfect (“I **have** suffered myself that I **have** fallen into your hands”), while the conjoined predicate has the modal verb *will* (“yea and **will** suffer even unto death”). Second, the conjoined predicate “will suffer even unto death” does not really relate to “I have suffered myself that I . . .”. It seems quite impossible for the intended reading to be “I have suffered myself that I . . . will suffer even unto death”. The clash in tense and aspect seems wholly unacceptable. Instead, Abinadi’s statement that he will suffer even unto death appears to be related to the earlier statement “and that ye may know of their surety”—that is, the intended reading is “and that ye may know of their surety . . . I will suffer even unto death”. The insertion of the subject pronoun *I* guarantees this reading. All the cases of *yea and* listed above are conjoined with the immediately preceding predicate and agree in tense and aspect. Thus it seems quite reasonable to assume that the omitted *I* in the earliest extant text for Mosiah 17:10 was the result of an early error in the transmission of the Book of Mormon text. It hardly seems possible that the *I* would have been intentionally omitted in the original text.

There is evidence that the scribes would sometimes accidentally omit the subject pronoun *I* when conjoining predicates, as in the following examples:

1 Nephi 5:8 (*I* apparently omitted by scribe 3 of  $\mathfrak{C}$ )

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

1 Nephi 18:2 (Oliver Cowdery’s omission in  $\mathfrak{D}$ )

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

Ether 8:10 (Oliver Cowdery’s initial omission in  $\mathfrak{D}$ )

and I will dance before him  
and [NULL > *I* 1 | *I* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST] will please him

The first of these is particularly relevant since the *I* was apparently lost after *yea and*; for discussion, see under 1 Nephi 5:8. As here in Mosiah 17:10, the *yea and* in 1 Nephi 5:8 is not related to the immediately preceding clause (“the Lord hath commanded my husband to flee into the wilderness”) but to the clause before that one (“now I know of a surety that . . .”).

**Summary:** Accept in Mosiah 17:10 the correction in  $\mathfrak{D}$  that added the subject pronoun *I* (“yea and I will suffer even unto death”); a similar emendation in 1 Nephi 5:8 is consistent with the addition of the *I* here in Mosiah 17:10.

## ■ Mosiah 17:10

*yea and I will suffer even **until** death*

The Book of Mormon text here has “even **until** death”, but there is good reason to believe this read “even **unto** death” in the original text (and perhaps also in the original manuscript, not extant for the book of Mosiah). First of all, *unto* and *until* are both orthographically similar, so a copying error is quite possible. There are two examples in the textual history of such a mix-up:

Alma 12:36 (scribe 2’s error in  $\mathcal{P}$ )

therefore your iniquity provoketh him  
that he sendeth down his wrath upon you as in the first provocation  
yea according to his word in the last provocation as well as in the first  
to the everlasting destruction of your souls  
therefore according to his word  
[*unto* 0ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST | §2 *until* > §1 *unto* 1] the last death  
as well as the first

Moroni 10:3 (typo in the 1906 LDS large-print edition)

that ye would remember how merciful the Lord hath been  
unto the children of men  
from the creation of Adam  
even down [*until* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMOPQRST | *unto* N] the time  
that ye shall receive these things

Notice in the first example that the original manuscript is extant and reads *unto*, which scribe 2 of  $\mathcal{P}$  mistakenly copied as *until*. Later, when proofing  $\mathcal{P}$  against  $\mathcal{C}$ , Oliver Cowdery corrected the *until* to *unto*.

Here in Mosiah 17:10, Abinadi is obviously predicting his own death; he is not predicting that he will continuously suffer from that point up to his death. Elsewhere in the Book of Mormon, when referring to a situation that results in someone’s death, the phraseology is always “**unto** death”, never “**until** death”; moreover, in three cases (each marked below with an arrow), the relevant verb is *suffer*, just as in Mosiah 17:10:

- |                |   |
|----------------|---|
| → Mosiah 3:7   | even more than man can <b>suffer</b> except it be <b>unto</b> death         |
| Mosiah 14:12   | because he hath poured out his soul <b>unto</b> death                       |
| Mosiah 15:7    | the flesh becoming subject even <b>unto</b> death                           |
| Mosiah 17:13   | and scorched his skin with fagots / yea even <b>unto</b> death              |
| → Mosiah 19:20 | and caused that he should <b>suffer</b> even <b>unto</b> death by fire      |
| Mosiah 27:28   | after wading through much tribulation /<br>repenting nigh <b>unto</b> death |
| Alma 1:18      | he that murdereth was punished <b>unto</b> death                            |
| → Alma 24:19   | they were firm and would <b>suffer</b> even <b>unto</b> death               |
| Alma 29:4      | according to their desires whether it be <b>unto</b> death or unto life     |
| Alma 30:10     | if he murdered he was punished <b>unto</b> death                            |
| Helaman 1:8    | he was taken and was tried . . . and condemned <b>unto</b> death            |
| Helaman 1:9    | when those people . . . saw that he was condemned <b>unto</b> death         |

*Mosiah 17*

Helaman 1:12 as many as were found were condemned **unto** death  
3 Nephi 6:25 these judges which had condemned the prophets of the Lord  
**unto** death  
Moroni 9:10 torturing their bodies even **unto** death  
Moroni 9:25 to weigh thee down **unto** death

Moreover, the two nearest passages after Mosiah 17:10 (namely, Mosiah 17:13 and Mosiah 19:20) specifically refer to being burned to death and also use the preposition *unto*.

The phrase “until death” occurs in two places, and in each of these the text refers to something (such as witnessing or procrastinating) that continues from some present moment up to when death occurs:

Mosiah 18:9  
and to stand as witnesses of God at all times and in all things  
and in all places that ye may be in even **until** death

Alma 34:35  
for behold if ye have procrastinated the day of your repentance even **until** death  
behold ye have become subjected to the spirit of the devil

Thus all the internal evidence suggests that the correct reading in Mosiah 17:10 should be “suffer even **unto** death”.

**Summary:** Emend Mosiah 17:10 to read “suffer even **unto** death” since the expression “suffer even **until** death” is not the intended meaning; Abinadi is predicting his martyrdom, not his continual suffering.

■ **Mosiah 17:10**

*and I will not recall my [mord > mords 1 | words ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]*

Oliver Cowdery first wrote the singular *word* (although orthographically he made the mistake of writing an *m* instead of a *w*); then virtually immediately he corrected *word* to the plural *words* (the level of ink flow is unchanged). Two preceding occurrences of “recall (all) the words” in this discourse support the plural reading:

Mosiah 17:8  
unless thou wilt recall all the words  
which thou hast spoken evil concerning me and my people

Mosiah 17:9  
I will not recall the words  
which I have spoken unto you concerning this people

**Summary:** Maintain in Mosiah 17:10 the plural *words*, Oliver Cowdery’s virtually immediate correction in *Œ*; this reading is also consistent with two previous references to Abinadi and whether he would recall his words.

## ■ Mosiah 17:13

*and it came to pass that they took him*

[& bound him 1 | *and bound him* ANOPQRST | BCDEFGHIJKL | NULL > *and bound him* M]  
*and . . .*

The conjoined predicate “and bound him” was accidentally omitted during the typesetting of the 1837 edition. The typesetter’s eye skipped from the first *him and* down to the following *him and*. The missing predicate was restored to the LDS text in the 1906 large-print edition and the third printing (in 1907) of the 1905 missionary edition, undoubtedly by reference to the 1830 edition. The 1908 RLDS edition restored it to the RLDS text, probably by reference to Ø. The critical text will maintain, of course, the earliest reading with the conjoined predicate “and bound him”.

**Summary:** Maintain in Mosiah 17:13 the conjoined “and bound him”, which was accidentally omitted in the 1837 edition but restored in the early 1900s to both the LDS and RLDS texts.

## ■ Mosiah 17:13–14

*and it came to pass that they took him and bound him*  
*and scoured his skin with fagots / yea even unto death*  
*and now when the flames began to scorch him*  
*he cried unto them saying . . .*

The printer’s manuscript reads *scoured* here in Mosiah 17:13, but this word is most likely an error for *scorched*. The word *scourge* literally refers to whipping and lashing, and it is rather difficult to scourge anyone with fagots (bundles of sticks tied together for burning people at the stake). One could try to interpret *scourge* in verse 13 as having its figurative sense of ‘to punish, afflict, or torment’, although “they tormented his skin with fagots / yea even unto death” sounds odd given the specific reference to doing something to “his skin with fagots”. Indeed, if *scoured* were correct here in Mosiah 17:13, we would expect something quite simple like “and scoured him unto death”.

Of course, the following verse (Mosiah 17:14) actually uses the verb *scorch* to refer to the burning of the outer surface of Abinadi’s body (“and now when the flames began to scorch him”). The use of the verb *scorch* in this context seems strange to modern readers, but in Early Modern English *scorch* was sometimes used to refer to burning people at the stake, as in the following quote from Elizabethan times (cited here with regularized accidentals):

John Hooker (1586)

who because with all cruel inhumanity, contrary to all natural humanity, they subdued a naked and a yielding people, whom they sought for gain and not for any religion or plantation of a commonwealth, over whom to satisfy their most greedy and insatiable covetousness, did most cruelly tyrannize, and most tyrannically and against the course of all human nature **did scorch and roast them to death**, as by their own histories doth appear.

For the original citation, see page 490 in volume 1 of *The Roanoke Voyages*, edited by David Beers Quinn (London: The Hakluyt Society, 1955); this passage is also cited on page 8 of Paul Johnson’s



*A History of the American People* (New York: HarperCollins, 1998). Given this historical usage, the emended reading “they took him and bound him and **scorched** his skin with fagots / yea even unto death” makes perfectly good sense.

We have the following extant spellings for the word *scourge* in the Book of Mormon manuscripts; the scribe was Oliver Cowdery except for scribe 2 of  $\mathcal{P}$  in the last instance:

	$\mathcal{C}$	$\mathcal{P}$
1 Nephi 2:24	Scourge	<b>scorge</b>
1 Nephi 19:9	scourge	scourge
1 Nephi 19:13	scourged	scourged
2 Nephi 5:25	<b>scorge</b>	<b>scorge</b>
2 Nephi 5:25	<b>scor( )</b>	<b>scorge</b>
2 Nephi 6:9	( rg)e	<b>scorge</b>
2 Nephi 20:26	—	scourge
2 Nephi 25:16	( <b>c</b> )orged	scourged
Jacob 3:3	—	<b>scorge</b>
Mosiah 3:9	—	scourge
Mosiah 15:5	—	scorged
Mosiah 17:13	—	scourged
Alma 23:2	scourge	scourge
Alma 52:10	scour >+ scourge	screen > scourge
3 Nephi 20:28	—	scourge

The word *scorch* is much less frequent in the text; it occurs only three times in the extant textual sources (Mosiah 17:14, Alma 15:3, and Alma 32:38) and is always spelled correctly. The common misspelling *scorge* for *scourge* in the manuscripts supports the possibility that for Mosiah 17:13 the word *scorched* in the original manuscript could have first been misread as *scorged* and then spelled as *scourged* in the printer’s manuscript.

Another possible explanation for the misspelling *scorge* is that *scourge* may have been pronounced by Joseph Smith and his scribes as /skɔrj/ rather than /skɛrj/. Merriam-Webster’s Collegiate Dictionary lists /skɔrj/ as an alternative pronunciation for *scourge*. Such a pronunciation would more readily lead to mishearing *scorched* /skɔrçt/ as /skɔrjd/ as well as to misspelling *scourged* as *scorged* in  $\mathcal{C}$ . Other misspellings in the manuscripts support the tendency to extend the spelling *or* to cases of /ɔr/ when immediately preceded by /k/ or /s/:

□ *concorse* (for *concourse*)

1 Nephi 1:8 (misspelled by Oliver Cowdery in  $\mathcal{P}$ )

numberless [*concors* 1 | *concourses* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] of angels

1 Nephi 8:21 (misspelled by scribe 3 of  $\mathcal{C}$ )

numberless [*concors* 0 | *concourses* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST] of people

Alma 36:22 (misspelled by Oliver Cowdery in  $\mathcal{P}$ , but not in  $\mathcal{C}$ )

numberless [*concourses* 0ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST | *concors* 1] of angels

- *intercorse* (for *intercourse*)

Helaman 6:8 (misspelled by Oliver Cowdery in  $\mathcal{P}$ )  
 free [*intercorse* 1 | *intercourse* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]  
 one with another for to buy and to sell

- *sorce* (for *source*)

2 Nephi 25:26 (misspelled by Oliver Cowdery in  $\mathcal{P}$ )  
 to what [*sorce* 1 | *source* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]  
 they may look for a remission of their sins

But the most significant factor in analyzing Mosiah 17:13 is that elsewhere the text always refers to Abinadi as having been burned to death, not whipped, lashed, or beaten:

Mosiah 17:15  
 behold even as ye have done unto me  
 so shall it come to pass that  
 thy seed shall cause that many shall suffer the pains that I do suffer  
 even the pains of **death by fire**

Mosiah 17:18  
 and in that day ye shall be hunted  
 and ye shall be taken by the hand of your enemies  
 and then ye shall suffer as I suffer the pains of **death by fire**

Mosiah 17:20  
 and now when Abinadi had said these words he fell  
 having suffered **death by fire**

Alma 25:9  
 thus the words of Abinadi was brought to pass  
 which he said concerning the seed of the priests  
 which caused that he should suffer **death by fire**

Alma 25:11  
 and now Abinadi was the first that suffered **death by fire**  
 because of his belief in God  
 now this is what he meant that many should suffer **death by fire**  
 according as he had suffered

From a literal point of view, the use of *scourged* in Mosiah 17:13 contradicts all other references to Abinadi’s “death by fire”, thus forcing one to interpret *scourged* as meaning something like ‘tormented’. But such vague language is inconsistent with the detailed language found everywhere else in this description of Abinadi’s death. The critical text will therefore emend Mosiah 17:13 to read that Abinadi was “**scorched** with fagots / yea even unto death”.

**Summary:** Replace *scourged* with *scorched* in Mosiah 17:13; *scourged* does not make much sense, given all other references to Abinadi’s death as “by fire”; the incorrect reading *scourged* seems to be the result of either mishearing or misreading *scorched* as *scourged*; the word *scourge* may have been pronounced /skɔrʒ/, which would have facilitated the replacement of *scorched* with *scourged*.

■ **Mosiah 17:15**

*behold even as ye have done unto me  
so shall it come to pass that  
thy seed shall cause that many shall **suffer***

- *the pains that I do **suffer***
IAPST
- NULL
BCDEFGHIJKLMNOQR

*even the pains of death by fire*

Here we have a visual skip in the 1837 edition from the first *suffer* to the second one. The correct phraseology was restored in the RLDS text in the 1908 edition, probably by reference to  $\mathfrak{P}$ . The LDS text restored the correct reading in the 1981 edition.

**Summary:** Maintain the original reading in Mosiah 17:15 with its phrase “the pains that I do suffer”; this phrase was accidentally omitted in the 1837 edition but eventually restored to both the LDS and RLDS texts.

■ **Mosiah 17:20**

*and now when Abinadi had said these words  
he fell having suffered death by fire  
yea having been put to death because he would not deny the commandments of God  
having sealed the truth of his words by [NULL > his 1 | his ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] death*

The supralinear insertion of *his* in the printer’s manuscript appears to have been made somewhat later (the level of ink flow is uneven); Oliver Cowdery’s correction here may have occurred when he proofed  $\mathfrak{P}$  against  $\mathfrak{O}$ . The *his* may have been initially lost here because Oliver had just come to the end of a line in  $\mathfrak{P}$ ; having written the *by* at the end of the line, he may have been momentarily distracted as he started a new line and forgot that he had not yet written the *his*. Another factor is that Oliver had just written *his* in the immediately preceding text (“the truth of **his** words), which may have led him to omit the second *his*.

Here in Mosiah 17:20, either reading is possible in English (“by death” or “by his death”). Thus there appears to be no reason for Oliver Cowdery to have edited the text from “by death” to “by his death”. The critical text will accept the corrected reading in  $\mathfrak{P}$  as the reading of the original text.

**Summary:** Retain in Mosiah 17:20 the corrected reading in  $\mathfrak{P}$  (“by **his** death”), the probable reading of the original manuscript (no longer extant here).

# Mosiah 18

## ■ Mosiah 18:1

*and now [ 1AFIJLMNOPQRST | that BCDEGHK] it came to pass that  
Alma who had fled from the servants of king Noah repented of his sins and iniquities*

The 1837 edition introduced an inexplicable intrusive *that* (“and now **that** it came to pass that . . .”). Amazingly, this typo continued for some time in the text. It was finally removed from the LDS text in the 1852 edition and from the RLDS text in the 1908 edition.

**Summary:** Ignore in Mosiah 18:1 the subordinate conjunction *that* (before the phrase “it came to pass”) that was accidentally introduced in the 1837 edition.

## ■ Mosiah 18:6

*and it came to pass that as many as believed him  
went [forth > NULL 1 | ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] thither to hear his words*

Here Oliver Cowdery initially wrote *forth* in  $\mathcal{P}$  but immediately crossed it out and wrote *thither* inline. Thus  $\mathcal{O}$ , not extant here, must have read “went thither” rather than “went forth”. As might be expected, there are many examples of “went forth” in the original text (85 of them). But here in Mosiah 18:6, we have the only occurrence in the entire text of “went thither”. There was clearly no reason for Oliver to have edited the highly expected “went forth” to a unique reading, “went thither”.

**Summary:** Maintain in Mosiah 18:6 the unique reading “went thither”, the corrected reading in  $\mathcal{P}$ .

## ■ Mosiah 18:7

*and it came to pass  
after many [day 1 | days ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]  
there were a goodly number gathered together to the place of Mormon*

The printer’s manuscript here reads *many day*, which the 1830 typesetter emended to *many days*. The original manuscript probably had *days*, and the *s* was therefore dropped while copying from  $\mathcal{O}$  into  $\mathcal{P}$ . Another possibility is that the original manuscript had the colloquial phrase “many a day” and the *a* was accidentally deleted during copying. Both kinds of copying errors

are possible, although Oliver Cowdery dropped the plural *s* considerably more frequently than he omitted the *a*.

There is no independent textual evidence in the Book of Mormon for the colloquial reading “many a day”. All except two of the 39 occurrences in the current text of “many days” read that way in the earliest textual sources. Besides the case here in Mosiah 18:7, there is one other instance of *many day* in the earliest source:

Helaman 13:2

and it came to pass that he did preach

[*many day* 1 | *many-day* A | *many days* BCEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST | *manv days* D]

repentance unto the people

In this other passage, the 1830 compositor interpreted *many day* as an adjectival modifier of *repentance* (he set the text as “many-day repentance”). Of course, Samuel the Lamanite was preaching long-term repentance (in contrast to short-term repentance), but this interpretation is clearly not what is meant in Helaman 13:2. Rather, the text intends to say that Samuel “did preach repentance many days unto the people”, but the original word order in Helaman 13:2 makes this sentence difficult to read. From the 1837 edition on, the text has read properly in the Helaman passage, thanks to some judicious punctuation (namely, the placement of commas before and after *many days*). For further discussion, see under Helaman 13:2.

Since 37 out of 39 occurrences of “many days” read as such in the manuscripts, but none actually read “many a day”, we should accept the reading “many days” for the two places in the text where the earliest extant text (the printer’s manuscript) reads *many day*. In both cases, a plural *s* was probably lost during the early transmission of the text.

**Summary:** Retain the reading “many days” found in the current text for Mosiah 18:7 (as well as for Helaman 13:2).

■ **Mosiah 18:7**

*and it came to pass after many days there were a goodly number gathered together*

[*to* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPS | *at* RT] *the place of Mormon*

Here the 1920 LDS edition changed the preposition *to* to *at*. The resulting reading is what modern English readers expect. Nonetheless, other examples of this same usage with *to* occur in the original text, many of which have never been edited. Consider, for instance, the following three cases where the verb phrase “to gather together” retains the preposition *to*:

Mosiah 7:17

that thereby they might gather themselves together **to** the temple

Alma 17:32

and they rushed forth with much swiftness

and did head the flocks of the king

and did gather them together again **to** the place of water

Mormon 3:5

that they should gather themselves together at the land Desolation  
**to** a city which was in the borders by the narrow pass  
 which led into the land southward

For other examples of where the preposition *to* has been edited to *at*, see the discussion under 1 Nephi 17:14.

**Summary:** Restore the original preposition *to* in Mosiah 18:7 (“there were a goodly number gathered together **to** the place of Mormon”); similar examples have been retained in the text.

■ **Mosiah 18:8**

*behold here [is 1A | are BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]  
 the [water > waters 1 | waters ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] of Mormon  
 for thus were they called*

Oliver Cowdery initially wrote “here is the **water** of Mormon”, but somewhat later he corrected the singular *water* to its plural, *waters* (the level of ink flow is uneven). This correction is undoubtedly correct. All other references to “the waters of Mormon” (seven more of them) have the plural *waters*: Mosiah 18:16, Mosiah 18:30 (three times), Mosiah 25:18, Mosiah 26:15, and Alma 5:3. Moreover, the plural verb form *were* in the next clause of Mosiah 18:8 (“for thus **were** they called”) supports the plural *waters*. Perhaps Oliver’s initial use of *water* was the result of his having just written the singular *is* (that is, “here **is** the **water** of Mormon”). As discussed under 1 Nephi 4:4, instances of subject-verb disagreement are common in the original text; for a complete discussion and listing of examples, see SUBJECT-VERB AGREEMENT in volume 3.

**Summary:** Retain the plural *waters* in the phrase “the waters of Mormon” in Mosiah 18:8 (and elsewhere in the text).

■ **Mosiah 18:10**

*if this be the [desires >js desire 1 | desires A | desire BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]  
 of your hearts . . .*

■ **Mosiah 18:11**

*this is the [desires 1A | desire BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] of our hearts*

Here in Mosiah 18:10 and 18:11, the 1837 edition changed the plural *desires* to the singular *desire*, undoubtedly because of the preceding singular subject *this* (in both cases) and the singular verb form *is* (in the second case). The first change was also marked by Joseph Smith in the printer’s manuscript. This same grammatical change has been made in the 1830 and 1837 editions for a number of similar occurrences of the plural *desires*:

Alma 11:25 (1830 change)

and **it was** only thy [*desire* > *desires* 1 | *desire* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]  
that I should deny the true and living God

Alma 17:22 (1837 change)

and the king inquired of Ammon  
if **it** [*were* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNPQRST | *was* NO]  
his [*desires* 1A | *desire* BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] to dwell in the land  
among the Lamanites or among his people

Alma 29:4 (1837 change, marked by Joseph Smith in Ø)

for I know that he granteth unto men  
according to their [*desires* > NULL 0 | 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNPQRST]  
[*desires* 0 | *desires* >js *desire* 1 | *desires* A | *desire* BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]  
whether **it** be unto death or unto life

Alma 47:4 (1830 change)

now behold **this was** the [*desires* 01 | *desire* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]  
of Amalickiah

In all of these cases, the text uses a singular pronoun (such as *it* or *this*) to directly refer to the plural *desires*. Thus the occurrences in Mosiah 18:10–11 of “if **this** be the **desires** of your hearts” and “**this** is the **desires** of our hearts”, despite the nonstandard grammar, are quite consistent with usage found elsewhere in the original text. The critical text will restore the plural *desires* in all these cases since such usage is clearly intended. For further discussion, see under SUBJECT-VERB AGREEMENT in volume 3.

It should also be pointed out that elsewhere the text refers to “the **desires** of the heart”, not “the **desire** of the heart”:

Mosiah 11:2

but he did walk after the **desires** of his own heart

Alma 41:3

and if their works were good in this life  
and the [*desires* 0ABCDEFGHIJKLMNPQRST | *desire* >+ *desires* 1]  
of their hearts were good  
that they should also at the last day be restored unto that which is good

Note that it makes no difference whether the text is referring to one person or many: we consistently get the plural *desires* with *heart(s)*. Thus the original use of “the desires of your hearts” and “the desires of our hearts” in Mosiah 18:10–11 is consistently supported by usage elsewhere.

**Summary:** Restore the original instances of the plural *desires* in Mosiah 18:10–11 (“if this be the **desires** of your hearts” and “this is the **desires** of our hearts”); the plural *desires* is supported by usage elsewhere in the text.

■ **Mosiah 18:12**

and now it came to pass that  
 Alma took [*Helaman* > *Helam* 1 | *Helam* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]  
 he being one of the first  
 and went and stood forth in the water and cried saying . . .

■ **Mosiah 18:13**

and he said  
 [*Helaman* > *Helam* 1 | *Helam* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] I baptize thee

■ **Mosiah 18:14**

both Alma and [*Helaman* > *Helam* 1 | *Helam* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] was buried  
 in the water

Here in the printer’s manuscript, Oliver Cowdery mistakenly wrote the much more frequent name *Helaman* in place of the less frequent *Helam*. Of course, by the time he came to making the printer’s manuscript, Oliver would have been very familiar with the name *Helaman* because earlier in his scribal work for  $\mathcal{O}$  he had taken down all of Joseph Smith’s dictation that deals with the life of Helaman, not only in the book of Alma (Alma 31, 36–38, 45–46, 48–50, 53, 56–60, 62–63) but also in the book of Helaman itself (Helaman 1–6).  $\mathcal{O}$  is extant for most of these portions of the text, and every extant instance in  $\mathcal{O}$  of the name *Helaman* is in Oliver’s hand.

Here in Mosiah 18:12–14, we have three corrections of *Helaman* to *Helam*, and they all appear to be virtually immediate: each crossout was done with multiple strokes, but the actual ink flow for each stroke seems to have involved no change in the level of ink flow. This immediacy in the corrections would mean that here in Mosiah 18 Oliver Cowdery, the scribe in  $\mathcal{P}$ , kept accidentally writing *Helaman* and then almost immediately correcting it to *Helam*. (I should point out here that quite a few times in writing this analysis, I initially typed out *Helam* as *Helaman* and then each time immediately deleted the extra *an*.)

Later in the book of Mosiah, as he copied from  $\mathcal{O}$  into  $\mathcal{P}$ , Oliver Cowdery once more consistently wrote *Helaman* instead of the correct *Helam*. All of these later cases of *Helam* refer to the land or the city of Helam, apparently named after the Helam that Alma baptized in Mosiah 18. But for this part of the text, Oliver’s crossouts of the final *an*’s were all done later: the level of ink flow for each stroke of the crossout is always heavier than the originally written text. In all, we have 11 instances in Mosiah 23 where *Helam* was originally written in  $\mathcal{P}$  as *Helaman*:

VERSE	PAGE	LINE	TRANSCRIPTION
19	154	11	the land Helam<an>_
20	154	12	the land of Helam_<an>
20	154	13	the city of Helam_<an>
25	154	20	the land of Helam_<an>
25	154	20	the city of Helam_<an>
26	154	23	the city of Helam<an>
29	154	30	the Land of Helam<an>_
35	155	3	the land of Helam<an>_
37	155	8	the land of Helam_<an>
38	155	9	the land of Helam<an>_
39	155	12	the land of Helam<an>_



These crossouts were made prior to the addition of the 1830 compositor’s penciled-in punctuation marks for these pages of  $\mathcal{P}$ . Note, in particular, the placement of the punctuation marks immediately after *Helam* but in front of the crossed out *an* in lines 12, 13, and 20 (two times) on page 154 and in line 8 on page 155.

The original manuscript is not extant for any portion of the book of Mosiah. One could argue that for Mosiah 23 the original manuscript actually read *Helaman* in all 11 cases and that this is why Oliver Cowdery originally copied it consistently as *Helaman* into  $\mathcal{P}$  and did not immediately correct it to *Helam*. This interpretation would imply that Oliver later decided that *Helaman*, both in  $\mathcal{C}$  and  $\mathcal{P}$  for Mosiah 23, was a mistake for *Helam* and that he therefore systematically emended the text. But such an innovative decision on Oliver’s part seems unlikely. A more plausible explanation, in my view, is that when Oliver got to copying Mosiah 23, he read *Helam* in  $\mathcal{C}$  but decided it was an error for *Helaman*, not realizing that the land and city of Helam had been named after the Helam that Alma had baptized in Mosiah 18.

There are actually a number of names that Oliver Cowdery, for some reason, decided were incorrect in  $\mathcal{C}$ , and so he changed their spelling when he copied the text from  $\mathcal{C}$  into  $\mathcal{P}$ . In fact, for two of these names, the first occurrence in  $\mathcal{C}$  is extant and every subsequent extant spelling of that name in  $\mathcal{C}$  reads the same:

$\mathcal{C}$	$\mathcal{P}$	FIRST OCCURRENCE
Kishcumen	Kishkumen	Helaman 1:9
Morionton	Morianton	Alma 50:25

For both of these cases, Oliver is clearly responsible for the change in the spelling of the name.

An especially relevant example for this discussion is the name *Amlicite*. In Alma 2–3, Oliver copied this name into  $\mathcal{P}$  as either *Amlicite* or *Amlikite*, but later in the book of Alma he consistently copied the name as *Amalekite* (Alma 21–24, 27, 43), not recognizing that there was only one name for the followers of Amlici. (For details, see the discussion under Alma 2:11.) I would suggest that Oliver made the same kind of error in Mosiah 23: he initially thought *Helam* in  $\mathcal{C}$  was a mistake for *Helaman*, and so he consistently copied it as *Helaman* into  $\mathcal{P}$ ; but later he must have decided that the name of the land and city in Mosiah 23 was the same as the name of the person in Mosiah 18 and therefore the consistent use of *Helam* in  $\mathcal{C}$  was indeed correct, so he restored in  $\mathcal{P}$  all 11 cases of *Helam* in Mosiah 23.

Given the evidence from Oliver Cowdery’s emendation of names elsewhere in the manuscripts, the critical text will accept the corrected spelling *Helam* in both Mosiah 18 and 23 as the original name for this individual and for the land and city named apparently after him. Of particular relevance here is the one instance where scribe 2 of  $\mathcal{P}$  copied the name into  $\mathcal{P}$ . Although he wrote the name as *Helem*, the name is still recognizable as *Helam*, not *Helaman*:

Mosiah 27:16  
 go and remember the captivity of thy fathers  
 in the land of [*Helim* >% *Helem* 1 | *Helam* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]  
 and in the land of Nephi

For the spelling *Helem* rather than *Helam*, see the discussion under Mosiah 27:16.

**Summary:** Accept Oliver Cowdery’s systematic correction in  $\mathcal{P}$  of the spelling *Helaman* to *Helam* in both Mosiah 18 and Mosiah 23.

■ **Mosiah 18:16**

*and after this manner he did baptize every one that went forth to the place of Mormon  
and they were in number about two hundred and four souls*

[NULL >+ *yea* 1 | *yea* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOQRT | *Yea* PS]

*and they were baptized in the waters of Mormon and were filled with the grace of God*

Oliver Cowdery initially wrote the text without the *yea*, but then later (with somewhat heavier ink flow) he supralinearly inserted the *yea*, perhaps when he proofed  $\wp$  against  $\mathcal{O}$ . The word *yea* is typically used to elaborate upon a subject that has already been referred to. In this example, the baptism of Alma's converts has just been mentioned; the following clause describes where they were baptized and explains that after their baptism they were filled with the grace of God (presumably a reference to the Holy Spirit). There would not have been any particular motivation for Oliver to have independently supplied the *yea* here.

**Summary:** Retain in Mosiah 18:16 Oliver Cowdery's inserted *yea*, the probable reading of  $\mathcal{O}$ .

■ **Mosiah 18:17**

*and it came to pass that  
whosoever was baptized by the power and authority of God*

[*they* >js NULL 1 | *they* A | BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *was added to his church*

As discussed under Jacob 1:14, Joseph Smith occasionally edited out redundant occurrences of the subject pronoun *they*. Such redundancy is frequently found in the original text when there is some delay between the initial occurrence of the subject and its associated predicate. For further discussion, see under SUBJECT REPETITION in volume 3. The critical edition will restore such examples of redundancy since they are clearly intended in the original text.

Note, by the way, that the generic plural pronoun *they* is used here rather than the singular *he*. Elsewhere the original text has examples of both *they* and *he* as the generic pronoun for *whoso(ever)*; for discussion, see under 1 Nephi 17:48. Here in Mosiah 18:17, the original *they* works better than the singular *he* because of the potential confusion that would result if *he* were the subject of the clause (“**he** was added to **his** church”).

**Summary:** Restore in Mosiah 18:17 the original reading with its redundant use of the subject pronoun *they*: “whosoever was baptized by the power and authority of God **they** was added to his church”.

■ **Mosiah 18:18**

*and it came to pass that  
Alma having authority from God ordained priests*

[NULL > *even one priest* 1 | *even one priest* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]

*to every fifty of their number  
did he ordain to preach unto them*

Here Oliver Cowdery's eye skipped from *priests* to *priest* as he copied this passage from  $\mathcal{O}$  into  $\wp$ . The error was only momentary since Oliver virtually immediately corrected  $\wp$  by supralinearly

inserting “even one priest” (there is no change in the level of ink flow). Clearly, the passage would not have made much sense without the phrase.

**Summary:** Maintain in Mosiah 18:18 the corrected reading in  $\mathcal{P}$ : “Alma . . . ordained priests / **even one priest** to every fifty of their number did he ordain”.

■ **Mosiah 18:22**

*and thus he [commandeth >+ commanded 1 | commanded ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] them to preach*

Here in the printer’s manuscript, Oliver Cowdery initially wrote the verb in the present tense (namely, *commandeth*). Somewhat later, perhaps when proofing against  $\mathcal{C}$ , he crossed out the *-eth* ending and supralinearly inserted the past-tense ending *-ed* (the level of the ink flow is somewhat heavier). The past tense is used throughout the larger passage, including a preceding occurrence of *commanded* and a following one (listed as 1 and 3 below):

Mosiah 18:21–23 (corrected text in  $\mathcal{P}$ )

- (1) and he **commanded** them  
     that there should be no contention one with another  
     but that they should look forward with one eye  
     having one faith and one baptism  
     having their hearts knit together in unity and in love one towards another
- (2) and thus he **commanded** them to preach  
     and thus they **became** the children of God
- (3) and he **commanded** them that they should observe the sabbath day

Oliver probably wrote the second *commanded* initially as *commandeth* because the two preceding present-participial clauses seem to imply the present tense: “having one faith and one baptism / having their hearts knit together in unity and in love one towards another”. The critical text will maintain the use of the past-tense *commanded* throughout this passage.

**Summary:** Maintain in Mosiah 18:22 the past-tense *commanded*, the corrected reading in  $\mathcal{P}$ ; the surrounding text is also in the past tense.

■ **Mosiah 18:27**

*and [he 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPS | of him RT] that hath but little  
 but little should be required  
 and to him that hath not  
 should be given*

Here the 1920 LDS edition changed the subject pronoun *he* to *of him* since an equivalent rephrasing of the first sentence is “but little should be required **of him** that hath but little”. The following parallel clause that begins with the prepositional phrase *to him* may have served as a model for

the change to *of him*. Nonetheless, the original reading with *he* is perfectly understandable. This particular example of editing increases the formality of the Book of Mormon text but without any gain in comprehension.

**Summary:** Restore in Mosiah 18:27 the original reading: “and **he** that hath but little / but little should be required”; despite its technical ungrammaticality, the original text reads perfectly well here.

#### ■ Mosiah 18:27–28

and again Alma **commanded** that the people of the church **should** impart of their substance every one according to that which he [hath >js had 1 | hath A | had BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] if he [have 1ABCEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST | had D] more abundantly  
 he **should** impart more abundantly  
 and he that [hath >js had 1 | hath A | had BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] but little but little **should** be required  
 and to him that [hath 1A | had BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] not **should** be given  
 and thus they **should** impart of their substance of their own free will and good desires towards God to those priests that **stood** in need / yea and to every needy naked soul

This passage begins with a past-tense verb form, *commanded*, but then the (original) text moves into a present-tense description of Alma’s welfare program. The modal verb *should* is used five times, but in an historical present-tense sense rather than as a conditional modal. Originally the present-tense verb form *hath* occurred three times in this passage, but for the 1837 edition Joseph Smith changed these cases of *hath* to the past-tense form *had*. Consistent with this editing, he could have also changed the subjunctive *have* in “if he **have** more abundantly” to the indicative past-tense *had* (but he did not). Although the 1841 British edition made the change to *had*, subsequent editions have retained the original subjunctive *have*. For further discussion regarding the use of the subjunctive in *if*-clauses, see under SUBJUNCTIVE in volume 3.

These attempts to shift the passage into the past tense can also be seen as consistent with the use of the past-tense *commanded* at the beginning of the passage as well as the past-tense *stood* that occurs near the end of this passage (“to those priests that **stood** in need”). However, the repeated use of *should impart*, *should be required*, and *should be given* gives a distinct present-tense sense to the central part of this passage, thus permitting the use of the present-tense *hath* and the subjunctive *have*. The critical text will restore these three original occurrences of *hath* and will maintain the subjunctive *have*.

**Summary:** Restore in Mosiah 18:27–28 the original multiple use of the present-tense *hath*; such usage is supported by surrounding occurrences of the modal verb *should*; also maintain the original subjunctive *have* in the *if*-clause.

■ **Mosiah 18:28**

*and thus they should impart of their substance  
of their own free will and good desires towards God*

- NULL 1\*
- *to those priests that stood in need* 1<sup>c1</sup>  
*yea and to every needy naked soul*
- **and** *to those priests that stood in need* 1<sup>c2</sup>ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST  
*yea and to every needy naked soul*

The last part of this passage (“to those priests that stood in need / yea and to every needy naked soul”) was accidentally omitted when Oliver Cowdery initially copied this part of the text from  $\mathfrak{C}$  into  $\mathfrak{P}$ . This error probably resulted from his eye skipping down a whole line in the original manuscript. There are two other examples of this kind of lengthy visual skip in this part of the text (in Mosiah 17:2 and Mosiah 18:35). In all three cases, there do not appear to be any identical words or phrases that could have led to the visual skip. Here in Mosiah 18:28, Oliver supralinearly inserted the long line of text at some later time, probably when he proofed  $\mathfrak{P}$  against  $\mathfrak{C}$  (the level of ink flow is somewhat heavier).

The 1830 compositor, as he was adding punctuation in pencil to the printer’s manuscript (just prior to setting the type), apparently felt that there was a missing conjunction at the beginning of this line of text that had earlier been skipped, so he inserted an ampersand in pencil at the beginning of Oliver Cowdery’s long supralinear insertion. Yet this inserted *and* makes little sense. The *and* leads the reader to think that the people’s “good desires” were not only “towards God” but also “to those priests that stood in need” and “to every needy naked soul”. Although the people would have had such desires, the actual intended meaning is that the people “should impart of their substance . . . to those priests that stood in need / yea and to every needy naked soul”. The long prepositional phrase “of their own free will and good desires towards God” describes the source of the people’s charity.

**Summary:** In Mosiah 18:28 the critical text will follow Oliver Cowdery’s corrected reading in  $\mathfrak{P}$  (with its restoration of a full line of  $\mathfrak{C}$ ); on the other hand, the secondary (and misleading) *and* that the 1830 compositor added will be removed.

■ **Mosiah 18:29**

*and they did walk uprightly before God  
imparting to one another  
both temporally and spiritually  
[according 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST | accordingly E] to their needs and their wants*

The 1849 LDS edition accidentally replaced *according* with *accordingly*, an error that resulted from the compositor just having set the two adverbs *temporally* and *spiritually* (both end in *-ly*). This obvious typo was removed in the subsequent LDS edition (1852). The word *accordingly*

occurs only once in the actual text, in Ether 6:20: “and accordingly the people were gathered together”; *according*, on the other hand, is always followed by either *to* or *as*.

**Summary:** The critical text will maintain the original *according* in Mosiah 18:29 and elsewhere in the text; *accordingly* occurs only once in the original text.

■ **Mosiah 18:32**

*but behold it came to pass that  
the king [NULL >+ having 1 | having ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] discovered a movement  
among the people  
sent his servants to watch them*

Oliver Cowdery initially wrote a complete sentence followed by an unattached predicate. Somewhat later, with somewhat heavier ink flow, he corrected this error by inserting *having* after *the king*. This change was probably based on proofing against the original manuscript, especially since the level of ink flow for this supralinear insertion is identical to that of the long supralinear insertion eight lines earlier on the manuscript page (see the discussion above under Mosiah 18:28). It is also possible, of course, that the insertion was simply Oliver’s attempt to correct a defective sentence. An alternative solution, if he had simply been correcting the text on his own initiative, would have been to insert an *and* before the verb form *sent*, which would have given two coordinated predicates: “the king discovered a movement among the people **and** sent his servants to watch them”.

There is one clear example where Oliver Cowdery accidentally omitted the present participle *having* while copying from  $\mathcal{O}$  into  $\mathcal{P}$  but then almost immediately supralinearly inserted *having* (there is no change in the level of ink flow):

Alma 58:23  
after [*having* 0ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST | NULL > *having* 1] traveled much  
in the wilderness

In this particular instance,  $\mathcal{O}$  is extant and reads *having*, so we know that Oliver’s correction is not his own emendation to the text. The most reasonable assumption in Mosiah 18:32 is to assume that Oliver corrected  $\mathcal{P}$  according to the reading in  $\mathcal{O}$  (as in Alma 58:23).

**Summary:** Accept in Mosiah 18:32 Oliver Cowdery’s insertion in  $\mathcal{P}$  of *having*; this correction probably represents Oliver’s proofing against the original manuscript rather than his own editing.

■ **Mosiah 18:33**

*and now the king saith  
that Alma was [a >jg NULL 1 | ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] stirring up the people  
to [a 1A | BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] rebellion against him*

The 1837 edition deleted the indefinite article *a* in the phrase “to a rebellion”, perhaps intentionally since in modern English we expect “to stir up someone to rebellion”. Elsewhere in the Book of

Mormon, most uses of the singular *rebellion* are noncount (16 times), as in the phrases “in open rebellion” (Mosiah 2:37), “the weapons of their rebellion” (Alma 23:7), and “rise up in rebellion” (Alma 61:11). There are four occurrences of the plural form *rebellions*, which is, of course, a count noun form. There are also two clear cases of a singular *rebellion* that functions as a count noun:

1 Nephi 7:7  
 and it came to pass that  
**in the which rebellion** they were desirous to return unto the land of Jerusalem

Ether 11:15  
 there arose **a rebellion** among the people

There is nothing strange about the use of the indefinite article *a* in the last example. There is one case where the singular *rebellion* can be interpreted as either count or noncount:

Alma 57:33  
 and it came to pass because of **their rebellion**  
 we did cause that our swords should come upon them

Finally, there is one example which is quite parallel to Mosiah 18:33:

Mosiah 10:6  
 and he began to stir his people up  
 in [ 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST | a HK] rebellion against my people

In this example, the first and second RLDS editions (1874 and 1892) had the indefinite article *a* (“in a rebellion”), probably by accident. But this insertion seems to indicate that in the 19th century the use of the indefinite article in the expression “in a rebellion” was possible. Nonetheless, this passage in Mosiah 10:6 did not apparently have the indefinite article originally (see the discussion under Mosiah 10:6).

It is possible that here in Mosiah 18:33, the *a* in “to a rebellion” was a copying error, perhaps influenced by the preceding occurrence of *a* in “Alma was **a** stirring up the people”. This prepositional *a* was consciously deleted by the 1830 typesetter since he marked its deletion (in pencil) in the printer’s manuscript. (For discussion of such usage as “a stirring”, see under 1 Nephi 8:28; also see the full list of examples under PREPOSITIONAL A in volume 3.)

In Early Modern English, the phrase “to a rebellion” seems to have been fairly frequent, as exemplified by the following examples culled online from the Oxford English Dictionary and *Literature Online* <lion.chadwyck.com>, with accidentals as cited:

John Ford (1633)  
 And this same whorson Court ease is temptation  
**To a rebellion** in the veines:

George Buck (1646)  
 His secret drift was, to apt and prepare the Duke **to a Rebellion** at any hand.

Aphra Behn (1683)  
 And soon will raise them up **to a Rebellion**;

Mary Pix (1705)

So long I've learn'd and Practic'd to Obey,  
I cannot force my Tongue **to a Rebellion**,

John Dennis (1709)

The News of your Death has been maliciously spread thro' the Camp,  
to animate the Legions **to a Rebellion**;

Thus there is support for the earliest reading in Mosiah 18:33 (“to a rebellion”), although none of it is contemporary with Joseph Smith.

Ultimately, the critical text will rely on the earliest textual sources for determining whether *rebellion* should occur with the indefinite article or not. Although the reading “to a rebellion” sounds odd in modern English, it seems to have been intended here in Mosiah 18:33.

**Summary:** Restore the indefinite article in “to a rebellion” in Mosiah 18:33; despite the awkwardness of this usage in modern English, the *a* may have been intended in the original text.

■ **Mosiah 18:34–35**

*therefore they took their tents and their families  
and departed into the wilderness*

- |   |                                   |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| □ NULL  | 1*                                |
| □ <i>and they were in number<br/>about four hundred and fifty souls</i> | 1 <sup>c</sup> ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST |

Here we have another large omission that took place when Oliver Cowdery initially copied the text from  $\mathcal{O}$  into  $\mathcal{P}$ . In this instance, Oliver may have caught his error almost immediately since the level of ink flow for the supralinear insertion appears to be unchanged. The length of the omission is close to being another whole line of  $\mathcal{O}$  (perhaps  $\mathcal{O}$  had a minor crossout in this line). There seem to be no identical words that could have led to a visual skip here. For two similar examples of what appears to be the omission of an entire line of  $\mathcal{O}$ , see above under Mosiah 17:2 and Mosiah 18:28. In those two instances, the level of ink flow is heavier, which suggests that those corrections were made while proofing  $\mathcal{P}$  against  $\mathcal{O}$ . In any event, the added line here in Mosiah 18:35 was clearly in the original manuscript; Oliver would never have added such specific information to the text, especially when there would have been no independent motivation for doing so.

**Summary:** Maintain Oliver Cowdery’s supralinearly inserted line of text in Mosiah 18:35 since this reading must have been in the original manuscript.



# Mosiah 19

## ■ Mosiah 19:1

*and it came to pass that  
the [Kings > NULL 1 | ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] army of the king returned*

Oliver Cowdery, the scribe here in  $\mathcal{P}$ , initially wrote “the king’s army” (although the possessive form *Kings* was written without the apostrophe). Oliver immediately caught his error here, crossed out *Kings*, and then continued inline with “of the king”. The original manuscript undoubtedly read “the army of the king”. Of course, either genitive form is possible. Oliver’s initial error was probably the result of the preceding instance of “the king’s army” that occurs only a couple of verses earlier:

Mosiah 18:34  
and it came to pass that  
Alma and the people of the Lord were apprised of the coming  
of the [*Kings* >jg *King’s* 1 | *king’s* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] army

The text has two instances of “the armies of king Noah” (both in Mosiah 23:1), but no more of “the king’s army” (or “the king’s armies”). In Mosiah 18:34, “the king’s army” avoids the rather awkward “apprised **of** the coming **of** the army **of** the king” (that is, a sequence of three prepositional phrases beginning with *of*).

**Summary:** Accept in Mosiah 19:1 Oliver Cowdery’s immediately corrected reading in  $\mathcal{P}$ , “the army of the king” rather than “the king’s army”, which occurs two verses earlier in the text.

## ■ Mosiah 19:3

*and the lesser part began to breathe out  
[threatning >jg threatenings 1 | threatnings ABCD | threatenings EFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]  
against the king*

The 1830 compositor penciled in the plural *s* for *threatenings* in the printer’s manuscript and set the 1830 edition with the plural *s*. Clearly, the earliest reading “to breathe out threatening” seems unacceptable. The 1830 emendation is consistent with all other occurrences of the noun *threatening* in the Book of Mormon text; that is, elsewhere the text has instances of only the plural *threatenings* (nine of them), including four more with the phraseology “to breathe out **threatenings**” (never “to breathe out **threatening**”):

1 Nephi 18:17	they did <b>breathe out</b> much <b>threatenings</b>
Alma 26:18	we went forth even in wrath with mighty <b>threatenings</b>
Alma 35:9	he <b>breathed out</b> many <b>threatenings</b> against them
Alma 54:16	I fear not your <b>threatenings</b>
Alma 54:19	ye have <b>breathed out</b> many <b>threatenings</b> against me and my people
Alma 54:19	we fear not your <b>threatenings</b>
3 Nephi 3:12	this Lachoneus . . . could not be frightened by the demands and the <b>threatenings</b> of a robber
3 Nephi 4:12	notwithstanding the <b>threatenings</b> and the oaths which Giddianhi had made
3 Nephi 5:5	as many as were found breathing out <b>threatenings</b> against their brethren

In the first example, we get the plural even with the preceding *much*; such usage is found fairly often in the original text (see under 1 Nephi 16:35 for “much afflictions”, Enos 1:21 for “much horses”, and the Words of Mormon 1:16 for “much contentions”). Also note that in 3 Nephi 5:5 there is no preceding determiner for *threatening(s)*, just as in Mosiah 19:3. Further support for the plural *threatenings* in the phrase “to breathe out threatenings against someone” can be found in the King James Bible:

Acts 9:1–2  
and Saul yet breathing out **threatenings** and slaughter  
against the disciples of the Lord  
went unto the high priest and desired of him letters . . .

In Mosiah 19:3, the plural *s* for *threatenings* was probably accidentally lost during the early transmission of the text.

**Summary:** Accept in Mosiah 19:3 the 1830 compositor’s decision to add a plural *s* to *threatening* (thus “to breathe out threatenings against the king”).

■ **Mosiah 19:5**

*and [now > NULL 1| ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] it came to pass that  
he fought with the king*

Here in the printer’s manuscript, Oliver Cowdery initially wrote “and now it came to pass”; then almost immediately he crossed out the *now* (the level of ink flow for the crossout appears to be unchanged). Either reading is possible, so there would have been no motivation for Oliver to delete the *now* except that the original manuscript didn’t have it. The intrusive *now* was probably prompted by the *and now* that begins the preceding verse:

Mosiah 19:4  
**and now** there was a man among them whose name was Gideon  
and he being a strong man and an enemy to the king  
therefore he drew his sword and swore in his wrath  
that he would slay the king

*Summary:* Maintain in Mosiah 19:5 the corrected reading in  $\mathcal{D}$ , “and it came to pass that he fought with the king” (that is, without any *now* after the initial *and*).

■ **Mosiah 19:6**

*and Gideon pursued after him and was about to get upon the tower*  
 [to 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST | and L] *slay the king*

Here the 1902 LDS missionary edition replaced the infinitival *to* with the conjunctive *and*. The critical text will maintain the original use of *to* here. For further discussion of this phraseology, see under Mosiah 19:21.

*Summary:* Maintain in Mosiah 19:6 the infinitival clause “to slay the king”, the earliest reading.

■ **Mosiah 19:7**

*for the Lamanites are upon us*  
*and they will destroy [them 1ABCDEFGHIJKLPS | them > us M | us NOQRT]*  
*yea they will destroy my people*

The use of *yea* in the following clause explains that the pronoun *them* refers to king Noah’s people. Even though the pronoun *them* seems stranded, the text recovers by using the *yea*-clause to provide the referent for *them*, namely “my people”.

The 1906 LDS large-print edition introduced the *us* that is found in the current LDS text. This change was adopted in the third printing (in 1907) of the 1905 Chicago missionary edition. The apparent source for this innovative *us* is the *us* in the preceding clause (“the Lamanites are upon us”). Although the change to *us* clears up the immediate problem with *them*, the resulting *yea*-clause now becomes virtually anomalous. The pronoun *us* already means king Noah, Gideon, and all the people, so why do we now need a *yea*-clause that provides no explication? Thus the change to *us* creates a difficulty that never existed in the original text.

It is possible that the 1906 change from *them* to *us* is a typo. Notice a similar error that occurred earlier in the book of Mosiah (in this case, as an initial error in the printer’s manuscript):

Mosiah 9:11  
 therefore it came to pass that  
 after **we** had dwelt in the land for the space of twelve years  
 that king Laman began to grow uneasy  
 lest by any means **my people** should wax strong in the land  
 and that they could not overpower [*us > them* 1 | *them* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]  
 and bring **them** into bondage

See under Mosiah 9:11 for discussion of that example. Here in Mosiah 19:7, the critical text will maintain the original reading.

*Summary:* Restore the original pronoun *them* in Mosiah 19:7 (“and they will destroy them”); the purpose of the following *yea*-clause is to explain what the pronoun *them* is referring to.

## ■ Mosiah 19:8

*and now the king was not  
so [much >js NULL 1 | much ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] concerned about his people  
as he was about his own life*

In his editing of the printer’s manuscript for the 1837 edition, Joseph Smith crossed out the *much* in this passage. The emended text (“not so concerned about his people”) is more formal sounding. Nonetheless, the 1837 edition never implemented this change. Perhaps it was decided that the original phraseology (“not so much concerned about his people”) sounded perfectly fine. All subsequent editions have maintained the original reading, as will the critical text.

There are no other passages where *so much* is followed by an adjective or an adjectival participle. We ignore one secondary instance that was introduced into the text in the 1837 edition: namely, the change of “so **exceeding** more numerous” to “so **much** more numerous” in Alma 58:2. For discussion of a case where Joseph Smith removed *much* from before a past participle, see under 1 Nephi 18:15.

**Summary:** Accept in Mosiah 19:8 the original “not so **much** concerned about his people”; Joseph Smith’s deletion of the *much* in  $\mathcal{P}$ , motivated perhaps by stylistic considerations, has never been implemented in any edition.

## ■ Mosiah 19:11

*[now >jg Now 1 | Now ABCDEFGHIJLMNOQRT | And KPS] it came to pass that  
the king commanded them that all the men should leave their wives and their children  
and flee before the Lamanites*

The 1892 RLDS edition accidentally replaced the sentence-initial *now* with *and*. There was no reason for emending the text here. Nor does the 1892 edition (the second RLDS edition) generally involve much editing; that edition is basically a copy of the first RLDS edition (1874). Yet this 1892 typo has been retained in the RLDS text. The preceding sentence (in verse 10) begins with “**and** it came to pass”; this is the probable source for the 1892 replacement of *now* with *and* in verse 11.

**Summary:** Maintain the original sentence-initial *now* in Mosiah 19:11.

## ■ Mosiah 19:13

*and it came to pass that  
those [that 1A | who BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] tarried with their wives and their children  
caused that their fair daughters should stand forth and plead with the Lamanites  
that they would not slay them*

Here the 1837 edition changed the relative pronoun *that* to *who*. Even so, nearby instances of *those that* have never been edited to *those who*:

Mosiah 19:16

and now there was one of the sons of the king  
among **those that** was taken captive  
whose name was Limhi

Mosiah 19:18

and it came to pass that Gideon sent men into the wilderness secretly  
to search for the king and **those that** was with him

Mosiah 19:19

and if their wives and their children were slain  
and also **those that** had tarried with them  
that they would seek revenge and also perish with them

Perhaps in Mosiah 19:13 there was some perceived difficulty with having *those that* immediately preceded by the subordinate conjunction *that* (“and it came to pass **that those that** tarried”). In any event, the critical text will restore the original *those that*. For further discussion, see under WHICH in volume 3.

*Summary:* Restore in Mosiah 19:13 the original use of *those that*; nearly all instances of *those that* which were in the original text have not been edited to *those who*.

■ **Mosiah 19:15**

*therefore the Lamanites did spare their lives  
and took them captives and carried them back to the land of Nephi  
and granted unto them that they might possess the land  
under the [condition > conditions 1 | conditions ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]  
that they would deliver up the king Noah into the hands of the Lamanites  
and deliver up their property*

Oliver Cowdery initially wrote the singular *condition*, which is what we expect in current English. However, almost immediately he corrected the text by inserting the plural *s* (with no change in the level of ink flow). Theoretically, Oliver could have made the change to the plural because two distinct conditions follow (“deliver up the king Noah . . . and deliver up their property”). But evidence from the rest of the Book of Mormon text shows that the text itself consistently prefers the plural *conditions*, even when there is only one condition listed. Consider, for instance, the original reading for the four instances where *conditions* is preceded by the preposition *on*. These four cases are semantically equivalent to the one case with *under* (here in Mosiah 19:15):

Alma 17:15

notwithstanding the promises of the Lord were extended unto them  
**on the conditions of** repentance

Alma 27:24

and we will guard them from their enemies by our armies  
**on conditions that** they will give us a portion of their substance to assist us

Alma 42:13

therefore according to justice  
the plan of redemption could not be brought about  
only **on conditions of** repentance of men in this probationary state

Alma 54:11

therefore I will close my epistle  
 by telling you that I will not exchange prisoners  
 save it be **on conditions that** ye will deliver up a man  
 and his wife and his children for one prisoner  
 if this be the case that ye will do it  
 I will exchange

Note that for two cases (Alma 27:24 and Alma 54:11) there is only one condition, yet the text still uses the plural *conditions*.

Based on the earliest textual sources, there appears to have been no occurrences of the singular *condition* for the entire text, only *conditions* (14 times). Nonetheless, there has been a strong tendency in the history of the text to replace the unexpected plural with the singular—sometimes accidentally, sometimes intentionally. Besides the case of Mosiah 19:15, there are four other instances:

Mosiah 4:8 (1852 LDS edition, first printing)

neither [*is* 1ABDEP | *are* CGHIJKLMNOQRST | *is* > *are* F] there  
 any [*conditions* 1ABCDEFGHJKLMNOPQRST | *condition* > *conditions* F]  
 whereby man can be saved except the conditions which I have told you

Alma 27:24 (1920 LDS edition)

on [*conditions* 1ABCDEFGHJKLMNOPQS | *condition* RT]  
 [*that* 1ART | BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQS] they will give us a portion of their substance

Alma 42:13 (1858 Wright edition)

only on [*conditions* 01ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOQRST | *condition* GHK]  
 of repentance of men in this probationary state

Helaman 14:18 (1830 edition)

and it bringeth to pass  
 the [*conditions* 1PS | *condition* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOQRT] of repentance

See each of these passages for discussion, especially the last one (which turns out to be more complicated than the others).

Thus the critical text will restore the consistent use of the plural *conditions* throughout the Book of Mormon text, including here in Mosiah 19:15: “under the conditions that they would deliver up the king Noah into the hands of the Lamanites and deliver up their property”.

**Summary:** Retain in Mosiah 19:15 the plural *conditions*, Oliver Cowdery’s corrected reading in  $\mathcal{P}$ ; the original Book of Mormon text consistently used the plural *conditions*, never the singular *condition*.

### ■ Mosiah 19:15

*under the conditions that they would deliver up*  
 [*the* 1A | BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *king Noah*  
*into the hands of the Lamanites*

There are perhaps ten places in the original text where a title and name are preceded by the definite article *the*, as here in the earliest sources for Mosiah 19:15 (namely, “the king Noah”). In the

1837 edition, this extra *the* was deleted. But in eight other instances of this usage in the earliest text, the original definite article has been retained. And in seven of these cases, compositors and editors have tried to mitigate the strangeness of this construction by adding nonrestrictive punctuation:

Alma 19:30 (“the king Lamoni”: commas added in the 1830 edition)

and when she had done this  
 she took the king  
 [ 1 |, ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] Lamoni  
 [ 1 |, ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] by the hand

Alma 51:2 (“the chief judge Parhoron”: comma added in the 1830 edition,  
 removed in the 1920 LDS edition)

for there began to be a contention among the people  
 concerning the chief judge  
 [ 0RT|NULL >jg , 1 |, ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQS]  
 Parhoron  
 [ 0|NULL >jg ; 1 ; ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]

Alma 51:12 (“the chief judge Parhoron”: comma added in the 1830 edition,  
 accidentally removed in the 1841 British edition, restored in the 1920  
 LDS edition)

and it was at the same time  
 that they had began to settle the affairs of their contentions  
 concerning the chief judge  
 [ 0DEFIJLMNOQ|NULL >jg , 1 |, ABCGHKPRST]  
 Parhoron  
 [ 0|NULL >jg . 1 |. ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]

Alma 52:12 (“the king Ammoron”: parentheses added in the 1830 edition)

now the king  
 [ 01|( ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST) Ammoron  
 [ 01|) HIJKLMNOPQRST|,) ABCDEFG]  
 had departed out of the land of Zarahemla

3 Nephi 6:6 (“the judge Lachoneus”: comma added in the 1920 LDS edition)

and now it was Gidgiddoni  
 and the judge  
 [ 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPS|, RT] Lachoneus  
 [ 1 |, ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]  
 and those which had been appointed leaders . . .

Ether 9:29 (“the king Heth”: comma added in the 1920 LDS edition)

and it came to pass that they done all these things  
 according to the commandment of the king  
 [ 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPS|, RT] Heth  
 [NULL >jg . 1 |. ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]

Ether 10:32 (“the king Amgid”: comma added in the 1920 LDS edition)

and he went to battle against the king  
 [ 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPS |, RT] Amgid  
 [ 1 |, ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]  
 and they fought for the space of many years

In only one case has the original instance of “the <title> <name>” been left without nonrestrictive punctuation:

Helaman 6:19 (“the chief judge Cezoram”: no parenthetical punctuation)

and it was they which did murder  
 the chief judge Cezoram  
 [ 1 |, ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]  
 and his son

Finally, there is one other possible instance of “the <title> <name>” in the original text:

3 Nephi 9:9

and behold that great city Jacob-Ugath  
 which was inhabited by the people of  
 [*the king of Jacob* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPS | *king Jacob* RT]  
 have I caused to be burned with fire

Here the earliest text reads “the people of the king **of** Jacob”, but this seems to be an error for an original “the people of the king Jacob”. It appears that early in the transmission of the text an additional *of* was inserted. Note that the 1920 LDS edition emended this reading to “the people of king Jacob”, showing that the editors for that edition felt that the *of* before *Jacob* was intrusive. But the 1920 edition also removed the extra *the* (just like the 1837 edition removed the *the* from “the king Noah” in Mosiah 19:15).

For the vast majority of cases, the Book of Mormon avoids the definite article usage before a title and name. Thus everywhere else the text has only examples like “king Noah”, not “the king Noah”. On the other hand, there is no evidence in the manuscripts that the scribes tended to accidentally add the definite article before a title and name. In other words, there is no independent evidence that the original ten cases of “the <title> <name>” are due to scribal error. They appear to be intended, even if they occur only infrequently in the text.

This unusual use of the definite article seems to be a Hebraism. In the Hebrew text of the Old Testament, expressions like “king David” are always represented in Hebrew as “the king David”. William Tyndale, the original translator of the Bible into Early Modern English (at least for the New Testament and the first half of the Old Testament, up through 2 Chronicles), consistently translated this Hebrew construction without the definite article, but Tyndale’s successors who completed the Early Modern English translation of the Old Testament were sometimes too literal in their translation. Thus the latter part of the Old Testament in Early Modern English translations had a number of cases where *the* preceded a title and name, including the following number of cases that made it into the 1611 King James Bible:



Mosiah 19

Ezra	“the king Artaxerxes”	1 time
Esther	“the king Ahasuerus”	13 times
	“the queen Vashti”	2 times
Jeremiah	“the king Zedekiah”	1 time
Daniel	“the king Nebuchadnezzar”	5 times

As in the Book of Mormon, this Hebraistic usage is very sporadic and inconsistently used, even within these biblical books. (Actually, the five instances found in the book of Daniel are not written in Hebrew but in Aramaic, a related Northwest Semitic language.) All in all, such usage is very strange for modern readers.

The use of the definite article in this construction existed in Old English and early in Middle English, as in the following examples from the *Peterborough Chronicle*, which dates from the 1100s:

- 1127    **se** kyng Heanri [**the** king Henry]
- 1127    **se** Scotte kyng Daudid [**the** Scot king David]
- 1127    ðurh **þone** kyng Heanri of Engleland [through **the** king Henry of England]
- 1154    **þe** king Stephne [**the** king Stephen] (two times)

But this usage died out later in Middle English, long before Tyndale’s translation of the Old Testament in the 1530s. For example, from William Caxton’s 1485 version of Thomas Malory’s *Le Morte Darthur*, we have examples of “kyng Arthur” [king Arthur]—that is, without any *the*. For these citations from the *Peterborough Chronicle* and from Caxton, see David Burnley, *The History of the English Language: A Source Book* (London: Longman, 1992), pages 68–69, 74–75, and 187–188. Alison Coutts points out (personal communication) that the English language uses the definite article for a few specific titles, as in “the Emperor Napoleon” (this usage may be due to the French use of the definite article in *l’Empéreur Napoléon*).

This sporadic use of *the* in the Early Modern English Bible appears to be due to an overly literal, but inconsistently applied, translation process. The same may hold for the Book of Mormon text with its occasional use of the same Hebraistic construction. The critical text will restore these instances of *the* followed by a title and name—and without treating the name parenthetically. For other examples of Hebrew-like constructions in the original text of the Book of Mormon, see under HEBRAISMS in volume 3.

**Summary:** Restore in Mosiah 19:15 the definite article of the original reading (“**the** king Noah”); the critical text will avoid any parenthetical treatment of the name for those cases where the original text appears to have had the Hebraistic construction “the <title> <name>”: Mosiah 19:15, Alma 19:30, Alma 51:2, Alma 51:12, Alma 52:12, Helaman 6:19, 3 Nephi 6:6, 3 Nephi 9:9, Ether 9:29, and Ether 10:32.

■ **Mosiah 19:21**

*and they were about to take the priests also  
[to 1PS | and ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOQRT] put them to death  
and they fled before them*

Here the 1830 typesetter accidentally replaced *to* with *and*. In accord with the reading of  $\mathfrak{P}$ , the 1908 RLDS edition restored the original *to*. There is nothing grammatically inappropriate with

having an explanative infinitival clause after the verb phrase “about to <do something>”, as in the following example from the same chapter:

Mosiah 19:6  
 and Gideon pursued after him  
 and was **about to** get upon the tower  
**to** slay the king

In that example, the 1902 LDS edition accidentally replaced the *to* with *and*, just as the 1830 edition did here in Mosiah 19:21 (see the discussion under Mosiah 19:6). Of course, there are also examples of “about to <do something>” where *and* is used instead of *to*, as in the following example:

1 Nephi 4:30  
 he began to tremble  
 and was **about to** flee from before me  
**and** return to the city of Jerusalem

We therefore follow the earliest reading in determining whether the following clause is connected by *and* or *to* to a preceding “about to <do something>”.

**Summary:** Restore in Mosiah 19:21 the infinitival *to* in “**to** put them to death”, the reading of the earliest textual source (here the printer’s manuscript).

■ **Mosiah 19:23**

*and his priests had fled from them*

[ *further* > *farther* 1 | *farther* ABCDEFGIJLMOPQRST | *further* HKN ] *into the wilderness*

When dealing with physical distance, speakers of modern English use either *further* or *farther*. In this passage, we see a persistent tendency to replace *farther* with *further*: (1) in the 1874 RLDS edition, (2) in the 1906 LDS large-print edition, and (3) early on, when Oliver Cowdery initially wrote down the word in the printer’s manuscript (which almost immediately he corrected to *farther* by overwriting the *u* with an *a*, but without any change in the level of ink flow).

There is a prescriptive grammar rule (discussed as early as 1906 by Frank Vizetelly) that insists speakers should use *farther* instead of *further* when physical distance is involved. This grammatical dictum is apparently based on the presumption that *farther* must be used in order to make the semantic relationship with *far* more transparent. Yet this rule (and its rationale) is completely artificial and has no historical basis since *farther* and *further* are derived from *forth*, not *far*. See the discussion under *farther*, *further* in Merriam-Webster’s Dictionary of English Usage and also under *farther* in the Oxford English Dictionary.

Here in Mosiah 19:23, Oliver Cowdery might have had difficulty reading the difference between a *u* and an *a* in the original manuscript (which is no longer extant for the book of Mosiah). Such a mix-up could have easily occurred if Oliver himself was the scribe in ☉ for this portion of the text since he frequently confused the letters *u* and *a* in the manuscripts. For instance, he apparently wrote *Cumorah* in the original manuscript as if it were *Camorah* (thus the 1830 compositor set the spelling for this name as *Camorah*); see the discussion under Mormon 6:2.

In other words, what may have looked like *farther* in the original manuscript might have actually been *further*. Elsewhere, the earliest text has three occurrences of *further*:

1 Nephi 19:4

and that these plates should be handed down from one generation to another  
or from one prophet to another until **further** commandments of the Lord

1 Nephi 22:29

and now I Nephi make an end  
for I durst not speak **further** as yet concerning these things

Mosiah 24:23

therefore get thee out of this land  
and I will stop the Lamanites in this valley  
that they come no **further** in pursuit of this people

For each of these examples, all the (extant) textual sources read *further*, including the last one (which refers to physical distance).

There is, however, additional support in the earliest textual sources for the possibility of *farther*—namely, in the compound word *farthermost*:

3 Nephi 4:23

and it came to pass that Zemnarihah did give command unto his people  
that they should withdraw themselves from the siege and to march  
into the [*farthar most* 1 | *farthermost* A | *furthermost* BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]  
parts of the land northward

Here both  $\mathcal{P}$  and the 1830 edition are firsthand copies of  $\mathcal{O}$ ; therefore the original manuscript most probably read *farthermost*. The 1837 edition replaced *farthermost* with *furthermost*, which has been retained in both the LDS and RLDS texts. This example of *farthermost* provides additional support for the possibility that the original manuscript for Mosiah 19:23 read *farther*. The critical text will therefore accept Oliver Cowdery’s virtually immediate correction of *further* to *farther* in  $\mathcal{P}$  for Mosiah 19:23. More generally, the critical text will ignore the artificial grammatical rule that requires the use of *farther* when physical distance is involved; in each case, we will rely on the earliest textual sources. In other words, variation sometimes occurs in the original text, thus *farther* in Mosiah 19:23, *further* in Mosiah 24:23, and *farthermost* in 3 Nephi 4:23.

**Summary:** Accept in Mosiah 19:23 Oliver Cowdery’s correction of *further* to *farther*; the original text seems to have had examples of both *farther* and *further* when referring to physical distance.

■ **Mosiah 19:24**

*and it came to pass that  
after they had ended the [cerimony 1 | ceremony ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]  
that they returned to the land of Nephi  
rejoicing because their wives and their children were not slain*

The problem in this passage is that the word *ceremony* does not seem appropriate. The larger context seems to imply that their discourse was simply over:

Mosiah 19:22–23

and it came to pass that  
 they were about to return to the land of Nephi  
 and they met the men of Gideon  
 and the men of Gideon told them of all that had happened  
 to their wives and their children  
 and that the Lamanites had granted unto them  
 that they might possess the land by paying a tribute to the Lamanites  
 of one half of all they possessed  
 and the people told the men of Gideon that they had slain the king  
 and his priests had fled from them farther into the wilderness

The Oxford English Dictionary lists no meaning for *ceremony* that would work reasonably well for this passage.

Over the years I have had some of my students and research assistants try to find another word that might work better in Mosiah 19:22–24, one that would perhaps sound or look like *ceremony*. The idea behind this approach is that such a word might have been miscopied or misheard as *ceremony*. The most plausible suggestion proposed thus far comes from Renee Bangerter. On pages 16–18 of her 1998 BYU master’s thesis (*Since Joseph Smith’s Time: Lexical Semantic Shifts in the Book of Mormon*), she proposes that the original word in Mosiah 19:24 might have been *sermon*. Although the current meanings for this word will not work in this passage, Bangerter notes that the Oxford English Dictionary gives the earliest meaning for *sermon* as ‘something that is said; talk, discourse’, which would exactly fit the context described in Mosiah 19:22–24. This meaning is, however, obsolete; the last citation in the OED with this meaning dates from 1594: “Desiring Don Infeligo with very mild sermon to be friends with Medesimo again.” The latest example I could find on *Literature Online* <lion.chadwyck.com> comes from Giles Fletcher and dates from 1593: “Out of my braine I made his Sermon flow”.

One might think that an archaic meaning for the word *sermon* would be strong evidence against accepting it as the reading of the original text for Mosiah 19:24. Yet there is considerable evidence in the earliest Book of Mormon text that its vocabulary and expressions date from the 1500s and 1600s rather than from the 1800s of Joseph Smith’s time. In other words, the original text contained a number of words or combinations of words with meanings that were lost from the English language by 1700, including the following (with the date of their last citation in the OED given in parentheses):

- *require* ‘request’ (1665)

Enos 1:18

thy fathers have also **required** of me this thing

- *but if* ‘unless’ (1596)

Mosiah 3:19

for the natural man is an enemy to God  
 and has been from the fall of Adam  
 and will be forever and ever  
**but if** he yieldeth to the enticings of the Holy Spirit

- *counsel* ‘counsel with’ (1547)  
 Alma 37:37  
**counsel the Lord** in all thy doings  
 and he will direct thee for good
- *extinct* ‘dead’ (1675) [referring to the death of a person, not the end of a species or race]  
 Alma 44:7  
 and I will command my men that they shall fall upon you  
 and inflict the wounds of death in your bodies  
 that ye may become **extinct**
- *cast arrows* ‘shoot arrows’ (1609)  
 Alma 49:4  
 for behold the Nephites had dug up a ridge of earth round about them  
 which was so high that the Lamanites could not **cast** their stones  
 and their **arrows** at them
- *depart* ‘part’ (1677)  
 Helaman 8:11  
 God gave power unto one man even Moses  
 to smite upon the waters of the Red Sea  
 and they **departed** hither and thither

Some of these archaic word uses have been edited out of the text; see the discussion under Mosiah 3:19, Alma 37:37, and Helaman 8:11. For one more example (one that involves conjectural emendation like Mosiah 19:24), see the discussion regarding “the pleading bar of God” under Jacob 6:13. Also see the extensive discussion in volume 3 regarding the archaic language of the original text of the Book of Mormon. In volume 3, I also consider the possibility that the ungrammatical usage in the original text is due more to archaic language from the 1500–1600s than to upstate New York English dialect from the early 1800s.

The original manuscript is not extant for the book of Mosiah, but one possibility is that the scribe in  $\mathcal{O}$  spelled *sermon* as *cermon*, which could have easily led Oliver Cowdery, the scribe for the printer’s manuscript, to mistake this word as *ceremony* (spelled as *cerimony* in  $\mathcal{P}$ ). There is considerable evidence that the scribes sometimes misspelled *s* as *c* when followed by the letter *e*, *i*, or *y*:

STANDARD SPELLING	MANUSCRIPT SPELLING	SCRIBE
cease	ceace	scribe 3 of $\mathcal{O}$
	seace	scribe 3 of $\mathcal{O}$
	seace	Oliver Cowdery
	seaced	Oliver Cowdery
consecrate	concecrated	Oliver Cowdery
consist	conclist	Oliver Cowdery
converse	converce	Oliver Cowdery
disperse	disperce	Oliver Cowdery
	disperced	Oliver Cowdery

STANDARD SPELLING	MANUSCRIPT SPELLING	SCRIBE
hypocrisy	hypocracy	Oliver Cowdery
immense	immence	Oliver Cowdery
paradise	paridice	scribe 2 of Ø
responsibility	responcibility	Oliver Cowdery
sincere	Cinsere	Hyrum Smith
sincerity	cincerity	Oliver Cowdery

So if *sermon* had been spelled as *cermon* in Ø, Oliver Cowdery could have misinterpreted the word as *ceremony*, a word that he was familiar with, even though this word didn't make much sense in this passage (of course, *sermon* wouldn't have made much sense to him either). There is considerable evidence that Oliver sometimes substituted more common words for unfamiliar words, even when the substitution itself made little or no sense. For a list of examples, see the discussion under Jacob 6:13.

Interestingly, modern nouns that might be synonymous with the archaic meaning of *sermon* are not found at all in the text of the Book of Mormon—namely, nouns such as *conversation*, *discussion*, and *discourse*. The word *conversation* was accidentally, but incorrectly, introduced into the 1841 and 1852 editions for Alma 27:25 (see the discussion there). One theoretical possibility for Mosiah 19:24 is that a nominalized form of the verb *converse* could have been used, as in “after they had ended the conversing”. The Book of Mormon does have instances of the verb *converse* with the meaning ‘to convey the thoughts reciprocally in talk’ (Samuel Johnson’s definition):

3 Nephi 11:2–3  
 and **they were also conversing** about this Jesus Christ  
 of which the sign had been given concerning his death  
 and it came to pass that while **they were thus conversing one with another**  
 they heard a voice as if it came out of heaven

Although the verb *converse* earlier meant ‘to associate with’, the modern meaning referring to mutual communication dates from around 1600, with the OED giving these first citations for the verb *converse* and its associated noun *conversation*:

Philip Sidney (1580)  
 She went to Pamela’s chamber, meaning to joy her thoughts  
 with the sweet **conversation** of her sister.

John Stephens (1615)  
 If . . . you desire to **converse** with him,  
 you must tarry till he be awake.

In any event, neither *conversation* nor *conversing* were used in Mosiah 19:24, although they could have been (even under the hypothesis that the vocabulary of the original text of the Book of Mormon dates from the 1500s and 1600s).

One argument that has been frequently made in support of *ceremony* here in Mosiah 19:24 is that in many cultures conversation is ceremonial, so the conveying of information between these two parties in Mosiah 19:22–23 could have been a ceremony. But by this standard, every event

in the Book of Mormon could be shown to be ceremonial, cultic, or ritualistic in some way—whether launching ships, engraving scriptures, preaching, fighting battles, planting crops, taking journeys, or dying: anything can be explained as a ceremony. Yet it should be noted that the Book of Mormon itself seems to avoid using words like *ceremony*, *rite*, and *cult*. The word *ceremony* occurs nowhere else in the Book of Mormon text. And although the scribal spelling *rites* has been maintained in a few places in the text, it is almost certain that in every case the original text read *rights* rather than *rites* (see the discussion under Alma 43:45).

Besides the general proposal that conversation is a ceremony, some scholars have found different ceremonial aspects that could be linked to the conversation described in Mosiah 19:22–23. John Sorensen, for instance, has argued that the reference to a ceremony in verse 24 has something to do with the earlier killing of king Noah, described in verses 19–21: “Mosiah 19:24 speaks of a ‘ceremony’ in connection with the slaying of king Noah by his rebellious subjects, but there is no hint of the nature or purpose of that ceremony”; see page 189 of *Images of Ancient America: Visualizing Book of Mormon Life* (Provo, Utah: FARMS, 1998). John Tvedtnes, on the other hand, has argued that the ceremony referred to in Mosiah 19:24 is “one of purification associated with the onset of the fall festivals of the month of Tishre, at which time citizen-soldiers in the ancient Near East returned home to engage in the fall harvest”; see pages 176–186 of *The Most Correct Book: Insights from a Book of Mormon Scholar* (Salt Lake City, Utah: Cornerstone, 1999), with the quote on page 186.

There is a more general problem with searching for cultural arguments as evidence for strange readings in a text—namely, there is no limit on the use of such arguments. If we hunt long enough, we can always find some culture somewhere with a practice that will support virtually any given reading (although for Book of Mormon work we might prefer that the evidence come from Mesoamerica or the Middle East). As an example, consider the case of Mosiah 17:3, where all the (extant) textual sources read “and **scourged** his skin with fagots”. Although the textual and linguistic evidence is very clear that in Mosiah 17:13 *scourged* is a mishearing for *scorched* (see the discussion for that passage), yet some have defended the current reading *scourged* by hunting for examples of people being beaten with burning sticks or of people being beaten prior to being burned at the stake. For one example, see Brant Gardner’s “Scourging with Faggots”, published in volume 21 (2001) of FARMS’s *Insights* (number 7, pages 2–3). In my own textual analyses of the Book of Mormon, I avoid using cultural evidence simply because it can always be found. In some cases, specific evidence from the Mosaic law and its practice may be appropriate, as in the discussion regarding whether *stripped*, the reading of the printer’s manuscript in Alma 11:2, should read *stripped* or *striped*. But even there that evidence is restricted to practices that are explicitly referred to in the biblical text.

I have also found that the original text of the Book of Mormon always makes linguistic sense, although not necessarily for modern-day speakers of English. There are Hebrew-like constructions that seem strange, even unacceptable, in English, yet these constructions make sense from the point of view of Hebrew. There is vocabulary that is strange today but would have been perfectly understandable to English speakers living in the 1500s and 1600s. And the biblically styled language of the text seems to date from this same time period, yet it does not imitate the specific language of the King James Bible (of course, the biblical quotes in the Book of Mormon do follow



the King James text for the most part). So when we run up against strange uses like *ceremony* in Mosiah 19:24, the most probable explanation is that *ceremony* stands for some kind of error, providing the error can be explained as textually derivable from an appropriate emendation, one that is consistent with language elsewhere in the Book of Mormon. The proposed *sermon* does fit if we allow the possibility that the original vocabulary of the Book of Mormon derives from the 1500s and 1600s, not the 1800s.

The critical text will therefore accept the proposed emendation *sermon* for Mosiah 19:24, not with the modern meaning but instead with the earlier meaning of ‘talk, discourse’. The reading *ceremony* is most likely the result of an early error in the transmission of the text, beginning with the misspelling of *sermon* as *cermon* in  $\mathfrak{C}$  and followed by the misinterpretation of *cermon* as *ceremony* when Oliver Cowdery could not recognize *cermon* as *sermon*, since for him a sermon would have been either a minister’s prepared discourse on a religious subject or, more generally speaking, an exhortation or even an harangue (see definitions 2 and 3 in the OED).

One might object that emending *ceremony* to *sermon* here in Mosiah 19:24 goes against the principles of textual criticism that I have been using elsewhere to determine the original text of the Book of Mormon. It could be argued that since one can make some sense out of “after they had ended the **ceremony**” (namely, their discourse must have involved some ceremonial aspect), the earliest extant reading should be accepted, especially since there are no other uses of the word *ceremony* in the text to provide evidence either for or against the strange use of *ceremony* in this passage. But it should be pointed out that there are other passages where I have rejected the earliest reading despite the fact that one can make sense out of that reading:

	EARLIEST EXTANT READING	EMENDED READING
1 Nephi 17:48	wither even as a dried <b>weed</b>	wither even as a dried <b>reed</b>
Alma 58:36	some <b>fraction</b> in the government	some <b>faction</b> in the government

Moreover, there are no other occurrences in the text of the words *weed* or *reed*, or of the words *fraction* or *faction*, which means that we have no information elsewhere in the text on the use of these words in the Book of Mormon. Yet for both of these cases, it is easy enough for readers to recognize the error and accept the emendation, mainly because the original words *reed* and *faction*, as used in the text, have retained their meanings in the language. (In fact, these two emendations were originally made by the 1830 typesetter and have been maintained in all subsequent editions.) But when an archaic word (or a word with an archaic use or meaning) has been replaced by a different word, it has been difficult for readers to recover the original word, not only here in Mosiah 19:24 but elsewhere in the text:

	EARLIEST EXTANT READING	EMENDED READING
Jacob 6:13	the <b>pleasing</b> bar of God	the <b>pleading</b> bar of God
Mosiah 17:13	<b>scourged</b> his skin with fagots	<b>scorched</b> his skin with fagots

The question of accepting *sermon* in Mosiah 19:24 essentially comes down to whether the original vocabulary of the Book of Mormon dates from the 1500s and 1600s rather than from the 1800s.

Don Brugger has suggested (personal communication, 6 July 2005) another possible emendation here—namely, the word *ceremony* may be an error for *testimony* (thus “after they had ended



the testimony”). Such an error in  $\mathcal{P}$  could have been the result of a mishearing or misreading, either in  $\mathcal{O}$  as the scribe took down Joseph Smith’s dictation or in  $\mathcal{P}$  as Oliver Cowdery copied the text from  $\mathcal{O}$ . Of course, the similarity between the two words would be restricted to how both words end. In fact, as a misreading, the spelling of *ceremony* with an *i* in  $\mathcal{P}$  (that is, *cerimony*) could be explained as the result of  $\mathcal{O}$  having the word *testimony*. Despite its initial attractiveness, there are several problematic aspects with this proposed emendation. First of all, evidence from actually recorded mishearings and misreadings in the Book of Mormon text shows general similarity across the entire word; the similarity is never restricted to only the last half of the word. In other words, the first syllable of the two words *testimony* and *ceremony* are sufficiently distinct (*test* versus *cer*) that it would be quite unusual if these two words were ever mixed up aurally or visually. A second difficulty with this proposed emendation is that this instance of *testimony* would be the only time in the text where the word would refer to giving or hearing testimony regarding some event. In fact, the use of *testimony* here in Mosiah 19:24 would be about as strange as *ceremony* is in the current text. And finally, the word *testimony* in the Book of Mormon text normally has some kind of postmodification, as in the following examples:

2 Nephi 27:13	to bear testimony <b>of</b> his word
Mosiah 3:24	they shall stand as a bright testimony <b>against</b> this people
Mosiah 21:35	as a witness and a testimony <b>that</b> they were willing to serve God
Alma 7:13	this is the testimony <b>which</b> is in me
Alma 24:15	as a testimony <b>to</b> our God at the last day
3 Nephi 7:25	as a witness and a testimony <b>before</b> God and <b>unto</b> the people

The only time the word *testimony* occurs without any postmodification is in Isaiah quotations:

2 Nephi 18:16	bind up the testimony
2 Nephi 18:20	to the law and to the testimony

Of course, the uniqueness of expression and form for this proposed emendation does not necessarily invalidate it, but the unique nature of the similarity between the two words *ceremony* and *testimony* (that is, the similarity is restricted to only the last half of the word) makes the proposed emendation *testimony* rather doubtful.

**Summary:** Emend Mosiah 19:24 to read “after they had ended the **sermon**”, with the understanding that *sermon* takes the obsolete meaning ‘talk or discourse’.

■ **Mosiah 19:24**

*they returned to the land of Nephi  
rejoicing because their wives and their children  
were not [destroid > slain 1 | slain ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]*

Here Oliver Cowdery’s correction in  $\mathcal{P}$  of *destroyed* (spelled as *destroid*) to *slain* was virtually immediate (the level of ink flow for the supralinear *slain* is unchanged). The Book of Mormon text frequently refers to slain people as being destroyed:

Alma 25:2

but they took their armies  
and went over into the borders of the land of Zarahemla  
and fell upon the people which were in the land of Ammonihah  
and **destroyed** them

The verb *destroy* is, of course, more general than *slay* and can even be conjoined with *slay*:

Helaman 4:20

the Nephites were in great fear  
lest they should be overpowered and trodden down  
and **slain and destroyed**

However, when referring specifically to killing women and children (as in Mosiah 19:24), the text prefers the verb *slain*:

Mosiah 19:19

now they had sworn in their hearts  
that they would return to the land of Nephi  
and if their wives and their children were **slain**  
and also those that had tarried with them  
that they would seek revenge and also perish with them

Alma 3:2

now many women and children had been **slain** with the sword  
and also many of their flocks and their herds  
and also many of their fields of grain were destroyed

Note that the first of these is found in this same chapter of Mosiah 19 and refers to the same event as in verse 24. Since the correction to *slain* in verse 24 appears to be virtually immediate, the critical text will accept it as the reading of the original manuscript.

*Summary:* Maintain in Mosiah 19:24 the corrected reading in  $\mathcal{P}$ : “their wives and their children were not **slain**”.

#### ■ Mosiah 19:25–26

*and it came to pass that  
the king of the Lamanites **made an oath** unto them  
that his people should not slay them  
and also Limhi being the son of the king  
having the kingdom conferred upon him by the people  
**made oath** unto the king of the Lamanites  
that his people should pay tribute unto him  
even one half of all they possessed*

The reading “made oath” here in Mosiah 19:26 seems odd without the indefinite article *an*, especially given the occurrence of “made an oath” in the previous verse. Elsewhere in the Book of Mormon text, whenever we have the expression “to make . . . oath”, *oath* is either preceded by *an*

(two more times) or *the* (eight times). The two other examples of “make **an** oath” refer to the oath that Zoram makes to Nephi and his brothers:

1 Nephi 4:35

yea and he also **made an oath** unto us  
that he would tarry with us from that time forth

1 Nephi 4:37

and it came to pass that  
when Zoram had **made an oath** unto us  
our fears did cease concerning him

Note further that in Mosiah 19:26, since there is no prior mention of the oath, we expect the indefinite article *an* in modern English.

Elsewhere in the scriptures, the only time we get *oath* without some kind of determiner (such as *an*, *the*, *my*, *his*, *thine*, *their*, *this*, and so forth) is when *oath* occurs in the plural. Yet even in the plural there is only one occurrence of *oaths* that takes no determiner:

Ether 10:33

and they adopted the old plans and administered **oaths**  
after the manner of the ancients

But the reading “made oath” in Mosiah 19:26 is probably not a mistake for *made oaths* since Limhi makes only a single oath.

There is also evidence in the manuscripts that the scribes sometimes omitted the indefinite article *an*:

Alma 11:13 (copying error by scribe 2 of  $\mathcal{P}$ , corrected later by Oliver Cowdery  
when he proofed  $\mathcal{P}$  against  $\mathcal{O}$ )

and [§2 *anti* > §1 *an onti* 1 | *an onti* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]  
was as great as them all

Alma 27:4 (Oliver Cowdery’s error while copying from  $\mathcal{O}$  into  $\mathcal{P}$ )

for they were treated as through they were angels sent from God  
to save them from [*an* 0 | 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST] everlasting destruction

Thus *an* could have been dropped when “made **an** oath” was copied from  $\mathcal{O}$  into  $\mathcal{P}$ . Of course,  $\mathcal{O}$  is not extant for any part of the book of Mosiah.

On the other hand, the term “to make oath” (that is, without the indefinite article *an*) has been common in legal language since Middle English, with the following sampling from the online Oxford English Dictionary:

John Kitchin (1598)

The Bargainee shall make Oath in Court.

Cowle’s *Institutes of the lawes of England* (1651)

Make Oath not to enter marriage again without the Kings consent.

John Arbuthnot (1712)

The witnesses farther made oath, that the said Timothy lay out a-nights.

Thomas Carlyle (1837)

With ceremonial evolution and manoeuvre, with fanfaronading . . .  
they made oath . . . to stand faithfully by one another.

Thus the reading “made oath” in Mosiah 19:26 is quite possible. Consequently, the critical text will accept the unique reading “made oath” here in Mosiah 19:26, even though it might be a mistake for “made **an** oath”.

**Summary:** Accept the unique instance of “to make oath” in Mosiah 19:26: “and also Limhi . . . **made oath** unto the king of the Lamanites”; although the indefinite article *an* may have been lost from this phrase during the early transmission of the text, the critical text will accept the reading without the *an* since there is considerable evidence for this phraseology in English, from Middle English to the present.

# Mosiah 20

## Mosiah 20:1

*now there was a place in Shemlon  
where the daughters of the Lamanites did gather themselves together  
[for >js NULL 1|for A| BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] to sing  
and to dance and to make themselves merry*

There were originally 15 occurrences of the archaic infinitival form *for to* in the original text. This construction is found quite frequently in the King James Bible, as in “and all countries came into Egypt to Joseph **for to** buy *corn*” (Genesis 41:57) and “but all their works they do **for to** be seen of men” (Matthew 23:5).

In the editing for the second (1837) edition of the Book of Mormon, 13 instances of *for to* were removed by deleting the *for*; nine of these deletions were marked by Joseph Smith in the printer’s manuscript. But two instances of *for to* were left unedited: namely, in Mosiah 13:25 and Alma 12:4, both of which have remained in the text (see the discussion under Mosiah 13:25). For a list of all 15 instances, see FOR TO in volume 3. The critical text will, of course, restore all 13 original occurrences of *for to* that were removed in the editing for the 1837 edition.

**Summary:** Maintain all 15 original instances of *for to* in the text, as in Mosiah 20:1 (“for to sing”).

## Mosiah 20:12

*and it came to pass that they found the king of the Lamanites  
among the number of [their 1ABDEFIJLMNOPQRST|the CGHK] dead  
yet he was not dead / having been wounded and left upon the ground*

The 1840 edition introduced the reading “among the number of **the** dead” in place of “among the number of **their** dead”, the earliest reading. This secondary reading was maintained in the RLDS textual tradition up to the 1908 RLDS edition, where *their* was restored (probably because this was the reading in the printer’s manuscript).

It is theoretically possible that this change of *their* to *the* was due to Joseph Smith’s editing. But evidence suggests that the use of *the* in the 1840 edition is actually a typo. For instance, in the next verse, those bringing the king of the Lamanites to king Limhi say the following:

Mosiah 20:13

behold here is the king of the Lamanites  
he having received a wound hath fallen among **their** dead  
and they have left him

Here we get the same expression “among **their** dead”, not “among **the** dead”; yet in this instance the 1840 edition left the original *their*. Elsewhere there are two more occurrences of the phraseology “the number of their dead”, and both of these occur in the same passage:

Alma 44:21  
 now **the number of their dead** were not numbered  
 because of the greatness of the number  
 yea **the number of their dead** were exceeding great  
 both on the Nephites and on the Lamanites

In this passage, it is theoretically possible that the second occurrence could have also read “the number of the dead” since both the Nephite and Lamanite dead are being counted.

More generally, the original Book of Mormon text has 15 examples of *their dead* (counting the instance in Mosiah 20:12). When referring to those who have died in battle, the text has three occurrences of *the dead* without any postmodification:

Alma 57:24	I immediately gave orders that my men which had been wounded should be taken from among <b>the dead</b>
Ether 14:21	the whole face of the land was covered with the bodies of <b>the dead</b>
Ether 14:22	there was none left to bury <b>the dead</b>

In general, either *their dead* or *the dead* is possible. We let the earliest textual sources determine whether any given passage should read *their dead* or *the dead*; thus the critical text will maintain the occurrence of *their dead* here in Mosiah 20:12.

**Summary:** Retain the original *their dead* in Mosiah 20:12, which is parallel to *their dead* in the next verse (Mosiah 20:13); the 1840 reading *the dead* is probably a typo rather than the result of editing on the part of Joseph Smith.

### Mosiah 20:15

*therefore in my anger [I did 1ABDEFIJLMNOPQRST | did I CGHK] cause my people to come up  
 to war against thy people*

The 1840 edition switched the word order after the initial adverbial prepositional phrase. The original order “I did cause” is more natural in terms of modern English, although the use of the periphrastic *do* is archaic. But the switch in order (“did I cause”) makes the phraseology even more archaic. Although this switch in word order could be a typo, it might also represent editing on the part of Joseph Smith, especially since there are four other cases in the 1840 edition where the subject-verb word order was switched to the inverted word order:

Mosiah 26:28  
 for him [*I will* 1ABDEFIJLMNOPQRST | *will I* CGHK] not receive at the last day  
 Alma 41:6 (the 1840 edition agrees with Ⓞ and Ⓟ)  
 even so [*shall he* 01CGHKPS | *he shall* ABDEFIJLMNOQRT] be rewarded  
 unto righteousness

Alma 46:27

yea and even [*it shall* 01ABCDEFGHIJLMNOPQRST | *shall it* CGHK] be us  
if we do not stand fast in the faith of Christ

Helaman 14:11

for for this intent [*I have* 1ABCDEFGHIJLMNOPQS | *have I* CGHKRT] come up  
upon the walls of this city  
that ye might hear and know of the judgments of God

There is also one example where Joseph made such a change to the inverted word order in his editing for the 1837 edition:

2 Nephi 33:9

but behold for none of these  
[*I cannot* 0A | *I cannot* >js *can I* 1 | *can I* BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] hope  
except they shall be reconciled unto Christ

In this passage, Joseph also removed the multiple negative.

The inverted word order (that is, with the helping verb before the subject) does occur elsewhere in the Book of Mormon. When preceded by *therefore* and a prepositional phrase beginning with *in* (as in Mosiah 20:15), most examples have the regular noninverted word order (that is, with the entire verb phrase after the subject):

Alma 24:14	therefore in his mercy <b>he doth visit</b> us
Alma 63:13	therefore in this year <b>they had been conferred</b> upon Helaman
Helaman 8:24	therefore in this <b>ye have sinned</b>

But the inverted word order is still possible:

3 Nephi 1:25	therefore in this same year <b>were they brought</b> to a knowledge of their error
--------------	---

Ultimately, the question of whether the 1840 change in word order in Mosiah 20:15 was intentional or accidental makes no difference as far as restoring the original text. The critical text will maintain the original, noninverted word order: “therefore in my anger **I did cause** my people to come up to war against thy people”.

**Summary:** Retain the original word order in Mosiah 20:15 (“therefore in my anger **I did cause** my people to come up to war against thy people”); for this context, the noninverted word order dominates in the text.

**Mosiah 20:15**

*and now the king said  
I have broken the oath because thy people did carry away the daughters of my people  
therefore in my anger I did cause my people to come up to war  
against [my > thy 1 | thy ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] people*

Here in the printer’s manuscript, Oliver Cowdery initially wrote “against my people”; then virtually immediately he crossed out the *my* and supralinearly inserted *thy* (there is no change in the level of ink flow). The error was undoubtedly caused by two preceding occurrences of *my people*: “thy people did carry away the daughters of **my people** . . . I did cause **my people** to come up to war”. Another example of this same kind of initial error is found later in this chapter:

Mosiah 20:24  
and I swear unto you with an oath  
that **my people** shall not slay  
[*my > thy > NULL 1 | ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST*] thy people

For other possible instances of this same error, see the discussion under 2 Nephi 3:12, 14.

**Summary:** Maintain in Mosiah 20:15 the corrected reading in  $\mathcal{P}$ : “therefore in my anger I did cause my people to come up to war against **thy** people”.

**Mosiah 20:16**

[*now 1 | Now ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQS | And now QRT*] *Limhi had heard nothing concerning this matter*

The 1911 LDS edition replaced the original sentence-initial *now* with *and now*; the LDS text has retained this reading. This change is undoubtedly an error and is probably due to the use of *and now* at the beginning of the previous verse: “**and now** the king said / I have broken the oath” (verse 15).

Elsewhere in the Book of Mormon, when the subject is a name and is preceded by *now*, the conjunction *and* is optional before the *now*. For various common names, we get the following statistics (here Mosiah 20:16 is counted as an example of *now* without any preceding *and*):

	<i>and now</i>	<i>now</i>
Limhi	4	1
Alma	4	10
Nephi	—	1
Lehi	—	1
Moroni	2	8
Jacob	2	—

Thus either reading is theoretically possible in Mosiah 20:16. The critical text will therefore follow the earliest reading: “now Limhi had heard nothing concerning this matter” (that is, without any sentence-initial *and*).



**Summary:** Restore the original “now Limhi” at the beginning of Mosiah 20:16 in place of the accidental “**and** now Limhi”, a typo introduced in the 1911 LDS edition.

**Mosiah 20:18**

*for do ye not remember the priests of thy father  
 which this people sought to destroy  
 and are they not in the wilderness  
 and [is it not they > are not they the ones 1 | is it not they A |  
 are not they the ones BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]  
 [which >js who 1 | which A | who BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] have stolen  
 the daughters of the Lamanites*

For the 1837 edition, Joseph Smith edited “and is it not they which” to “and are not they the ones who”. In part, Joseph’s editing here in Mosiah 20:18 increases the parallelism with the immediately preceding question since both now begin with “and are”:

<i>original:</i>	and are	they	not		in the wilderness
	and <b>is</b>	<b>it</b>	not	they	which
<i>edited:</i>	and are	they	not		in the wilderness
	and <b>are</b>		not	they	<b>the ones</b> who . . .

The change of *which* to *who* here in Mosiah 20:18 makes the text agree with modern English usage, but there is little grammatical need for the other changes (from “is it not they” to “are not they the ones”). In standard English, when referring to a previously mentioned group, despite its plurality, the pronoun *it* can be used to identify that group as the subject. Thus we can ask, for instance, “Was it not the Mormons who first settled Utah?” (or, more commonly, in the contracted form “Wasn’t it the Mormons who first settled Utah?”). Although the corresponding question “Weren’t the Mormons the ones who first settled Utah?” is perfectly acceptable, there is nothing wrong with the existential singular construction. The text has no other examples of yes-no questions with this existential form, but there are positive declarative examples that have been retained in the text (although in the following list each archaic use of the relative pronoun *which* has been edited to the appropriate form of *who*):

Alma 3:12	and it is they which have kept the records
Alma 19:15	for it was they which had stood before the king
Alma 57:22	for it was they who did beat the Lamanites
Helaman 6:19	and it was they which did murder the chief judge Cezoram
3 Nephi 9:9	for it was they that did destroy the peace of my people
3 Nephi 10:12	and it was they which received the prophets and stoned them not
3 Nephi 10:12	and it was they which had not shed the blood of the saints
Ether 13:10	for it is they whose garments are white

See 1 Nephi 22:22–23 for four additional examples of this existential construction that Joseph Smith removed in his editing for the 1837 edition. The critical text will restore the original existential expression here in Mosiah 20:18.

*Summary:* Restore the original existential construction in Mosiah 20:18 (“is it not they which have stolen the daughters of the Lamanites”); this existential usage is perfectly acceptable in modern English and is found elsewhere in the Book of Mormon text.

**Mosiah 20:19**

*and now behold*

[& 1 | *and* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *tell the king of these things*

The occurrence of the connective *and* between the two imperative verb forms *behold* and *tell* seems strange, and one may wonder if the *and* is an accidental intrusion into the text. Yet elsewhere the text has other examples of *and* between *behold* and a following imperative verb form:

Mosiah 15:26	but behold <b>and</b> fear and tremble before God
Alma 5:52	behold <b>and</b> remember the Holy One hath spoken it
Ether 3:2	now behold O Lord <b>and</b> do not be angry with thy servant

There is also one example where the *and* precedes an indicative clause:

Mosiah 3:11	for behold <b>and</b> also his blood atoneth for the sins . . .
-------------	---

The use of *and* as a connector between *behold* and a following clause (especially if it’s imperative) is therefore quite possible. The critical text will accept these instances of *and*.

There are, of course, many examples of *behold* without an intervening *and*, including some with an immediately following imperative:

1 Nephi 16:37	behold let us slay our father
2 Nephi 28:6	behold hearken ye unto my precept
Jacob 2:5	but behold hearken ye unto me
Jacob 5:16	behold look here
Alma 46:23	yea and now behold let us remember to keep the commandments
Alma 47:26	behold come and see
Mormon 8:33	behold look ye unto the revelations of God

In each instance, therefore, we let the earliest textual sources determine whether *and* should follow *behold* or not.

*Summary:* Maintain in Mosiah 20:19 (and elsewhere) the occurrence of *and* immediately following *behold*.

**Mosiah 20:19**

*that he may tell his people*

*that they may be* [ *persuaded* > *passified* 1 | *pacified* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST ] *towards us*

Oliver Cowdery initially wrote “that they may be persuaded”; almost immediately he corrected the reading to “that they may be pacified” (where *passified*, the spelling in  $\mathfrak{P}$ , is supralinearly inserted

and shows no difference in the level of ink flow). Here we have a good example of a visual misreading. This occurrence of the verb *pacify* is the first of five instances of this verb within a short section of the text (Mosiah 20:19–26). The critical text will retain Oliver’s correction to the original reading. The phraseology “to be persuaded towards us” seems rather implausible.

**Summary:** Maintain in Mosiah 20:19 the occurrence of the verb *pacify* in “that they may be pacified towards us”.

**Mosiah 20:20**

*and except the king doth pacify them*  
 [*towards* 1ABCDEFGHIJLMNOPQRST | *toward* HK] *us*  
*we must perish*

In this passage, the earliest textual sources have *towards*, but in the 1874 RLDS edition *towards* was replaced by *toward*, probably accidentally since usually the 1874 edition retained the *towards* that predominates in the text. However, there are two other places where this same edition made this change (in 2 Nephi 27:25 and Alma 62:14). It appears that the typesetter for this edition preferred *toward* over *towards* and allowed *toward* to occasionally enter the text. For a list of the variation in the text regarding *towards* and *toward*, see under 1 Nephi 5:22; also see TOWARDS in volume 3.

**Summary:** Maintain in Mosiah 20:20 *towards*, the reading of the earliest textual sources.

**Mosiah 20:21**

*and all this because we would not hearken*  
*unto the* [*word* 1ABCGHKPS | *words* DEFIJLMNOQRT] *of the Lord*

The 1841 British edition accidentally changed the singular “the word of the Lord” to the plural “the words of the Lord”; this reading has continued in the LDS text. Generally, the original text has instances of both readings, but the singular dominates:

the word of the Lord	30 times
the words of the Lord	11 times

When the associated verb is *hearken*, the statistics are nearly equal:

<i>the word of the Lord</i>	<i>the words of the Lord</i>
1 Nephi 7:9	1 Nephi 17:23
Jacob 2:27	Helaman 7:7
Mosiah 20:21	Helaman 10:13
	Mormon 9:27

Of course, we count Mosiah 20:21 as an example of “the word of the Lord”. The six other examples that refer to “hearkening (un)to the word(s) of the Lord” show no substantive textual variance.

**Summary:** Restore the singular “the word of the Lord” in Mosiah 20:21 since the earliest textual sources read this way; there are two other occurrences in the Book of Mormon of “hearkening (un)to the **word** of the Lord”, and neither of these show variation in number.

**Mosiah 20:22**

*therefore let us put a stop  
to [so much > the 1 | the ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] shedding  
of [NULL > so much 1 | so much ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] blood*

Oliver Cowdery initially miswrote this sentence by placing the modifier *so much* before *shedding*. Almost immediately he corrected the reading, replacing the first *so much* with *the* (supralinearly inserted) and then supralinearly inserting *so much* before *blood*. The level of ink flow is unchanged except for the very first part of the inserted *so much*, which suggests that Oliver redipped his quill before supralinearly inserting this phrase.

Elsewhere the text supports modifying *blood* with *much*; in fact, four out of five occurrences are found in the phrase “(the) shedding (of) much blood”:

- |              |   |
|--------------|---|
| Mosiah 9:2   | but I was rescued by the <b>shedding of much blood</b>                      |
| Mosiah 29:7  | which would be the cause of <b>shedding much blood</b>                      |
| Mosiah 29:21 | save it be through much contention and<br>the <b>shedding of much blood</b> |
| Alma 52:4    | save they had lost <b>much blood</b>  |
| Ether 11:10  | in the which he did cause the <b>shedding of much blood</b>                 |

There are also four examples of *much* modifying *bloodshed*; two of these are of the form “so much bloodshed”:

- |             |   |
|-------------|---|
| Omni 1:24   | a serious war and <b>much bloodshed</b> between the Nephites<br>and the Lamanites |
| Alma 60:16  | which caused <b>so much bloodshed</b> among ourselves                             |
| Alma 60:16  | which was the cause of <b>so much bloodshed</b> among ourselves                   |
| Helaman 4:1 | insomuch that there was <b>much bloodshed</b>                                     |

On the other hand, there are no examples of *much* modifying the verb *shed* or nominalized forms of it (as in “much shedding of blood”). Thus the corrected reading in Mosiah 20:22 is consistent with usage elsewhere in the text.

**Summary:** Follow in Mosiah 20:22 Oliver Cowdery’s corrected reading in  $\mathcal{P}$ : “let us put a stop to the shedding of **so much blood**”.

**Mosiah 20:24**

*let us go forth to meet my people without arms  
and I [swear 1ABCGHKLMOPQRST | sware DEFIJN] unto you with an oath  
that my people shall not slay thy people*

The 1841 British edition misspelled the present-tense *swear* as the past-tense homophone *sware*. This misspelling persisted in the LDS text up through the 1906 large-print edition. The 1902 and 1905 missionary editions were the first LDS editions to restore the correct present-tense *swear*. The 1841 typesetter made this same mistake two other times in the text:

Alma 12:35

behold I [swear 1ABCEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST | sware D] in my wrath  
that they shall not enter into my rest

Alma 36:1

for I [swear 01ABCGHIJKLMNOPQRST | sware DEF] unto you  
that inasmuch as ye shall keep the commandments of God  
ye shall prosper in the land

In all three cases, the larger context supports the present-tense *swear* rather than the past-tense *sware*. For additional discussion regarding *swear* versus *sware*, see under Enos 1:14 as well as under SWEAR in volume 3.

**Summary:** Maintain the present-tense *swear* in Mosiah 20:24 (“I swear unto you with an oath”).

**Mosiah 20:24**

*and I swear unto you with an oath  
that my people shall not slay [my > thy > NULL 1 | ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] thy people*

Oliver Cowdery initially wrote *my people* here in  $\mathcal{P}$ , undoubtedly because of the preceding occurrence of *my people*. His correction of *my* to *thy* is immediate. He initially wrote *my*, then first tried to overwrite the *m* with *th*; but he ended up crossing out this first attempt to correct the word and writing the correct *thy* inline (as expected, there is no change in the level of ink flow for this inline correction). For another example of where Oliver made the same scribal error, see under Mosiah 20:15.

**Summary:** Maintain in Mosiah 20:24 the immediately corrected reading in  $\mathcal{P}$ : “my people shall not slay **thy** people”.

**Mosiah 20:26**

*and when the Lamanites saw the people of Limhi that they were without arms  
[that >jg NULL 1 | ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] they had compassion on them*

In the earliest text for this passage, there is a second *that* which the 1830 compositor crossed out in the printer’s manuscript and did not set in the 1830 edition. Earlier in this sentence there is

a subordinate *that*-clause (“that they were without arms”) which serves as a complement for the past-tense verb form *saw* in the immediately preceding *when*-clause. On the other hand, the second *that*-clause in the earliest text is not a subordinate clause; instead, it is the main clause that the preceding *when*-clause depends upon, which is the reason why the 1830 compositor deleted the *that*. Of course, the extra *that* here in Mosiah 20:26 could be an error that occurred in the early transmission of the text. Such an intrusive *that* could have entered the text because of the preceding *that*. Nonetheless, this extra *that* helps bring the reader back to the earlier *when*-clause rather than the immediately preceding subordinate *that*-clause. The critical text will therefore maintain the earliest reading with the nonsubordinate *that* in both Mosiah 20:26 and Mosiah 22:2.

**Summary:** Restore the original nonsubordinate *that* in Mosiah 20:26: “that they had compassion on them”; sometimes a main clause can begin with a connective *that* in order to help the reader recover from a preceding subordinate clause that interrupts the flow of the text.

# Mosiah 21

## ■ Mosiah 21:3

*but they would smite them on their cheeks and exercise authority over them  
and began to put heavy burdens upon [them > their 1 | their ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] backs  
and drive them as they would a dumb ass*

In the printer's manuscript, Oliver Cowdery initially wrote "and began to put heavy burdens upon **them**"; then he crossed out the *them* and supralinearly inserted *their* and wrote *backs* inline at the beginning of the next line. Thus the correction was clearly immediate; undoubtedly the original manuscript read *their backs*. Oliver probably wrote *them* because he had just written *them* in the preceding predicate ("and exercise authority over **them**"); there are also two other occurrences of *them* in this long sentence ("they would smite **them** on their cheeks . . . and drive **them** as they would a dumb ass").

**Summary:** Maintain the immediately corrected reading in  $\mathcal{P}$ : "and began to put heavy burdens upon **their** backs".

## ■ Mosiah 21:6

*and it came to pass that the people began to murmur **with** the king because of their afflictions  
and they began to be desirous to go against them to battle  
and they did afflict the king sorely with their complaints  
therefore he granted unto them that they should do according to their desires*

The use of the preposition *with* in the phrase "began to murmur with the king" seems strange since in modern usage the *with* implies that the king too was murmuring. But later in this passage, the text indicates that "they did afflict the king sorely **with** their complaints". One might propose that somehow this later use of *with* led to the introduction of *with* in the earlier phrase "to murmur with the king". Yet such an interference seems unlikely since the distance between the two occurrences of *with* is about one and a half manuscript lines of text. If the distance had been a single line, then the possible influence of *with* just below in the next line could have led to introducing a *with* in the preceding line.

The usual phraseology in the text is "to murmur **against** someone" (which occurs 13 times, but only in the small plates of Nephi). Here in Mosiah 21:6 the people are not murmuring against king Limhi but instead are pestering him with their murmurings. Karl Franson (personal communication, 10 October 2003) suggests that the preposition *with* may be a mistake for *to*. Elsewhere, there are two instances of "to murmur **to** someone":

Mosiah 27:1

the church began to **murmur** and complain **to** their leaders concerning the matter  
and they did complain to Alma

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  
yea all the travails of soul for their people  
and also all the **murmurings** of the people **to** their king

In the first of these (“to murmur and complain **to** their leaders”), the preposition *to* may apply only to the verb *complain* (note the following “and they did complain **to** Alma”). But there is at least one clear instance of “to murmur **to** someone” in the text (namely, the second instance listed above). Yet one instance is probably not enough to motivate emending Mosiah 21:6 from “to murmur **with** the king” to “to murmur **to** the king”.

The online Oxford English Dictionary cites one example (under definition 2 for the verb *question*) for which *with* may be associated with the verb *murmur*:

Henry Brooke (1768)

Nay, I was not far from **murmuring** and questioning **with** my God,  
on his putting to such tortures the most guiltless of his creatures.

Of course, like the example in Mosiah 27:1, the preposition (here *with*) may be associated with only the immediately preceding verb (namely, *question*).

The critical text will maintain the preposition *with* in “to murmur **with** the king”. Although difficult, this reading seems possible and may be intended.

**Summary:** Retain in Mosiah 21:6 the preposition *with* in “the people began to murmur **with** the king”; this reading, although strange, appears possible.

#### ■ Mosiah 21:6

*and they began to be desirous*

*to go [ 1 ABCDEFHIJKLMNOPQRST | again G ] against them to battle*

The 1858 Wright edition introduced *again* right before *against*, an obvious dittography. This verse describes the first time that the people of Limhi decided to offensively attack the Lamanites (previously, they had been attacked by the Lamanites). A later passage in this chapter clearly refers to the second and third times that the people of Limhi attacked the Lamanites:

Mosiah 21:11–12

and they went **again** to battle  
but they were driven back **again** / suffering much loss  
yea they went **again**—even the **third** time—  
and suffered in the like manner





1 Nephi 8:22 (Oliver Cowdery, from  $\mathcal{O}$  into  $\mathcal{P}$ )

they did come forth  
and [*commensed* 0 | *commence* 1 ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] in the path

1 Nephi 8:24 (Oliver Cowdery, initially in  $\mathcal{P}$ ; 1830 typesetter)

even until they did come forth  
and [*partook* 0 | *partake* >+ *partook* 1 | *partake* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]  
of the fruit of the tree

1 Nephi 16:12 (1830 typesetter)

we did take our tents  
and [*departed* 01 | *depart* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] into the wilderness

Mosiah 25:10 (Joseph Smith)

they did raise their voices  
and [*gave* >js *give* 1 | *gave* A | *give* BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] thanks to God

Note, in particular, Oliver Cowdery's correction in 1 Nephi 8:24; there he changed the past-tense *partook* to the infinitive form *partake* when he initially copied the text from  $\mathcal{O}$  into  $\mathcal{P}$ . But he caught his error and with heavier ink flow corrected the *partake* to *partook*. Yet earlier, in 1 Nephi 8:22, Oliver made the same kind of mistake but did not catch it.

On the other hand, there are no examples of changes in the opposite direction (that is, from the infinitive form to the simple past-tense form when there is a preceding conjunctive predicate with the *do* auxiliary). Thus evidence from changes in the text argues that the infinitive forms *drive* and *slay* that Oliver initially wrote in  $\mathcal{P}$  are errors for the past-tense forms *drove* and *slew*, the reading of the original manuscript (no longer extant here). There seems to be little motivation for Oliver to have edited the verbs to forms that he otherwise avoided introducing into his copy work. Instead, here in Mosiah 21:8 he seems to have twice more made the same mistake (and subsequent correction) as he did in 1 Nephi 8:24—namely, replacing a simple past-tense form with its corresponding infinitive form as he copied from  $\mathcal{O}$  into  $\mathcal{P}$  (but then catching his error and correcting  $\mathcal{P}$  to agree with  $\mathcal{O}$ ).

As discussed under 1 Nephi 8:11, there are three possible patterns for a conjoined verb phrase when the first verb phrase has the auxiliary verb *do*. The auxiliary *do* may be repeated or, if not, the verb form can take the infinitive form or the simple past-tense form. We have a number of invariant cases in the text for the last two possibilities. Consider the following examples which involve either the verb *drive* or *slay*:

Alma 62:36 (past tense)

but behold the king did awake his servants before he died  
insomuch that they did pursue Teancum and **slew** him

Mormon 4:15 (infinitive)

insomuch that they did beat again the Lamanites  
and **drive** them out of their lands

Ether 13:29 (past tense)

and behold he did beat Coriantumr  
and **drove** him back again to the valley of Gilgal

Ether 14:5 (past tense)

and the brother of Shared did march forth out of the wilderness by night  
and **slew** a part of the army of Coriantumr

Here the past-tense usage dominates, with only one occurrence having the infinitive verb form (in Mormon 4:15). Either pattern is possible, but the clear tendency in the transmission of the text has been to replace simple past-tense forms with infinitive forms in this context. Thus the critical text will accept the two verb corrections in  $\mathcal{P}$  for Mosiah 21:8 as the reading of the original manuscript.

**Summary:** Accept in Mosiah 21:8 the two simple past-tense forms in the corrected text for  $\mathcal{P}$ : “the Lamanites did beat them and **drove** them back and **slew** many of them”.

■ **Mosiah 21:13**

*and they did humble themselves*

*even to [NULL > the 1 | the ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] dust*

Oliver Cowdery initially wrote “to dust” in  $\mathcal{P}$ ; then without any change in the ink flow, he supra-linearly inserted *the* (giving “to the dust”). This change appears to be an almost immediate correction to the reading of the original manuscript, no longer extant here.

Elsewhere the original Book of Mormon text consistently has the definite article *the* in the phrase “to (the) dust”:

1 Nephi 22:14	yea that great and abominable church shall tumble <b>to the dust</b>
Jacob 2:15	and with one glance of his eye he can smite you <b>to the dust</b>
Alma 34:38	that ye humble yourselves even <b>to the dust</b>
Alma 42:30	but let it bring you down <b>to the dust</b> in humility

In fact, 35 out of the 36 occurrences of *dust* in the Book of Mormon text are preceded by *the*; the only exception is found in a biblical quote: “and their blossom shall go up as dust” (2 Nephi 15:24, citing Isaiah 5:24). The critical text will therefore accept the corrected reading “in the dust” for Mosiah 21:13.

**Summary:** Maintain in Mosiah 21:13 the corrected reading in  $\mathcal{P}$ : “and they did humble themselves even to **the dust**”.

■ **Mosiah 21:18**

*now the people of Limhi kept together in a body as much as it was possible*

**and** [*secure* 1ABCDGHKPS | *secured* EFIJLMNOQRT] *their grain and their flocks*

The earliest attested text here reads “and secure”—that is, with a present-tense form of the verb, which doesn’t make much sense considering the preceding past-tense verb forms *kept* and *was*. The 1849 LDS edition emended the text to read “and secured”, which the LDS text has consistently

followed ever since. On the other hand, the RLDS text has retained the earliest but difficult reading, “and secure”.

The 1849 emendation suggests that the original text actually might have read “and secured” — that is, the verb *secure* ended in the past tense ending *-d*, but early in the transmission of the text the *d* was lost. One possibility is that when Joseph Smith dictated this passage, the scribe for  $\mathcal{O}$  had difficulty hearing the final voiced alveolar stop /d/ because the next word began with the voiced interdental fricative /ð/. In other words, *secured their* /səkjurd ðɛr/ was misheard as *secure their* /səkjur ðɛr/. There is support for this kind of mishearing in Alma 56:37, where internal evidence suggests that the original text read “and as we **supposed that** it was their intent to slay us before Antipus should overtake them”; here the *d* at the end of *supposed* was apparently not heard because of the following *that*. For further discussion, see under Alma 56:37.

One semantic difficulty with the emendation to *secured* here in Mosiah 21:18 is that the resulting text seems to treat separately the keeping together of the people and the securing of grains and flocks, with the added implication that the people’s attempts to secure their grain and flocks were successful. Another possible reinterpretation for Mosiah 21:18 is that the people of Limhi kept together as much as possible **in order to** secure their grain and flocks. Such an interpretation suggests that the original text actually read “to secure”, not “and secured” (or “and secure”), and that the copying error was to accidentally replace the infinitive marker *to* with the conjunction *and*, not to drop the *d* at the end of a supposedly original past-tense form *secured*.

There are other examples in the text where a conditional clause of the form “it <be> possible” is followed by an infinitive clause:

Alma 12:23

if **it had been possible** for Adam  
for **to** have partaken of the fruit of the tree of life at that time . . .

Alma 56:29

they began to be fearful and began to sally forth  
if **it were possible to** put an end to our receiving provisions and strength

Mormon 2:16

and they were pursued until they came even to the land of Jashon  
before **it were possible to** stop them in their retreat

The example from Alma 56:29 closely parallels the suggested emendation here in Mosiah 21:18. Both take the form “finite clause + conditional clause + resultive infinitive clause”. We also have the following parallel examples in the King James Bible:

Acts 20:16

for he hasted if **it were possible** for him  
**to** be at Jerusalem the day of Pentecost

Acts 27:39

but they discovered a certain creek with a shore  
into the which they were minded if **it were possible**  
**to** thrust in the ship

There are also some examples of mix-ups between *to* and *&* in the early transmission of the text; in the following list, I include examples from the 1830 edition, which was set from manuscript (in which *and* was typically written as an ampersand):

Mosiah 19:21 (*to* misread as *and* in setting the 1830 edition)

and they were about to take the priests also  
[*to* 1PS | *and* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRT] put them to death  
and they fled before them

Alma 51:17 (*&* initially miswritten as *to* in  $\mathcal{P}$ )

Moroni commanded that his army should go against those kingmen  
to pull down their pride and their nobility and level them with the earth  
or they should take up arms  
[*&* 0 | *to* >+ *&* 1 | *and* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] support  
the cause of liberty

Helaman 1:18 (*&* initially miswritten as *to* in  $\mathcal{P}$ ; corrected *&* in  $\mathcal{P}$  misread as *to*  
in setting the 1830 edition)

for they had supposed that  
the Lamanites durst not come into the heart of their lands  
[*&* 0 | *to* > *&* 1 | *to* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] attackt  
that great city Zarahemla

These examples support the possibility of mixing up *to* and *&*, although we do not have an explicit example in the manuscripts of *to* being miswritten as *&*.

**Summary:** Emend Mosiah 21:18 by replacing “**and** secure” (the reading of the earliest textual source, the printer’s manuscript) with “**to** secure”; this emendation is supported by usage elsewhere in the text, while the 1849 LDS emendation to “and secured”, although theoretically possible, does not fit the expected semantics for this passage.

#### ■ Mosiah 21:21

*for they had come into the land of Nephi by night  
and carried off [of 1A | BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] their grain  
and many of their precious things*

The original text here in Mosiah 21:21 (“carried off **of** their grain”) is correct, despite its difficulty for modern English readers. The *of* here provides a partitive sense—namely, the priests of king Noah carried off **some** of the grain, not all of it. The 1837 edition removed the preposition *of* here, perhaps intentionally. But it was not deleted by Joseph Smith when he marked up the printer’s manuscript in his editing for the 1837 edition. Interestingly, the 1908 RLDS edition did not restore the original *of* here, despite the fact that Joseph left the *of* unchanged in  $\mathcal{P}$ . Perhaps the 1908 editors thought that *off of* was some kind of dittography.

A similar example of the partitive *of* is found earlier in the book of Mosiah; once more, the 1837 edition removed the difficult *of*—in this instance, by replacing it with *off*:

Mosiah 9:14

a numerous host of Lamanites came upon them and began to slay them  
and to take [*of* 1APS | *off* BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRT] their flocks  
and the corn of their fields

There are quite a few examples of the partitive *of* in the Book of Mormon text, as in Mosiah 2:3: “they also took **of** the firstlings of their flocks” (that is, not all of their firstlings, only some of them). For a complete list of the partitive usage “to take of X”, see under Mosiah 9:14.

*Summary:* Restore the original partitive *of* in Mosiah 21:21 (“and carried off **of** their grain”).

#### ■ Mosiah 21:23

*and the king having been without the gates of the city with his guard*  
[*he* 1A | BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *discovered Ammon and his brethren*

Here the 1837 edition removed the redundant *he*. As already discussed under Mosiah 8:7, in the original Book of Mormon text the subject is frequently repeated as a pronoun when there is an intervening participial clause. Some of these redundancies have been removed, as here in Mosiah 21:23, but others have been left unchanged. For further discussion and a complete list of examples, see SUBJECT REPETITION in volume 3.

*Summary:* Restore the repeated subject *he* in Mosiah 21:23; such usage was fairly common in the original text and is still found to some degree in the current text.

#### ■ 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*

One may wonder here in Mosiah 21:26 if the last occurrence of the relative pronoun *which* refers to the land that was destroyed or to the people that inhabited that land. Usually the Book of Mormon refers to people being destroyed. There are two instances in quotations from the King James Bible where the Book of Mormon text refers to the land being destroyed:

2 Nephi 23:5 (Isaiah 13:5)  
they come from a far country  
from the end of heaven  
yea the Lord and the weapons of his indignation  
to **destroy the whole land**

2 Nephi 24:20 (Isaiah 14:20)  
thou shalt not be joined with them in burial  
because thou hast **destroyed thy land**  
and slain thy people

There is one nonbiblical passage which parallels the language of Mosiah 21:26:

Alma 22:30

and it bordered upon the land which they called Desolation  
it being so far northward that it came into **the land**  
**which** had been peopled and **had been destroyed**  
**of whose bones** we have spoken  
which was discovered by the people of Zarahemla

The text in Alma 22:30 clearly refers to “the land which had been peopled and had been destroyed”, but the following “of whose bones we have spoken” seems to refer to the bones of these people (the Jaredites) rather than the bones of the land (although that interpretation is not impossible). Similarly, there is a reference to the bones of the Jaredites in Mosiah 21:27 (which immediately follows the verse under consideration, Mosiah 21:26): “and they brought a record with them / even a record of the people **whose bones** they had found”. It seems that in both Mosiah 21:26–27 and Alma 22:30, when the text refers to the land which was destroyed, it really means that the people of the land were destroyed, thus the shift in both cases to mentioning the bones of the people who were destroyed.

The critical text, of course, does not need to determine whether the *which* in Mosiah 21:26 refers to the land or the people as having been destroyed, although this distinction could become an issue in translating the text into another language or in determining whether *which* should be grammatically emended to *who* in the standard text. Given the specific usage in Alma 22:30, it is most reasonable to assume that the antecedent for the last *which* in Mosiah 21:26 is indeed *the land*. For a complete discussion of the editing of the relative pronoun *which*, see WHICH in volume 3.

**Summary:** Maintain the relative pronoun *which* whenever it is supported by the earliest textual sources; here in Mosiah 21:26, as in Alma 22:30, the antecedent for *which* is technically *the land*.

#### ■ Mosiah 21:27

*and they brought a record with them*  
*even a record of the people whose bones they had found*  
*and [they were 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPS | it was RT] engraven on plates of ore*

Sometimes the text uses a plural pronoun to refer to a record, as in Mosiah 12:8: “yet they shall leave **a record** behind them and I will preserve **them** for other nations”. Similarly, here in Mosiah 21:27, there is a single record that is referred to in the plural. The 1920 LDS edition changed the plural *they were* to *it was*, but the critical text will restore the original plural forms. For further discussion and a list of examples where the text uses plural pronouns to refer to a record, see under 1 Nephi 5:21.

**Summary:** Restore in Mosiah 21:27 the original plural *they were*; the Book of Mormon text often uses plural pronouns when referring to a record.

## ■ Mosiah 21:28

*and now Limhi was again filled with joy on learning from the mouth of Ammon that king [Benjamin 1A | Mosiah BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] had a gift from God whereby he could interpret such engravings*

Here king Limhi is referring to the Jaredite record (described in Mosiah 8:9 as 24 engraved plates of pure gold) that his men had found while searching for the land of Zarahemla. This passage clearly implies that king Benjamin is still alive. Yet earlier in Mosiah 6–7 it states (1) that king Benjamin lived three years after turning the kingdom over to his son Mosiah, and (2) that after three years of reigning as king, Mosiah sent Ammon and his men to search for the people of Zeniff (known later as the people of Noah and ultimately as the people of Limhi):

Mosiah 6:4–5

and Mosiah began to reign in his father's stead  
and he began to reign in the thirtieth year of his age  
making in the whole about four hundred and seventy-six years  
from the time that Lehi left Jerusalem  
and king Benjamin lived **three years** and he died

Mosiah 7:1–3

And now it came to pass that  
after king Mosiah had had continual peace for the space of **three years**  
he was desirous to know concerning the people  
which went up to dwell in the land of Lehi-Nephi  
or in the city of Lehi-Nephi . . .  
and it came to pass that king Mosiah granted that  
sixteen of their strong men might go up to the land of Lehi-Nephi  
to inquire concerning their brethren  
and it came to pass that on the morrow they started to go up  
having with them one Ammon  
he being a strong and mighty man and a descendant of Zarahemla  
and he was also their leader

The timing of these two events is so close that some overlap is possible. Perhaps Ammon and his men left not knowing that Benjamin had died, or perhaps he was still alive when they left. This interpretation requires that we not literally read the sequencing of the description in Mosiah 6–7 as precisely reflecting the actual chronology. Another possibility, of course, is that the original record read *Benjamin* simply because of Mormon's own mistake in abridging the record—or because the large plates of Nephi which Mormon abridged from were defective here.

Here in Mosiah 21:28, the 1837 edition made the change from *Benjamin* to *Mosiah* to avoid the apparent contradiction. Presumably, this emendation was made by Joseph Smith, although the change is not marked in the printer's manuscript. Quite clearly, this 1837 change is not an accident since *Benjamin* and *Mosiah* are so different visually, nor is there any nearby occurrence of *Mosiah* in Mosiah 21 that might have triggered an accidental replacement of *Benjamin* with *Mosiah* in the 1837 edition. In fact, the nearest preceding occurrence of *Mosiah* is in Mosiah 7:2, cited above. Nor can we consider the occurrence of *Benjamin* here in Mosiah 21:28 as an error prompted by



an earlier occurrence of *Benjamin* since the nearest preceding occurrence of *Benjamin* is also some distance away, in Mosiah 8:3 (“and he also rehearsed unto them the last words which king Benjamin had taught them”).

A similar change from *Benjamin* to *Mosiah* has been made in the book of Ether; as in Mosiah 21:28, the text refers to the Jaredite record:

Ether 4:1

and the Lord commanded the brother of Jared  
to go down out of the mount from the presence of the Lord  
and write the things which he had seen  
and they were forbidden to come unto the children of men  
until after that he should be lifted up upon the cross  
and for this cause did king [*Benjamin* 1ABCDGHK | *Mosiah* EFIJLMNOQRT |  
*Benjamin* [*Mosiah?*] P | *Benjamin* {*Mosiah?*} S] keep them  
that they should not come unto the world  
until after Christ should shew himself unto his people

In the 1849 LDS edition, Orson Pratt emended *Benjamin* to *Mosiah* in Ether 4:1. The RLDS text, from the 1908 edition on, has parenthetically suggested the possibility that the name *Benjamin* in Ether 4:1 might be an error for *Mosiah* (there is even an added question mark), but no such suggestion, however, is provided in the RLDS text for Mosiah 21:28. The original text in Ether 4:1 undoubtedly read *Benjamin*, just as in Mosiah 21:28. There is virtually no possibility of visually misreading or miscopying *Mosiah* as *Benjamin*; nor is there any nearby occurrence of *Benjamin* to serve as the source for miscopying.

The passage in Ether 4:1 causes more difficulties than the one in Mosiah 21:28. The Ether passage implies that king Benjamin had some control over the Jaredite record, which means, of course, that he must have still been alive when king Limhi handed over these newly found records to king Mosiah:

Mosiah 22:13–14

and after being many days in the wilderness  
they arrived in the land of Zarahemla  
and joined his people and became his subjects  
and it came to pass that Mosiah received them with joy  
and he also received their records  
and also **the records which had been found by the people of Limhi**

Although king Benjamin had earlier put Mosiah in charge of the Nephite records and other artifacts (as described in Mosiah 1:16), it is reasonable to assume that king Benjamin, while yet alive, would have had access to the Nephite records as well as the Jaredite record and the records of the people of Limhi. In fact, king Benjamin may have still exercised some monarchical prerogatives as long as he was alive. For instance, the pronoun *his* that occurs twice in Mosiah 22:13 (“they arrived in the land of Zarahemla and joined **his** people and became **his** subjects”) may actually refer to king Benjamin, not king Mosiah—that is, the people of Limhi joined the people of king Benjamin and became his subjects. For discussion of this possibility, see Mosiah 22:13–14.

In other words, these seeming contradictions can be reconciled. King Benjamin could have still been alive when the people of Limhi arrived in the land of Zarahemla, and he could have later had access to the records, including the Jaredite record. If king Limhi and Ammon arrived in Zarahemla before the end of the fourth year of king Mosiah's reign, then we could interpret the statement in Mosiah 6:5 that "king Benjamin lived three years and he died" as meaning that king Benjamin did not live to see the completion of four years of retirement. Prior to his death, king Benjamin still had access to the records, and the Lord could have told him that the prophecies in those records were not to be revealed at that time. Later king Mosiah translated the Jaredite record (presumably after king Benjamin's death). This translation process is described in some detail later on in Mosiah 28:10–19, but the account there specifically mentions that king Mosiah revealed to his people the history of the Jaredites and their destruction, but there is no mention about him telling the people about the prophecies that had been revealed to the brother of Jared.

Hugh Nibley, in the 1960s, proposed a similar solution to this problem, as indicated on page 7 of his *Since Cumorah: The Book of Mormon in the Modern World* (Salt Lake City, Utah: Deseret Book, 1967):

And was it necessary to change the name of Benjamin (in the first edition) to Mosiah in later editions of Ether 4:1? Probably not, for though it is certain that Mosiah kept the records in question, it is by no means certain that his father, Benjamin, did not also have a share in keeping them. It was Benjamin who displayed the zeal of a life-long book-lover in the keeping and studying of records; and after he handed over the throne to his son Mosiah he lived on and may well have spent many days among his beloved records. And among these records could have been the Jaredite plates, which were brought to Zarahemla early in the reign of Mosiah, when his father could have still been living.

We also have an earlier statement from Nibley in a 1963 letter to Stan Larson:

The time schedule is a tight one . . . but since we have no means of exact dating we cannot say that Benjamin was dead before the records were brought to Zarahemla, and we are not told how long he kept them. When Ammon told Limhi that Benjamin could read the stuff, Benjamin was still alive, or Ammon certainly thought he was.

For this citation (as well as further discussion of this problem regarding the name *Benjamin*), see pages 271–272 of Stan Larson, *A Study of Some Textual Variations in the Book of Mormon Comparing the Original and the Printer's Manuscripts and the 1830, the 1837, and the 1840 Editions* (Brigham Young University master's thesis, 1974).

Despite the difficulties of the earliest readings, the critical text will maintain the original name *Benjamin* in Mosiah 21:28 and Ether 4:1 rather than the emended *Mosiah*, the reading in the current LDS text (and in the current RLDS text for Mosiah 21:28). If *Benjamin* is an error, the error occurred in the original plates and not during the early transmission of the English language text. Internal analysis suggests, however, that the identification of Benjamin in these passages is actually correct and not a mistake.

**Summary:** Despite the apparent difficulties with the original reading, the critical text will restore the name *Benjamin* in Mosiah 21:28 and Ether 4:1; the occurrence of *Benjamin* instead of *Mosiah* cannot

be readily explained as an error in the early transmission of the text; moreover, the text can be interpreted so that Benjamin was still alive when the plates of Ether were delivered by king Limhi to king Mosiah, who then gave the Jaredite record to his father, king Benjamin, for his examination and perhaps safekeeping.

■ **Mosiah 21:29**

*yet Ammon and **his** brethren were filled with sorrow  
because so many of [his >js their 1 | his A | their BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] brethren  
had been slain*

The second occurrence of the possessive pronoun *his* in this sentence seems to be referring to Ammon, yet the first part of the sentence states that not only Ammon but also his men were filled with sorrow over the losses that the people of Limhi had suffered. Joseph Smith’s emendation of the second *his* to *their* for the 1837 edition appears to have been an attempt to have the possessive pronoun refer to Ammon and his men. Earlier Ammon specifically refers to the people of Limhi (originally, the people of Zeniff) as “our brethren”:

Mosiah 7:13  
for I am Ammon and am a descendant of Zarahemla  
and have come up out of the land of Zarahemla  
to inquire concerning **our brethren** which Zeniff brought up out of that land

Similarly, king Limhi refers to Ammon and his men as “his brethren”:

Mosiah 21:24  
but when he [Limhi] found that they were not [the priests of Noah]  
but that they were **his brethren** and had come from the land of Zarahemla  
he was filled with exceeding great joy

Although the use in Mosiah 21:29 of *his* creates a difficult reading, it is possible to interpret the *his* as referring to Ammon alone. Sometimes the Book of Mormon text will refer to a leader’s individual actions and then in the same passage use the leader’s name to describe the actions of the group he leads, as in the following descriptions regarding the actions of the Nephite general Lehi:

Alma 43:35  
and he **led** his army forth  
and **encircled** the Lamanites about on the east in their rear

Alma 43:40  
and they were **pursued by Lehi and his men**  
and they were **driven by Lehi** into the waters of Sidon

Thus it is possible to interpret Mosiah 21:29 as switching from a reference to the group (“Ammon and his brethren”) to Ammon alone, the leader of the group (“many of **his** brethren”).

Joseph Smith’s emendation to *their* suggests a second possibility: the occurrence of *his* in “many of his brethren” in Mosiah 21:29 may actually be the result of an early scribal error for

*their* in the transmission of the text. For instance, Oliver Cowdery could have accidentally copied an original “many of **their** brethren” as “many of **his** brethren” since he had just written “Ammon and **his** brethren”. It is also possible that such an error could have occurred when the scribe in  $\mathcal{O}$  took down Joseph’s original dictation.

A third possibility is that the earliest reading “many of **his** brethren” is correct but that the possessive pronoun *his* actually refers to Limhi rather than Ammon. In other words, the intended meaning of the earliest reading in Mosiah 21:29 is that “Ammon and his brethren were filled with sorrow because so many of his [Limhi’s] brethren had been slain”. Sometimes in the Book of Mormon, the pronominal referent is not the last-mentioned individual; the referent may have occurred some time earlier in the passage, as in the following complex example involving Alma, Amulek, and Zeezrom in the book of Alma:

Alma 12:1

Now Alma seeing that the words of Amulek had silenced Zeezrom  
for **he** [Alma] beheld that Amulek had caught **him** [Zeezrom]  
in his lying and deceiving to destroy **him** [Amulek]  
and seeing that **he** [Zeezrom] began to tremble  
under a consciousness of his guilt  
**he** [Alma] opened his mouth and began to speak unto **him** [Zeezrom]  
and to establish the words of Amulek

It is therefore possible that the *his* in Mosiah 21:29 could be referring to king Limhi. Also note that Limhi himself refers to his own people as “our brethren”, as in the following passage where Limhi is speaking to his people:

Mosiah 7:24

yea I say unto you  
great are the reasons which we have to mourn  
for behold how many of **our brethren** have been slain  
and their blood hath been spilt in vain

Since the pronoun *his* will work in Mosiah 21:29, the critical text will maintain the earliest reading. The *his* can refer either to Ammon or to king Limhi himself. But there also remains the possibility that the phrase “many of **his** brethren” is an error deriving from the previous “Ammon and **his** brethren”.

**Summary:** Restore the earliest reading in Mosiah 21:29: “because so many of **his** brethren had been slain”, where the *his* may refer to Ammon or to king Limhi; there is also the possibility that this *his* is an error for *their*.

# Mosiah 22

## ■ Mosiah 22:2

*they could find no way to deliver themselves out of bondage  
except it were to take their women and children  
and their flocks and [their 1ABCDEFGHIJLMNOPQRST | HK] herds and their tents  
and depart into the wilderness*

In this passage, the 1874 RLDS edition omitted, probably accidentally, the repeated *their* in the conjunctive phrase “their flocks and their herds”. The third RLDS edition (in 1908) restored the original repeated *their*. In general, the Book of Mormon text has 22 cases where *flocks* and *herds* are conjoined (see under Enos 1:21 for a complete list of the 22 cases). Of the 16 cases that involve a possessive pronoun before the first conjunct, ten of them repeat the possessive pronoun, but six do not:

- *repetition*

their flocks and their herds	7 times
our flocks and our herds	2 times
his flocks and his herds	1 time
  
- *no repetition*

their flocks and herds	5 times
your flocks and herds	1 time

In each case, the critical text will follow the earliest textual sources in determining whether the possessive pronoun is repeated in this conjunctive noun phrase. Here in Mosiah 22:2, the *their* is repeated. For additional discussion of the repeated possessive pronoun, see under CONJUNCTIVE REPETITION in volume 3.

**Summary:** Maintain the repeated *their* in Mosiah 22:2: “their flocks and **their** herds” (the reading of the earliest textual sources).

## ■ Mosiah 22:2

*for the Lamanites being so numerous  
[that 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPS | RT] it was impossible  
for the people of Limhi to contend with them  
thinking to deliver themselves out of bondage by the sword*

The original text here is grammatically difficult. After the conjunction *for*, we expect (at least eventually) a main clause. Instead, we get two subordinate clauses: a present participial clause

(“the Lamanites being so numerous”) followed by a resultive *that*-clause (“that it was impossible for the people of Limhi to contend with them”). The 1920 LDS edition removed the subordinate *that* here in this passage. David Calabro (personal communication) suggests two alternative grammatical changes that could have been implemented here: delete the conjunctive *for* at the beginning or edit the nonfinite *being* to *were*:

□ *alternative grammatical emendations*

- (1) the Lamanites **being** so numerous **that** it was impossible for the people of Limhi to contend with them
- (2) **for** the Lamanites **were** so numerous **that** it was impossible for the people of Limhi to contend with them

There is one other example of this kind of subordinate construction in the text, although this one has a following main clause (“therefore he caused . . .”) that leads to closure:

Mosiah 2:6

**for** the multitude **being** so great  
**that** king Benjamin could not teach them all within the walls of the temple  
 therefore he caused a tower to be erected  
 that thereby his people might hear the words which he should speak unto them

Of course, the original text has many examples where a subordinate construction is left stranded. The critical text will therefore restore the earliest reading here in Mosiah 22:2, despite its grammatical difficulty.

*Summary:* Restore the resultive *that* in Mosiah 22:2: “for the Lamanites being so numerous **that** it was impossible for the people of Limhi to contend with them”; the original text has numerous examples of subordinate expressions that fail to achieve closure.

■ **Mosiah 22:4**

*or if thou hast hitherto listened  
 to my [word >+ words 1 | words ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] in any degree  
 and they have been of service to thee*

Here in the printer’s manuscript, Oliver Cowdery initially wrote “listened to my **word**”, but then later the plural *s* was inserted with heavier ink flow. The *s* appears to be Oliver’s; he may have supplied it when he proofed  $\mathcal{P}$  against  $\mathcal{O}$ , although editing is also a possibility given that the immediately following clause uses the plural pronoun *they* to refer to Gideon’s words. The surrounding text also uses the plural *words* in reference to Gideon’s advice to king Limhi:

verse 3	thou hast hitherto hearkened unto my <b>words</b> many times
verse 4	I desire that thou wouldst listen to my <b>words</b> at this time
verse 9	the king hearkened unto the <b>words</b> of Gideon

The use of the plural *words* is most probably the reading of the original text for Mosiah 22:4: “if thou hast hitherto listened to my **words** in any degree”.

In general, the text prefers the plural *words* when referring to the speech of humans. When referring to the word(s) of deity, the text has a considerable number of examples of both singular *word* and plural *words*. For discussion regarding “my word(s)”, see under 1 Nephi 16:24.

**Summary:** Maintain in Mosiah 22:4 the corrected reading with the plural *words*: “if thou hast hitherto listened to my **words** in any degree”.

■ **Mosiah 22:7**

*and we will pass through the secret pass  
on the left of [their 1PST | the ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQR] camp*

The printer’s manuscript here reads “on the left of **their** camp”, but the 1830 compositor mistakenly set “on the left of **the** camp”. In accord with the reading of  $\varnothing$ , the 1908 RLDS edition restored the original *their* to the RLDS text. The 1981 LDS edition restored the *their* to the LDS text.

When the text refers to *camp(s)*, the choice between using a possessive premodifier or the definite article *the* is consistently determined. Basically, we get *the* for *camp* only when there is a postmodifying prepositional phrase (there are no instances of plural *camps* under this type):

the camp of Moroni	4 times
the camp of the Amlicites	3 times
the camp of the Lamanites	3 times
the camp of Amalickiah	1 time
the camp of the Nephites	1 time

Otherwise, we get only a possessive premodifier for *camp(s)*, never *the*. In the following list, I include the example from Mosiah 22:7:

their camp(s)	10 times
his own camp	1 time
Lehonti’s camp	1 time

Thus the use of “their camp” in the earliest text for Mosiah 22:7 is quite correct.

**Summary:** Maintain in Mosiah 22:7 the use of the possessive *their* before *camp*; not only is this the earliest reading, but it is also supported by other examples of *camp(s)* in the text.

■ **Mosiah 22:8**

*[& > thus 1 | thus ABCDEFGHK | Thus IJLMNOPQRST] we will depart  
with our women and our children / our flocks and our herds  
into the wilderness*

Here Oliver Cowdery initially wrote *and* at the beginning of the sentence; then virtually immediately he corrected the *and* to *thus* by supralinear insertion (there is no change in the level of ink flow). In the book of Mosiah, there are 15 occurrences of finite clauses beginning with *thus*

(I include Mosiah 22:8 in this count), 29 with *and thus*, and hundreds with *and* alone. Although it is possible that the original text in Mosiah 22:8 could have read *and thus*, quite a few sentences in Mosiah begin with *thus*; consequently, there is no reason to reject Oliver’s virtually immediate correction here in Mosiah 22:8.

*Summary:* Retain in Mosiah 22:8 Oliver Cowdery’s probable correction to the reading of the original manuscript (that is, *thus* alone—not *and* alone or the combined *and thus*).

■ **Mosiah 22:8**

*thus we will depart  
with our women and our children / our flocks and our herds  
into the wilderness*

One might wonder here if there is a missing *and* between “our women and our children” and “our flocks and our herds”. Earlier in this chapter, the same basic pair of conjunctive noun phrases is separated by an *and*:

Mosiah 22:2  
except it were to take their women and children  
**and** their flocks and their herds and their tents  
and depart into the wilderness

Even so, elsewhere in the text there is no *and* separating “women and children” from “flocks and herds” (in each case below, I identify with an arrow where the *and* is lacking):

Alma 7:27  
and now may the peace of God rest upon you  
and upon your houses and lands  
and upon your flocks and herds  
and all that you possess  
→ your women and your children  
according to your faith and good works

3 Nephi 3:13  
yea he sent a proclamation among all the people  
that they should gather together  
their women and their children  
→ their flocks and their herds  
and all their substance—save it were their land—  
unto one place

Thus the lack of a connecting *and* in Mosiah 22:8 is supported by usage elsewhere in the text.

*Summary:* Maintain in Mosiah 22:8 the invariant reading without an *and* between “our women and our children” and “our flocks and our herds”; such usage is supported elsewhere in the text.



## ■ Mosiah 22:9–10

*and it came to pass that the king hearkened unto the words of Gideon*  
 [& it came to pass that >js NULL >js and 1 |

*And it came to pass that A | And BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]*  
*king Limhi caused that his people should gather their flocks together*  
*and he sent the tribute of wine to the Lamanites*

As noted under 1 Nephi 10:17, Joseph Smith removed 48 examples of the biblical phrase “it came to pass” in his editing for the 1837 edition. For this particular instance here in Mosiah 22:9–10, the apparent motivation was that the second instance of “it came to pass” was purely redundant since Gideon’s advice was precisely that—to gather their flocks together and to get the Lamanite guards drunk:

Mosiah 22:6–7

therefore let us send a proclamation among all this people  
 that they gather together their flocks and herds  
 that they may drive them into the wilderness by night  
 and I will go according to thy command  
 and pay the last tribute of wine to the Lamanites  
 and they will be drunken

Such redundant uses of the “it came to pass” phrase have been generally removed from the text, although this kind of repetitive usage can be found in the Hebrew text for Genesis but not in the corresponding King James translation of it; for specific examples and discussion, see pages 35–37 of my article “The Original Language of the Book of Mormon: Upstate New York Dialects, King James English, or Hebrew?” *Journal of Book of Mormon Studies* 3/1 (1994): 28–38. For a general discussion of this particular Hebraistic aspect of the original Book of Mormon text, see under COME TO PASS in volume 3. The critical text will restore all these examples of what might be considered unnecessary repetition of the biblical phrase “it came to pass”.

In this particular instance of 1837 editing, Joseph Smith initially crossed out the original ampersand in the printer’s manuscript as well as the following *it came to pass*. But then he apparently decided that he needed a connecting *and* to follow the preceding sentence, so he supra-linearly restored the *and*.

**Summary:** Restore the redundant use of “it came to pass” in Mosiah 22:10; such usage is characteristic of the original Book of Mormon text as well as the Hebrew text for Genesis (but not the corresponding King James English-language translation).

## ■ Mosiah 22:12

*and they had taken all their gold and silver*  
*and their precious things which they could carry*  
*and also their provisions with them*  
 [unto > into 1 | into ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *the wilderness*

Here Oliver Cowdery initially wrote “**unto** the wilderness”, but then almost immediately he corrected this to “**into** the wilderness” by overwriting the *un* with *in* (there is no change in the level

of ink flow). The original text has exactly 100 instances of “**into** the wilderness”, including six here in Mosiah 22. (In the total count, I include the variants “into some strange wilderness”, “into the south wilderness”, and “into the east wilderness”.) On the other hand, there are no occurrences of “**unto** the wilderness”. Further, there are two other cases where Oliver initially wrote in  $\mathcal{D}$  “**unto** the wilderness” instead of the correct “**into** the wilderness”; in both cases (as here in Mosiah 22:12), he caught his error almost immediately:

1 Nephi 4:36  
 that the Jews might not know concerning our flight  
 [*into* 0ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST | *unto* > *into* 1] the wilderness

1 Nephi 5:8  
 the Lord hath commanded my husband to flee  
 [*into* 0ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST | *unto* > *into* 1] the wilderness

For a more general list of cases where scribes accidentally wrote *unto* rather than *into*, see the discussion under 2 Nephi 8:23. For discussion regarding “**into** the wilderness” versus “**in** the wilderness”, see under 1 Nephi 4:33.

**Summary:** Maintain in Mosiah 22:12 the occurrence of “**into** the wilderness”, Oliver Cowdery’s corrected reading in  $\mathcal{D}$ .

■ **Mosiah 22:13–14**

*they arrived in the land of Zarahemla  
 and joined [*his* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPS | Mosiah’s RT] people  
 and became his subjects  
 and it came to pass that Mosiah received them with joy*

Originally, the possessive pronoun *his* was used twice in verse 13 (“and joined **his** people and became **his** subjects”), but there is no apparent antecedent. One’s first inclination is to assume that the text here is referring to Mosiah, the king in the land of Zarahemla. Mosiah is explicitly mentioned in the immediately following sentence (in verse 14): “Mosiah received them with joy”. The 1920 LDS edition cleared up this minor difficulty by replacing the first *his* with *Mosiah’s* (giving “and joined Mosiah’s people and became his subjects”). One might even consider the possibility that the original text here actually read *Mosiah’s people* and that early in the transmission of the text the following *his* in “and became his subjects” led to the replacement of *Mosiah’s* with *his*.

One problem with the 1920 emendation is that it created the only occurrence of “X’s people” in the entire Book of Mormon text. The original text has occurrences of only “the people of X”, with the following number of occurrences when X refers to an individual:

Nephi	141
(king) Limhi	23
Ammon	19
Zarahemla	11
Morionton	7
Shiz	6

Coriantumr	5
Mosiah	4
(king) Noah	4
Jared	3
(king) Lamoni	3
Antipus	2
Akish	1
Amalickiah	1
Amlici	1
Amulon	1
(the king) Jacob	1
Lehi	1
Moroni	1
Moronihah	1
Zemnarihah	1
Zeniff	1

Out of 238 cases, we always get “the people of X”, never “X’s people”. This result holds even when we extend X to include places, such as “the people of Gideon” in Alma 8:1 (that is, the people of the land Gideon) and “the people of Antiparah” in Alma 57:4 (that is, the people of the city Antiparah). For this construction involving *people*, the Book of Mormon text unexceptionally prefers the *of*-genitive rather than the *s*-genitive. This finding suggests that if Mosiah 22:13 were to be emended, a more consistent emendation would be to replace “his people” with “the people of Mosiah” (thus “they arrived in the land of Zarahemla and joined **the people of Mosiah** and became his subjects”). It should be noted that for such an emendation the antecedent for *his* would occur in a preceding postmodifying prepositional phrase (namely, “of Mosiah”); a similar example of such usage is found in the original text for the three-witness statement: “which is a record of **the people of Nephi** and also of the Lamanites **his** brethren”. Despite the theoretical possibility of “the people of Mosiah” here in Mosiah 22:13, it seems unlikely that the original text actually read this way since the change of “the people of Mosiah” to “his people” appears rather unlikely; the manuscripts and editions show no independent evidence for this kind of transmission error.

The consistent use of “the people of X” does not mean that the *s*-genitive never occurs at all in the Book of Mormon. We have, for instance, the following examples involving the names of individuals:

1 Nephi preface	<b>Nephi’s</b> brethren rebelleth against him
2 Nephi 5:16	wherefore it could not be built like unto <b>Solomon’s</b> temple
Alma 44:12	behold one of <b>Moroni’s</b> soldiers smote it even to the earth
Alma 47:8	now it was not <b>Amalickiah’s</b> intention to give them battle
Alma 47:12	he went up into the mount nearly to <b>Lehonti’s</b> camp
Alma 59:1	after Moroni had received and had read <b>Helaman’s</b> epistle
Helaman 6:18	and they were called <b>Gaddianton’s</b> robbers and murderers
3 Nephi 27:8	for if a church be called in <b>Moses’</b> name / then it be <b>Moses’</b> church

In no case does *people* serve as the head noun for a premodifying *s*-genitive.

It has been frequently observed that the Book of Mormon text often prefers the *of*-genitive, as in the phrases “the rod of iron” and “the plates of brass”, never “the iron rod” or “the brass plates” (although this is how English speakers today refer to these two objects). John A. Tvedtnes has identified such examples of the *of*-genitive as possible Hebraisms representing the construct state in Hebrew. See page 55 of his article “Hebraisms in the Book of Mormon: A Preliminary Survey”, *Brigham Young University Studies* 11/2 (1970): 50–60.

There are, however, other possible antecedents, at least theoretically, for the two *his*'s in Mosiah 22:13. For instance, one could interpret the first *his* as meaning that the people of Limhi joined the people of Zarahemla: “they arrived in the land of **Zarahemla** and joined **his** people”. The problem, of course, is that by that time Zarahemla had been dead for about two generations. Thus the narrative itself makes it virtually impossible for the second *his* (in “and became **his** subjects”) to mean that the people of Limhi became Zarahemla's subjects. David Calabro (personal communication) has suggested another possibility: the two instances of *his* may actually refer to king Benjamin, not king Mosiah. In the previous chapter, the original text actually refers to Benjamin rather than Mosiah as the king in Zarahemla:

Mosiah 21:28

and now Limhi was again filled with joy  
on learning from the mouth of Ammon that  
king [*Benjamin* 1A | *Mosiah* BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] had a gift from God  
whereby he could interpret such engravings

In fact, in searching for an antecedent for the two *his*'s here in Mosiah 22:13, we find that *Benjamin*, not *Mosiah*, is the nearest preceding name that will work, although this potential antecedent is found some distance away, in Mosiah 21:28 (about one and a half manuscript pages earlier in the text). If the two *his*'s in Mosiah 22:13 refer to king Benjamin, then we can explain why the following verse (Mosiah 22:14) suddenly uses the name *Mosiah* rather than the expected pronominal *he* (“and it came to pass that **Mosiah** received them with joy”). King Benjamin, being in retirement, was not there to receive the people of Limhi. Even though Mosiah is the *de facto* king, king Benjamin is still alive and the people in the land of Zarahemla are still referred to as the people of king Benjamin, so that technically the people of Limhi joined king Benjamin's people and were his subjects until Benjamin finally died. See under Mosiah 21:28 for further discussion regarding the use of *Benjamin* rather than *Mosiah* in that passage.

The critical text will therefore restore the earliest but difficult reading *his people* in Mosiah 22:13. One possible explanation for the difficult reading is that Mormon, in writing the text here, did not realize that he had provided no immediate antecedent for the two *his*'s that he wrote in verse 13. He had earlier mentioned that “the people of king Limhi . . . bent their course towards the land of Zarahemla / being led by Ammon and his brethren” (Mosiah 22:11). Mormon seems to have assumed that the reader remembers who is king in the land of Zarahemla, although the original text seems to treat both Benjamin and Mosiah as ruling kings until king Benjamin actually dies. Thus the two *his*'s in Mosiah 22:13 may refer to either king Benjamin or Mosiah, although textually the first works better.

*Summary:* Restore the original use of *his* in Mosiah 22:13 (“they arrived in the land of Zarahemla and joined **his** people”); there is no immediate antecedent for this *his*, but previous usage in the original text suggests that the *his* here actually refers to king Benjamin.

■ **Mosiah 22:14**

*and he also received their records*

*and also the [records 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST | record HK]*

*which had been found by the people of Limhi*

In this verse, the 1874 RLDS edition replaced the second occurrence of the plural *records* with the singular *record*. In this passage, either occurrence of *records* could read in the singular. Thus there seems to be no particular motivation for the change in the RLDS text, which suggests that the singular *record* is simply a typo. The third RLDS edition (in 1908) restored the original plural, apparently by reference to the printer’s manuscript.

As discussed under 1 Nephi 5:21, the Book of Mormon text has considerable variation between the singular *record* and the plural *records*. Moreover, either number can be used to refer to one specific record. For instance, here in Mosiah 22:14, the second occurrence of *records* refers to the record of the people of Jared (that is, the 24 gold plates of Ether). The text elsewhere in the book of Mosiah uses both the singular and the plural to refer to this particular record, although most instances are in the plural:

Mosiah 8:12

for I am desirous that **these records** should be translated into our language

Mosiah 8:13

I can assuredly tell thee O king  
of a man that can translate **the records**

Mosiah 21:27

and they brought **a record** with them  
even **a record** of the people whose bones they had found

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 delivered to him by the hand of Limhi . . .

Mosiah 28:17

now after Mosiah had finished translating **these records**  
behold **it** gave an account of the people which were destroyed

Notice in the last example how the singular pronoun *it* is used to refer to the plural *these records*. Variation in number for *record(s)* is clearly possible. Thus for each case of *record(s)*, the critical text will follow the reading of the earliest textual sources in determining the number.

*Summary:* Maintain in Mosiah 22:14 both occurrences of the plural *records* (the reading of the earliest textual sources).

# Mosiah 23

## ■ Mosiah 23:1

Now Alma **having** been warned of the Lord  
that the armies of king Noah would come upon them  
and [*had* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPS | *having* RT] made it known to his people  
therefore they gathered together their flocks

Here the 1920 LDS edition replaced *had* with *having* so that there would be two present participial clauses beginning with the same *having*. This emendation suggests that the original text may have read “and **having** made it known to his people”. However, there are no examples in the early transmission of the text (either in the manuscripts or in the 1830 edition) of *having* and *had* ever being mixed up, although there are some changes involving the present participle and the past-tense form for other verbs:

1 Nephi 4:21 (Oliver Cowdery’s editing in  $\mathcal{P}$ )  
and he [*soposing* 0 | *supposeing* >+ *supposed* 1 |  
*supposed* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST] me to be his master Laban

Alma 2:27 (error by scribe 2 of  $\mathcal{P}$ , corrected by Oliver Cowdery  
when proofing  $\mathcal{P}$  against  $\mathcal{O}$ )  
the Lamanites and the Amlicites  
being as numerous almost as it were as the sands of the sea  
[ $\mathcal{S}2$  *comeing* >  $\mathcal{S}1$  *came* 1 | *came* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST] upon them  
to destroy them

Alma 4:14 (initial error by scribe 2 of  $\mathcal{P}$ , corrected later with heavier ink flow)  
looking forward to that day  
thus [*retained* >+ *retaining* 1 | *retaining* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST]  
a remission of their sins

The last example shows the scribe first writing a past-tense form and then correcting it to the present participial form. This could be taken as evidence that in Mosiah 23:1 either the scribe in  $\mathcal{O}$  or Oliver Cowdery in  $\mathcal{P}$  could have mistakenly written the past-tense *had* instead of the present participle *having*.

Another possible emendation in Mosiah 23:1 would be to remove the conjunction *and*, thus providing a finite predicate for the subject noun *Alma*:

Mosiah 23:1 (possible emendation)  
Now Alma **having** been warned of the Lord  
that the armies of king Noah would come upon them  
**had** made it known to his people  
**therefore** they gathered together their flocks

In fact, the original text could have read this way, which would mean that in the early transmission of the text an *and* was accidentally inserted here.

There are examples in the text of both these constructions. The one with conjoined participial clauses is considerably more frequent; in each of the following examples, one of the participial forms is the perfect auxiliary *having*:

1 Nephi 4:31

and now I Nephi  
**being** a man large in stature  
**and** also **having** received much strength of the Lord  
**therefore** I did seize upon the servant of Laban

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

Here is one example of the other type (namely, where a finite predicate completes a subject after an intervening present participial clause):

Mosiah 18:32

but behold it came to pass that  
the king **having** discovered a movement among the people  
**sent** his servants to watch them  
**therefore** on the day that they were assembling themselves together  
to hear the word of the Lord  
they were discovered unto the king

Interestingly, the editors for the 1920 LDS edition replaced one instance of a finite predicate with a present participial clause and inserted a connecting *and*:

Alma 19:16–17

even until they had all fallen to the earth  
save it were one of the Lamanitish women whose name was Abish  
she **having** been converted unto the Lord for many years  
on account of a remarkable vision of her father  
thus **having** been converted to the Lord  
[*never had* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPSQ | *and never having* RT] made it known  
**therefore** when she saw that all the servants of Lamoni had fallen to the earth  
and also her mistress the queen and the king  
and Ammon lay prostrate upon the earth  
she knew that it was the power of God

Thus the participle *having* or the finite *had* without the *and* could represent the original text for Mosiah 23:1, which would mean that during the early transmission of Mosiah 23:1 an original *having* was replaced by *had* or an *and* was accidentally added. There is evidence in the early transmission of the text for the occasional intrusion of a connective *and*, although there are no examples of an *and* intruding right before the past-tense form of a verb.

David Calabro (personal communication) proposes a third emendation: perhaps the *having* at the beginning of the passage is a mistake for *had*—that is, the original text may have read as follows:

Mosiah 23:1 (another possible emendation)

Now Alma **had** been warned of the Lord  
that the armies of king Noah would come upon them  
**and had** made it known to his people  
**therefore** they gathered together their flocks

In support of this construction, we can cite a number of instances like this that begin with *now* as a narrative connector:

Mosiah 20:16

now Limhi **had** heard nothing concerning this matter  
**therefore** he saith: I will search among my people

Mosiah 26:10

now there **had** not any such thing happened before in the church  
**therefore** Alma was troubled in his spirit

Mosiah 29:3

now Aaron **had** gone up to the land of Nephi  
**therefore** the king could not confer the kingdom upon him

Alma 8:9

now Satan **had** got great hold upon the hearts of the people  
of the city of Ammonihah  
**therefore** they would not hearken unto the words of Alma

Alma 22:20

now the servants **had** seen the cause of the king's fall  
**therefore** they durst not lay their hands on Aaron and his brethren

On the other hand, there are corresponding examples with the same form except that the initial verb is the present participial *having*:

Alma 15:18

now as I said  
Alma **having** seen all these things  
**therefore** he took Amulek and came over to the land of Zarahemla

Alma 19:2

now the queen **having** heard of the fame of Ammon  
**therefore** she sent and desired that he should come in unto her

As noted earlier, there are no instances of *having* and *had* being mixed up in the early transmission of the text.

There is one other possibility that needs to be considered: perhaps the earliest reading here in Mosiah 23:1, despite its difficulty, is the actual original reading. In support of that possibility, consider the same construction found nearby in the earliest text:



Mosiah 29:42

and it came to pass that Alma was appointed to be the chief judge  
 he being also the high priest  
 his father **having** conferred the office upon him  
**and** [*had* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPS | *having* RT] given him the charge  
 concerning all the affairs of the church

As in Mosiah 23:1, the 1920 LDS edition emended the *had* in Mosiah 29:42 to *having*. Thus there are two original examples of the same construction, which now makes it less likely (although still possible) that both represent textual errors. Admittedly, the original construction is very non-English. The critical text will nonetheless accept the earliest readings in Mosiah 23:1 and Mosiah 29:42 for which a finite predicate is conjoined with a preceding participial clause. Such nonstandard usage could be intentional; and it is not that difficult to understand.

**Summary:** Restore the earliest reading in Mosiah 23:1, which permits a finite predicate to be conjoined with a preceding present participial clause: “Now Alma having been warned of the Lord that the armies of king Noah would come upon them **and had** made it known to his people”; for a similar example, see Mosiah 29:42.

■ **Mosiah 23:5**

*and it came to pass that  
 they pitched their tents and began to till the ground  
 and began to build buildings*  
 [.&C. 1 | &c. ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOQ | *etc.* JPS | RT]

The 1920 LDS edition omitted the *etc.* here, even though the text appears to be saying that they began to build buildings and do the other work necessary to found the city of Helam. (Later on in this chapter, in verse 20, the text describes the people of Alma as having built a city: “and they built a city which they called the city of Helam”.) The critical text will restore the *etc.* here in Mosiah 23:5 and elsewhere. For a complete discussion, see ETC. in volume 3.

**Summary:** Restore in Mosiah 23:5 the *etc.* of the earliest text; its use here is not unwarranted.

■ **Mosiah 23:7–8**

*it is not expedient that ye should have a king  
 nevertheless if it were possible that  
 ye could always have [a just man >– just men 1 | just men ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST]  
 to be your [king > kings 1 | kings ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST]  
 it would be well for you to have a king*

Here in the printer’s manuscript, Oliver Cowdery initially wrote a singular form for every noun that refers to kings, including in the clause “ye could always have **a just man** to be your **king**”, which agrees with two occurrences of *a king* elsewhere in this passage (“ye should have **a king** . . . for you to have **a king**”). In this intermediate clause, Oliver seems to have first added the plural *s* to *kings* (there the *s* is added inline and without any change in the ink flow). Later he turned to

correcting *a just man* to *just men*; in this case, the ink is lighter and the ink flow is smoother. It is possible that this second correction was done later, perhaps when proofing  $\mathcal{P}$  against  $\mathcal{O}$ ; the correction of *king* to *kings*, on the other hand, suggests immediacy. Clearly, the singular works perfectly well through the entire passage, so we should probably assume that the corrected reading is the reading of the original manuscript, no longer extant here. In fact, the plural usage in “ye could always have **just men** to be your **kings**” also works well enough despite the two nearby occurrences of the singular *a king*.

**Summary:** Maintain in Mosiah 23:8 the corrected plural reading in  $\mathcal{P}$ : “if it were possible that ye could always have **just men** to be your **kings**”.

■ **Mosiah 23:9**

*and I myself was caught in a snare  
and did many things which was abominable  
in the sight of [God > NULL 1 | ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] the Lord*

In Mosiah 23:9, Oliver Cowdery initially wrote “in the sight of God” in  $\mathcal{P}$ . He then crossed out the word *God* and wrote inline *the Lord*, which shows that the correction was immediate and that the original manuscript must have read “in the sight of the Lord”. Elsewhere, the text has examples of both phrases, with five of “in the sight of God” and six of “in the sight of the Lord”, so either reading is possible. For each case we therefore follow the earliest textual sources in determining whether we have “in the sight of God” or “in the sight of the Lord”.

**Summary:** Maintain in Mosiah 23:9 the corrected reading in  $\mathcal{P}$ : “in the sight of the Lord”.

■ **Mosiah 23:12**

*and now I say unto you  
[as >js NULL 1 | As A | BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]  
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  
[NULL >jg ; 1 | ABCGHKNPRST | : DEFIJLMOQ]  
therefore ye were bound with the bands of iniquity*

Here in his editing for the 1837 edition, Joseph Smith deleted the subordinate conjunction *as*. Yet elsewhere in the current text there are numerous examples of an initial *as*-clause followed by a finite clause beginning with *therefore*:

Alma 31:5

and now **as** the preaching of the word had had a greater tendency to lead the people to do that which was just —yea it had had more powerful effect upon the minds of the people than the sword or any thing else which had happened unto them— **therefore** Alma thought it was expedient that they should try the virtue of the word of God

Alma 34:33

and now **as** I said unto you before  
**as** ye have had so many witnesses  
**therefore** I beseech of you that  
 ye do not procrastinate the day of your repentance until the end

Alma 43:6

and now **as** the Amlicites were of a more wicked and a murderous disposition  
 than the Lamanites were / in and of themselves  
**therefore** Zerahemnah appointed chief captains over the Lamanites . . .

Alma 49:15

and **as** the city of Noah had hitherto been the weakest part of the land  
**therefore** they would march thither to battle

Alma 56:57

and **as** we had no place for our prisoners  
 that we could guard them to keep them from the armies of the Lamanites  
**therefore** we sent them to the land of Zarahemla

Helaman 5:2

for **as** their laws and their governments were established by the voice of the people  
 and they which chose evil were more numerous than they which chose good  
**therefore** they were ripening for destruction

Ether 3:17

and now **as** I Moroni said  
 I could not make a full account of these things which are written  
**therefore** it sufficeth me to say that  
 Jesus shewed himself unto this man in the spirit

There are three other cases where *therefore* was deleted from this kind of construction, all by Joseph Smith in his editing for the 1837 edition:

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

Alma 42:6

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

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 | BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] it was expedient that  
 mankind should be reclaimed from this spiritual death

In each of these three cases, there is a preceding *wherefore* or *therefore* before the *as*; the apparent intent of Joseph’s editing in these three cases was to avoid the repetition of *wherefore* and *therefore*. For further discussion, see under 2 Nephi 5:21.

The real problem with Mosiah 23:12 results from the 1830 compositor’s decision to place a semicolon (which leads to closure) just before the finite *therefore*-clause. This punctuation ended up creating a stranded subordinate clause, which induced Joseph Smith to remove the *as* in his editing for the 1837 edition. Instead, the semicolon should have been replaced by a comma, as in the numerous examples of the *as-therefore* construction that have been retained in the Book of Mormon text. In another passage, the 1830 compositor omitted the *as* (perhaps accidentally), which then permitted him to place a semicolon before the *therefore*-clause:

Alma 3:18

nevertheless [*as* 1 | ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] they had come out  
in open rebellion against God  
[ 1 | ; ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]  
**therefore** it was expedient that the curse should fall upon them

For a passage where an original *as* may have been removed from the original manuscript itself, see Alma 57:3.

**Summary:** Restore the subordinate conjunction *as* in Mosiah 23:12; the following main clause (which begins with *therefore*) completes the preceding subordinate *as*-clause, which means that there should be no semicolon (or any other punctuation that leads to closure) separating the two clauses.

■ **Mosiah 23:12**

*and now I say unto you*

*as* [*you* 1 | *ye* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST | *Ye* κ] *have been oppressed by king Noah . . .*

Here in the printer’s manuscript, the subject of the *as*-clause takes the pronoun form *you*, which was changed to the archaic *ye* by the 1830 typesetter. Generally the Book of Mormon text has *ye* in subject position and *you* in object position (just like the King James Bible). But there are some examples of *you* in subject position in the earliest textual sources, as here in Mosiah 23:12. It is possible that the immediately preceding occurrence of *you* (“and now I say unto **you**”) caused an original *ye* in “as **ye** have been oppressed by king Noah” to be replaced with *you* early on in the transmission of the text. However, there are quite a few examples of *you* being used in subject position in the earliest text (see the statistics cited under Mosiah 4:14); thus the critical text will in each case let the earliest textual sources determine whether the subject pronoun form is *ye* or *you*. In subject position, the biblical *ye* clearly dominates in the text, but *you* is also possible. For further discussion, see YE in volume 3.

**Summary:** Restore in Mosiah 23:12 the modern use of *you* in subject position since the earliest extant textual source (the printer’s manuscript) reads this way (“as **you** have been oppressed by king Noah”).

## ■ Mosiah 23:12

*and now I say unto you  
as you have been [opposed > oppressed 1 | oppressed ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]  
by king Noah . . .*

Here Oliver Cowdery initially wrote *opposed* in the printer’s manuscript; then almost immediately he corrected *opposed* to *oppressed* (the level of ink flow for the supralinear insertion is unchanged). Undoubtedly, the orthographic similarity of the two words and the semantic possibility of *opposed* led to this scribal error. It turns out that there are no examples of *oppose* being used in the passive in the Book of Mormon text—instead, there are only three active uses:

Alma 51:7	that they durst not oppose
Alma 57:19	and did administer death unto all those who opposed them
Helaman 1:20	and they did slay every one who did oppose them

On the other hand, there are three additional passive examples of *oppress* in the text as well as three active examples; all six of these are in biblical quotations or refer to such:

1 Nephi 21:26	and I will feed them that oppress thee with their own flesh
2 Nephi 6:18	and I will feed them that oppress thee with their own flesh
2 Nephi 13:5	and the people shall be oppressed every one by another
Mosiah 13:35	and that he himself should be oppressed and afflicted
Mosiah 14:7	he was oppressed and he was afflicted
3 Nephi 24:5	and against those that oppress the hireling in his wages

The corrected reading in Mosiah 23:12 is at least consistent with other usage in the Book of Mormon.

**Summary:** Accept “oppressed by king Noah”, Oliver Cowdery’s correction in  $\mathcal{P}$  and undoubtedly the reading of the original text.

## ■ Mosiah 23:12–13

*therefore ye were bound with the bands of iniquity  
and now as ye have been delivered by the power of God out of these bonds  
yea even out of the hands of king Noah and his people  
and also from the bonds of iniquity  
even so I desire that ye should stand fast in this liberty wherewith ye have been made free*

Here verse 12 has the phrase “the bands of iniquity”, but verse 13 has two uses of *bonds* referring to iniquity (“these bonds” and “the bonds of iniquity”). The two occurrences of *bonds* implies that the *bands* in verse 12 could have read as *bonds* in the original text. The visual similarity of the scribal *a*’s and *o*’s could have readily led here in Mosiah 23:12–13 to a mix-up between *bands* and *bonds*. In fact, there is one case of variation in the text between *band* and *bond*:

Mormon 9:13	
	and all shall stand before his bar
	being redeemed and loosed
	from this eternal [ <i>bond</i> 1   <i>band</i> ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] of death

Evidence elsewhere in the Book of Mormon argues that for Mormon 9:13 the original text probably read “from this eternal **band** of death” (for discussion, see that passage). The important point from this example is that scribe 2 of  $\mathcal{P}$  and the 1830 typesetter read the original manuscript differently, thus confirming that mix-ups between *band* and *bond* are possible.

In support of emending “the **bands** of iniquity” in Mosiah 23:12 to “the **bonds** of iniquity”, we observe that all other specific occurrences of “bands/bonds of iniquity” read *bonds*, not *bands*:

Mosiah 23:13

and now as ye have been delivered by the power of God out of these bonds  
yea even out of the hands of king Noah and his people  
and also from the **bonds** of iniquity

Mosiah 27:29

my soul hath been redeemed  
from the gall of bitterness and **bonds** of iniquity

Alma 41:11

all men that are in a state of nature  
or I would say in a carnal state  
are in the gall of bitterness and in the **bonds** of iniquity

Mormon 8:31

for they are in the gall of bitterness and in the **bonds** of iniquity

Moroni 8:14

behold I say unto you  
that he that supposeth that little children needeth baptism  
is in the gall of bitterness and in the **bonds** of iniquity

Note, in particular, that three of these cases read exactly alike: “in the gall of bitterness and in the bonds of iniquity”, which parallels the King James usage in Acts 8:23: “for I perceive that thou art in the gall of bitterness and *in* the bond of iniquity”—except that the King James version and the original Greek have the singular *bond* rather than the plural *bonds*.

On the other hand, for these five cases of “bonds of iniquity”, the associated verb is not *bind*. When the verb is *bind*, we get *bands* in the Book of Mormon rather than *bonds* (I include here the case in Mosiah 23:12):

1 Nephi 7:17

yea even give me strength  
that I may burst these **bands** with which I am **bound**

Mosiah 23:12

therefore ye were **bound** with the **bands** of iniquity

Alma 7:12

and he will take upon him death  
that he may loose the **bands** of death which **binds** his people

Alma 8:31

nevertheless they did not exercise their power  
until they were **bound** in **bands** and cast into prison

The three other examples involving the verb *bind* argue that the use of *bands* in Mosiah 23:12 may be correct, despite the fact that the following verse reads “these **bonds**” and “the **bonds** of iniquity”. The critical text will therefore maintain the unique occurrence of “the **bands** of iniquity” in Mosiah 23:12.

The possibility of a choice between *bonds* and *bands* is found elsewhere in the Book of Mormon text. For instance, when referring to physical bonds, there are 11 cases of *bands* and 3 of *bonds* (the instances of *bonds* are all in the second half of the book of Alma and are each marked below with an asterisk):

1 Nephi 7:17	that I may burst these <b>bands</b> with which I am bound
1 Nephi 7:18	the <b>bands</b> were loosed from off my hands and feet
1 Nephi 18:15	they came unto me and loosed the <b>bands</b> which was upon my wrists
2 Nephi 8:25	loose thyself from the <b>bands</b> of thy neck
Mosiah 7:8	and their <b>bands</b> were loosed
Mosiah 7:13	ye would not have suffered that I should have wore these <b>bands</b>
Alma 8:31	until they were bound in <b>bands</b> and cast into prison
Alma 14:24	deliver yourselves from these <b>bands</b>
Alma 14:28	and they were loosed from their <b>bands</b>
Alma 17:24	and caused that his <b>bands</b> should be loosed
* Alma 36:27	God hath delivered me from prisons and from <b>bonds</b> and from death
* Alma 38:4	for I knew that thou wast in <b>bonds</b>
* Alma 62:50	that he had delivered them from death and from <b>bonds</b> and from prisons and from all manner of afflictions
3 Nephi 20:37	loose thyself from the <b>bands</b> of thy neck

Thus competition between *bands* and *bonds* seems to be inherent within the text. Although Mosiah 23:12–13 deals with spiritual bonds, the variation regarding physical bonds suggests that we should in each case allow the earliest textual sources to determine whether the word is *band(s)* or *bond(s)*. The critical text will thus allow for variation with respect to physical and spiritual bonds.

Variation between *band(s)* and *bond(s)* was much more prevalent in earlier English. Under the noun *band*, the Oxford English Dictionary explains that “*band* and *bond* were at first merely phonetic variants . . . but are now [by the 1880s] largely differentiated in use”. We find that the King James Bible, like the Book of Mormon, shows some variation with respect to *band* and *bond*, as in the following expression that occurs four times in the Old Testament:

Jeremiah 2:20	for of old time I have broken thy yoke <i>and</i> burst thy <b>bands</b>
Jeremiah 5:5	but these have altogether broken the yoke <i>and</i> burst the <b>bonds</b>
Jeremiah 30:8	I will break his yoke from off thy neck and will burst thy <b>bonds</b>
Nahum 1:13	for now will I break his yoke from off thee and will burst thy <b>bonds</b> in sunder

The first of the four occurrences has *bands*, the rest *bonds*. This example supports the variation with respect to “bands/bonds of iniquity” in the Book of Mormon text, which has one occurrence of *bands* (here in Mosiah 23:12) but five of *bonds*.

*Summary:* Maintain in Mosiah 23:12 the unique occurrence of “the **bands** of iniquity”, the reading of all the (extant) textual sources; this use of *bands* rather than *bonds* is consistent with usage elsewhere in the text (namely, whenever the associated verb is *bind*, we have *bands* rather than *bonds*).

#### ■ Mosiah 23:13

*yea* [NULL >+ *even* 1 | *even* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *out of the hands of king Noah and his people*

Here in the printer’s manuscript, the word *even* was supralinearly inserted somewhat later (the flow of ink is considerably heavier and broader). Oliver Cowdery may be the scribe here, but since *even* was written quite awkwardly, one cannot be sure.

The phrase “yea even” is very frequent in the Book of Mormon text (with 190 of them in the original text), but of course *yea* without *even* is even more frequent. So there is no grammatical or stylistic motivation for inserting *even* here in Mosiah 23:13. This correction probably occurred when Oliver (presumably) proofed  $\mathfrak{P}$  against  $\mathfrak{C}$ . For further discussion on the use of “yea even” in the text, see under 1 Nephi 10:3.

*Summary:* Accept in Mosiah 23:13 “yea even”, the corrected reading in  $\mathfrak{P}$ ; this correction was definitely done later, probably when  $\mathfrak{P}$  was proofed against  $\mathfrak{C}$ .

#### ■ Mosiah 23:13–14

*even so I desire that ye should stand fast in this liberty wherewith ye have been made free and that ye trust no man to be a king over you and also* [trusting 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPS | trust RT] *no one to be your teachers nor your ministers except he be a man of God **walking** in his ways and **keeping** his commandments*

Here the earliest text has a detached participial clause. The 1920 LDS edition changed the present participle *trusting* to *trust*, the base form of the verb. This occurrence of *trust* could be interpreted either as an imperative (“and also / trust no one to be your teachers nor your ministers”) or as the head of a conjoined verb phrase, equivalent to “and also [that ye] trust no one to be your teachers nor your ministers”.

It is possible that the occurrence of the present participle *trusting* may be an error that resulted from the two present participial forms that follow: “except he be a man of God **walking** in his ways and **keeping** his commandments”. There is evidence in the manuscripts that a present participial verb form can be accidentally introduced into the text:

Mosiah 29:17–18 (initial error by Hyrum Smith in  $\mathfrak{P}$ , corrected almost immediately)  
 for behold how much iniquity doth one wicked king cause to be committed  
 yea and what great destruction  
 yea [*remmbering* > *remmber* 1 | *remember* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]  
 king Noah / his wickedness and his abominations  
 and also the wickedness and abominations of his people



Alma 2:27 (scribe 2 of  $\mathcal{P}$ 's error, corrected by Oliver Cowdery while proofing  $\mathcal{P}$  against  $\mathcal{O}$ )

and the Amlicites **being** as numerous almost as it were as the sands of the sea  
[ $\mathcal{S}2$  *comeing* >  $\mathcal{S}1$  *came* 1 | *came* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] upon them  
to destroy them

3 Nephi 22:16 (scribe 2 of  $\mathcal{P}$ 's initial error, corrected almost immediately)

behold I have created the smith that bloweth the coals in the fire  
and that [*bringing* > *bringeth* 1 | *bringeth* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] forth  
an instrument for his work  
and I have created the waster to destroy

In the second of these cases (Alma 2:27), there is a nearby present participial verb form, *being*, that could have served as the source for scribe 2 of  $\mathcal{P}$ 's *comeing*.

Another possible emendation in Mosiah 23:14 would be to eliminate the conjunction *and* that precedes *also trusting*: “and that ye trust no man to be a king over you / also trusting no one to be your teachers nor your ministers”. If this were the original text for this passage, then an extra *and* must have been accidentally introduced into the text during its early transmission. The text has two other present participial clauses where the verb form is *trusting*, but both of these are properly attached to the preceding text:

Jacob 7:25

wherefore the people of Nephi did fortify against them  
with their arms and with all their might  
**trusting** in the God and the rock of their salvation

Alma 17:13

and it came to pass  
when they had arriven in the borders of the land of the Lamanites  
that they separated themselves and departed one from another  
**trusting** in the Lord that they should meet again at the close of their harvest

Neither of these examples have an *also* or any other adverbial element before *trusting*. Moreover, the verb *trust* is not repeated in either of these examples, as it is in Mosiah 23:14 (“and that ye **trust** no man to be a king over you and **also trusting** no one to be your teachers nor your ministers”).

Despite the evidence for making some kind of emendation here in Mosiah 23:14, there is also evidence elsewhere in the text in support of the earliest reading (“**and** also **trusting** no one to be your teachers nor your ministers”):

Mosiah 28:20

he took the plates of brass and all the things which he had kept . . .  
and conferred them upon him  
**and** [*CommanDing* >js *CommanDed* 1 | *commanding* A |  
*commanded* BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] him  
that he should keep and preserve them  
and also keep a record of the people  
**handing** them down from one generation to another

Alma 16:3

they had destroyed the people which were in the city of Ammonihah  
and also some around the borders of Noah  
**and** [*taking* 1ABCDEGPS | *taken* FHIJKLMNOQRT] others captive  
into the wilderness

Helaman 4:22

and that they had altered and trampled under their feet the laws of Mosiah  
or that which the Lord commanded him to give unto the people  
**and** [*thus seeing* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPS | *they saw* RT]  
that their laws had become corrupted  
and that they had become a wicked people

In the example in Mosiah 28:20, it is marginally possible that the present participle *commanding* may be an error in anticipation of the following *handing* (in  $\mathcal{P}$  there is about one and a half manuscript lines between the two participial forms). On the other hand, no such influence can be proposed for the two other examples. All three examples suggest that the original text of the Book of Mormon could have a final, but detached, present participial clause connected by means of an *and* to a preceding main clause. Clearly, this construction is difficult for modern English readers. In fact, all four of them are no longer found in the standard LDS text: one was removed by Joseph Smith in his editing for the 1837 edition, another in the 1852 LDS edition, and the two others in the 1920 LDS edition.

The critical text will restore the four occurrences in the earliest text of the detached present participial clause. Such usage appears to be intended, despite its difficulty for modern English readers.

**Summary:** Restore the original present participial clause in Mosiah 23:14 (“and also **trusting** no one to be your teachers nor your ministers”); the disconnected usage here is difficult but apparently intended since it is found a number of times in the earliest text.

#### ■ Mosiah 23:14

*and also trusting no one to be*  
*your* [*teachers* >js *teacher* 1 | *teachers* A | *teacher* BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]  
*nor your* [*ministers* >js *minister* 1 | *ministers* A | *minister* BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]  
*except he be a man of God*

The plural usage in the conjunctive phrase “your teachers nor your ministers” appears to be fully intended, even though the surrounding text uses singular forms: “and also trusting **no one** . . . except **he** be **a man** of God”. Joseph Smith replaced the plurals here with the expected singular forms *teacher* and *minister* in his editing for the 1837 edition. Earlier in this chapter, there is a similar kind of switching in number, from singular to plural and back to singular, although not within a single sentence as here in Mosiah 23:14:

Mosiah 23:7–8

it is not expedient that ye should have **a king**  
nevertheless if it were possible that ye could always have **just men**  
to be **your kings**  
it would be well for you to have **a king**

Such switches in number are more common with pronouns, especially when used generically. Consider the following example from the original text where the singular *an one* was followed by the plural pronoun *they*:

Alma 5:25 (earliest reading)

ye cannot suppose that such **an one** can have place in the kingdom of heaven  
but **they** shall be cast out  
for **they** are the children of the kingdom of the devil

Here is an extended example of multiple switching in pronominal number, also from the original text:

Alma 12:34–35 (earliest reading)

therefore whosoever repenteth and hardeneth not **his** heart  
**he** shall have claim on mercy through mine only begotten Son  
unto a remission of **their** sins and **these** shall enter into my rest  
and whosoever will harden **his** heart and will do iniquity  
behold I swear in my wrath that **they** shall not enter into my rest

Thus the critical text will accept switches in number such as the one found in Mosiah 23:14 (“and also trusting **no one** to be your **teachers** nor your **ministers** except **he** be a **man** of God”).

*Summary:* Accept in Mosiah 23:14 the original switch in number from singular (“no one”) to plural (“your teachers nor your ministers”) and then back to singular (“except he be a man of God”); such number switching is fairly frequent in the original text.

#### ■ Mosiah 23:16–17

*and now Alma was their high priest  
he being the founder of their church  
and it came to pass that none received authority to preach or to teach  
except it were by him from God  
therefore he consecrated all their priests and all their teachers*

Karl Franson (personal communication, 10 October 2003) suggests that the clause “except it were **by him** from God” may contain an error or, in any event, should be read as meaning ‘except it were **given him** from God’. Under such an interpretation, the *him* here would refer to the preceding generic pronoun *none*, not to the earlier *Alma*. Part of the difficulty here results from the versification break. Verse 17 begins with “and it came to pass that”, and therefore *Alma*, the antecedent for the *him* in “except it were by him from God”, occurs in the previous verse, 16. The result is that the reader tends to think that *by him* refers to *none*, which is in verse 17. Of course, in the following clause (“therefore **he** consecrated all their priests and all their teachers”), the *he* clearly refers to Alma. The *him* in “except it were by him” refers to Alma since he was the one who gave others the authority to preach or to teach.

The usage “except/save it were by X” means ‘except it were **by means of X**’ or ‘except it were **through X**’, as in the following examples:

1 Nephi 17:31	and there was not any thing done save it were by his word
2 Nephi 29:6	have ye obtained a Bible save it were by the Jews
2 Nephi 31:19	for ye have not come thus far save it were by the word of Christ
2 Nephi 32:2	how could ye speak with the tongue of angels save it were by the Holy Ghost
Alma 49:18	the Lamanites could not get into their forts of security . . . save it were by the entrance
3 Nephi 15:23	that I should not manifest myself unto them save it were by the Holy Ghost

Thus the clause “except it were by him from God” means ‘except it were through Alma from God’. The invariant reading here in Mosiah 23:17, although strange, is correct and means that no one became a priest or a teacher unless Alma consecrated him.

*Summary:* Maintain in Mosiah 23:17 the phraseology “except it **were by him** from God”, which means ‘except it were through Alma from God’.

■ **Mosiah 23:17**

*and none were consecrated*

*except [it >js they 1 | it A | they BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] were just men*

The singular *it* here in the original text acts as an existential *it*, not as a pronoun for the preceding *none*. Except for this *it*, the sentence is in the plural: “and **none were** consecrated except it were **just men**” (the second *were* is actually a subjunctive form, not a plural indicative form). In his editing for the 1837 edition, Joseph Smith replaced the existential *it* with the plural pronoun *they*, which directly refers to the preceding plural *none*.

There are several other examples of this existential usage in the original text, none of which have had the existential *it* edited to the personal pronoun *they* or *he*; moreover, in each case the existential *it* is followed by the subjunctive *were*:

Mosiah 6:2

and it came to pass that there was **not one soul**  
except **it were** little children  
but what had entered into the covenant  
and had taken upon them the name of Christ

Mosiah 24:21

for they were in bondage and **none** could deliver them  
except **it were** the Lord their God

Alma 36:2

for they were in bondage and **none** could deliver them  
except **it were** the God of Abraham and the God of Isaac and the God of Jacob

Helaman 8:21

will ye say that the sons of Zedekiah were not slain  
**all** except **it were** Muloch

In the first of these (Mosiah 6:2), *it were* is completed by a plural noun phrase (“little children”) and in this respect is precisely like the original reading for Mosiah 23:17. Moreover, in all these examples the main clause at the beginning contains a universal quantifier, either negative (*none* or *not one*) or positive (*all*). Clearly, the original usage in Mosiah 23:17 is intended and will therefore be restored in the critical text.

**Summary:** Restore in Mosiah 23:17 the original use of the existential *it*: “and none were consecrated except **it** were just men”.

#### ■ Mosiah 23:19

*and it came to pass that they began to prosper exceedingly in the land  
and they called the land [Helaman >+ Helam 1 | Helam ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]*

Here in chapter 23, beginning in verse 19 and ending in verse 39, there are 11 instances of the name *Helam* for the city and land founded by Alma and his people—and presumably named after the Helam who was Alma’s first baptized convert (see Mosiah 18:12). Yet in all 11 cases, Oliver Cowdery (the scribe here in *Ø*) initially wrote this name as *Helaman*. Later, he crossed out the final *an* for each of these, thus systematically changing *Helaman* to *Helam*. In each case, his crossout was with heavier ink flow. The name *Helam* is most probably the original name in Mosiah 23. In the discussion under Mosiah 18:12–14, I argue that the original manuscript read *Helam* in Mosiah 23 but that Oliver initially decided that *Helam* was a mistake for *Helaman*. He later decided to accept the name as written in *Ø*, and thus he corrected all 11 instances of *Helaman* to *Helam*. For a complete list of the 11 instances in Mosiah 23, see under Mosiah 18:12–14; there is also some discussion regarding variant spellings for the name *Helam* under Mosiah 27:16.

**Summary:** Accept in Mosiah 23 the systematically corrected spelling *Helam* for the name of the city and land, presumably named after the Helam that Alma baptized at the waters of Mormon (Mosiah 18:12).

#### ■ Mosiah 23:20

*and they built a city  
which they called [the city of 1BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST | A] Helam*

Here the 1830 edition omitted the phrase “the city of”. One might consider the omission as possibly intentional since the original text is redundant (“they built **a city** which they called **the city** of Helam”). Nonetheless, the 1837 edition restored the original “the city of”, undoubtedly by reference to the printer’s manuscript.

Usually the text does not show this kind of redundancy; normally we have nonrepetitious language, as in the following sampling involving the words *city*, *land*, and *valley*:

Alma 6:7	the city of Gideon which was in the <b>valley</b> that was called Gideon
Alma 8:6	he came to a <b>city</b> which was called Ammonihah
Alma 21:1	Aaron took his journey towards the <b>land</b> which was called by the Lamanites Jerusalem

But there are a few more instances in the text of the redundant usage:

Omni 1:13	they came down into the <b>land</b> which is called the <b>land</b> of Zarahemla
Alma 5:3	the <b>land</b> was called the <b>land</b> of Mormon
Alma 6:7	there having been a <b>city</b> built which was called the <b>city</b> of Gideon

None of these examples were removed in the 1830 edition, which argues that the 1830 omission of “the city of” in Mosiah 23:20 was unintentional. The critical text will retain this kind of redundant usage wherever it is supported by the earliest textual sources.

**Summary:** Maintain in Mosiah 23:20 the original redundancy in “they built a **city** which they called the **city** of Helam”.

#### ■ Mosiah 23:23

*and none could deliver them but the Lord their God  
yea even the God of Abraham  
and [of 1APS| BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRT] Isaac  
and of Jacob*

The loss of the preposition *of* before *Isaac* in the 1837 edition is probably a typo since elsewhere that edition (and others) have maintained the repetitive elements in conjuncts involving the names *Abraham*, *Isaac*, and *Jacob*. The 1908 RLDS edition restored the repetitive *of* before *Isaac*, probably by reference to the printer’s manuscript rather than the 1830 edition. The original conjunctive phraseology in Mosiah 23:23 is also found in Acts 3:13 (the King James version). For some discussion regarding the repetition of elements in this particular conjunctive expression, see under 1 Nephi 19:10. Also see the general discussion under CONJUNCTIVE REPETITION in volume 3. The critical text will, of course, restore the repeated *of* here in Mosiah 23:23.

**Summary:** Restore in Mosiah 23:23 the repeated preposition *of* before *Isaac* (“the God of Abraham and **of** Isaac and of Jacob”), the reading of the earliest textual sources.

#### ■ Mosiah 23:24

*and it came to pass that he did deliver them  
and [he 1ABDEFIJLMNOPQRST | CGHK] did shew forth his mighty power unto them*

The repeated subject pronoun *he* was omitted in the 1840 edition; the shortened reading continued in the RLDS textual tradition until the 1908 RLDS edition restored the *he* to the RLDS text, probably by reference to the printer’s manuscript.

The elimination of the subject pronoun *he* in the 1840 edition could be either a typo or an instance of intentional editing by Joseph Smith. The subject *he* could have been consciously deleted in order to avoid the awkward conjoining of two instances of *he did* so close to each other (“**he did** deliver them and **he did** shew forth his mighty power”). Yet elsewhere, we have quite a few examples of *he did* in close proximity, as in the following cases with three instances of *he did*:

Alma 21:21

**and he did** rejoice over them  
**and he did** teach them many things  
**and he did** also declare unto them that . . .

Ether 14:17

**and he did** overthrow many cities  
**and he did** slay both men women and children  
**and** [NULL >+ *he* 1 | *he* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] **did** burn the cities thereof

The second example here shows that the repeated *he* can be accidentally omitted, at least initially (in this case by Oliver Cowdery as he copied from  $\mathcal{O}$  into  $\mathcal{P}$ ).

On the other hand, there are cases in the text where an initial *he did* is followed by *and did* rather than *and he did*:

Alma 58:11

yea insomuch that **he did** speak peace to our souls  
**and did** grant unto us great faith  
**and did** cause us that we should hope for our deliverance in him

3 Nephi 4:24

therefore **he did** send out his armies in the nighttime  
**and did** cut off the way of their retreat  
**and did** place his armies in the way of their retreat

And we can also get a mixture of the two possibilities:

Helaman 1:17

therefore **he did** stir them up to anger  
**and he did** gather together his armies  
**and he did** appoint Coriantumr to be their leader  
**and did** cause that they should march down to the land of Zarahemla

These examples show that in each case we should follow the earliest textual sources in determining whether the subject pronoun *he* is repeated or not.

**Summary:** Retain the repeated subject pronoun *he* in Mosiah 23:24 (“he did deliver them and **he** did shew forth his mighty power”).

#### ■ Mosiah 23:25

*behold an army of the Lamanites* [were 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPS | was RT] *in the borders of the land*

Here the 1920 LDS edition replaced the original plural *were* with the singular *was*; the obvious intent was to make the verb agree with the singular head noun *army*. Of course, the word *army* can be treated in the singular (as a group of people) or in the plural (as the individuals in the group). The Book of Mormon text shows both possibilities. This variation in usage even holds when words like *part* and *remainder*, not *army*, serve as the head noun. There are six cases in the singular:

Alma 43:20

now the **army** of Zerahemnah **was** not prepared with any such thing

Alma 43:34

the Lamanites came up on the north of the hill  
where a **part** of the **army** of Moroni **was** concealed

Alma 43:35

the **army** which **was** concealed on the south of the hill . . .

Alma 47:3

therefore he gave Amalickiah the command  
of that **part** of his **army** which **was** obedient unto his commands

Alma 50:35

the **army** which **was** sent by Moroni  
which **was** led by a man whose name was Teancum  
did meet the people of Morionton

Alma 57:7

it was our desire to wage a battle  
with the **army** which **was** placed to protect the city Cumeni

But almost as frequent are five occurrences in the plural (counting Mosiah 23:25):

Mosiah 19:6

and behold the **army** of the Lamanites **were** within the borders of the land

Mosiah 23:25 (original text)

behold an **army** of the Lamanites **were** in the borders of the land

Alma 52:24

Moroni commanded that a **part** of his **army** which **were** with him  
should march forth into the city and take possession of it

Alma 56:50

the **army** of Antipus  
being weary because of their long march in so short a space of time  
**were** about to fall into the hands of the Lamanites

Alma 57:20

and as the **remainder** of our **army were** about to give way  
before the Lamanites  
behold these two thousand and sixty were firm and undaunted

In fact, the only place in the text where a plural *were* referring to an army has been edited to *was* is here in Mosiah 23:25; all other instances of “army were” have been left unedited, as have all instances of “army was”. The critical text will follow in each case of “army was/were” the reading of the earliest textual sources.

**Summary:** Restore the plural *were* in Mosiah 23:25: “an army of the Lamanites were in the borders of the land”.



## ■ Mosiah 23:26

*now it came to pass that the brethren of Alma fled from their fields  
and gathered themselves together [into 1ABCDEFGHIKPS | in FIJLMNOQRT] the city of Helam*

There is really nothing wrong here with the use of the motion preposition *into*. The change to *in* beginning with the 1852 LDS edition is not necessary and is probably a typo. Moreover, the preposition *into* makes it very clear that the brethren of Alma were outside the city, in their fields; thus they fled “**into** the city”. It is true that there are two examples (in a single passage) where the text refers to “gathering together **in** a land”:

3 Nephi 3:24

and there were a great many thousand people which were called Nephites  
which did gather themselves together **in** this land  
now Lachoneus did cause that  
they should gather themselves together **in** the land southward  
because of the great curse which was upon the land northward

Here the text is referring to the land of Zarahemla, as noted in the previous verse: “and the land which was appointed was the land of Zarahemla”. Some of the people were already in that land, so the use of *in* in 3 Nephi 3:24 is perfectly appropriate.

Although there are no other examples in the text of the preposition *into* occurring with the verb “to gather together”, there are examples of motion prepositions like *to* and *unto* occurring with the verb “to gather in”:

Mormon 6:5

we had gathered in all the remainder of our people **unto** the land Cumorah

Mormon 6:6

when we had gathered in all our people in one **to** the land of Cumorah . . .

For further discussion of cases where the text prefers *into* over *in* when motion is involved, see the following examples (all of which read *into* in the original text but were changed to *in* sometime during the history of the text):

1 Nephi 4:33	if he would go down <b>into</b> the wilderness with us
Jacob 5:29	let us go down <b>into</b> the vineyard
Alma 28:8	their journeyings <b>into</b> the land of Nephi
Alma 47:1	and went up <b>into</b> the land of Nephi
Alma 47:29	and came over <b>into</b> the land of Zarahemla
Alma 52:22	and Moroni and his army by night marched <b>into</b> the wilderness
Alma 60:30	behold I come unto you even <b>into</b> the land of Zarahemla

The occurrence of *into* in Mosiah 23:26 is quite correct, and the critical text will maintain that reading since it is the original reading.

**Summary:** Restore the original motion preposition *into* in Mosiah 23:26 (“and gathered themselves together into the city of Helam”).

■ Mosiah 23:28

*therefore they hushed their fears and began to cry unto the Lord  
that he would soften the hearts of the Lamanites  
that they would spare them and their wives and [ 1 | their ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST ] children*

The printer's manuscript lacks a repeated *their* before *children*. Normally, the Book of Mormon text repeats the determiner in conjuncts involving *wives* and *children* (30 times in the original text):

their wives and <b>their</b> children	21 times
our wives and <b>our</b> children	5 times
your wives and <b>your</b> children	2 times
for their wives and for <b>their</b> children	1 time
the wives and <b>the</b> children of the guards	1 time

In two of these cases, the repeated determiner has been omitted at some time in the history of the text; in the first case, the omission was restricted to only one edition, but in the second case the omission has continued in all subsequent editions:

Mosiah 23:38 (the repeated *the* omitted only in the 1906 LDS edition)  
and the remainder of them went to the land of Nephi  
and a part of them returned to the land of Helam  
and also brought with them the wives  
and [*the* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMOPQRST | N] children of the guards

Alma 35:14 (the repeated *their* omitted in the 1837 edition and all subsequent editions)  
and they have taken up arms to defend themselves  
and **their** wives and [*their* 01A | BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] children  
and their lands

These examples show once more the tendency to remove repeated determiners from conjunctive noun phrases (for a complete discussion, see CONJUNCTIVE REPETITION in volume 3).

However, there are three other cases where the earliest source for the text (the printer's manuscript in each instance) has the determiner in front of only the first conjunct, *wives*:

Alma 14:8  
and they brought **their** wives and children together

Alma 15:2  
and they related unto them  
all that had happened unto **their** wives and children

Ether 14:2  
and every man kept the hilt of his sword thereof in his right hand  
in the defence of his property and his own life  
and they of **his** wives and [ 1ABCEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST | his D] children

Note in the last instance how the 1841 British edition accidentally inserted a repeated *his* before *children*, but this repeated determiner did not continue in subsequent editions.

Thus there appears to be some evidence that the determiner is not always repeated when *wives* and *children* are conjoined. The critical text will in each case follow the earliest textual sources in determining whether the determiner is repeated.

**Summary:** Restore in Mosiah 23:28 the earliest reading without the repeated *their*: “that they would spare them and their wives and children”.

■ **Mosiah 23:31**

*and they [had 1ABCEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST | D]  
[began 1ABCDEFGHijklNP | began > begun M | begun OQRST] to possess the land of Amulon  
and had [began 1ABCDEFGHijklNP | began > begun M | begun OQRST] to till the ground*

In this passage we have two instances where the original text read “had began” instead of the standard “had begun”. As discussed under Jacob 2:12, such nonstandard occurrences of the simple past-tense form *began* as the past participle for the verb *begin* have all been removed from the standard text. Here in Mosiah 23:31, the change to *begun* was introduced into the LDS text in the third printing (in 1907) of the 1905 missionary edition; the RLDS text adopted this change in the 1953 edition. For further discussion, see under PAST PARTICIPLE in volume 3.

We also note here that the typesetter for the 1841 British edition accidentally omitted the *had* from the first occurrence of *had began* but not from the second occurrence, thus creating a very odd nonparallel conjoining of predicates: “and they **began** to possess the land of Amulon and **had began** to till the ground”. The following LDS edition (1849) restored the missing *had*.

**Summary:** Restore the nonstandard but original past participial form *began* in Mosiah 23:31 and elsewhere in the text; also maintain in this passage the parallel occurrences of *had began* in the conjoined predicates.

■ **Mosiah 23:35**

*and Amulon and his brethren did join  
[them >% the 1 | the ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] Lamanites  
and they were traveling in the wilderness in search of the land of Nephi*

Oliver Cowdery initially wrote *them* instead of *the Lamanites* here in  $\mathcal{P}$ . His correction was immediate since he corrected the *them* by erasing the *m* and then writing inline *Lamanites*. Undoubtedly the original manuscript (and the original text) read “Amulon and his brethren did join **the Lamanites**”. Oliver made a similar error in  $\mathcal{P}$  for a nearby passage:

Mosiah 21:3  
and began to put heavy burdens  
upon [them > their 1 | their ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] backs

See that passage for further discussion.

**Summary:** Retain in Mosiah 23:35 Oliver Cowdery’s immediate correction in  $\mathcal{P}$ : “Amulon and his brethren did join **the Lamanites**”.

■ Mosiah 23:38

*and the remainder of them went to the land of Nephi  
and a part of them returned to the land of Helam  
and also brought with them the wives  
and [the 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMOPQRST | N] children of the guards  
which had been left in the land*

As discussed nearby under Mosiah 23:28, the 1906 LDS large-print edition accidentally dropped the repeated determiner *the* in this instance of conjoined *wives* and *children*. The critical text will retain the repeated *the* here since its occurrence is supported by all the other (extant) textual sources. For additional discussion, see under CONJUNCTIVE REPETITION in volume 3.

**Summary:** Maintain in Mosiah 23:38 the definite article before *children*, the reading of the earliest textual sources (“the wives and **the** children of the guards”).

# Mosiah 24

## ■ Mosiah 24:1

*yea even over the people  
which was **in** the land of Shemlon  
and [ 1 | *in* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] the land of Shilom  
and **in** the land of Amulon*

Here in the printer's manuscript, the middle conjunct ("the land of Shilom") seems to be missing the preposition *in*, which the 1830 typesetter supplied. It is possible that the original text had the preposition *in* at the beginning of the second conjunct and that this repeated *in* was lost during the early transmission of the text. Similar losses of the repeated *in* have sometimes occurred in the transmission of the Book of Mormon text:

Omni 1:25 (1892 RLDS edition)

and believe **in** prophesying  
and [*in* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST | K] revelations  
and **in** the ministering of angels  
and **in** the gift of speaking with tongues  
and **in** the gift of interpreting languages  
and **in** all things which is good

Alma 5:55 (scribe 2 of  $\mathcal{P}$ ; corrected by Oliver Cowdery while proofing  $\mathcal{P}$  against  $\mathcal{O}$ )

yea and will you persist  
**in** turning your backs upon the poor and the needy  
and [ $\mathcal{S}2$  NULL >  $\mathcal{S}1$  *in* 1 | *in* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] withholding  
your substance from them

Alma 12:36 (1837 edition)

yea according to his word **in** the last provocation  
as well as [*in* 01A | BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] the first  
to the everlasting destruction of your souls

Ether 10:12 (1841 British edition)

and the people became exceeding rich under his reign  
both **in** buildings  
and **in** gold  
and [*in* 1ABCGHKPS | DEFIJLMNOQRT] silver  
and **in** raising grain  
and **in** flocks and herds  
and such things which had been restored unto them

On the other hand, conjunctive repetition of the preposition is not always found between closely associated noun phrases, as in the conjunctive phrase “**with** a bow and an arrow / **with** a sling and **with** stones” in 1 Nephi 16:23 (this example is discussed under Enos 1:20). Here in Mosiah 24:1, one could interpret the lands of Shemlon and Shilom as more closely associated with each other than with the recently founded land of Amulon; note the following two references to the historically and geographically related lands of Shilom and Shemlon:

Mosiah 11:12

he built a tower near the temple  
 yea a very high tower  
 even so high that he could stand upon the top thereof  
 and overlook **the land of Shilom**  
 and also **the land of Shemlon**  
 which was possessed by the Lamanites

Alma 23:12

and also of the people of the Lamanites  
 which were in **the land of Shilom**  
 and which were in **the land of Shemlon**  
 and in the city of Lemuel  
 and in the city of Shimnilom

Thus the lack of the repeated *in* for the land of Shilom in Mosiah 24:1 may be intentional. The critical text will therefore accept the earliest reading for this passage, although it remains a distinct possibility that a repeated *in* was lost in Mosiah 24:1. For additional discussion, see under CONJUNCTIVE REPETITION in volume 3.

*Summary:* Restore in Mosiah 24:1 the reading of the printer’s manuscript, which lacks the repeated *in* before “the land of Shemlon”; although the missing *in* could be due to an early error in the transmission of the text, it may also be intentional since the lands of Shilom and Shemlon were historically and geographically connected.

■ **Mosiah 24:5**

*nevertheless they knew not God  
 neither did the brethren of [Amulon 1ACGHIJKLMNQRST | Ammon BDE | Ammon > Amulon F]  
 teach them any thing concerning the Lord their God*

The compositor for the 1837 edition accidentally replaced the name *Amulon* with *Ammon* in this passage, probably because he had gotten used to associating *Ammon* and *his brethren* earlier in the book of Mosiah:

Mosiah 21:22	even until the time that <b>Ammon and his brethren</b> came into the land
Mosiah 21:23	he discovered <b>Ammon and his brethren</b>
Mosiah 21:29	yet <b>Ammon and his brethren</b> were filled with sorrow
Mosiah 22:11	being led by <b>Ammon and his brethren</b>

Even so, the 1837 compositor correctly set even closer occurrences of “Amulon and his brethren” and “the brethren of Amulon”, all preceding Mosiah 24:5:

Mosiah 23:34	the Lamanites had compassion on <b>Amulon and his brethren</b>
Mosiah 23:35	and <b>Amulon and his brethren</b> did join the Lamanites
Mosiah 24:4	and he appointed teachers of <b>the brethren of Amulon</b> in every land

The correct *Amulon* was restored to Mosiah 24:5 in the 1840 edition, but because the copytext for the 1841 British edition was the 1837 edition, the incorrect *Ammon* continued in the LDS text until the second printing of the 1852 LDS edition (where textual corrections in the stereotyped plates for that edition derive from the 1840 edition). Here in Mosiah 24, the text is discussing Amulon and his fellow priests, not Ammon (the leader of the party that found the people of Limhi).

**Summary:** Maintain the correct reference to “**Amulon** and his brethren” in Mosiah 23–24, not “**Ammon** and his brethren”.

■ **Mosiah 24:9**

*yet he exercised authority over them  
and put tasks upon them  
and put [taskmasters >% task masters >jg task-masters 1 | task-masters ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]  
over them*

Here Oliver Cowdery initially wrote the word *taskmasters* as *taskmasters*—that is, as a compound noun composed of the plural *tasks* and the plural *masters*. Oliver immediately corrected his error here by erasing the plural *s* of *tasks*, leaving a space between *task* and *masters*. Later, John Gilbert (the 1830 typesetter) added a hyphen between *task* and *masters*. The same basic spelling error and corrections in  $\mathcal{D}$  are found later in this chapter:

Mosiah 24:19  
and all their [tasks masters >% task masters >jg task-masters 1 |  
task-masters ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]  
were in a profound sleep

One may wonder what the source of the misspelling *taskmasters* was. One distinct possibility is that the misspelling originated in the original manuscript (which is not extant here). The scribe for  $\mathcal{C}$  may have heard Joseph Smith pronounce *taskmasters* as /tæsmæstərz/—that is, without the final *k* of *task*. The internal consonant cluster /skm/ is a relatively difficult one, and the *k* could very well have been omitted in Joseph’s pronunciation. Hearing /tæsmæstərz/, the scribe in  $\mathcal{C}$  could then have interpreted the word as *taskmasters*, which would have been pronounced basically the same as *taskmasters* (with perhaps only a slightly longer *s* for the /tæs/ in *taskmasters*). Similarly, a common pronunciation for the separate plural form *tasks*, especially in casual speech, is /tæs/ (usually with a slightly longer *s* when pronounced as the isolated word *tasks*). In other words, the misspelling *taskmasters* may have resulted from the fact that the original manuscript was dictated and thus subject to phonetic misinterpretation. In addition, for the example here in verse 9,

the plural misinterpretation *taskmasters* could have been semantically facilitated by the preceding plural form *tasks* (“and put **tasks** upon them”).

A similar kind of phonetic misinterpretation of a compound word is found in the early spellings of the word *priestcrafts* in the printer’s manuscript. For the first occurrences of this word in  $\mathcal{P}$ , Oliver spelled it as *priestscrafts* (or equivalently as *Priests crafts*), undoubtedly because Joseph Smith pronounced it as /priskræft/ rather than /pristkræft/. Given the difficulty in pronouncing the internal consonant cluster /stkr/, the *t* was dropped, which thus led Oliver, the scribe in  $\mathcal{O}$  for that part of the text, to misinterpret the word as *priestscrafts*. For discussion, see under 2 Nephi 25:12.

**Summary:** Maintain the standard spelling *taskmasters* in Mosiah 24:9, 19; it is possible that the scribe in  $\mathcal{O}$  misinterpreted Joseph Smith’s pronunciation of the word as *taskmasters*.

■ **Mosiah 24:11**

*and it came to pass that Amulon commanded them that they should stop their cries  
and [NULL >jg he 1 | he ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] put guards over them to watch them*

In this sentence, the verb form *put*, if interpreted as an infinitive form, would take *they* as its subject, resulting in a virtually impossible reading: that is, Amulon commanded Alma’s people to guard themselves (“Amulon commanded them that they should stop their cries and [that they should] put guards over them to watch them”). More reasonably, *put* should be interpreted as the simple past-tense form, in which case the subject for *put* would be *Amulon* (“Amulon commanded them that they should stop their cries and [Amulon] put guards over them to watch them”). In order to avoid the difficult reading, the 1830 typesetter supplied the subject pronoun *he*, with its obvious antecedent *Amulon*.

Textually, there are two possibilities: (1) the original text had the *he*, which was accidentally lost sometime during the early transmission of the text; or (2) the earliest reading is actually correct, despite the difficulty in processing it. Given that the reading in  $\mathcal{P}$ , as originally written, is difficult, one wonders if there might be some support elsewhere in the text for such a conjunction of predicates where there is an intervening subordinate *that*-clause. Here are two examples that also involve the verb *command* and a *that*-clause. In both these cases, it should be noted, the coordinating conjunction is *but* rather than *and*, with the result that the reversal in polarity (from negative to positive) is easier to process without repeating the subject as a pronoun:

Mosiah 7:16

and now **king Limhi commanded** his guards  
**that** they should no more bind Ammon nor his brethren  
**but caused** that they should go to the hill which was north of Shilom  
and bring their brethren into the city

3 Nephi 18:25

and ye see that **I have commanded**  
**that** none of you should go away  
**but rather have commanded** that ye should come unto me



Note that for these two examples, the pair of conjoined verbs both occur in past time (thus “commanded . . . caused” and “have commanded . . . have commanded”), just as *commanded* and *put* are in Mosiah 24:11. These two examples suggest that the earliest reading in Mosiah 24:11 is not impossible and may actually represent the original text.

To be sure, there is manuscript evidence that a conjoined subject pronoun *he* can be lost from the text, if only momentarily, as in the following two examples which have an intervening subordinate clause:

Alma 11:2

and the judge executed authority and sent forth officers  
that the man should be brought before him  
and [§2 NULL > §1 *he* 1 | *he* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] judgeth the man  
according to the law

Alma 51:25

but it came to pass that Amalickiah would not suffer  
the Lamanites to go against the city of Nephiah to battle  
but [*he* 0 | 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOQRST] kept them down by the seashore

With respect to the first example, Oliver Cowdery (while proofing  $\mathcal{P}$  against  $\mathcal{C}$ ) corrected scribe 2’s accidental omission of the subject pronoun *he*. In the second example, Oliver himself dropped the *he* when he copied the text from  $\mathcal{C}$  into  $\mathcal{P}$ , thus creating another example where the conjoined subject pronoun is omitted (once more the conjunction is *but*).

Ultimately, here in Mosiah 24:11, the question is how egregious is the earliest reading without the subject pronoun *he*. Once we are used to it, this difficult reading can be parsed. The critical text will restore the original reading since there are a few similar examples in the earliest text where the expected subject pronoun seems to have been omitted (although those examples involve *but* rather than *and*). Of course, the distinct possibility remains that an original *he* was lost here in Mosiah 24:11 during the early transmission of the text.

**Summary:** Restore in Mosiah 24:11 the earliest reading without the subject pronoun *he* in the conjoined predicate “and it came to pass that Amulon commanded them that they should stop their cries and put guards over them to watch them”; this difficult reading can be parsed, although perhaps not on the first reading.

#### ■ Mosiah 24:13

*and I will covenant with [this 1PS | ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRT] my people*

The 1830 compositor seems to have accidentally dropped the determiner *this* from this passage. There are eight occurrences of the phrase “this my people” elsewhere in the text, with five more in Mosiah (1:10, 10:18, 12:1, 12:4, and 29:32) and three in 3 Nephi (3:6, 3:10, and 21:2). The 1830 compositor correctly set each of these other instances of “this my people”, so there is no reason to consider the 1830 compositor’s omission here of the *this* as some kind of grammatical or stylistic emendation to the text. In accord with the printer’s manuscript, the 1908 RLDS edition restored the *this* to the RLDS text.

There are a number of occurrences of the noun phrase “this my X” in the King James Bible, including “this my oath” (Genesis 24:8), “this my lord” (Daniel 10:17), “this my son” (Luke 15:24), “this my joy” (John 3:29), and “*this* my tabernacle” (2 Peter 1:14). Besides the nine original occurrences of “this my people” in the Book of Mormon, there is also one occurrence of “this my joy” (in Mormon 2:13).

**Summary:** Restore the original reading “this my people” in Mosiah 24:13; this phrase is fairly common in the Book of Mormon text.

#### ■ Mosiah 24:14

*and I will also ease [their > the 1 | the ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] burdens  
which is put upon your shoulders*

Here Oliver Cowdery initially wrote in  $\mathcal{P}$  “I will also ease **their** burdens”. He was probably influenced by the third person *them* in the immediately preceding clause: “and I will covenant with this my people and deliver **them** out of bondage” (at the end of verse 13). Right before that third person usage, the Lord addresses the people of Alma in the second person: “Lift up **your** heads and be of good comfort / for I know of the covenant which **ye** have made unto me”. And here in verse 14, the Lord returns to the second person usage (“and I will also ease the burdens which is put upon **your** shoulders”). Ultimately, the *their* is quite impossible here in verse 14. Oliver caught his error virtually immediately and crossed out the *ir* of *their*, giving the correct *the* (the ink level for the crossout is unchanged). The critical text will follow the corrected reading in  $\mathcal{P}$  (and the reading in all the printed editions).

**Summary:** Maintain the definite article *the* before *burdens* in Mosiah 24:14; the initial *their* is a simple scribal error prompted, it would appear, by the preceding occurrence of *them* in verse 13.

#### ■ Mosiah 24:16

*the voice of the Lord came unto them again saying: be of good comfort  
for on the morrow I will deliver [thee >js you 1 | thee A | you BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]  
out of bondage*

As discussed under 1 Nephi 3:29, the original Book of Mormon text occasionally used the historically singular pronoun *thou* for plural referents. Here in Mosiah 24:16 is one more example, which Joseph Smith emended to *you* in his editing for the 1837 edition. The critical text will restore such plural uses of *thou* whenever they are supported by the earliest textual sources, even in cases where the nearby text uses the historically plural *ye*, *you*, and *your(s)*. For instance, with respect to this example of *thee* in Mosiah 24:16, the preceding verses 13 and 14 consistently have the historically plural forms: “your heads”, “which ye have made”, “your shoulders”, “you cannot feel them”, “your backs”, “you are in bondage”, “ye may stand”, and “ye may know”. For a complete list of cases where the earliest text uses the plural *thou*, see under THOU in volume 3.

**Summary:** Restore the pronoun form *thee* in Mosiah 24:16, even though it refers to more than one person; such usage is found fairly often in the original text.

■ **Mosiah 24:19**

*and in the morning the Lord caused a deep sleep to come upon the Lamanites  
yea [ & 1 | and ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST | even D ] all their taskmasters were in a profound sleep*

The 1841 British edition accidentally replaced *and* with *even*, which works well enough. However, the original use of *yea and* here implies that not all the Lamanites were taskmasters, while *yea even* could be interpreted as meaning that all the Lamanites were taskmasters. In fact, some of the Lamanites were the guards that made sure no one escaped or prayed out loud (see verse 11), while the taskmasters would have made sure that the people of Alma fulfilled their forced labor (see verse 9). Of course, there may not have been a sharp demarcation between these two groups. And there were probably other Lamanites with other tasks that needed to be put to sleep. In any event, the Lord put the Lamanites to sleep, including their taskmasters. The following 1849 LDS edition restored the original use of *yea and* here in Mosiah 24:19.

**Summary:** Maintain the use of *yea and* in Mosiah 24:19; the incorrect *yea even* found in the 1841 edition could be interpreted as implying a somewhat different meaning.

■ **Mosiah 24:20**

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

The 1830 typesetter accidentally dropped the phrase “the name of”, which seems redundant in current English but is characteristic of the Book of Mormon text. Elsewhere in the original text (when referring to the naming of geographical places), we have seven occurrences in main clauses of “call the name of X Y” but three of “call X Y”. For both lists, see the discussion of the clause “they call the name of the place Bountiful” in the 1 Nephi preface. In that example, the phrase “the name of” was apparently lost when Oliver Cowdery copied the text from  $\mathfrak{C}$  into  $\mathfrak{P}$ , but the phrase was restored in Joseph Smith’s editing of the text for the 1840 edition (when he sometimes referenced the original manuscript in his editing for that edition). The critical text will restore the earliest reading here in Mosiah 24:20 (“they called **the name of** the valley Alma”).

It is also worth noting that in relative clauses the phrase “the name of” never occurs:

Mosiah 23:20

and they built a city which they called the city of Helam

Ether 3:1

therefore the brother of Jared went forth unto the mount  
which they called the mount Shelem

Obviously, the use of “the name of” in these instances would prove extraordinarily awkward, as in “a city **the name of** which they called the city of Helam” or “the mount **the name of** which they called the mount Shelem”.

**Summary:** Restore the phrase “the name of” in Mosiah 24:20 (“and they called the name of the valley Alma”).

## ■ Mosiah 24:23

for the Lamanites have [*awoke* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNO PQ | *awakened* RST]  
and doth pursue thee

This passage brings up the question of what past participial forms the verb *awake* and the related verbs *awaken*, *wake*, and *waken* should take. Here the original text had *awoke*, which was later edited to *awakened* in the 1920 LDS edition and in the 1953 RLDS edition. Elsewhere in the text, there are six past participial occurrences of these verbs; in half the cases, the original past participial form is *awakened*, while in the other half it is *awoke* (as here in Mosiah 24:23):

Mosiah 4:5 (with perfect *hath*)

if the knowledge of the goodness of God at this time hath **awakened** you  
to a sense of your nothingness . . .

Mosiah 9:17 (with passive *were*)

for we were **awakened** to a remembrance of the deliverance of our fathers

Alma 4:3 (with passive *were*)

therefore they were **awakened** to a remembrance of their duty

Alma 51:36 (with perfect *had*)

and he caused that his armies should stand in readiness  
lest the Lamanites had [*awoke* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNO PQ | *awakened* RST]

Alma 55:18 (with perfect *had*)

but had they [*awoke* 01ABCDEFGHIJKLMNO PQ | *awaked* O | *awakened* RST]  
the Lamanites  
behold they were drunken and the Nephites could have slain them

Mormon 9:13 (with passive *be*)

which bringeth to pass a redemption from an endless sleep  
from which sleep all men shall be [*awoke* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNO PQ |  
*awaked* O | *awakened* RST] by the power of God  
when the trump shall sound

The three cases in this list of *awoke* have basically undergone the same editing as in Mosiah 24:23, although in the last two instances the 1907 LDS vest-pocket edition substituted *awaked* for *awoke*.

The four occurrences of the past participle *awoke* are identical to the simple past-tense form *awoke*. For many verbs, the original text frequently used the simple past-tense verb form as the past participle, such as “had came” in 1 Nephi 5:1 and “have grew” in Jacob 5:37. Over time, the standard editions have removed these nonstandard past participial uses of the simple past-tense form. For a complete discussion, see under PAST PARTICIPLE in volume 3. The critical text will in each case maintain the past participial form as found in the earliest textual sources. Here in Mosiah 24:23, the critical text will therefore restore the verb form *awoke* (as also in Alma 51:36, Alma 55:18, and Mormon 9:13).

Historically, the English language has shown considerable variation in the use of the verbs *awake*, *awaken*, *wake*, and *waken* (and their forms). For a survey of the variation, see the discussion under *awake*, *awaken* and *wake*, *waken* in Merriam Webster’s Dictionary of English Usage.

Like the English language as a whole, the Book of Mormon has shown similar variation. For the competition between *awake* and *wake*, see under 2 Nephi 27:3; for the use of both *awoke* and *awaked* as the simple past-tense form for *awake*, see under Alma 5:7; and for the competition between *awake* and *awaken*, see under Alma 62:36.

**Summary:** Maintain throughout the text the original past participial forms for the various verbs meaning ‘awake’; we have instances in the original text of both *awoke* and *awakened*, about equally divided.

■ **Mosiah 24:25**

*they arrived [to 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPS | in RT] the land of Zarahemla*

As discussed under 1 Nephi 17:14, the original text had quite a few cases of “arriving **to** a land” rather than “arriving **in** a land”. The editing tendency in the history of the text has been to replace these cases of *to* with *in* or *at*; here in Mosiah 24:25, the 1920 LDS edition made the change to *in*. The critical text will restore the original *to* in all cases where it is supported by the earliest textual sources, including here in Mosiah 24:25.

**Summary:** Maintain in Mosiah 24:25 the original preposition *to* (“they arrived **to** the land of Zarahemla”) rather than *in*.

# Mosiah 25

## ■ Mosiah 25:2

*now there were not so many of the children of Nephi  
or so many of those which were descendants of Nephi  
as there were of the people of Zarahemla  
which was a descendant of [Muloch 1 | Mulok ABCDEFGHKPS | Mulek IJLMNOQRT]  
and those which came with him into the wilderness*

The printer's manuscript in Mosiah 25:2 has the spelling *Muloch*, which the 1830 typesetter changed to *Mulok*. For the 1879 edition, Orson Pratt changed *Mulok* to *Mulek* in the LDS text, under the reasonable assumption that the individual named is the Mulek mentioned in the book of Helaman. This Mulek, the son of king Zedekiah, came to the promised land shortly after Lehi and was the most prominent founder for the people of Zarahemla:

Helaman 6:10

now the land south was called Lehi  
and the land north was called **Mulek**  
which was after the son of Zedekiah  
for the Lord did bring  
[*Muleh* > *Mulek* 1 | *Mulek* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] into the land north  
and Lehi into the land south

Helaman 8:21

will ye say that the sons of Zedekiah were not slain  
all except it were **Mulek**

It is, of course, theoretically possible that the Book of Mormon is referring to two different individuals: Muloch, an ancestor of Zarahemla, in the book of Mosiah; and Mulek, a son of king Zedekiah, in the book of Helaman. The reference to Muloch in Mosiah 25:2 is rather surprising; Mormon writes here as if he has already mentioned this Muloch and those who came with him. There is a similar example in the book of Alma where Amulek refers to an ancestor of his (namely, Aminadi) that he assumes his listeners are already familiar with:

Alma 10:2–3

I am Amulek  
I am the son of Gidanah  
who was the son of Ishmael  
who was a descendant of Aminadi  
and it was that same Aminadi which interpreted the writing  
which was upon the wall of the temple

which was written by the finger of God  
 and Aminadi was a descendant of Nephi  
 who was the son of Lehi who came out of the land of Jerusalem  
 who was a descendant of Manasseh who was the son of Joseph  
 which was sold into Egypt by the hands of his brethren

The sudden reference to Muloch in Mosiah 25:2 may not be the first mention of Muloch in the original Book of Mormon text. We are missing the book of Lehi as well as, it would appear, the first two chapters of the original book of Mosiah, which would have described how the first king Mosiah found the people of Zarahemla. (For discussion regarding these two missing chapters at the beginning of the book of Mosiah, see pages 137–139 of my article “Critical Methodology and the Text of the Book of Mormon”, *Review of Books on the Book of Mormon* 6/1 (1994): 121–144; also see the section in volume 3 of the critical text that deals with chapters in the Book of Mormon.) It is quite possible that those now-lost portions of the original text mentioned this Muloch; in fact, Aminadi too may have been mentioned in the original book of Lehi or in the first two original chapters of Mosiah. In other words, the loss of the 116 pages of manuscript may be the reason for the abruptness of the comment here in Mosiah 25:2 concerning Muloch. The book of Omni, it should also be pointed out, briefly describes the founding of Zarahemla and indirectly refers to its founders but without mentioning Muloch (or Mulek) by name:

Omni 1:15–16

behold it came to pass that Mosiah discovered  
 that the people of Zarahemla came out from Jerusalem  
 at the time that Zedekiah king of Judah was carried away captive into Babylon  
 and they journeyed in the wilderness  
 and was brought by the hand of the Lord across the great waters  
 into the land where Mosiah discovered them

It is important to note here that both Omni 1:16 and Mosiah 25:2 refer to these ancestors of the people of Zarahemla as having traveled in the wilderness:

Omni 1:16	and they journeyed <b>in the wilderness</b>
Mosiah 25:2	Muloch and those which came with him <b>into the wilderness</b>

In other words, these two passages appear to be referring to the same group of people. When these two statements are combined with the two in the book of Helaman, we find strong support for concluding that Muloch and Mulek are the same person.

Another reason for believing that both the books of Mosiah and Helaman are referring to the same individual is that the probable meaning for Mosiah 25:2 is actually a plural one:

Mosiah 25:2

- *earliest extant text*  
 the people of Zarahemla **which was a descendant**  
 of Muloch and those which came with him into the wilderness
- *proposed meaning of the text*  
 the people of Zarahemla **who were descendants**  
 of Muloch and those who came with him into the wilderness

The original text of the Book of Mormon sometimes used the singular *a descendant* to refer to the ancestral descent of a whole group of people, as in 1 Nephi 6:2: “we are a descendant of Joseph” rather than “we are descendants of Joseph”, the current LDS reading (see the discussion under 1 Nephi 6:2). We should also note that the use of the singular *was* to refer to plural antecedents is also quite common in the original text, as nearby in Mosiah 25:11: “when they thought upon the Lamanites **which was** their brethren” (now edited to “when they thought upon the Lamanites **who were** their brethren”). In other words, it is quite possible that the text in Mosiah 25:2 is referring to the lineage of the people of Zarahemla, not Zarahemla himself. The purpose of this passage is to compare the population sizes for the two peoples that had united under the first king Mosiah. The description lists the original founding fathers for each group, Nephi in the first case and Muloch, with others, in the second:

(1) *the people of Nephi*

now there were not so many of the children of Nephi  
or so many of those which were descendants of Nephi

(2) *the people of Zarahemla*

as there were of the people of Zarahemla  
which was a descendant of Muloch and those  
which came with him into the wilderness

The text is not providing an offhand remark about the lineage of Zarahemla, which explains why we have the added reference to the others who came with Muloch.

Under this plural interpretation of “which was a descendant of Muloch”, the identification of Muloch with the Mulek mentioned in the book of Helaman is considerably firmer. This interpretation also implies that there is one more instance of *a descendant* with a plural referent (see the list under 1 Nephi 6:2) and, by implication, one more instance of the need to grammatically emend *a descendant* to *descendants* in the standard text for Mosiah 25:2, thus “the people of Zarahemla who **were descendants** of Muloch and those who came with him into the wilderness”.

This interpretation is also consistent with the following result: everywhere else in the text, individuals are always given a single line of descent (24 times), never a multiple one:

1 Nephi 5:14	he was a descendant of Joseph
1 Nephi 5:16	and Laban also was a descendant of Joseph
2 Nephi 3:4	and I am a descendant of Joseph
Mosiah 7:3	he being a strong and mighty man and a descendant of Zarahemla
Mosiah 7:13	for I am Ammon and am a descendant of Zarahemla
Mosiah 17:2	he also being a descendant of Nephi
Alma 10:2	Ishmael who was a descendant of Aminadi
Alma 10:3	and Aminadi was a descendant of Nephi
Alma 10:3	Lehi . . . who was a descendant of Manasseh
Alma 17:21	and he was a descendant of Ishmael
Alma 54:23	I am Ammoron and a descendant of Zoram
Alma 55:4	a man which was a descendant of Laman's



Helaman 1:15	and he was a descendant of Zarahemla
3 Nephi preface	Alma being a descendant of Nephi
3 Nephi 5:20	I am Mormon and a pure descendant of Lehi
Mormon 1:5	and I Mormon being a descendant of Nephi
Mormon 8:13	and my father was a descendant of Nephi
Ether 1:6	and he was a descendant of Coriantor
Ether 1:16	and Aaron was a descendant of Heth
Ether 1:23	and Morianton was a descendant of Riplakish
Ether 10:1	Shez which was a descendant of Heth
Ether 10:9	he being a descendant of Riplakish
Ether 11:11	Ethem being a descendant of Ahah
Ether 11:17	and he was a descendant of the brother of Jared

On the other hand, when the text refers to the line of descent for a group of people, those people can descend from one or more ancestors (below I mark each case of plural ancestors with an asterisk); in the following list, I provide the original text, which includes four cases of *a descendant* and six of *descendants*:

1 Nephi 6:2	we are <b>a descendant</b> of Joseph
* 2 Nephi 30:4	they are <b>a descendant</b> of the Jews
Mosiah 25:2	those which were descendants of Nephi
Mosiah 25:13	those which were descendants of Nephi
* Alma 24:29	but they were actual descendants of Laman and Lemuel
* Alma 43:13	the descendants of the priests of Noah
Alma 56:3	these were <b>a descendant</b> of Laman
* Helaman 11:24	a certain number which were real descendants of the Lamanites
3 Nephi 10:4	O ye people . . . which are <b>a descendant</b> of Jacob
Ether 10:8	and his descendants were driven out of the land

Thus the evidence, taken as a whole, argues that Mosiah 25:2 is referring to the people of Zarahemla and their descent from Muloch and the others who came with him after the fall of the kingdom of Judah. So now the question is: What was the actual name of this son of Zedekiah who survived and was one of the founding fathers for the people of Zarahemla? Based on the manuscript readings, there are two possibilities: *Muloch* or *Mulek*. Internal evidence strongly argues that the correct name is *Muloch*. First of all, the earliest extant occurrence of the name in the text is here in Mosiah 25:2. We have only the printer's manuscript for this occurrence, but the same limitation holds for the occurrences of *Mulek* in the book of Helaman. Secondly, the tendency in the transmission of the text has always been to replace the final *ch* spelling in a name with either *ck* or *k*: (1) the 1830 typesetter changed *Muloch* to *Mulok* here in Mosiah 25:2; (2) Oliver Cowdery normally misspelled *Zenoch* as *Zenock*, with the result that the standard text now has only the misspelled *Zenock* (see the discussion under 1 Nephi 19:10). Clearly, the final *ch* spelling in names is difficult to maintain in the text.

On the other hand, there are no examples of a name ending in a final *k* ever being misspelled as *ch*. In the manuscripts, the scribes correctly spelled the final *k* for every occurrence of the

names *Amulek*, *Melchizedek*, *Melek* (the land), and *Mulek* (the city). For one of the three cases in the book of Helaman where *Mulek* refers to Muloch, Oliver initially miswrote the final *k* as an *h*, but this scribal misstroke was virtually immediately corrected (there is no change in the level of ink flow for the overwriting):

Helaman 6:10 (line 15 on page 342 of  $\mathcal{P}$ )

for the Lord did bring Mule{h|k} into the land North

This kind of miswriting is found elsewhere in Oliver Cowdery's scribal work; for instance, in the printer's manuscript for Jacob 2:21, Oliver wrote *heep*, which the 1830 compositor correctly set as *keep*:

Jacob 2:21 (line 1 on page 98 of  $\mathcal{P}$ )

should heep his commandments

The important point here is that there is no evidence whatsoever in the manuscripts (or in the editions, for that matter) for misspelling a final *k* as *ch*. Final *k*'s in names are virtually impervious to any sort of change, while final *ch*'s in names are readily subject to change.

So if *Muloch* is the original reading for the name of the son of king Zedekiah, then why is it spelled all three times as *Mulek* in the book of Helaman? My guess is that the error entered the text when Joseph Smith dictated that book. Normally, when a name first appeared in the text, Joseph and his scribe would make sure it was spelled correctly, especially if the name was unusual. Clearly, when the name first appeared in Mosiah 25:2, there would have been a need to spell out the strange *Muloch* (at least to Oliver Cowdery, Joseph's scribe after the loss of the 116 manuscript pages). Joseph probably pronounced *Muloch* as /myulək/; as with the name *Zenoch*, he must have taken care to make sure his scribe got the name /myulək/ down correctly as *Muloch*. Thus in Mosiah 25:2, Joseph and his scribe would have made sure of the spelling, the difficult *Muloch*. Presumably this difficult spelling was later copied correctly into  $\mathcal{P}$  by Oliver Cowdery.

When Joseph Smith came to dictating *Muloch* in the book of Helaman, he and his scribe probably did not check the spelling. The scribe in  $\mathcal{C}$  for Helaman 6–8 was probably Oliver Cowdery since all the extant portions of that book are in Oliver's hand. As before, Joseph would have pronounced the name *Muloch* as /myulək/, but now the scribe (presumably Oliver) may have not asked how to spell the name since the pronounced form would have been the same as the name of the city of Mulek, which had been written down by Oliver 12 times in Alma 51–53 and then once more just before Helaman 6–8:

Helaman 5:15

and from thenceforth to the city of Gid

and from the city of Gid to the city of **Mulek**

Oliver would have been used to writing the name with the pronunciation /myulək/ as *Mulek*, so he continued to write it as *Mulek* when Joseph read off the three examples of *Muloch* in Helaman 6–8. It is also possible that in the original manuscript Oliver wrote down *Muloch* for these three instances in Helaman 6–8 but then decided to consistently replace *Muloch* with *Mulek* when he copied from  $\mathcal{C}$  into  $\mathcal{P}$ . We do know that Oliver sometimes consistently changed the spelling of names; see, for instance, the discussion under Mosiah 18:12–14 regarding the name *Helam*.

With respect to *Muloch* in Helaman 6–8, it seems more reasonable to assume that Oliver simply neglected to ask Joseph how this /myulək/ was spelled as he took down the original dictation. He probably assumed it was *Mulek*, the name he had been writing down for the last while.

The spelling *Muloch* (ending in *och*) reminds us of the biblical spelling *Enoch* and the Book of Mormon spelling *Zenoch* for an earlier prophet in Israel. Thus the spelling *Muloch* for this son of Zedekiah is quite reasonable; it also conforms to other biblical spellings ending in *och* (such as *Antioch*, *Arioch*, and *Hanoch*, the last a variant of *Enoch*). The spelling *Muloch* suggests an ominous connection with the god Molech/Moloch (to which children in Israel were sacrificed prior to the Babylonian captivity):

Leviticus 18:21

and thou shalt not let any of thy seed pass through *the fire* to **Molech**

1 Kings 11:7–8

then did Solomon build an high place for Chemosh the abomination of Moab  
in the hill that *is* before Jerusalem  
and for **Molech** the abomination of the children of Ammon  
and likewise did he for all his strange wives  
which burnt incense and sacrificed unto their gods

2 Kings 23:10

and he defiled Topheth  
which *is* in the valley of the children of Hinnom  
that no man might make his son or his daughter  
to pass through the fire to **Molech**

Jeremiah 32:35

and they built the high places of Baal  
which *are* in the valley of the son of Hinnom  
to cause their sons and their daughters to pass through *the fire* unto **Molech**  
which I commanded them not  
neither came it into my mind that they should do this abomination  
to cause Judah to sin

Amos 5:25–26

have ye offered unto me sacrifices and offerings in the wilderness forty years  
O house of Israel  
but ye have borne the tabernacle of your **Moloch** and Chiun your images  
the star of your god which ye made to yourselves

Acts 7:42–43

then God turned and gave them up to worship the host of heaven  
as it is written in the book of the prophets  
O ye house of Israel  
have ye offered to me slain beasts and sacrifices  
*by the space of* forty years in the wilderness  
yea ye took up the tabernacle of **Moloch**  
and the star of your god Remphan  
figures which ye made to worship them  
and I will carry you away beyond Babylon

Naming a child *Muloch* might not have been that much out of character for some of the people living in the kingdom of Judah prior to its fall to the Babylonians.

It should be noted that changing the spelling of the name of the son of Zedekiah to *Muloch* means that his people should be referred to as the Mulochites, not the Mulekites. Of course, this designation (as either Mulekites or Mulochites) occurs nowhere in the Book of Mormon text per se but only in extracanonical material, as in the following chapter summaries (with original accidentals) written for the 1981 LDS edition:

- *chapter summary for Omni 1*  
— **The Mulekites** had discovered Coriantumr, the last of the Jaredites—
- *chapter summary for Mosiah 25*  
The people (**the Mulekites**) of Zarahemla become Nephites—

**Summary:** Restore in Mosiah 25:2 the original earliest spelling *Muloch* for the name of the son of king Zedekiah; this spelling should also be extended to the three other occurrences of this name in Helaman 6:10 (two times) and Helaman 8:21; also the phrase “the people of Zarahemla **which was a descendant of X**” should be interpreted as meaning ‘the people of Zarahemla **who were descendants of X**’, especially since X here is the plural “Muloch and those which came with him into the wilderness”.

■ **Mosiah 25:5**

*yea he read the records of the people of Zeniff  
from the time they left the land of Zarahemla  
until [the time 1A| BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] they returned again*

The 1837 edition dropped the second occurrence of the noun phrase *the time* from Mosiah 25:5. In the immediately following verse, the language is identical, yet there the 1837 edition left the parallel phraseology unchanged:

Mosiah 25:6  
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

The loss of *the time* in verse 5 is most probably a typo, not the result of editing. Also note that the deletion wasn’t marked by Joseph Smith in the printer’s manuscript. The expression “until the time that <something happens>” is fairly frequent in the text:

2 Nephi 5:19	until the time that they sought to take away my life
Mosiah 8:2	even until the time that he himself came up out of the land
Mosiah 9 preface	until the time that they were delivered out of the hands of the Lamanites
Mosiah 21:22	even until the time that Ammon and his brethren came into the land
Alma 25:15	until the time that he should be revealed unto them

Alma 40:21	until the time which is appointed of God that the dead shall come forth
3 Nephi 26:3	until the time that he should come in his glory
Moroni 10:3	even down until the time that ye shall receive these things

Notice, however, that in Mosiah 25:5–6, neither occurrence of “until the time” is followed by *that* (the same holds for both occurrences of “from the time” in this same passage).

*Summary:* Restore in Mosiah 25:5 the original phraseology “until **the time** they returned again”; the use of *the time* is supported by the identical “until the time they returned again” in the following verse.

■ **Mosiah 25:5–6**

*and it came to pass that  
 Mosiah did read and caused to be read the records of Zeniff to his people  
 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***

This passage presents a difficult reading. Alma and his brethren were probably born in the land of Nephi, not in the land of Zarahemla; between the time that the people of Zeniff left the land of Zarahemla and then returned under king Limhi, at least two generations had elapsed (from Zeniff to Noah and from Noah to Limhi). Earlier the text refers to Alma as a young priest of Noah:

Mosiah 17:1–2  
 And now it came to pass that when Abinadi had finished these sayings  
 that the king commanded that the priests should take him  
 and cause that he should be put to death  
 but there was one among them whose name was Alma  
 he also being a descendant of Nephi  
**and he was a young man**

Moreover, even if Alma had been born in the land of Zarahemla and left for the land of Nephi as an infant, he did not have any religious brethren until after his conversion. Thus it seems impossible to refer to “Alma and his brethren” as having left the land of Zarahemla and returning again. One might conjecture that in Mosiah 25:5–6 we have an unintended parallelism: when Mormon came to writing about the people of Alma, he repeated the language that he had just written regarding the people of Zeniff (“from the time they left the land of Zarahemla until the time they returned again”). In other words, to be accurate, Mormon should have written only “and he also read the account of Alma and his brethren and all their afflictions”. One could, I suppose, go even further and construct a cultural explanation for the current reading: perhaps a group of people, once formed, are always considered an integral whole going back into time to include ancestors that were technically never a part of that group. Or one might interpret the repetition

as perfunctory, that it means simply ‘from the beginning to the end’. Nonetheless, the Book of Mormon text is usually quite careful in its statements, so the incongruity of using the same specific phraseology to refer to Alma and his people does seem quite out of place.

An intriguing conjectural emendation for this passage has been suggested by Ellis Harris (personal communication, 19 September 2004): a large visual skip may have occurred during the early transmission of the text for Mosiah 25:5–6 (probably when copying from  $\mathcal{O}$  into  $\mathcal{P}$ ). That skip could have been an entire line of text that was virtually identical to the immediately preceding line:

Mosiah 25:5–7 (proposed original text for  $\mathcal{O}$ , lined up appropriately)

& it came to pass that Mosiah did read & caused to be read the records of  
 Zeniff to his people yea he read the records of the people of Zeniff from  
 the time they left the land of Zarahemla untill the time they returned again  
 & he also read the account of Alma **& his brethren & all their afflictions**  
**& he also read the account of Ammon** & his brethren & all their afflictions  
 from the time they left the land of Zarahemla untill the time they returned  
 again & now when Mosiah had made an end of reading the records . . .

Such a visual jump is clearly possible, with Oliver’s eye skipping from one line of  $\mathcal{O}$  to the next one, with the result that in  $\mathcal{P}$  he ended up creating the anomalous statement referring to Alma and his brethren as having left the land of Zarahemla and returning to it again. The amount of missing text is of the appropriate line length.

Oliver Cowdery was the scribe in  $\mathcal{P}$  for Mosiah 25:5–6. Earlier in the book of Mosiah there are four cases where he initially skipped a whole line of  $\mathcal{O}$  (or nearly a whole line of text) as he copied from  $\mathcal{O}$  into  $\mathcal{P}$ . In the first two cases, there are some identical or partially identical words that may have facilitated the skip (I mark these words in bold in the following listing); but in the two last cases, Oliver seems to have simply omitted a whole line. In each case, I lay out the proposed reading of the original manuscript (although the lines may have ended differently); I mark each line that was initially skipped with an arrow:

Mosiah 8:16 (see lines 29–30 on page 131 of  $\mathcal{P}$ )

is greater can no man have except he should possess the **power of God**  
 → which no man can yet a man may have great **power** given him from **God**  
 but a seer can know of things which has past & also of things which is

Mosiah 17:2 (see line 33 on page 143 of  $\mathcal{P}$ )

death but there was one among them whose name was Alma  
 → **he** also **being** a desendant of Nephi & he was a young man  
 & **he** **believed** the words which Abinadi had spoken for he

Mosiah 18:28 (see line 20 on page 146 of  $\mathcal{P}$ )

their substance of their own free will & good desires towards God  
 → to those Priests that stood in need yea & to every needy naked soul  
 & this he said unto them having been commanded of God & they did

Mosiah 18:35 (see line 34 on page 146 of  $\mathcal{P}$ )

their tents & their families & departed into the wilderness  
 → & they were in number about four hundred & fifty souls  
 & it came to pass that the army of the King returned having

Of course, if a whole line of text was skipped in Mosiah 25:6, we can't be precisely sure about what was in that line. Skipping a large part of a line of text allows for a number of additional conjectures: maybe the *also* was not repeated; perhaps the word *record* or *records* occurred instead of *account*; maybe the phrase "and all their afflictions" was not repeated. And perhaps there were other variations in the text, including substitutions or even extra words. One could argue, however, that if two lines had been virtually identical, it would have been harder during proofing to discover that one of those lines had been skipped.

Another possible emendation for Mosiah 25:6 would be to simply replace *Alma* with *Ammon*. While copying from  $\mathcal{O}$  to  $\mathcal{P}$ , Oliver Cowdery (the scribe here in  $\mathcal{P}$ ), could have miscopied "Ammon and his brethren" as "Alma and his brethren", especially since in the chapters immediately preceding Mosiah 25:6, we get varying examples of "X and his brethren", as shown by the following sequence:

<b>Ammon</b> and his brethren	3 times	Mosiah 21:22, 23, 29
<b>Alma</b> and his brethren	1 time	Mosiah 21:34
<b>Ammon</b> and his brethren	1 time	Mosiah 22:11
<b>Alma</b> and his brethren	1 time	Mosiah 23:29
<b>Amulon</b> and his brethren	2 times	Mosiah 23:34, 35
<b>Alma</b> and his brethren	5 times	Mosiah 23:35, 36, 37; 24:8, 15

So just before coming to Mosiah 25:6, Oliver had written five uninterrupted occurrences of "Alma and his brethren", and thus he could have easily ended up writing the same in Mosiah 25:6 instead of the correct "Ammon and his brethren". And as far as Ammon is concerned, there is no doubt that he and his men left the land of Zarahemla and suffered numerous afflictions before finding the people of Zeniff and returning again to Zarahemla:

Mosiah 7:16

and now king Limhi commanded his guards  
 that they should no more bind Ammon nor his brethren  
 but caused that they should go to the hill which was north of Shilom  
 and bring their brethren into the city  
 that thereby they might eat and drink  
 and rest themselves **from the labors of their journey**  
**for they had suffered many things**  
**they had suffered hunger thirst and fatigue**

We can also find scribal evidence that scribes were sometimes influenced by the name *Ammon* as they started to write the name *Alma*:

Mosiah 29:44 (initial error by scribe 2 of  $\mathcal{P}$ )

and [*Alman* >% *Alma* 1 | *Alma* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] was the first  
 and chief judge

Alma 48:18 (initial error by Oliver Cowdery in  $\mathcal{O}$ )

yea and also [*Almon* >% *Alma* 0 | *Alma* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST]  
 and his sons



Of course, in Mosiah 25:6 the proposed emendation has an original *Ammon* being replaced by *Alma*, while these examples show the opposite influence.

One difficulty with the simpler emendation (replacing *Alma* with *Ammon*) is that the subsequent text clearly implies that king Mosiah read to his people the record of Alma and his brethren:

Mosiah 25:7–10

and now when Mosiah had made an end of reading the records  
 his people which tarried in the land was struck with wonder and amazement  
 for they knew not what to think  
 for when they beheld those that had been delivered out of bondage  
 they were filled with exceeding great joy  
 and again when they thought of their brethren which had been slain by the Lamanites  
 they were filled with sorrow and even shed many tears of sorrow  
 and again when they thought of the immediate goodness of God  
 and his power **in delivering Alma and his brethren  
 out of the hands of the Lamanites and of bondage**  
 they did raise their voices and gave thanks to God

One could argue, of course, that the record of Alma and his brethren was included as part of “the records of the people of Zeniff”. But this proposal is contradicted by the separate historical account for the people of Alma in Mosiah 23–24, especially with its own individual preface that distinguishes Alma’s people from king Noah’s: “An account of Alma and the people of the Lord which was driven into the wilderness by the people of king Noah”.

In opposition to any emendation that would introduce *Ammon* into this passage, one might argue that Ammon’s expedition to find the people of Zeniff was a minor one and not worthy of its own historical account. Yet the text itself treats Ammon and his men on a par with Limhi and his people, even though Ammon’s party of 16 men (Mosiah 7:2) was immensely smaller in number:

Mosiah 21:36

and now all the study of **Ammon and his people** and **king Limhi and his people**  
 was to deliver themselves out of the hands of the Lamanites and from bondage

In fact, the text in the above passage lists “Ammon and his people” first. Moreover, Ammon’s expedition seems to have remained an important event in the history of the Nephites; note Mormon’s reference to it later on when Nephi and Lehi, great-great-grandsons of the first Alma, were thrown into a Lamanite prison in the land of Nephi:

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

Ammon’s expedition is an important one, and it is quite reasonable that Ammon and his men would have kept their own record.

Thus the odds are that there was some kind of long visual skip in Mosiah 25:6 that was never corrected. The problem, of course, is in reconstructing that original line of text. The simplest



solution is to make two lines identical except for the names *Alma* and *Ammon*, but obviously other possibilities remain.

**Summary:** Emend Mosiah 25:6 so that it reads “and he also read the account of Alma **and his brethren and all their afflictions and he also read the account of Ammon** and his brethren and all their afflictions from the time they left the land of Zarahemla until the time they returned again”; this emendation is based on the assumption that, except for the names *Alma* and *Ammon*, two lines of text in  $\mathcal{O}$  were identical and that Oliver Cowdery’s eye skipped down one whole line as he copied from  $\mathcal{O}$  into  $\mathcal{P}$ , thus leading to the anomalous current text that states that Alma and his people left the land of Zarahemla and then returned again to it; other possible emendations would involve variation in the wording, including one that would simply replace *Alma* with *Ammon*, although that emendation doesn’t readily explain the subsequent reaction of the people to king Mosiah’s reading of the records.

■ **Mosiah 25:10**

*they did raise their voices and*

[*gave* >js *give* 1 | *gave* A | *give* BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *thanks to God*

As discussed under Mosiah 21:8, the original text had quite a few examples where a simple past-tense verb form was conjoined to a preceding predicate containing the past-tense auxiliary verb form *did*. In this particular instance, Joseph Smith emended the *gave* to *give* in his editing for the 1837 edition. The critical text will, of course, restore the original *gave*. For additional discussion, see under 1 Nephi 8:11.

**Summary:** Restore the original simple past-tense form *gave* in Mosiah 25:10.

■ **Mosiah 25:12**

*and it came to pass that*

[*when* >js NULL 1 | *when* A | BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]

*those which were the children of Amulon and his brethren*

*which had taken to wife the daughters of the Lamanites*

[*they* >js NULL 1 | *they* A | BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *were displeased with the conduct*

*of their fathers*

*and they would no longer be called by the names of their fathers*

*therefore they took upon themselves the name of Nephi*

The original text of the Book of Mormon frequently used a redundant pronominal subject to refer to an immediately preceding complex noun phrase, as in the following nearby examples that involve relative clauses:

Mosiah 15:22

and all those that have believed in their words

—or all those that have kept the commandments of God—

[*these* >js NULL 1 | *these* A | BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] shall come forth

in the first resurrection

Mosiah 16:5

but remember that he that persists in his own carnal nature  
and goes on in the ways of sin and rebellion against God  
[*he* 1A] BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] remaineth in his fallen state

Here in Mosiah 25:12 the complex noun phrase is quite long and involves two relative clauses: “those **which** were the children of Amulon and his brethren **which** had taken to wife the daughters of the Lamanites”. The original redundant *they* helps the reader recover the subject after processing this long noun phrase. The critical text will restore such usage whenever it is supported by the earliest textual sources. See the discussion under Mosiah 15:22 and Mosiah 16:5. For other examples of this kind, see under SUBJECT REPETITION in volume 3.

Also in this passage Joseph Smith deleted the subordinate conjunction *when* at the beginning of the passage. The scope of the original *when*-clause seems to have extended all the way down to the word *therefore*, which means that the original text explained that when these children had decided to reject their fathers, then they decided to call themselves Nephites. Thus the original *when* in Mosiah 25:12 increases the clausal dependency in this passage and should be restored.

The original text had quite a few examples of a complex *when*-clause followed by a logically related independent clause preceded by *therefore*. The following examples have been retained in the current text:

Alma 27:4

now **when** Ammon and his brethren saw this work of destruction  
among those who they so dearly beloved  
and among those who had so dearly beloved them  
—for they were treated as though they were angels sent from God  
to save them from an everlasting destruction—  
**therefore** when Ammon and his brethren saw this great work of destruction  
they were moved with compassion and they said unto the king . . .

Alma 46:29

and it came to pass that **when** Amalickiah saw that  
the people of Moroni were more numerous than the Amalickiahites  
—and he also saw that his people were doubtful  
concerning the justice of the cause which they had undertaken—  
**therefore** fearing that he should not gain the point  
he took those of his people which would and departed into the land of Nephi

Alma 58:15

and it came to pass that **when** they saw that  
we were not strong according to our numbers  
and fearing that we should cut them off from their support  
except they should come out to battle against us and kill us  
and also supposing that they could easily destroy us with their numerous hosts  
**therefore** they began to make preparations to come out against us to battle

Helaman 1:9

now **when** those people which were desirous that he should be their governor  
saw that he was condemned unto death  
**therefore** they were angry

For additional examples of this kind of construction, but with *as*-clauses rather than *when*-clauses, see under Mosiah 23:12.

**Summary:** Restore the original *when* in Mosiah 25:12; this subordinate conjunction increases the dependency between the complex subordinate clause and the subsequent main clause in the passage (“therefore they took upon themselves the name of Nephi”); also restore the redundant subject pronoun *they*, which helps the reader to process the complex syntax in this sentence.

■ **Mosiah 25:16**

*and he did exhort the people of Limhi and his brethren  
—all those that had been delivered out of bondage—  
that [NULL > they 1 | they ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] should remember that  
it was the Lord that did deliver them*

In Mosiah 25:14, the principal scribe for the printer’s manuscript changed from Oliver Cowdery to scribe 2. This unknown scribe produced most of the text in  $\mathcal{P}$  from Mosiah 25:14 to Alma 13:20, when Oliver took over once more. (Hyrum Smith substituted briefly for this scribe 2 on five different occasions during the copying of  $\mathcal{G}$  into  $\mathcal{P}$ : namely, Mosiah 28:1, Mosiah 28:20–29:19, Mosiah 29:29–35, Alma 2:38–3:1, and Alma 5:1 and its preface.) Later, scribe 2 returned to do the copywork from 3 Nephi 19:21 through the end of Mormon.

In both of these large sections of text, the proofing of the copywork was done by Oliver Cowdery, not scribe 2 or Hyrum Smith. But these other scribes made corrections as they initially wrote down the text. Here in Mosiah 25:16, we have an example of a virtually immediate correction made by scribe 2 — namely, the supralinear insertion of the subject pronoun *they*:

Mosiah 25:16 (line 29 on page 157 of  $\mathcal{P}$ )  

$$\text{delivered out of bondage that } \overset{\text{they}}{\wedge} \text{ should remember}$$

It appears that scribe 2 made this correction shortly after writing the initial text. Although for this correction the size of the writing is smaller and the ink flow is not as broad, the level of ink flow itself is the same. Perhaps scribe 2 altered the angle his quill made with respect to the paper, thus restricting the ink flow for this insertion. The initially written text in  $\mathcal{P}$  does not make much sense (“and he did exhort the people of Limhi and his brethren . . . that should remember that it was the Lord that did deliver them”).

Another example of an obviously needed correction made by scribe 2 is found later in verse 23. In this instance, he inserted the word *or* inline between *of Christ* and *of God*:

Mosiah 25:23 (line 14 on page 158 of  $\mathcal{P}$ )  

$$\text{of Christ } \wedge \text{|or| of God they did join the churches of God}$$

The initial text here in  $\mathcal{P}$  (“whosoever was desirous to take upon them the name of Christ of God”) is clearly defective.

As we would expect from copywork, scribe 2 of  $\mathcal{P}$  did not catch all of his copying errors, including some obvious ones. Oliver’s first correction to scribe 2’s work comes in verse 22; there the linking verb is missing, which Oliver supplied when he proofed  $\mathcal{P}$  against  $\mathcal{G}$ :

Mosiah 25:22 (line 9 on page 158 of  $\mathcal{D}$ )

§1 were  
there being many churches they ^ §2 all one church

In virtually every case from Mosiah 25:14 through Alma 13:20, scribe 2's and Hyrum Smith's corrections as well as Oliver's subsequent proofing reflect their attempt to get the text of  $\mathcal{O}$  down correctly in  $\mathcal{D}$ . Obviously, the text requires the *they* in Mosiah 25:16, the *were* in Mosiah 25:22, and the *or* in Mosiah 25:23. In the case of Oliver's proofing, the accuracy of his corrections is strongly confirmed when we examine the corrections he made to scribe 2's work from 3 Nephi 19:21 through Mormon 9:37. For that part of the text the 1830 edition is a firsthand copy of  $\mathcal{O}$ , not  $\mathcal{D}$ —and nearly every one of Oliver's corrections in  $\mathcal{D}$  agrees with the 1830 reading. (A detailed listing of all these corrections can be found in volume 3.)

Generally speaking, the critical text will accept the virtually immediate manuscript corrections made by scribe 2 and Hyrum Smith in  $\mathcal{D}$  as well as the subsequent proofing corrections made by Oliver Cowdery. Most of the manuscript corrections repair obvious defects and will usually not be individually discussed in this analysis of textual variants (here in volume 4 of the critical text). In fact, I normally would not have discussed these three obvious corrections here in the last part of Mosiah 25 (after scribe 2 of  $\mathcal{D}$  took over for Oliver).

**Summary:** Obvious corrections in  $\mathcal{D}$  made by scribe 2 or by Hyrum Smith will be accepted; Oliver Cowdery's subsequent corrections of obvious errors while proofing these two scribes' copywork will also be accepted.

#### ■ Mosiah 25:17

*and it came to pass that after Alma had taught the people many things  
and had made an end of speaking to them  
that king Limhi [was 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST | were L] desirous that he might be baptized  
and all his people were desirous that they might be baptized also*

The 1902 LDS missionary edition accidentally replaced *was* with the rather implausible *were* here in Mosiah 25:17 (although one could, I suppose, interpret the *were* as representing some kind of subjunctive usage). The source of the error is the *were* in the next line of text. The copytext for the 1902 edition was the 1879 LDS edition; the 1902 compositor's eye apparently skipped down one line as he was setting *was desirous that*, and he ended up setting *were desirous that*:

Mosiah 25:17 (1879 edition, line for line)

them, that king Limhi was desirous that he might be bap-  
tized; and all his people were desirous that they might be

**Summary:** Reject in Mosiah 25:17 the obvious 1902 typo, "that king Limhi **were** desirous that he might be baptized".

■ **Mosiah 25:20**

*now this was done because there was so many people  
that they could not [be all 1 | all be ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] governed by one teacher*

The 1830 typesetter accidentally, it would appear, switched the order of *be all* to *all be* here in Mosiah 25:20. Elsewhere in the original text, the order is always *all be*:

Alma 34:13	yea it shall <b>all be</b> fulfilled
Alma 40:19	whether the souls and the bodies . . . shall <b>all be</b> reunited at once
3 Nephi 1:25	till it should <b>all be</b> fulfilled
3 Nephi 5:8	they cannot <b>all be</b> written in this book
3 Nephi 15:6	as many as have not been fulfilled in me . . . shall <b>all be</b> fulfilled
3 Nephi 29:2	the words of the Lord . . . shall <b>all be</b> fulfilled
Moroni 8:10	they shall <b>all be</b> saved with their little children

However, in one of these cases, the order has been switched to *be all* in the LDS text:

Alma 34:13 (1879 error)  
yea it shall [*all be* 1ABCDEFGHIKPS | *be all* IJLMNOQRT] fulfilled

The three other cases of “all be fulfilled” have maintained their original word order. The word order *be all* is clearly possible; note that *be all* was introduced into the 1879 LDS edition in Alma 34:13 and has been retained in the LDS text ever since. The critical text will in each case follow the word order as found in the earliest textual sources, either *all be* or *be all*. This means that there is a unique occurrence of the order *be all* here in Mosiah 25:20, although the possibility remains that this unique word order could be an error.

**Summary:** Restore in Mosiah 25:20 the unique word order *be all* in “they could not **be all** governed by one teacher”; the dominant order *all be* will be restored in Alma 34:13 (“it shall **all be** fulfilled”).

■ **Mosiah 25:22–23**

*for there was nothing preached in all the churches  
[in the land of Zarahemla > NULL 1 | ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]  
except it were repentance and faith in God  
and now there was seven churches  
**in the land of Zarahemla***

Scribe 2 of  $\mathfrak{P}$  initially wrote “in the land of Zarahemla” after *churches* in verse 22. But this was an error due to his eye accidentally moving down to the next line in the original manuscript, where it read “seven churches in the land of Zarahemla” (verse 23). There would have been almost exactly one entire line of  $\mathfrak{C}$  between the two instances of *churches* that led to this initial copying error:

Mosiah 25:22–23 (proposed original text for  $\mathfrak{C}$ , lined up appropriately)  
there was nothing preached in all the **churches** except it were repentance  
& faith in God & now there was seven **churches in the land of Zarahemla**

It appears that virtually immediately scribe 2 of  $\mathcal{P}$  caught his error and crossed out this addition to the text (there is no change in the level of ink flow for the crossout).

*Summary:* Accept in Mosiah 25:22 scribe 2’s crossout of the extra “in the land of Zarahemla” in  $\mathcal{P}$ ; the source for these words was in the next line of the original manuscript.

■ **Mosiah 25:23**

*and it came to pass that*

*whosoever* [was >]s were 1 | was A | were BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *desirous*

*to take upon* [them 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST | themselves G] *the name of Christ or of God*

*they did join the churches of God*

Here in his editing for the 1837 edition, Joseph Smith changed the singular *was* to the plural *were*. His apparent motivation was to interpret the generic *whosoever* as a plural so that there would be agreement with the following plural pronoun *them*. As discussed under 1 Nephi 17:48, *whoso(ever)* is sometimes treated as a singular and sometimes as a plural in the Book of Mormon text; there are also examples of mixture where *whoso(ever)* occurs with both singular and plural pronouns. The critical text will restore the original *was* here in Mosiah 25:23; for further discussion, see under SUBJECT-VERB AGREEMENT in volume 3.

This passage also shows a minor variant for the object pronoun *them*—namely, the reflexive *themselves* in the 1858 Wright edition. This form was not adopted in the subsequent RLDS text; rather, the earlier *them* (the reading of the 1840 edition) was restored. For the phrase “take upon them(selves)”, the Book of Mormon normally has the simple object pronoun *them* (15 times, including here in Mosiah 25:23) rather than the reflexive form *themselves*, which does occur but only twice:

Mosiah 25:12      they took upon **themselves** the name of Nephi

Helaman 11:24      and took upon **themselves** the name of Lamanites

It is quite possible that the 1858 error in Mosiah 25:23 was prompted by the nearby occurrence of this usage earlier in verse 12 (“they took upon **themselves** the name of Nephi”). The critical text will follow in each case the earliest textual sources in determining whether an object pronoun should take the reflexive form or not. Typically, the Book of Mormon text favors the older use of nonreflexive pronominal forms.

*Summary:* Restore in Mosiah 25:23 the original use of *whosoever was*, even though this singular form is associated with a following plural *them*; also maintain the nonreflexive *them* (the earliest reading) rather than the reflexive *themselves*.

■ **Mosiah 25:24**

*and they were* [blest >]s blessed 1 | blest A | blessed BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]  
*and prospered in the land*

As discussed under 1 Nephi 14:2, the critical text will maintain the modern spelling *blessed*. The original spelling *blest* shows that the scribes and Joseph Smith himself probably pronounced the

word as /blɛst/, which is also how it would be pronounced in modern English. In this particular passage, Joseph himself made the spelling correction from *blest* to *blessed* in his editing for the 1837 edition.

The conjunctive combination of *blessed* and *prospered* seems to be saying that “they were blessed and [they were] prospered in the land”; what we expect in modern English is “they were blessed and [they] prospered in the land” (which is actually one way to interpret this conjunctive combination). The intransitive use of the verb *prosper* dominates the text (with 55 occurrences), as in the well-used phraseology “inasmuch as thy seed shall keep my commandments / they shall prosper in the land of promise” (1 Nephi 4:14). But the text also has 15 instances of the transitive use of the verb *prosper*, including six others that are conjoined with the verb *bles*:

Mosiah 2:22	he doth <b>bles</b> you and <b>prosper</b> you
Mosiah 2:36	that ye may be <b>blessed prospered</b> and preserved
Helaman 12:1	the Lord in his great infinite goodness doth <b>bles</b> and <b>prosper</b> those who put their trust in him
3 Nephi 5:22	he hath <b>blessed</b> them and <b>prospered</b> them
4 Nephi 1:18	yea even they were <b>blessed</b> and <b>prospered</b>
Ether 10:28	and never could be a people more <b>blessed</b> than were they and more <b>prospered</b> by the hand of the Lord

This transitive use of *prosper* is also found in the King James Bible, as in these examples:

Nehemiah 2:20	the God of heaven / he will prosper us
1 Corinthians 16:2	as <i>God</i> hath prospered him

For every one of the six other Book of Mormon conjunctive uses of *bles* and *prosper*, the verb *prosper* is clearly transitive. Thus in Mosiah 25:24 the verb *prosper* should probably be interpreted as a transitive verb (“they were blessed and [they were] prospered in the land”).

**Summary:** Retain the spelling *blessed* in Mosiah 25:24 (and elsewhere in the text); the verb *prosper* is frequently used as a transitive verb in the Book of Mormon text, including here in this passage when it is combined with *blessed*.

## Mosiah 26

### ■ Mosiah 26:4

*and they were a separate people as to their faith and remained so ever after even in their carnal [and sinful 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST | K] state*

The 1892 RLDS edition accidentally omitted the conjunct “and sinful” in this passage; it was restored in the subsequent RLDS edition (1908). Although this particular conjunctive construct is unique to the text, there are similar ones in the text:

Mosiah 25:11	their sinful and polluted state
Mosiah 27:25	their carnal and fallen state
Alma 26:17	our awful sinful and polluted state

**Summary:** Maintain in Mosiah 26:4 the conjunctive adjectival construction “their carnal and sinful state”.

### ■ Mosiah 26:5–6

*and now in the reign of Mosiah they were not half so numerous as the people of God but because of the dissensions among the brethren they became more numerous [for 1 | For ABCDEGHKPRST | And FIJLMNOQ] it came to pass that they did deceive many with their flattering words which were in the church and did cause them to commit many sins*

The 1852 LDS edition replaced the conjunction *for* with *and*. This substitution appears to be accidental. The original *for* was restored to the LDS text in the 1920 edition, undoubtedly by reference to one of the early editions. The *for* is necessary because it explains that the dissenters became more numerous as a result of their effective (but deceitful) proselyting methods.

**Summary:** Maintain the conjunction *for* in Mosiah 26:6, which is used to explain why the dissenters were so successful in gaining adherents.

### ■ Mosiah 26:7–9

*and it came to pass that they were brought before the priests and delivered up unto the priests by the teachers and the priests brought them before Alma which was the high priest now king Mosiah had given Alma the authority over the church and it came to pass that Alma did [§2 NULL >+ §1 not 1 | not ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] know concerning them [for 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPS | but RT] there were many witnesses against them*



Here the original text in the printer's manuscript, as written by scribe 2, makes perfectly good sense: Alma knew concerning the apostates because there were witnesses against them. For some reason, Oliver Cowdery, presumably while proofing the printer's manuscript against the original, inserted a *not* here, but this change makes the passage nonsensical: Alma knew nothing concerning these apostates because there were witnesses against them? This difficult reading motivated the editors for the 1920 LDS edition to change the conjunction *for* to *but*. In other words, Alma personally didn't know concerning the apostates and he therefore had to rely on the witnesses who did know.

It is difficult to understand why Oliver Cowdery corrected  $\mathcal{P}$  here. It is possible that the original manuscript actually had a *not*, but that, of course, does not alleviate the difficulty in explaining how the *not* got there in the first place (although it would explain why Oliver corrected  $\mathcal{P}$  by adding the *not*). One possible explanation is that the phrase *did know* seemed odd to the scribe (in either  $\mathcal{C}$  or  $\mathcal{P}$ ), thus leading him to think a *not* must have been lost, for clearly "did not know" is much more expected in modern English than "did know" unless the *do* auxiliary is being used contrastively (as in "you're wrong—he **did** know").

Even so, such expectations about usage in modern English do not necessarily hold in the Book of Mormon text. Note first that the text has four other instances of "did know" without any intervening *not*:

Mosiah 24:12

and it came to pass that  
Alma and his people did not raise their voices to the Lord their God  
but did pour out their hearts to him  
and he **did know** the thoughts of their hearts

Alma 21:8

neither do we believe that thy fathers and also that our fathers **did know**  
concerning the things which they spake of that which is to come

Helaman 9:23

but behold I say unto you  
that this is because I have testified unto you  
that ye might know concerning this thing  
yea even for a witness unto you  
that I **did know** of the wickedness and abominations which is among you

3 Nephi 11:15

until they had all gone forth  
and did see with their eyes  
and did feel with their hands  
and **did know** of a surety  
and did bear record that it was he

In contrast, there is actually only one example of "did not know" in the entire Book of Mormon text: "now the Lamanites **did not know** that Moroni had been in their rear with his army" (Alma 52:29). So it was clearly not familiarity with the Book of Mormon style that led the scribe in  $\mathcal{C}$  or Oliver Cowdery in  $\mathcal{P}$  to insert the *not*.

Less striking than the case of “did (not) know” is the occurrence in the Book of Mormon of 14 instances of the present-tense “do know” versus 10 of “do not know”. Yet even the present-tense usage shows once more that the archaic use of the auxiliary verb *do* without a *not* is more frequent in the Book of Mormon. For further discussion of the role of the auxiliary verb *do* in the Book of Mormon text, see DO AUXILIARY in volume 3.

The critical text will accept what scribe 2 originally wrote here in the printer’s manuscript. Whatever reason Oliver Cowdery had for supralinearly inserting a *not* here in  $\mathcal{P}$ , his correction does not appear to represent the original reading.

**Summary:** Restore in Mosiah 26:9 the reading found in the original hand (scribe 2’s) in the printer’s manuscript: “and it came to pass that Alma **did know** concerning them **for** there were many witnesses against them”; in other words, the negative *not* should be removed from the current text, and *but* should be replaced by the original conjunction, *for*.

#### ■ Mosiah 26:9

*and it came to pass that Alma did know concerning them  
for [there 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST | they E] were many witnesses against them*

Here we have a simple typo in the 1849 LDS edition, replacing *there* with *they*. This error was readily recognized and corrected in the following LDS edition (1852). The misreading may have been the result of the preceding and following occurrences of *them* (“concerning them . . . against them”).

**Summary:** Maintain the existential *there* in Mosiah 26:9 (“for there were many witnesses against them”).

#### ■ Mosiah 26:11

*therefore we have brought them before thee  
that thou [may 1A | mayest BCDEGHKNPRST | mayst FIJLMOQ] judge them  
according to their crimes*

The original text apparently had a few instances of the base verb form for the subject pronoun *thou*, as here in Mosiah 26:11 (“that thou **may** judge them according to their crimes”). In this particular instance, the 1837 edition replaced the base form *may* with the indicative form *mayest*. Interestingly, the 1852 edition, set in Liverpool, England, replaced the two-syllable *mayest* with the dialectal one-syllable *mayst*, which was retained in the LDS text until the 1920 edition. Elsewhere, the Book of Mormon text has *mayest* (eight times), but never *mayst*. And here in Mosiah 26:11, we have the only occurrence of “thou may”. Although this subjunctive usage here may be an error, it is also possible that it is intended, as discussed under Mosiah 12:11. A similar use of the base form of a modal verb also occurs nearby in Mosiah 26:20 (“and thou shalt serve me and go forth in my name and **shall** gather together my sheep”). For discussion, see that passage.

**Summary:** Restore in Mosiah 26:11 the original base form *may* for the modal auxiliary; such usage, although fairly infrequent in the original text, may have been intended here.

■ **Mosiah 26:15**

*thou art blessed because of thy exceeding faith in the words of my servant*  
 [*Aminadi* > NULL 1 | ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *Abinadi*

Here scribe 2 of  $\mathcal{P}$  initially wrote Abinadi's name as *Aminadi*, but he immediately caught his error, crossed out *Aminadi* (there is no change in the level of ink flow), and then wrote the correct *Abinadi* inline. Interestingly, this name *Aminadi* actually occurs three times in the text, in Alma 10:2–3. We should note that here in Mosiah 26:15 was the first time scribe 2 of  $\mathcal{P}$  was required to write down the name *Abinadi*, so we should not be surprised that he might have initially written the name incorrectly.

The name *Abinadi* occurs 37 times in the text. The only other place where there is any variation in the spelling of this name is in the book of Alma; in this instance the scribe was once more scribe 2 of  $\mathcal{P}$ , and in this case he misspelled this name as *Abinedi*:

Alma 5:11  
 the words which was delivered by the mouth  
 of [*Abinedi* 1 | *Abinadi* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]

It is possible in Alma 5:11 that  $\mathcal{S}$  itself read *Abinedi*—that is, the scribe in  $\mathcal{S}$  for that part of the text (probably Oliver Cowdery) accidentally misspelled it there as well. Such a misspelling could have occurred if Joseph Smith pronounced the word with stress on the second syllable so that the third vowel would have been the unstressed schwa vowel (which can be spelled variously in English). In any event, the first occurrences of the name *Abinadi* are spelled correctly and without variation (although there are no occurrences of the name in the extant portions of  $\mathcal{S}$ ).

**Summary:** Maintain the spelling *Abinadi* for the name of the prophet that confronted king Noah and his priests.

■ **Mosiah 26:19**

*and because thou hast inquired of me*  
*concerning the* [*transgressors* >% *transgressor* 1 | *transgressor* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]  
*thou art blessed*

Here scribe 2 of  $\mathcal{P}$  initially wrote the plural *transgressors*, but then he immediately erased the plural *s*, giving the singular *transgressor*. The singular was undoubtedly the reading in the original manuscript. Either the singular or the plural is theoretically possible here, so there would have been little motivation for scribe 2 to have edited the plural *transgressors* to the singular *transgressor*.

**Summary:** Follow in Mosiah 26:19 the corrected reading in  $\mathcal{P}$ : “because thou hast inquired of me concerning the **transgressor**”.

## ■ Mosiah 26:20

and I covenant with thee that thou **shalt** have eternal life  
 and thou **shalt** serve me and go forth in my name  
 and [shall 1ABCDEFGHJKPS | shalt IJLMNOQRT] gather together my sheep  
 and he that will hear my voice **shall** be my sheep  
 and him **shall** ye receive into the church

Here the text starts out with two cases of “thou shalt”, followed by a conjoined predicate that in the earliest text begins with *shall* rather than the grammatically expected *shalt*: “thou shalt serve me . . . and [thou] **shall** gather together my sheep”. It is possible that the *shall* is an error, perhaps influenced by two occurrences of *shall* in the subsequent text: “he . . . **shall** be my sheep and him **shall** ye receive”. It is also possible that the preceding base form *go* (“and **go** forth in my name”) may have led to the use of the base form of the modal verb *shall* in the following conjoined predicate (“and **shall** gather together my sheep”). The 1879 LDS edition made the change to the expected *shalt*, which has been retained in the LDS text. The RLDS text has maintained the earlier *shall*.

As discussed under Mosiah 12:11, there are other cases in the earliest text where *thou* takes the base form of the verb rather than the expected archaic ending *-est* or, in the case of modals like *shall* and *will*, the ending *-t* (that is, *shalt* and *wilt*). Since the use of the base form may be intended, the critical text will follow the earliest reading here in Mosiah 26:20. Also see the discussion regarding the use of *may* rather than *mayest* nearby in Mosiah 26:11.

**Summary:** Restore in Mosiah 26:20 the reading in  $\mathfrak{P}$ , the earliest extant reading, where the subject *thou* takes the base form of the modal verb *shall* in a conjoined predicate.

## ■ Mosiah 26:22

whosoever [that >js NULL 1 | that A | BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] is baptized  
 shall be baptized unto repentance

In his editing for the 1837 edition, Joseph Smith here removed the relative pronoun *that* after *whosoever*. The use of the *that* appears to be fully intended and will be restored in the critical text. Elsewhere in the text we have two similar cases of “who(m)soever . . . that”, although in both these cases there is a postmodifying prepositional phrase between the *who(m)soever* and the *that*:

Mosiah 4:28

and I would that ye should remember that  
**whosoever** among you  
 [that 1ABCDEFGHGIJKLMNOPQS | RT] borroweth of his neighbor  
 should return the thing that he borroweth

Alma 46:35

and it came to pass that  
**whomsoever** of the Amalickiahites  
**that** would not enter into a covenant to support the cause of freedom  
 that they might maintain a free government  
 he caused to be put to death

In the first case, the 1920 LDS edition removed the relative pronoun *that*; this emendation agrees with Joseph Smith’s decision to remove the *that* here in Mosiah 26:22. As discussed under Mosiah 4:28, there are good reasons for maintaining the *that* in that passage.

This occurrence of *who(m)soever that* without any intervening prepositional phrase is strikingly unique in the Book of Mormon text. Nor are there any occurrences of this usage in the King James Bible. The Oxford English Dictionary has examples of the related *whoso that* (sometimes spelled *who so that*); this usage seems to have been fairly prevalent in late Middle English:

Geoffrey Chaucer (about 1374)

Who so that . . . coueyteth nat to ben deseyuyd by no mys-weyes.

‘whoso that . . . coveteth not to be deceived by no misways’

John Maundeville (about 1400)

Whoso that wole, may leve me zif he wille;

‘whoso that would / may believe me if he will’

*Romaunt of the Rose* (about 1400)

Who so that hath hadde the subtelte The double sentence for to se.

‘whoso that hath had the subtlety the double sense to see’

Thomas Hoccleve (about 1412)

Who so that hatethe moche clappe or speche Quenchethe malice.

‘whoso that hateth much clap or spech quencheth malice’

(I wish to thank Don Chapman for help with these Middle English citations.) We should also note that *whosoever that* is not difficult to understand. Its use here in Mosiah 26:22 seems to be fully intended, and therefore the critical text will restore it. For a related example of *that* occurring after a *wh*-word, see under Mosiah 29:6 for the use in  $\mathcal{D}$  of *whom that*.

**Summary:** Restore in Mosiah 26:22 the occurrence of *whosoever that*; this unique usage appears to be intended and is not that difficult to understand.

## ■ Mosiah 26:22

*whosoever that is baptized shall be baptized*

[*into* > *unto* 1 | *unto* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *repentance*

Scribe 2 of  $\mathcal{D}$  initially wrote “baptized **into** repentance”, but then he immediately corrected the preposition *into* to *unto* by overwriting the *i* with a *u* (there was no change in the level of ink flow, nor was there any dot for the *i*). Undoubtedly, the original manuscript read *unto*. Elsewhere the text refers to “baptizing **unto** repentance” (12 times) or to “baptism **unto** repentance” (once, in Moroni 8:11). The use of *unto* follows the King James language in Matthew 3:11: “I indeed baptize you with water **unto** repentance”.

Scribe 2 of  $\mathcal{D}$  frequently mixed up *unto* and *into*, at least initially as he copied from  $\mathcal{C}$  into  $\mathcal{D}$ ; in the following, I give the actual reading in  $\mathcal{D}$ :

Mosiah 26:27      & thin will I confess [*into* > *unto* 1] them

Mosiah 26:27      & they shall depart [*unto* >% *into* 1] everlasting fire

Mosiah 27:32	at the time the angel appeared [ <i>into</i> > <i>unto</i> 1] them
Alma 5:8	Behold I say [ <i>into</i> > <i>unto</i> 1] you
Alma 5:49	yea to speak [ <i>into</i> > <i>unto</i> 1] my beloved Brethren
Alma 9:16	therefore the Lord will be merciful [ <i>into</i> > <i>unto</i> 1] them
Mormon 6:15	& a few which had deserted over [ <i>into</i> >% <i>unto</i> 1] the Lamanites

Except for the second example in Mosiah 26:27, scribe 2 initially wrote *into* in place of the correct *unto* (as here in Mosiah 26:22).

**Summary:** Retain in Mosiah 26:22 the use of the preposition *unto* in “baptized unto repentance” (the corrected reading in  $\mathcal{P}$ ).

■ **Mosiah 26:22**

*and* [*whosoever* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPS | *whomsoever* RT] *ye receive shall believe in my name*

Here the 1920 LDS edition grammatically emended *whosoever* to *whomsoever*, in accord with the prescriptive grammatical rule that *whosoever* takes the subject or object form according to the role it plays within the *who(m)soever* clause itself, as in “I gave the book to **whosoever** wanted it” versus “I gave the book to **whomsoever** I liked”. Here in Mosiah 26:22, the subject for the nominal clause is *ye*; therefore *who(m)soever* is the direct object within that clause and, according to prescriptive grammar, should be *whomsoever*. As in the case of *who* versus *whom*, the critical text will follow the earliest reading, not necessarily what is prescribed. For further discussion of subject versus object forms of pronouns, see under PRONOUNS as well as under WHICH in volume 3.

**Summary:** Maintain in Mosiah 26:22 the original *whosoever* in the nominal relative clause “whosoever ye receive” even though *whosoever* is acting as the direct object within the nominal clause itself.

■ **Mosiah 26:22–23**

*and whosoever ye receive shall believe in my name  
and **him** will I freely forgive  
for it is I that taketh upon me the sins of the world  
for it is I that hath created **them**  
and it is I that granteth unto **him** that believeth  
in the end a place at my right hand*

Richard Tripp II, a student in my fall 1997 textual criticism class, suggested that the plural pronoun *them* in this passage may be an error for *him*. As noted under 1 Nephi 10:18–19, there is manuscript evidence that the scribe in  $\mathcal{C}$  sometimes had difficulty determining whether Joseph Smith had dictated *them* or *him*. Tripp observed that the use of *them* in this passage seems to imply that God created the sins of the world—that is, the plural *sins* might be misinterpreted as the antecedent for *them*. Elsewhere this passage uses the singular *him* rather than the plural *them* as the generic pronoun: “and **him** will I freely forgive” and “it is I that granteth unto **him** that believeth”, so perhaps the original text also read *him* in “for it is I that hath created **him**”.

There are several problems with this suggestion. First of all, *him* instead of *them* would definitely sound quite strange in the larger context of “for it is I that taketh upon me the sins of the world / for it is I that hath created **him**”. There is nothing in the preceding clause for the *him* to refer to; one has to go earlier in the passage to find the generic reference: “and **whosoever** ye receive shall believe in my name and **him** will I freely forgive”. Secondly, it seems that the antecedent for the *them* is actually *the world*, which by implication is plural. There is one other passage that uses plural pronouns in referring to the world (but by inference to the people of the world):

1 Nephi 19:9

and **the world** because of **their** iniquity shall judge him to be a thing of naught  
wherefore **they** scourge him and he suffereth it  
and **they** smite him and he suffereth it  
yea **they** spit upon him and he suffereth it

Finally, we should note that throughout the larger passage we find additional shifting between singular and plural, as in the immediately following text:

Mosiah 26:23–24

and it is I that granteth unto **him** that believeth  
in the end a place at my right hand  
for behold in my name are **they** called  
and if **they** know me **they** shall come forth

Given all of these factors, the *them* in Mosiah 26:23 should probably be interpreted as referring to the nearest noun, *world* (that is, the people of the world).

**Summary:** Maintain in Mosiah 26:23 the plural pronoun *them*, the consistent reading in all the textual sources; although *them* could be a mishearing for *him*, the plural *them* actually works since its probable antecedent is *the world*, for which plural pronouns can be used to refer to the world’s inhabitants.

### ■ Mosiah 26:23

*and it is I that granteth unto him that believeth*  
[in 1ABDEPS | unto CGHIJKLMNOQRT | in > unto F] *the end*  
*a place at my right hand*

The 1840 edition changed “in the end” to “unto the end”. This change appears to be intended; if so, Joseph Smith would probably be the one responsible for the change. The stereotyped plates for the second printing of the 1852 LDS edition were corrected here to agree with the 1840 reading. All subsequent LDS editions have followed the corrected 1852 edition, but the 1908 RLDS edition restored the *in* (since this is the reading of the printer’s manuscript). Of course, there is the possibility that the *in* of the printer’s manuscript is a copying error, and there is a slight possibility that the 1840 change represents the reading of the original manuscript since we know Joseph used the original manuscript to make a few changes in that edition. However, the 1840 corrections from the original manuscript seem to be restricted to restoring small phrases that had accidentally dropped out when  $\mathcal{O}$  was originally copied into  $\mathcal{P}$  (see the discussion in part 1 of this volume regarding “they call the name of the place Bountiful” in the 1 Nephi preface).

The problem here in Mosiah 26:23 is determining which verb the prepositional phrase “in the end” belongs to. The reference to “believing in the end” sounds like it allows for deathbed repentance, which may have been the reason for changing the preposition *in* to *unto* in the 1840 edition. “Believing **unto** the end” makes much better sense. But the other way to interpret the original “in the end” is that this prepositional phrase belongs to the verb *grant*: “it is I that granteth unto him . . . in the end a place at my right hand”). Under this interpretation, we can accept the original *in*.

Admittedly, the syntax of the earlier form “in the end” is difficult. Nonetheless, there are cases in the text where a prepositional phrase is postponed from its expected position in a sentence, as in the following:

2 Nephi 33:11 (compare with “Christ will show at the last day that . . .”)  
 for **Christ will shew** unto you with power and great glory  
 that they are his words  
**at the last day**

Mosiah 15:24 (compare with “these have died in their ignorance”)  
 and these are they **that have died**  
 before Christ came  
**in their ignorance**

For an example where the postponed prepositional phrase seems to have caused a dittography, see 2 Nephi 25:6. For further discussion and a list of examples, see **DISPLACED PREPOSITIONAL PHRASES** in volume 3.

Elsewhere in the Book of Mormon text there are examples of enduring, desiring righteousness, serving the Lord, and being faithful or obedient to the end. The preposition in all of these cases (either *to*, *unto*, or *until*) implies an extended period of time. When the preposition is *in*, the reference is to a more specific moment in time, as here in the original text for Mosiah 26:23 where the Lord will grant “in the end” a place on his right hand to those who believe on him. The language in this passage refers to the day of judgment as described in the Gospel of Matthew:

Matthew 25:33–34 (King James Bible)  
 and he shall set the sheep on his right hand but the goats on the left  
 then shall the King say unto them on his right hand  
 come ye blessed of my Father  
 inherit the kingdom prepared for you from the foundation of the world

All of the original Book of Mormon examples of “unto the end” involve righteous behavior (not just belief) on the part of the individual. The emended reading referring to “believing unto the end” here in Mosiah 26:23 does not contradict such usage; nonetheless, there are no other examples in the text that specifically refer to “believing unto the end”.

There are two other uses of “in the end” in the Book of Mormon text, and these two refer to a moment in time. In one case, the apostate Nehor extends the concept of eternal life to all people rather than to just the righteous:

Alma 1:4  
 for the Lord had created all men and had also redeemed all men  
 and **in the end** all men should have eternal life



In the other case, Lehi refers to a specific time near the end of the history of this world when the descendants of Laman and Lemuel will be blessed:

2 Nephi 4:9  
 wherefore thou shalt not utterly be destroyed  
 but **in the end** thy seed shall be blessed

Finally, we should consider whether the preposition *unto* could have been the original reading. If so, there must have been an early error in the transmission of the text that changed the *unto* to *in*. Although there are examples of *in* and *into* being mixed up in the early transmission, there are none of *in* and *unto* (or of *in* and *to*, for that matter). This finding suggests that it is doubtful that the *in* here in Mosiah 26:23 is a scribal error for *unto* (or *to*). Ultimately, the most reasonable solution here is to accept the earliest reading, “in the end”, but to recognize that this prepositional phrase refers to the verb *grant*, not *believe*.

**Summary:** Restore in Mosiah 26:23 the original prepositional *in*; the text refers to the Lord granting in the end a place on his right hand to those who believe.

■ **Mosiah 26:27**

*and then [will I 1ABCDEFGHijklNOPS | I will MQRT] confess unto them  
 that I never knew them*

The 1905 LDS edition switched the word order from the inverted *will I* to the noninverted *I will*, yet elsewhere in the Book of Mormon, when preceded by *then*, there are only occurrences of “then will I” (13 of them, of which seven are “**and then will I**”), none of “then I will”. And only one of these 13 other examples shows any variation in the word order:

3 Nephi 16:11  
 and then [will I 1ABCDEFGHKPRST | I will FIJLMNOQ] remember my covenant  
 which I have made unto my people

The 1905 change in Mosiah 26:27 was probably unintended, as was the change in the 1852 LDS edition for 3 Nephi 16:11. For discussion of nearby examples of this kind of mix-up in word order, see Mosiah 11:6 (“yea and **thus were they** supported in their laziness”) and Mosiah 20:15 (“therefore **in my anger I did** cause my people to come up to war”). Also see the nearby example in Mosiah 26:28 (“**him I will** not receive at the last day”).

The passage here in Mosiah 26:27 parallels a well-known biblical passage in the King James Bible:

Matthew 7:23  
 and then will I profess unto them I never knew you

We note here the same order (“and then will I”), but also that the Book of Mormon verb is *confess* instead of the King James *profess*. Despite the orthographic and semantic similarity of these two words, *confess* is probably the intended word here in the Book of Mormon. Elsewhere in the text, *confess* refers to a sincere expression, most frequently an expression of guilt (14 times), but frequently as an honest admission of belief or knowledge (6 times). On the other hand, in the Book of Mormon, there are six references to *profess*, of which five refer to a false or undeserved claim:

Alma 5:37	ye that have professed to have known the ways of righteousness
Alma 51:21	those people which professed the blood of nobility
Helaman 3:33	the people who professed to belong to the church of God
Helaman 4:11	those also which professed to belong to the church of God
4 Nephi 1:27	there were churches which professed to know the Christ

There is only one example in the Book of Mormon where *profess* refers to a sincere expression—and that is in 3 Nephi 14:23, which agrees word for word with the King James text in Matthew 7:23! Thus the use of *confess* rather than *profess* in Mosiah 26:27 is normal for Book of Mormon usage. In addition, the Oxford English Dictionary lists under the verb *confess* the general meaning ‘to declare or disclose; to acknowledge, own, or admit’ (see definition 1). The verb *profess* has a very similar definition in the OED: ‘to declare openly, announce, affirm; to avow, acknowledge, confess’ (see definition 2). Despite their similarity in meaning, there is no specific evidence of these two words having ever been mixed up in the transmission of the Book of Mormon text, in either the manuscripts or the editions.

**Summary:** Restore the original word order in Mosiah 26:27 (“and then **will I** confess unto them”), which is the expected order in the Book of Mormon as well as the order found in Matthew 7:23; maintain *confess* in this passage since it is consistent with Book of Mormon usage, even though the verb in the related Matthew 7:23 is *profess* rather than *confess*.

#### ■ Mosiah 26:27

*and then will I confess unto them that I never knew them  
and they [shall 1ABCDEFHIJKLMNOPQRST | wilst G] depart into everlasting fire*

The 1858 Wright edition inexplicably replaced the modal verb *shall* with the fairly rare second person singular form *wilst*, as if the text read *thou wilt* when what we expect, if that were the case, would be *thou wilt* (the *-st* ending is due to second person singular forms like *wouldst* and *shouldst*). The form *wilst* is not found in the online Oxford English Dictionary, but I found a few examples of *thou wilt* on *Literature Online* <lion.chadwyck.com> (including one from Queen Elizabeth I). There are also quite a few instances of *wilst* on <www.google.com> (accessed on 13 June 2005), but virtually all of these are in imitation of archaic English (such as “thou wilt be mine” and “thou wilt pass through lands of magic”). Not surprisingly, this bizarre 1858 reading was not copied into the RLDS text (the 1874 edition).

**Summary:** Maintain the modal verb *shall* in Mosiah 26:27.

#### ■ Mosiah 26:27

*and they shall depart  
[unto >% into 1 | into ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] everlasting fire*

Scribe 2 of  $\mathcal{D}$  initially wrote “unto everlasting fire”, but then he erased the *u* of the *unto* and overwrote the erased *u* with an *i*, giving “into everlasting fire”. In 2 Nephi 9:16, Oliver Cowdery

made the same initial error and subsequent correction in the same phrase “into everlasting fire”. As discussed under that passage, the preposition *into* is undoubtedly the original preposition for “everlasting fire”.

**Summary:** Maintain the preposition *into* in Mosiah 26:27, the corrected reading in  $\mathcal{P}$ : “they shall depart into everlasting fire”.

■ **Mosiah 26:28**

*for him [I will 1ABDEFIJLMNOPQRST | will I CGHK] not receive at the last day*

In this passage, the 1840 edition changed the word order from the noninverted *I will* to the inverted *will I*, the common order when there is a preceding object such as *him*. The 1908 RLDS edition restored the original noninverted order *I will*. The 1840 change was probably influenced by the two preceding occurrences of *him will I* in this chapter:

Mosiah 26:21	and him will I also receive
Mosiah 26:22	and him will I freely forgive

Other occurrences of *him will I* are found near the end of the Book of Mormon text:

3 Nephi 9:14	him will I receive
3 Nephi 9:20	him will I baptize with fire
3 Nephi 9:22	him will I receive
3 Nephi 15:1	him will I raise up at the last day
3 Nephi 27:16	him will I hold guiltless
Ether 4:11	him will I visit with the manifestations of my Spirit

There are also occurrences of *him will I* where *him* is the object of the preposition *unto* or *to*:

2 Nephi 3:7	and <b>unto him will I</b> give commandment that . . .
2 Nephi 3:11	and <b>unto him will I</b> give power to bring forth my word
3 Nephi 15:9	for <b>unto him</b> that endureth to the end <b>will I</b> give eternal life
3 Nephi 18:5	and <b>to him will I</b> give power that he shall break bread
Mormon 9:25	<b>unto him will I</b> confirm all my words

The noninverted order *him I will* is fairly rare, with only one other example besides the one here in Mosiah 26:28:

2 Nephi 28:30	for <b>unto him</b> that receiveth <b>I will</b> give more
---------------	--

Despite its rarity, the noninverted word order of *him I will* here in Mosiah 26:28 will be maintained in the critical text. (For a similar example involving the inverted and noninverted word orders, see the nearby discussion under Mosiah 26:27 of “and **then will I confess** unto them that I never knew them”.)

**Summary:** Maintain in Mosiah 26:28 the original reading with its noninverted word order: “for **him I will** not receive at the last day”.

## ■ Mosiah 26:31

*he that forgiveth not his neighbor's trespasses  
when [ 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST | that HK] he  
[ 1ABDEFHIJKLMNQRST | that CG] saith  
[that 1ABDEFIJKLMNQRST | CGHK] he repenteth  
the same hath brought himself under condemnation*

Here the original text reads perfectly normally as “when he saith that he repenteth”. The 1840 compositor accidentally moved the subordinate conjunction *that* before the word *saith*, giving the quite impossible “when he that saith he repenteth”. Even so, this reading was copied into the 1858 Wright edition. Editors for the 1874 RLDS edition (which derives from the 1858 Wright edition but with frequent reference to the 1840 edition) tried to emend this strange reading by moving the *that* before the subject pronoun *he*. The resulting reading is even more difficult: “when that he saith he repenteth”. Finally, the 1908 RLDS edition restored the correct reading to the RLDS text since Ø reads “when he saith that he repenteth”.

**Summary:** Maintain in Mosiah 26:31 the placement of the *that* after the verb *saith* (“when he saith that he repenteth”).

## ■ Mosiah 26:33

*and it came to pass when Alma had heard these words  
he wrote them down that he might have them  
that he might judge the people of **that** church  
according to the commandments of God*

Ross Geddes has suggested (personal communication, 18 September 2005) that the reading “the people of **that** church” here in Mosiah 26:33 is an error for “the people of **the** church”. The nearest preceding reference to *the church* is some distance away, in verse 21, so the use of *that church* here in verse 33 is unexpected. Geddes also points out that elsewhere in this chapter there are 13 references to *the church*, but none to *that church*. However, it should be pointed out that the Lord refers to Alma as having established “a church” (in verse 17), which the Lord later refers to as “my church” (in verses 22 and 28). These additional examples with *a* and *my* suggest that other churches are conceptually possible. Yet there is only one church actually referred to in the entire book of Mosiah, the church of God established by Alma. In other words, there is no other specific church mentioned that could serve as a contrast to Alma’s church. Thus the reference to *that church* seems inappropriate. In fact, the Book of Mormon otherwise has no examples of *that church* except for ten instances of “that great (and abominable) church”. Clearly, the use of *that church* is odd here in Mosiah 26:33.

Geddes proposes that the *that* accidentally entered the text in Mosiah 26:33 because of two preceding occurrences of the subordinate conjunction *that* (“he wrote them down **that** he might have them **that** he might judge the people of **that** church”). There is some manuscript evidence that *the* was sometimes replaced with *that* (although there are many more examples in the manuscripts of the opposite tendency, to replace *that* with *the*). We do have two cases where Oliver

Cowdery initially wrote *that* instead of *the*; in both cases he soon corrected the *that* to *the* (there is no change in the level of ink flow):

1 Nephi 1:14

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

Alma 52:26

and thus Moroni had obtained a possession  
 of [*that* > *the* 0 | *the* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST] city Mulek

Both of these examples involve *city*, not *church*. The text has 11 examples of *that city*; there are also 10 examples of *that great city*, nearly all of which are followed by the name of a city. Thus Oliver's two initial errors involving *that city* were quite natural. But there is no other evidence for *that church* in the text beyond its specific use in "that great (and abominable) church".

Since the manuscript evidence for replacing *the* with *that* is relatively meager and *that church* is not impossible (although exceptional), the critical text will maintain *that church*, the reading of all the (extant) textual sources for this passage. But there remains a good chance that the unique occurrence of *that church* here in Mosiah 26:33 is an error for *the church*.

*Summary:* Retain the unique reading *that church* in Mosiah 26:33; this reading could well be an error for *the church*.

#### ■ Mosiah 26:35–36

*and whosoever repented of their sins and did confess them*  
**them** *he did number among the people of the church*  
*and* [*them* >]s *those* 1 | *them* A | *those* BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *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*

The earliest text here has two instances of *them* in clause-initial position; the first instance functions as a direct object ("**them** he did number"), the second as the head of a complex noun phrase that is treated as a subject by the following main clause ("and **them** that would not confess their sins . . . **the same** were not numbered among the people"). Since *them that* is dialectal, Joseph Smith replaced it with *those that* in his editing for the 1837 edition, although another possible emendation would have been *they that* ("and **they that** would not confess . . . **the same** were not numbered among the people"). The original text has examples of all three types, as in the following sampling of cases where the pronoun is found in clause-initial position:

2 Nephi 3:14 (invariant reading)

and **they that** seek to destroy him shall be confounded

2 Nephi 28:30 (original reading)

and **them that** shall say we have enough  
 from them shall be taken away even that which they have

Mosiah 21:12 (invariant reading)

and **those that** were not slain returned again to the city of Nephi

The critical text will in each of these cases follow the earliest reading. Thus *them* will be restored in Mosiah 26:36 (which means that the original parallel use of clause-initial *them* will be restored to the larger passage covering both verses 35 and 36). For additional discussion and examples, see under PRONOMINAL DETERMINERS in volume 3.

David Calabro (personal communication) points out the possibility that verse 35 might contain a dittography—namely, “whosoever repented of their sins and did confess **them** / **them** he did number among the people of the church”. The first *them*, of course, refers to *their sins* while the second *them* redundantly refers to the whole *whosoever*-clause. In standard English, in fact, the second *them* would be omitted, thus giving “whosoever repented of their sins and did confess them he did number among the people of the church”. In support of this hypothesis (that the occurrence of *them them* is a dittography), there is one other case where scribe 2 of  $\mathcal{P}$  accidentally repeated the pronoun *them*:

3 Nephi 28:18

they did go forth upon the face of the land  
and did minister unto all the people  
uniting as many to the church as would believe in their preaching  
baptizing [ $\mathfrak{S}2$  *them* >  $\mathfrak{S}1$  NULL 1 | ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] them

Oliver Cowdery, when he proofed  $\mathcal{P}$  against  $\mathcal{C}$  for this later part of scribe 2’s copywork, removed the obvious dittography. The 1830 edition, set in 3 Nephi from  $\mathcal{C}$  rather than  $\mathcal{P}$ , has only one *them* (as we would expect). The problem in Mosiah 26:36 is that the double *them* will work and could represent the original text. Moreover, the original text has examples where a pronoun is used to restate an initial *whosoever*-clause, such as this nearby example:

Mosiah 18:17

and it came to pass that  
whosoever was baptized by the power and authority of God  
[*they* >js NULL 1 | *they* A | BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] was added to his church

Unlike the case in 3 Nephi 28:18, the parallelistic conjoined sentence in Mosiah 26:35–36 seems to require the extra *them* (or at least some kind of pronoun-like noun phrase) in verse 35:

Mosiah 26:35–36

- (1) and **whosoever** repented of their sins and did confess them
- (2) **them** he did number among the people of the church
- (1′) and **them** that would not confess their sins and repent of their iniquity
- (2′) **the same** were not numbered among the people of the church

Each verse starts with a clausal noun phrase (the *whosoever*-clause in case 1 and *them* modified by a relative clause in case 1′), which is then followed by a main clause that begins with a pronoun or pronoun-like noun phrase (*them* in case 2 or *the same* in case 2′) that redundantly restates the preceding clausal noun phrase. The two verses are also semantically parallel, with the second one acting as the negative reversal of the first one. Also notice that the first *them* in verse 35 (“and did

confess **them**”) participates in the parallelism: the verb *confess* takes a direct object in both verses 35 and 36 (*them* in verse 35 and *their sins* in verse 36). Thus parallelism argues that both *them*’s in verse 35 are necessary and most probably intended. The critical text will therefore maintain the *them them* in Mosiah 26:35.

**Summary:** Restore the nonstandard use of *them that* in Mosiah 26:36: “and them that would not confess their sins . . . the same were not numbered among the people”; the occurrence of the double *them them* in Mosiah 26:35 appears to be intended because of the strong syntactic and semantic parallels between verses 35 and 36.

■ **Mosiah 26:38**

*walking in all diligence*

*teaching the word of God in all things*

[*sufferings* 1 | *suffering* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *all manner of afflictions*

*being persecuted by all those who did not belong to the church of God*

The printer’s manuscript has the plural noun form *sufferings*, which the 1830 typesetter interpreted as an error for the present participle *suffering*. His emendation is undoubtedly correct. For this verse, we have a sequence of four present participial forms: *walking*, *teaching*, *suffering*, and *being persecuted*. The probable source for the plural *s* in *sufferings* is the immediately preceding plural *things* (“teaching the word of God in all things”). The following plural *afflictions* may have also had some influence in causing the error.

**Summary:** Accept in Mosiah 26:38 the 1830 typesetter’s emendation of *sufferings* to *suffering*; the reading in  $\mathcal{P}$  is obviously wrong.

■ **Mosiah 26:39**

*and they were also admonished every one by the word of God*

*according to his sins*

or [to 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST | J] *the sins which he had committed*

Here the 1888 LDS large-print edition accidentally deleted the repeated preposition *to* in this conjunctive structure (“to his sins or **to** the sins which he had committed”). This particular edition was never used as a copytext, and so this typo was never transmitted into any subsequent LDS edition.

There are a number of other examples of “to X or to Y” elsewhere in the text (where X and Y are nouns):

1 Nephi 11:25

I beheld that the rod of iron which my father had seen was the word of God which led **to** the fountain of living waters **or to** the tree of life

Alma 24:23

neither would they turn aside **to** the right hand **or to** the left

Alma 41:4 (omission of the repeated *to* in the first printing of the 1852 edition)  
 raised **to** endless happiness  
 to inherit the kingdom of God  
**or** [*to* 01ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST | NULL > *to* F] endless misery  
 to inherit the kingdom of the devil

Alma 41:5 (omission of the repeated *to* in copying from  $\mathcal{C}$  into  $\mathcal{P}$ )  
 the one restored **to** happiness  
 according to his desires of happiness  
**or** [*to* 0 | 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST] good  
 according to his desires of good

Alma 54:20  
 and we will wage a war which shall be eternal  
 either **to** the subjecting the Nephites to our authority  
**or to** their eternal extinction

The tendency to eliminate the repeated *to* is fairly strong, as exemplified by the two instances in Alma 41. For additional discussion, see under CONJUNCTIVE REPETITION in volume 3. The critical text will maintain instances of the repeated preposition whenever they are supported by the earliest textual sources.

**Summary:** Maintain in Mosiah 26:39 the repeated preposition *to*: “according to his sins or **to** the sins which he had committed”.

■ **Mosiah 26:39**

*and they were also admonished every one by the word of God  
 according to his sins or to the sins which he had committed  
 being commanded of God to pray without ceasing  
 [NULL > & 1 | and ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST] to give thanks in all things*

Here scribe 2 of  $\mathcal{P}$  initially omitted the *and* between these two infinitival clauses, but soon thereafter he inserted inline an ampersand (the level of ink flow is unchanged). His corrected reading most probably represents the original text here. It is theoretically possible for *and* to be lacking between infinitival phrases, yet the Book of Mormon text almost always prefers a connecting *and*, as in the following example where the conjoined infinitive phrases are found within a present participial clause (as here in Mosiah 26:39):

4 Nephi 1:12  
 but they did walk after the commandments  
 which they had received from their Lord and their God  
 continuing in fasting and prayer  
 and in **meeting** together oft  
 both **to pray and to hear** the word of the Lord

**Summary:** Continue to follow in Mosiah 26:39 the corrected reading in  $\mathcal{P}$ —namely, scribe 2’s inserted *and* between the two infinitival clauses.



# Mosiah 27

## ■ Mosiah 27:1

*and Alma laid the case before their king*

[ 1CGHKPS|, ABDEFIJLMNOQRT] *Mosiah*

[ 1|. ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]

[and 1|And ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *Mosiah consulted with his priests*

The expression “their king Mosiah” has been treated in the first two editions and in the LDS textual tradition as if the name *Mosiah* is in nonrestrictive apposition (namely, by having a comma before *Mosiah*). However, it is also possible that this construction could be treated like the Hebraistic “the king <name>” found elsewhere in the Book of Mormon text. As discussed under Mosiah 19:15, there should be no punctuation after *the king* in such constructions involving names (for a complete list of examples, see under HEBRAISMS in volume 3). The similarity of “their king <name>” suggests that no punctuation be placed between *their king* and *Mosiah* in Mosiah 27:1 (which is how the RLDS text reads). There is one more example of “their king X” later on in the text:

Alma 49:25

and it came to pass that they returned to the land of Nephi  
to inform their king

[ 01|, ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *Amalickiah*

[ 0|NULL >jg, 1|, ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]

who was a Nephite by birth

concerning their great loss

For the same reason, the comma could be dropped between *their king* and *Amalickiah* in Alma 49:25.

**Summary:** Omit the comma after “their king” in Mosiah 27:1 and Alma 49:25 since the construction “their king X” seems to parallel the Hebraistic construction “the king X”, which is occasionally found elsewhere in the original text.

## ■ Mosiah 27:3

*and there was a strict command throughout all the churches*

*that there should be no [persecutions 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOQRST|persecution HK] among them*

Here the 1874 RLDS edition changed the plural *persecutions* to the singular *persecution*, unintentionally it would appear. The 1908 RLDS edition restored the plural reading, probably by reference to Ø. Elsewhere the text has 11 instances of the plural *persecutions* and 4 of the singular

*persecution*, yet there has been a clear tendency in the history of the text to replace the plural with the singular, as in these three additional examples:

2 Nephi 26:8 (1902 and 1905 LDS editions)

notwithstanding all [*persecutions* 1ABCDEFGHIJKNOPS | *persecution* LMQRT]

Alma 5:54 (1852 LDS edition)

yea will ye persist

in the [*persecutions* 1ABCDEGHKPS | *persecution* FIJLMNOQRT] of your brethren

Mormon 8:36 (1906 LDS edition)

unto envying and strifes and malice

and [*persecutions* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMOPQRST | *persecution* N]

The critical text will follow in each case the evidence from the earliest textual sources in determining whether *persecution* should be in the singular or plural.

**Summary:** Maintain in Mosiah 27:3 the original plural *persecutions* (“that there should be no persecutions among them”), the reading of the earliest textual sources.

#### ■ Mosiah 27:4

*that they should [let no 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST | not let J] pride nor haughtiness disturb their peace*

The 1888 LDS large-print edition replaced “they should **let no** pride . . . disturb their peace” with “they should **not let** pride . . . disturb their peace”. The occurrence of *let no* here is unique in the Book of Mormon text. On the other hand, *not let* occurs in three places:

Alma 26:19      yea why **did he not let** the sword of his justice fall upon us

Alma 35:5      and their teachers **did not let** the people know concerning their desires

Alma 37:46      **do not let** us be slothful because of the easiness of the way

Note, however, that in each of these three cases, there is a preceding form of the auxiliary verb *do* (which is not the case in Mosiah 27:4). The safest solution in this situation is to follow the earliest textual sources.

**Summary:** Maintain the original reading in Mosiah 27:4: “that they should **let no** pride nor haughtiness disturb their peace”.

#### ■ Mosiah 27:4

*that they should let no pride [nor 1ABCEFGHIJKLMNQRST | or D] haughtiness disturb their peace*

Here the original text reads “**no** pride **nor** haughtiness” (namely, we have the correlative *no-nor*). The 1841 British edition replaced the *nor* with *or*, thus creating an instance of the alternative correlative *no-or*. This change was probably accidental since no other instances of *no-nor* were replaced

with *no-or* in that edition. In general, the original Book of Mormon text has examples of only *no-nor* conjoining noun phrases, none of *no-or*:

2 Nephi 2:13	no righteousness nor happiness
2 Nephi 2:13	no punishment nor misery
Mosiah 3:17	no other way nor means
Mosiah 14:2	no form nor comeliness
Mosiah 27:4	no pride nor haughtiness
Mosiah 29:14	no wars nor contentions
Mosiah 29:14	no stealing nor plundering
Alma 4:1	no contentions nor wars
Alma 16:1	no wars nor contentions
Alma 38:9	no other way nor means
Alma 40:13	no part nor portion
Helaman 5:9	no other way nor means
3 Nephi 4:2	no wild beasts nor game
3 Nephi 6:22	no lawyer nor judge
4 Nephi 1:16	no envyings nor strifes
Mormon 9:7	no revelations nor prophecies

There is one other case where *no-nor* has been replaced by *no-or*:

Alma 38:9  
 there is **no** other way [*nor* 01ABCDEFGHIKPS | *or* FIJLMNOQRT] means  
 whereby man can be saved

In this case, the 1852 LDS edition made the change from *nor* to *or*. But unlike the 1841 example in Mosiah 27:4, this instance of *no-or* has been retained in the LDS text.

The prescriptive rule for the negative correlatives *no-nor* and *no-or* has changed over time. Merriam Webster’s Dictionary of English Usage (see the second item listed under *no*) indicates that in the 19th century, *no-nor* was preferred, but in the 20th century this correlative was generally superseded by *no-or*. The Book of Mormon text follows the earlier preference. Since either correlative is theoretically possible, the critical text will follow the earliest textual sources in determining the reading (which means that there will be instances of only *no-nor* in the critical text). Here in Mosiah 27:4, *no-nor* will be maintained; in Alma 38:9, the *no-nor* will be restored. For further discussion, see under NEGATION in volume 3.

**Summary:** Maintain the original *no-nor* correlative found in the earliest textual sources for Mosiah 27:4 and Alma 38:9 (and elsewhere in the text).

■ **Mosiah 27:4**

*that every man should esteem his neighbor as himself  
 laboring with their own [hand > hands 1 | hands ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] for their support*

Here scribe 2 of  $\mathcal{P}$  initially wrote “with their own **hand** for their support”; then almost immediately he corrected the singular *hand* by inserting inline a plural *s* at the end of the original *hand*.

There are many instances in the manuscripts of the singular *hand* and the plural *hands* being mixed up; see the list under Mosiah 16:1.

Elsewhere in the text there are nine more instances of the phrase “to labor with one’s (own) hands”; all of these take the plural *hands*, including a nearby example in Mosiah 27:5, the next verse: “yea and all their priests and teachers should labor with their own **hands** for their support”. None of the nine other examples show any variation in number for *hands*.

**Summary:** Accept scribe 2’s virtually immediate correction in  $\mathcal{P}$  of *hand* to *hands*; the text is consistent in that only the plural *hands* is found for the verb phrase “to labor with one’s (own) hand(s)”.

### ■ Mosiah 27:7

*and they became a large and [a 1ABDEPS | CFGHIJKLMNOQRT] wealthy people*

In this adjectival conjunctive phrase, the repeated *a* was lost in the 1840 edition as well as in the 1852 LDS edition. The 1908 RLDS edition restored the original repeated *a*, most probably by reference to  $\mathcal{P}$ . The LDS text has continued with the secondary reading that omits the repeated *a*.

In general, the indefinite article is repeated for the conjoined adjective in “a large and (a) <adjective> <noun>”, although interestingly the clear tendency in the history of the text has been to omit that repeated article at least once during the textual history for every example of this construction that originally had the repeated *a*. Besides the example in Mosiah 27:7, we have these three other examples:

Alma 46:3 (omitted in the 1840 edition)

now the leader of those which were wroth against their brethren  
was a large and [a 01ABDEFGHIJKLMNOQRST | C] strong man

Helaman 1:15 (omitted in the 1858 Wright edition)

and he was a large and [a 01ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOQRST | GHK] mighty man

Ether 1:34 (omitted in the 1852 LDS edition, also in the 1874 RLDS edition)

and the brother of Jared  
being a large and [a 1ABCDEGSPS | FHIJKLMNOQRT] mighty man . . .

On the other hand, when *large* is conjoined with *spacious*, the *a* is never repeated in the original text:

1 Nephi 8:9	a large and spacious field
1 Nephi 8:20	a large and spacious field
1 Nephi 11:35	a large and spacious building

In fact, whenever any adjective is conjoined with *spacious*, no determiner (such as *a*, *the*, or *many*) is ever repeated. For a list of these other examples involving *spacious*, see under 1 Nephi 11:35. For a general discussion, see under CONJUNCTIVE REPETITION in volume 3.

**Summary:** In accord with the reading of the earliest textual sources, restore the repeated *a* in Mosiah 27:7: “and they became a large and **a** wealthy people”.

■ Mosiah 27:11

*and as I said unto you  
as they were going about rebelling against God  
behold **the** angel of the Lord appeared unto them*

Joanne Case (personal communication, 20 December 2003) has suggested that use of the definite article *the* before *angel* in Mosiah 27:11 (“**the** angel of the Lord”) seems strange since this is the first time this angel (or any angel) has appeared to Alma. Case also notes that when this same angel appears to Alma later on in Alma 8, the text then uses the indefinite article *an*:

Alma 8:14–15  
and it came to pass that  
while Alma was thus weighed down with sorrow  
behold **an** angel of the Lord appeared unto him saying . . .  
for thou hast been faithful in keeping the commandments of God  
from the time which thou received thy first message from him  
behold I am he that delivered it unto thee

The original manuscript is not extant for either passage. One might wonder if the usage shouldn’t be reversed: *an* in the first case (in Mosiah 27:11) and *the* in the second case (in Alma 8:14).

A similar kind of variation is found in the Gospel of Matthew in the King James Bible, although the biblical text does not make it clear whether the angel of the Lord is the same angel in the three different dreams:

Matthew 1:20  
but while he thought on these things  
behold **the** angel of the Lord appeared unto him in a dream saying . . .

Matthew 2:13  
and when they were departed  
behold **the** angel of the Lord appeareth to Joseph in a dream saying . . .

Matthew 2:19–20  
but when Herod was dead  
behold **an** angel of the Lord appeareth in a dream to Joseph in Egypt saying . . .

This biblical usage in Matthew is strikingly similar to the usage in the Book of Mormon in that the first occurrence (as well as the second) refers to “**the** angel of the Lord” but the last one refers to “**an** angel of the Lord”. This similarity suggests that there is no need to emend the definite article in Mosiah 27:11 or the indefinite article in Alma 8:14.

In the Greek for the Gospel of Matthew, the biblical text never uses the definite article before *angel* when the angel of the Lord first appears to Joseph in any given dream. Each of these initial references should therefore be translated as “an angel of the Lord” (which is how they are translated in modern translations such as the Revised Standard Version and the New International Version). But when the angel of the Lord is referred to later within the same dream, then the definite article appears in the Greek and in the modern translations, as also in the King James text:

Matthew 1:24  
then Joseph being raised from sleep  
did as **the** angel of the Lord had bidden him

So the Greek usage is consistent in its choice of the article: there is no article when the angel first appears in a dream, but the definite article does occur for any subsequent reference to the angel in the same dream. (The lack of the article means indefiniteness since in the Greek of the time there was no explicit indefinite article like the English *a/an*.) On the other hand, the King James translation of the Greek is quite inconsistent in its choice of the article, as is the Book of Mormon text.

As far as the Hebrew of the Old Testament is concerned, David Calabro (personal communication) points out that the Hebrew expression is invariant and should be systematically translated as “the angel of the LORD”. Excluding the book of Judges, the King James Bible consistently reads “**the** angel of the LORD” (37 times). In Judges, on the other hand, we get variation: 13 cases of the correct “**the** angel of the LORD” but 6 of “**an** angel of the LORD”.

*Summary:* Maintain the mixture of “**the** angel of the Lord” and “**an** angel of the Lord” in the Book of Mormon text; such variation is also found in the King James translation: in the New Testament (but not in the original Greek) and in the book of Judges in the Old Testament (but not in the original Hebrew).

■ **Mosiah 27:13**

*for why [persecutith >% persecuteth 1 | persecuteth ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQS | persecutest NRT] thou the church of God*

As discussed under 1 Nephi 11:2, the manuscript evidence throughout the text suggests in the few cases where the verb for the subject pronoun *thou* takes the ending *-(e)th* that this ending is a textual error for the correct *-(e)st*. In this particular case, the *-eth* ending may have resulted from the fact that the following word *thou* begins with a *th* sound.

■ **Mosiah 27:13**

*and nothing shall overthrow it save it is the [transgressions >% transgression 1 | transgression ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] of my people*

Here scribe 2 of  $\mathcal{P}$  initially wrote “save it is the **transgressions** of my people”—that is, he wrote the plural *transgressions*. But he immediately corrected the text to the singular *transgression* by erasing the word-final plural *s*. In general, the earliest text allows either singular or plural forms for the noun *transgression*, with 31 of the singular and 13 of the plural. Scribe 2 of  $\mathcal{P}$  tended to accidentally write the plural in place of the singular, as noted in two out of the three other cases where he was required to copy the singular *transgression*:

Alma 3:6 (error immediately corrected by erasure)  
 because of their [transgressions >% transgression 1 |  
 transgression ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRT | transgression s]

Alma 9:23 (error corrected later when  $\mathcal{P}$  was proofed by Oliver Cowdery)  
 if they should fall into [§2 transgressions > §1 transgression 1 |  
 transgression ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]

Alma 10:19 (no error here in copying)  
 if the time should come that this people should fall into **transgression**

Elsewhere in the text, we consistently get the singular “transgression of X” when X refers to Adam and Eve eating the forbidden fruit in the garden (which was a single transgression):

2 Nephi 2:21	the transgression of <b>their parents</b>
Mosiah 3:11	the transgression of <b>Adam</b>
Alma 30:25	the transgression of <b>a parent</b>

More generally, we normally get the plural *transgressions* in the phrase “transgression(s) of X”, where X is semantically plural:

Mosiah 14:8	the transgressions of <b>my people</b>
Alma 11:40	the transgressions of <b>those</b> who believe on his name
Alma 34:8	the transgressions of <b>his people</b>

When we expand our search to include “their transgression(s)”, we find that the original text is evenly divided between the singular and plural:

- *their transgression*  
Mosiah 7:29, Alma 3:6, Alma 37:42, Helaman 4:26, 3 Nephi 5:12
- *their transgressions*  
Enos 1:10, Mosiah 15:9, Mosiah 15:12, Alma 7:13, Alma 9:14

The tendency in the transmission of the text has been to replace the singular with the plural, not only here in Mosiah 27:13 but also in Alma 3:6 and Alma 9:23 by scribe 2 of  $\mathcal{P}$  (see above) as well as once by Oliver Cowdery as he copied from  $\mathcal{C}$  into  $\mathcal{D}$ :

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* 0 | *transgressions* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST]

These more general results suggest that we should follow the earliest textual sources in determining whether *transgression* should be singular or plural when postmodified by a prepositional phrase headed by *of*.

**Summary:** Maintain in Mosiah 27:13 the singular form *transgression*, the immediately corrected reading in  $\mathcal{D}$  (“and nothing shall overthrow it save it is the **transgression** of my people”).

■ **Mosiah 27:14**

*behold the Lord hath heard*

- **the prayers of his people and also** 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST
- NULL CGHK

**the prayers of his servant Alma**

When the type for the 1840 edition was set for this passage, the words “the prayers of his people and also” were accidentally skipped. There is, of course, no reason to delete these words. The

compositor's eye must have skipped from the first case of "the prayers of his" to the second one. The 1908 RLDS edition restored the correct reading (probably by reference to  $\mathcal{P}$ ). The LDS text has always retained these words since its editions derive from the 1841 British edition, which was set from a copy of the 1837 edition, not the 1840 edition.

*Summary:* Maintain in Mosiah 27:14 the words "the prayers of his people and also"; the 1840 compositor accidentally skipped these words as he set the type.

#### ■ Mosiah 27:16

*go and remember the captivity of thy fathers  
in the land of [Helim >% Helem 1 | Helam ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]  
and in the land of Nephi  
and remember how great things he hath done for them  
for they were in bondage and he hath delivered them*

Here the earliest textual source, the printer's manuscript, reads *Helem*. Scribe 2 of  $\mathcal{P}$  initially misspelled the name as *Helim*, but then he immediately erased the *i* and overwrote the erasure with an *e*. This specific correction of the second vowel is a strong indicator that the original manuscript (not extant here) read *Helem*, not *Helam*. Based on the readings in chapters 18 and 23 of Mosiah, the spelling should be *Helam*, which is what the 1830 compositor set for this single occurrence of this name here in chapter 27.

As discussed under Mosiah 18:12–14 and Mosiah 23:19, Oliver Cowdery initially wrote every occurrence of the name *Helam* in Mosiah 18 and 23 as *Helaman*. For the three occurrences in Mosiah 18, Oliver's corrections to *Helam* (by crossing out the final *an*) appear to be virtually immediate. In Mosiah 23, on the other hand, the 11 occurrences of *Helaman* were all later corrected to *Helam*, again by crossing out the final *an* but now with heavier ink flow. One wonders then whether  $\mathcal{C}$  actually read *Helam* in Mosiah 18 and Mosiah 23. One possibility is that  $\mathcal{C}$  actually read *Helem* but that Oliver, when he corrected all his instances of *Helaman* in  $\mathcal{P}$  (by simply crossing out the final *an*), systematically neglected to restore the original second *e* vowel in *Helem* and thus ended up consistently replacing *Helem* with *Helam*. There is one later instance of this same name in the text, and that instance also reads *Helem* in  $\mathcal{P}$  (for this example,  $\mathcal{C}$  is unfortunately not extant):

Alma 24:1  
and it came to pass that the Amlicites and the Amulonites  
and the Lamanites which were in the land of Amulon and also in the land  
of [*Helem* >jg *Helam* 1 | *Helam* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] . . .

In this instance, John Gilbert (the 1830 typesetter) corrected  $\mathcal{P}$  by overwriting the second *e* in *Helem* with an *a*.

On the other hand, one could interpret these two later instances of *Helem* as scribal errors for *Helam*. The second vowel in this name is a stressless schwa; thus that vowel could have been easily misspelled in  $\mathcal{C}$ . We could assume that the first use of the name was spelled correctly as *Helam* (in Mosiah 18:12) but that later in Mosiah 27:16 Oliver (the probable scribe in  $\mathcal{C}$  for the latter part of the book of Mosiah) misspelled the name as *Helem*. We have indirect support for



this type of error in one other place in the original manuscript; in this instance, Oliver initially miswrote the name *Helaman* as *Heleman*:

Alma 46:1

and it came to pass that as many as would not hearken to the words of  
 [*Heleman* > *Helaman* 0 | *Helaman* 1 ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] and his brethren  
 were gathered together against their brethren

In this case, Oliver's correction was virtually immediate: there was no change in the level of ink flow when he overwrote the *e* with the correct *a*. Thus one could argue that in  $\mathcal{O}$  the name *Helam* could have been misspelled as *Helem* (at least in Mosiah 27:16 and in Alma 24:1). In addition, one could argue that the reason Oliver miswrote *Helaman* in Mosiah 18 and Mosiah 23 was that for those two chapters  $\mathcal{O}$  correctly read *Helam* rather than *Helem*.

This issue is further complicated by the fact that early on in the book of Mosiah there is another person whose name is spelled *Helem* in the printer's manuscript ( $\mathcal{O}$  is not extant here) and in all the printed editions:

Mosiah 7:6

and Ammon took three of his brethren  
 and their names were Amaleki **Helem** and Hem  
 and they went down into the land of Nephi

Once more, various hypotheses suggest themselves. For instance, perhaps this first occurrence of *Helem* is also an error for *Helam*—one might argue that the name was misspelled as *Helem* because the following name *Hem* began with an *h* and ended in *em*. It is also possible, of course, that there are simply two different names, *Helam* and *Helem*, in the Book of Mormon. In the text there are other nonbiblical names that are spelled differently and refer to different individuals but are pronounced the same (at least in English):

<i>Amaron</i>	Omni 1
<i>Ammoron</i>	Alma 52 — Helaman 1
<i>Ammaron</i>	4 Nephi 1 — Mormon 4
<i>Amoron</i>	Moroni 9
<i>Cezoram</i>	Helaman 5–6
<i>Seezoram</i>	Helaman 8–9

The text is also fairly balanced between Book of Mormon names ending in unstressed *am* and *em*; in addition to *Helam* versus *Helem*, there are five that end in *am* and four in *em*:

- *am* spellings: Cezoram, Luram, Seezoram, Zeram, Zoram
- *em* spellings: Ethem, Gazelem, Shelem, Sherem

(The names *Cezoram* and *Seezoram* may be compounds based on the name *Zoram*: *Ce+zoram* and *See+zoram*.) For the name *Ethem*, we find further evidence for scribal confusion over how to spell a final unstressed /əɪm/ syllable:

Ether 11:11

and [*Etham* > *Ethem* 1 | *Ethem* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]  
 being a descendant of Ahah  
 did obtain the kingdom

In this case, Oliver Cowdery initially wrote the name as *Etham*, but then almost immediately he crossed out the whole name and supralinearly inserted the correct *Ethem* (there is no change in the level of ink flow). The name *Ethem* occurs four other times in the book of Ether, and each of those other cases is correctly spelled in  $\mathcal{D}$  without variation as *Ethem* (none of these, including the one in Ether 11:11, are extant in  $\mathcal{C}$ ). The important point is that mix-ups have occurred in the manuscripts over whether to spell a final unstressed /əm/ syllable as *am* or *em*.

Ultimately, the question comes down to two possibilities: (1) we could emend the first 14 occurrences of *Helam* in Mosiah 18 and 23 to *Helem*, based on two later occurrences of *Helem* in  $\mathcal{D}$  (in Mosiah 27 and Alma 24); or (2) we could follow the 1830 typesetter in his emendation of the two later occurrences of *Helem* to the earlier *Helam*. In my opinion, the simplest solution is to maintain the spelling *Helam* since it is the earlier one and there are so many more instances that support *Helam* over *Helem*. Of course, this decision applies only to the *Helam* that Alma first baptized at the waters of Mormon (and after whom the city and the land *Helam* were apparently named). On the other hand, the earlier *Helem* (found in Mosiah 7) is the name of a different individual (one of Ammon's men). Thus the single occurrence of the name *Helem* for this particular individual will be maintained.

**Summary:** Accept the 1830 typesetter's decision to emend the spelling *Helem* in Mosiah 27:16 and Alma 24:1 to *Helam*; maintain the earlier spelling *Helem* in Mosiah 7:6 since this refers to a different person and can therefore have a different spelling.

#### ■ Mosiah 27:16

*and seek* [NULL >js not 1 | ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *to destroy the church no more*

Here in the printer's manuscript, while editing for the 1837 edition, Joseph Smith inserted a *not* but neglected to change the following *no* to *any*; thus in  $\mathcal{D}$  he ended up creating a multiple negative (which is definitely not characteristic of his editing for the 1837 edition). Joseph probably changed his mind here and decided not to make any change but then neglected to cross out the inserted *not*. In any event, this change was not implemented in the 1837 edition.

The use of *not* directly after the verb *seek* is fairly common in the text (with seven occurrences), as in Jacob 4:10: "seek not to counsel the Lord". But equally significant is the use of the adverbial phrase "no more" with the verb *seek* (with four occurrences besides the one in Mosiah 27:16):

Alma 36:9	seek no more to destroy the church of God
Alma 36:11	seek no more to destroy the church of God
Helaman 5:29	and seek no more to destroy my servants
Helaman 5:32	and seek no more to destroy my servants

The first two of these occurrences (in Alma 36) give Alma's account of his conversion; here in Mosiah 27, Mormon gives his abridged version of the same event. We note the basic difference in the placement of the adverbial phrase "no more": in Mosiah 27:16 it comes at the end of the clause, but in Alma 36:9, 11 it comes both times right after the verb. Thus the ultimate decision to reject the addition of the word *not* in the 1837 edition is appropriate since the original text for Mosiah 27:16 has the adverbial phrase "no more" and the original phraseology is very similar to the phraseology in Alma 36:9, 11.

*Summary:* Ignore Joseph Smith’s initial decision to insert a *not* after the verb *seek* in Mosiah 27:16; the original “seek to destroy the church no more” should be retained, especially since the adverbial phrase “no more” occurs in Alma’s own account of his conversion in Alma 36:9, 11.

#### ■ Mosiah 27:16

*that their prayers may* [ 1 | *be* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]  
 [*understood* > NULL 1 | ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *answered*

Here scribe 2 of  $\mathcal{P}$  initially wrote the wrong verb form, *understood*, which he immediately crossed out, and then wrote inline the correct verb form, *answered*. But in all of this, scribe 2 forgot to insert the necessary passive auxiliary *be*. And Oliver Cowdery apparently missed it when he proofed  $\mathcal{P}$  against  $\mathcal{C}$  for this passage. The 1830 typesetter added the necessary *be*. The use of the *be* is undoubtedly correct since similar language is found nearby in Mosiah 27:14 (“that the prayers of his servants might **be answered** according to their faith”) as well as further away in Mormon 9:37 (“that their prayers may **be answered** according to their faith”).

*Summary:* Accept the 1830 typesetter’s decision in Mosiah 27:16 to supply the helping verb *be* in the clause “that their prayers may **be answered**”.

#### ■ Mosiah 27:18

*and now Alma and those that were with him fell again to the earth*  
*for great* [*was* >]s *wer* 1 | *was* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *their astonishment*

Joseph Smith emended *was* to *were* here (with *were* spelled as *wer*). Perhaps he was influenced by the preceding *were* (“those that **were** with him fell again to the earth”). Since the subject for the original *was* is the singular noun phrase “their astonishment”, this initial emendation of *was* to *were* was never implemented in the actual 1837 edition. See verse 16 for a similar aborted emendation by Joseph Smith (in that case, an inserted *not*).

*Summary:* Maintain in Mosiah 27:18 the singular *was* in the clause “for great **was** their astonishment” (the reading of the earliest textual sources).

#### ■ Mosiah 27:18

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

Here we have a virtually immediate correction in  $\mathcal{P}$ , where scribe 2 supralinearly inserted the subordinate conjunction *that* (there is no change in the level of ink flow). Since either reading is possible in English, there is no strong motivation for scribe 2 to have edited the text here. Generally, the text has examples with and without *that*, as in the following parallel examples found in the same chapter of Alma:

Alma 30:39 “I know there is a God” (Alma speaking)

Alma 30:52 “and I always knew **that** there was a God” (Korihor speaking)

In all such cases where the *that* is optional in English, the critical text will follow the earliest textual sources. For further discussion as well as examples involving a variety of verbs, see under THAT in volume 3.

*Summary:* Maintain the subordinate conjunction *that* which was virtually immediately inserted in Mosiah 27:18 by scribe 2 of  $\mathcal{P}$ .

■ **Mosiah 27:19**

*and now the astonishment of Alma was so great  
that he became dumb  
that he could not open his mouth  
yea and he became weak  
even that he could not move his **hands**  
therefore he was taken by those that were with him  
and carried helpless even until he was laid before his father*

Ross Geddes has suggested (personal communication, 23 May 2004) that the word *hands* here in Mosiah 27:19 may be an error for *limbs*. If Alma’s only incapacity had been the inability to open his mouth and move his hands, one might think he should have been able to walk. The use of the *therefore* at the beginning of the following clause (“therefore he was taken . . . and carried helpless”) strongly suggests that he could not move at all and not simply because his hands could not move. Geddes also refers to the parallel account in Alma 36:10 in support of *limbs* rather than *hands* in describing Alma’s malady:

Alma 36:10  
and it came to pass that I fell to the earth  
and it was for the space of three days and three nights  
that **I could not open my mouth**  
neither had I the use of **my limbs**

Note, in particular, the same phraseology referring to Alma not being able to open his mouth (besides not being able to use his limbs).

Both Mosiah 27 and Alma 36 each have an additional reference to Alma’s incapacity; both refer to his total inability to speak or to move his limbs:

Mosiah 27:22–23  
and they began to fast and to pray to the Lord their God  
that he would **open the mouth of Alma**  
that he might speak  
and also that **his limbs** might receive their strength . . .  
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 and he stood up  
and began **to speak** unto them

Alma 36:23

but behold **my limbs** did receive their strength **again**  
and I stood upon my feet and **did manifest** unto the people  
that I had been born of God

These related verses support the hypothesis that the use of *hands* in Mosiah 27:19 could be a mistake for *limbs*. The original manuscript is not extant for Mosiah, but it may have read *limbs*. Both *hands* and *limbs* are visually similar (they have the same visual contour). Thus it is quite possible that scribe 2 of  $\mathcal{P}$ , when he copied the text from  $\mathcal{C}$  into  $\mathcal{P}$  for this passage, misread *limbs* as *hands*. (It is less feasible that *limbs* could have been misheard as *hands* when Joseph Smith dictated the text of Mosiah 27:19 to his scribe.) On the other hand, elsewhere in the manuscripts, we have no evidence of the noun *limb* ever being mixed up with *hand*, but of course, *limb* is quite infrequent in the text compared with *hand*; besides these examples involving Alma's conversion, *limb* occurs only three times in the text. Thus, the much higher frequency of *hands* may have led Oliver to write down *hands* rather than *limbs*.

David Calabro (personal communication) points out that there is another way to interpret the reading in Mosiah 27:19: namely, Alma became weak, so much so that he could not even move his hands; as a consequence of his extreme weakness, he had to be carried to his father. In other words, the reference to Alma's complete immobility is the result of his overall weakness rather than the more specific reference to his inability to move his hands. Since this interpretation of Mosiah 27:19 clearly works, the critical text will maintain the reading of all the textual sources: "even that he could not move his **hands**". There still remains the possibility that the original manuscript actually read "even that he could not move his **limbs**" and that scribe 2 of  $\mathcal{P}$  misread *limbs* as *hands* when he copied from  $\mathcal{C}$  into  $\mathcal{P}$ .

*Summary:* Maintain in Mosiah 27:19 the word *hands* in "yea and he became weak even that he could not move his **hands**"; Alma had to be carried because of his weakness, not because he couldn't move his hands; nonetheless, it is possible that the original text here read "yea and he became weak even that he could not move his **limbs**".

#### ■ Mosiah 27:22

*and they began to fast and to pray*

to [§2 their > §1 the 1 | the ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] Lord their God

Here in the printer's manuscript, scribe 2 wrote "**their** Lord their God", which Oliver Cowdery later corrected to "**the** Lord their God". Presumably, Oliver's correction occurred when he proofed  $\mathcal{P}$  against  $\mathcal{C}$ . There are two other examples where scribe 2 of  $\mathcal{P}$  made the same error except that in these two cases he caught his error and erased the final *ir* of the *their* that he initially wrote:

Mosiah 28:2

that they might also be brought to rejoice  
in [*their* >% *the* 1 | *the* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] Lord their God

Alma 9:19

after having had so much light and so much knowledge given unto them  
of [*their* >% *the* 1 | *the* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] Lord their God

In all three cases, scribe 2's error was the result of anticipating the following *their* in "their God". Also see under 1 Nephi 10:3 for a list of cases where Oliver Cowdery anticipated a following *their*.

The phrase "the Lord their God" is very frequent in the text, occurring 20 times in the book of Mosiah and 65 times overall. In addition, there are three other cases that refer to people praying "(un)to the Lord their God":

1 Nephi 7:21	that they would pray unto <b>the Lord their God</b>
Alma 62:51	and they did pray unto <b>the Lord their God</b> continually
3 Nephi 3:25	and they did put up their prayers unto <b>the Lord their God</b>

Theoretically, the reading "their Lord their God" could be an error for "their Lord and their God", but there are only two occurrences of this phraseology and they are both found far away in the last part of the text:

3 Nephi 19:18	and they did pray unto Jesus calling him <b>their Lord and their God</b>
4 Nephi 1:12	but they did walk after the commandments which they had received from <b>their Lord and their God</b>

Most probably the original text for Mosiah 27:22 read according to Oliver Cowdery's correction in  $\mathcal{P}$  ("the Lord their God"), not "their Lord and their God".

**Summary:** Maintain in Mosiah 27:22 Oliver Cowdery's corrected reading in  $\mathcal{P}$ , "the Lord their God" (the probable reading of the original manuscript).

#### ■ Mosiah 27:25

*yea men and women—all nations kindreds tongues and people—  
must be born again / yea born of God  
changed [§2 of >+ §1 from 1 | from ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] their carnal and fallen state  
to a state of righteousness*

Here scribe 2 of  $\mathcal{P}$  wrote "changed **of** their carnal and fallen state to a state of righteousness". The occurrence of the preposition *of* with the verb form *changed* seems to be an error, perhaps the result of the immediately preceding "born **of** God". Oliver Cowdery, apparently when he proofed  $\mathcal{P}$  against  $\mathcal{C}$ , replaced the preposition *of* with *from*, which agrees with usage elsewhere in the text:

Alma 12:20	and be changed <b>from</b> this mortal to an immortal state
3 Nephi 28:8	ye shall be changed . . . <b>from</b> mortality to immortality
3 Nephi 28:15	they were changed <b>from</b> this body of flesh into an immortal state

It is true that originally in English the preposition *of* meant 'from', so one could theoretically argue that the *of* here in Mosiah 27:25 is correct. But since *of* never occurs with the verb form *changed* elsewhere in the Book of Mormon text, it seems more reasonable to assume that *of* here is a scribal error rather than having the archaic sense of 'from'.

**Summary:** Accept in Mosiah 27:25 Oliver Cowdery's replacement in  $\mathcal{P}$  of *of* with *from* in "changed **from** their carnal and fallen state", which is probably the reading of the original manuscript (no longer extant here).

■ Mosiah 27:28

*nevertheless after [wadeing 1 | wandering ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQR | wading PST]  
 through much tribulation  
 repenting nigh unto death  
 the Lord in mercy hath seen fit to snatch me out of an everlasting burning*

Here the 1830 typesetter misread *wadeing* in  $\mathfrak{P}$  as *wandering*. The visual similarity as well as the semantic plausibility of either reading contributed to this error. In accord with the reading of the printer’s manuscript, the 1908 RLDS edition and the 1981 LDS edition restored the original *wading*. Clearly, either *wading* or *wandering* will work, but it is worth noting that the only other passage with similar language uses the verb *wade*:

Alma 8:14  
 and it came to pass that while he was journeying thither  
 being weighed down with sorrow  
**wading through much tribulation** and anguish of soul  
 because of the wickedness of the people . . .

*Summary:* Maintain the original verb form *wading* in Mosiah 27:28, the reading of the earliest textual source, here the printer’s manuscript.

■ Mosiah 27:29

*my soul hath been redeemed from the gall of bitterness  
 and [ 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMOPQRST | the N ] bonds of iniquity*

Here the earliest text is missing the repeated definite article *the* before the second conjunct in “from the gall of bitterness and bonds of iniquity”. The 1906 LDS large-print edition supplied the *the*; but since this edition never served as a copytext, the repeated *the* in this conjunct was not copied into any subsequent LDS edition. Elsewhere, references to “the gall of bitterness and (the) bonds of iniquity” repeat the definite article *the*:

Alma 41:11  
 all men that are in a state of nature or I would say in a carnal state  
 are **in the** gall of bitterness and **in the** bonds of iniquity

Mormon 8:31  
 for they are **in the** gall of bitterness and **in the** bonds of iniquity

Moroni 8:14  
 he that supposeth that little children needeth baptism  
 is **in the** gall of bitterness and **in the** bonds of iniquity

All three of these examples also repeat the preposition *in*, which means that these three cases are not exactly equivalent to Mosiah 27:29, which repeats neither the definite article *the* nor the preposition *from* (“from the gall of bitterness and bonds of iniquity”). The three other examples also more closely follow the biblical parallel:

Acts 8:23 (King James Bible)  
 for I perceive that thou art **in the** gall of bitterness and **in the** bond of iniquity



The repeated preposition *in* is in italics in the King James text, which means that the translators recognized that the repeated preposition is not in the original Greek of Acts 8:23. (In addition, the biblical text here has the singular *bond* rather than the plural *bonds*. The Book of Mormon consistently uses the plural phrases “the **bonds** of iniquity” and “the **bands** of iniquity” rather than the singular “the **bond** of iniquity” or “the **band** of iniquity”. See the discussion under Mosiah 23:12–13.) In any event, the preposition *in* and the definite article *the* are repeated in the biblical text and in the three Book of Mormon passages that follow it closely. The fact that both the preposition *from* and the article *the* are not repeated in Mosiah 27:29 suggests that the reading there is more paraphrastic. Although it is possible that a repeated *the* could have been lost in the early transmission of the text, the reading without the repetition will work and the critical text will therefore accept it. For additional discussion, see under CONJUNCTIVE REPETITION in volume 3.

**Summary:** Accept in Mosiah 27:29 the earliest reading “my soul hath been redeemed from the gall of bitterness and bonds of iniquity” — that is, without any repetition of either the preposition *from* or the definite article *the* before “bonds of iniquity”.

#### ■ Mosiah 27:29

*my soul was [wrecked 1ABCDEFGHJKPS | racked IJLMNOQRT] with eternal torment*

Here the printer’s manuscript reads *wrecked*, apparently an error for *racked*. The 1879 LDS edition made the emendation to *racked* for the LDS text, while the RLDS text has retained the earlier *wrecked*. This error probably occurred as the scribe in  $\mathcal{O}$  (presumably Oliver Cowdery here) mixed up /rækt/ with the phonetically similar /rɛkt/ as he took down Joseph Smith’s dictation. It is also possible that the error occurred when Oliver copied from  $\mathcal{O}$  into  $\mathcal{P}$ , especially if *racked* had been misspelled in  $\mathcal{O}$  as *wracked*. There are no extant examples of Oliver misspelling *rack* as *wrack* in the manuscripts. But we do have five examples of him misspelling *rent* as *wrent*, so the misspelling *wrack* for *rack* is theoretically possible. In any event, the verb or noun *wreck* never occurs in the Book of Mormon text (or in any of the scriptures, for that matter). On the other hand, in parallel passages in Alma 36, when Alma later explains these same events to his son Helaman, the text consistently uses the verb *rack* to refer to the torment that Alma suffered:

Alma 36:12	but I was <b>racked</b> with eternal torment
Alma 36:12	for my soul was harrowed up to the greatest degree and <b>racked</b> with all my sins
Alma 36:14	the very thoughts . . . did <b>rack</b> my soul with inexpressible horror
Alma 36:16	for three nights was I <b>racked</b> even with the pains of a damned soul
Alma 36:17	as I was thus <b>racked</b> with torment

There are also two other occurrences of the verb *rack* in the text:

Alma 26:9	these our dearly beloved brethren . . . would still have been <b>racked</b> with hatred against us
Mormon 9:3	when your souls are <b>racked</b> with a consciousness of your guilt

Clearly, the occurrence of *wrecked* in  $\mathcal{P}$  for Mosiah 27:29 is an error for *racked*.



*Summary:* In Mosiah 27:29, the original text undoubtedly read “my soul was **racked** with eternal torment”; most probably, the scribe in Ⓔ (presumably Oliver Cowdery) misheard Joseph Smith’s dictated /rækt/ as /rɛkt/ and thus spelled this verb form as *wrecked*, which was then copied as such into Ⓒ and ultimately into the 1830 edition.

■ **Mosiah 27:30**

*but [now 1AEIJLMNOPQRST | own BCDGHK | now > own F] that they may foresee that he will come . . .*

Here we have an 1837 typo that has been very difficult to remove from the text, even though it is clearly wrong and virtually nonsensical. This typo was copied into both the 1840 and 1841 editions. The 1849 LDS edition (edited by Orson Pratt) restored the correct *now*, probably as a result of simply realizing that *own* was a typo for *now*. Pratt did not have to refer to a copy of the 1830 edition to restore the original reading, although he may have. The first printing of the 1852 LDS edition had *now* (since its copytext was the 1849 edition), but incredibly the second printing restored the impossible *own* (by reference to the 1840 edition). Pratt restored the correct *now* a second time to the LDS text when he did the editing for the 1879 LDS edition. The correct *now* was finally restored to the RLDS text in 1908.

*Summary:* Maintain the original *now* in “but **now** that they may foresee that he will come”; despite the fact that the 1837 typo *own* is impossible, this reading was retained in the text for many 19th-century editions.

■ **Mosiah 27:30–32**

*but now that they may foresee*

- (1) [ 1AIJLMNOPQRST | *and* BCDGFKH ] *that he will come*
- (2) **and** *that he remembereth every creature of his creating*
- (3) [ & >js NULL 1 | *and* AQ | BCDGFKHIJKLNOPQRST | NULL > *and* M ]

*he will make himself manifest unto all*  
*—yea every knee shall bow and every tongue confess before him*  
*yea even at the last day when all men shall stand to be judged of him*  
*then shall they confess that he is God*  
*then shall they confess who live without God in the world*  
*that the judgment of an everlasting punishment is just upon them*  
*and they shall quake and tremble and shrink beneath the glance of his all-searching eye—*  
*and now it came to pass that Alma began from this time forward to teach the people . . .*

In this passage we have two variants involving the conjunction *and*. In the 1837 edition, an extra *and* was introduced before “that he will come” (listed above as 1); in addition, Joseph Smith removed the *and* before “he will make himself manifest unto all” (listed above as 3). It is possible that the introduction of the extra *and* may simply be a typo in the 1837 edition since the resulting reading doesn’t really make much sense, nor was this change marked by Joseph in his editing of Ⓒ (unlike the deletion of the *and*, which he did mark in Ⓒ). This extra *and* introduced in the 1837

edition was removed from the LDS text in 1879 (apparently by reference to the 1830 edition) and from the RLDS text in 1908 (apparently by reference to  $\mathcal{D}$ ).

The removal of the last *and* (listed above as 3) needs to be discussed more fully. The earliest text (the reading in  $\mathcal{D}$  and the 1830 edition) is clearly a difficult reading:

but now that they may foresee that he will come  
and that he remembereth every creature of his creating  
and he will make himself manifest unto all . . .

This passage could be interpreted as a Hebraistic construction, where initially we have a conjunctive subordinate clause (“that they may foresee that he will come and that he remembereth every creature of his creating”) followed by the main clause but with a Hebrew-like conjunctive *and* before the main clause (“and he will make himself manifest unto all”). For other examples of this kind of Hebraistic use of *and*, see the discussion under 1 Nephi 4:8–9 (for *when*-clauses) and under 1 Nephi 8:13 (for *as*-clauses); more generally, see under HEBRAISMS in volume 3.

This interpretation of the last clause in Mosiah 27:30 as a main clause seems to be behind Joseph Smith’s editing for the 1837 edition when he removed the *and*. For some reason, in the third printing in 1907 of the 1905 LDS missionary edition, the *and* was restored to the text (perhaps by reference to the 1830 edition), although one wonders why since the 1907 printing did not otherwise restore similar cases of *and* that had been deleted by Joseph in his editing for the 1837 edition. The 1907 decision was clearly a conscious one since the change was made in the stereotyped plates that had originally been made for the first printing in 1905. The 1911 LDS edition followed this reading (since it was typeset from a 1907 or later printing of the corrected stereotyped plates). In any event, the 1920 LDS edition removed the *and*, thus restoring Joseph’s 1837 reading.

But there is a problem with interpreting this strange initial sentence as a Hebraism—namely, the third clause does not appear to be a conclusion to the preceding dependent clause “that they may foresee . . .”. Instead, it seems to be one more example in a list of what may be foreseen. In fact, this third clause seems to be associated with the immediately preceding clause—that is, the text seems to be saying that they (the fathers) will foresee (1) that Christ will come and (2) that he will manifest himself unto all because he remembers every individual:

but now that they may foresee  
    (1) that he will come  
    (2a) and that he remembereth every creature of his creating  
    (2b) and he will make himself manifest unto all . . .

Immediately after this listing of what will be foreseen, Alma suddenly breaks off (at the beginning of verse 31) to declare that all will bow before the Lord (“yea every knee shall bow and every tongue confess before him”). Going on from there, Alma never does state what will be the result of the fathers foreseeing the coming of Christ and his manifesting himself to everyone. Ultimately this long sentence in verses 30–31 never achieves closure. Joseph Smith’s editing, of course, creates closure here in Mosiah 27:30 but seems to state that Christ’s manifesting himself unto all of his creation is somehow the result of the fathers’ foreseeing.

David Calabro (personal communication) suggests another possibility: perhaps the original text for Mosiah 27:30 involves elision of the phrase “I know”—that is, the meaning of the initial clause is as if the text read “but now I know that they may foresee”. This kind of awkward elision is quite rare in the Book of Mormon text; one similar possibility is the proposed elision of “shall be lifted up” in Mormon 8:28 (see the discussion there). But Calabro’s suggestion can be taken one step further: perhaps the original text in Mosiah 27:30 actually read that way:

Mosiah 27:30 (proposed emendation)

but now **I know** that they may foresee that he will come  
and that he remembereth every creature of his creating  
and he will make himself manifest unto all

Notice what this single emendation achieves. First of all, now we have closure and there is no need to delete the final *and* in this verse. Secondly, the text now forms a whole with Alma’s preceding language. In this part of his discourse, Alma makes three comparisons between his earlier sinful state and what has now happened to him as a result of his repentance:

Mosiah 27:29–30

- (1) I **was** in the darkest abyss  
**but now** I behold the marvelous light of God
- (2) my soul **was** racked with eternal torment  
**but** I am snatched and my soul is pained no more
- (3) I **rejected** my Redeemer and **denied** that which had been spoken of by our fathers  
**but now** I know that they may foresee that he will come  
and that he remembereth every creature of his creating  
and he will make himself manifest unto all

Each of these three comparisons begins with a past-tense statement and is immediately followed by a corresponding but contrastive present-tense statement. The conjunction *but* is consistently used to separate the pairs of contrastive statements. The first and third pairs also use the present-tense adverb *now* to emphasize Alma’s present state of repentance in comparison to his sinful past. Moreover, the third pair implies that earlier Alma denied the possibility that the Nephite fathers could have had revelations about the coming of a Savior, much like the apostates Sherem and Korihor also argued:

Jacob 7:7 (Sherem’s words)

and ye have led away much of this people  
that they pervert the right way of God  
and keep not the law of Moses which is the right way  
and convert the law of Moses into the worship of a being  
which ye say shall come many hundred years hence  
and now behold I Sherem declare unto you that this is blasphemy  
for no man **knoweth** of such things  
for he cannot tell of things to come

Alma 30:13–15 (Korihor’s words)

O ye that are bound down under a foolish and a vain hope  
 why do ye yoke yourselves with such foolish things  
 why do ye look for a Christ  
 for no man can **know** of any thing which is to come  
 behold these things which ye call prophecies  
 which ye say are handed down by holy prophets  
 behold they are foolish traditions of your fathers  
 how do ye **know** of their surety  
 behold ye cannot **know** of things which ye do not see  
 therefore ye cannot **know** that there shall be a Christ

The phrase “now I know” is fairly common in the text, where *now* is a present-tense adverb (I ignore those cases where *now* is used more as a sentence connector than as an adverb referring to the present):

1 Nephi 5:8 (Sariah speaking)

**now I know** of a surety that  
 the Lord hath commanded my husband to flee into the wilderness

Mosiah 7:14 (Limhi speaking)

**now I know** of a surety that  
 my brethren which was in the land of Zarahemla are yet alive

Alma 5:46 (Alma speaking)

behold I have fasted and prayed many days  
 that I might know these things of myself  
 and **now I do know** of myself that they are true  
 for the Lord God hath made them manifest unto me by his Holy Spirit

Alma 18:4, 11 (Lamoni speaking)

**now I know** that it is the Great Spirit  
 and he hath come down at this time to preserve your lives  
 that I might not slay you as I did your brethren . . .  
**now I surely know** that this is the Great Spirit

The probable reason for the proposed loss of *I know* from Mosiah 27:30 would be the visual similarity between *now* and *know*, which could have led to a visual skip when copying from  $\mathcal{O}$  into  $\mathcal{P}$ . We may conjecture that the original manuscript, not extant here, read “but **now I know** that they may foresee”. When scribe 2 of  $\mathcal{P}$  came to copy this phrase, he first wrote *but now* but then accidentally skipped over the *I know* since both end in *now*. There is also a similarity in contour between *but now* and *I know*. The letters *b* and *t* in *but now* have ascenders as do the letters *I* and *k* of *I know*.

Yet it should be pointed out that Oliver Cowdery, when he proofed  $\mathcal{P}$  against  $\mathcal{O}$ , did not catch this proposed loss of *I know*. One possible reason for this is that the *know* in  $\mathcal{O}$  could have been accidentally misspelled as *now* (as “but now I now”). If so, the chances of skipping from one *now* to a second *now* would be quite high. In fact, when copying the text here, scribe 2 of  $\mathcal{P}$  might have assumed that “but now I now” was some kind of dittography, which he then simplified to

simply “but now”. (Similarly, Oliver could have accepted the reading “but now” in  $\mathcal{D}$  since “but now I now” in  $\mathcal{G}$  might have seemed simply inexplicable rather than an error for “but now I know”.)

In support of the possible misspelling *know* as *now* in the original manuscript, there are a number of cases in  $\mathcal{G}$  where the scribes initially spelled *know* or inflected forms of *know* without the initial *k*. In all cases but one, the scribes caught their error:

□ scribe 3 of  $\mathcal{G}$ :

1 Nephi 4:36	that the jews might Not [ <i>now</i> > <i>know</i> o] concerning our flight
1 Nephi 9:5	i [ <i>now</i> > <i>know</i> ] Not
1 Nephi 9:6	but the lord <b>noweth</b> all things

□ Oliver Cowdery in  $\mathcal{G}$ :

Alma 35:5	did not let the People [ <i>now</i> > <i>know</i> ] concerning their desires
Alma 40:4	no one [ <i>noes</i> > <i>knoes</i> ] but God knoweth
Alma 46:27	& now who [ <i>noweth</i> > <i>koweth</i> ]

Presumably, Oliver Cowdery was the scribe in  $\mathcal{G}$  for Mosiah 27:30.

The critical text will emend the text here in Mosiah 27:30 to read “but now **I know** that they may foresee that he will come”. This conjectural emendation readily clears up the many difficulties with the current reading. And we can explain the loss of *I know* as a visual skip from the end of *but now* to the end of *I know* in  $\mathcal{G}$ , perhaps as an attempt to deal with an inexplicable reading in  $\mathcal{G}$ : “but now I **now**”.

**Summary:** Emend Mosiah 27:30 by adding *I know* so that the initial clause reads “but now **I know** that they may foresee that he will come”; this emendation clears up the difficulties that the earliest reading and its edited readings have posed for readers in deciphering the larger passage; thus the *and* that Joseph Smith deleted in his editing for the 1837 edition should be restored (“**and** he will make himself manifest unto all”); in addition, the intrusive *and* before “that he will come” (which was accidentally inserted in the 1837 edition and later removed from the LDS and RLDS texts) can be ignored.

### ■ Mosiah 27:32

*and now it came to pass that Alma began from this time forward to teach the people and those [that > which >js who 1 | which A | who BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] were with Alma at the time the angel appeared unto them*

Scribe 2 of  $\mathcal{D}$  initially wrote *those that*; but before crossing the *t*’s for *that*, he deleted the *that* and then wrote inline the alternative relative pronoun *which*. This immediate correction is undoubtedly the reading of the original manuscript. Both readings are possible for the Book of Mormon. For a similar example of a mix-up between the relative pronouns *which* and *that* (but in Oliver Cowdery’s copywork), see under Mosiah 5:6. For more general discussion, see under WHICH in volume 3.

**Summary:** Accept scribe 2’s immediate correction of *that* to *which* in  $\mathcal{D}$ ; since either reading is possible, the corrected reading in  $\mathcal{D}$  is undoubtedly the reading of the original manuscript.

## ■ Mosiah 27:33

*but notwithstanding all this  
they did impart much consolation to the church  
confirming their faith and exhorting them  
with long-suffering and much [travel 1 | travail ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]  
to keep the commandments of God*

Here in Mosiah 27:33, the 1830 typesetter’s interpretation of *travel* (the reading in  $\mathfrak{P}$ ) as *travail* is correct and will be retained in the critical text. For the textual evidence, see the discussion of this issue under 2 Nephi 29:4.

## ■ Mosiah 27:35

*and [after >js NULL 1 | after A | BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]  
they [had >js NULL 1 | had A | BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] 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  
confessing all their sins  
and publishing all the things which they had seen  
and explaining the prophecies and the scriptures  
to all who desired to hear them  
and thus they were instruments in the hands of God  
in bringing many to the knowledge of the truth  
yea to the knowledge of their Redeemer*

In this long passage, the original text has a long subordinate clause that is never completed. In his editing for the 1837 edition, Joseph Smith eliminated the lack of closure by deleting the subordinate conjunction *after* at the beginning of the passage. As discussed above under Enos 1:3, the earliest text sometimes fails to achieve closure. Although such usage is unacceptable in modern discourse structure, it is found fairly often in the original text of the Book of Mormon and will therefore be maintained in the critical text.

In this passage, after deleting the *after*, Joseph Smith also deleted the perfective auxiliary form *had* so that the resulting sentence would fit better with the past-tense forms of the overall narrative, as in the preceding text: “they **did impart** much consolation to the church . . . these **were** the names of the sons of Mosiah” (Mosiah 27:33–34). The critical text will, of course, restore the perfective usage since this is how the earliest textual sources read.

**Summary:** Restore the original subordinate clause with its perfective auxiliary in Mosiah 27:35 (“and **after** they **had** traveled throughout all the land of Zarahemla”), despite the fact that this construction never achieves closure.

# Mosiah 28

## ■ Mosiah 28:1

*they took a small number with them  
and returned to their father the king  
and desired of him that he would grant unto them  
that they might with [those 1PS | these ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] whom they had selected  
go up to the land of Nephi*

Here the 1830 typesetter replaced *those* with *these*, perhaps because these other individuals were also present (or at least were in the immediate vicinity: “they took a small number with them”). The phrase *these whom* occurs elsewhere only in 3 Nephi 19:20. Here Jesus is referring to the twelve that he has chosen, and they are nearby as he is praying; thus *these* is appropriate:

3 Nephi 19:20

Father I thank thee that thou hast given the Holy Ghost  
unto **these whom** I have chosen

Yet even in this case, Jesus could have used the more remote determiner *those*: “I thank thee that thou hast given the Holy Ghost unto **those whom** I have chosen”. The phrase *those whom* is clearly possible. In addition, there are two other instances of *those whom* in the original text:

Alma 60:33

if **those whom** ye have appointed your governors  
do not repent of their sins and iniquities  
ye shall go up to battle against them

Ether 9:5

and he applied unto **those whom** he had sworn by the oath of the ancients

There are at least 30 places in the text where *these* and *those* have been mixed up at some time during the transmission of the text. In virtually every case, either determiner would work. Here are five other examples where the 1830 typesetter is clearly the one responsible for the mix-up:

Alma 24:10 (1830 change from *these* to *those*)

he hath forgiven us  
of [*these* 1 | *those* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] our many sins

Alma 39:19 (1830 change from *those* to *these*)

for the Lord to send his angel  
to declare [*those* 01 | *these* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] glad tidings unto us

Alma 50:2 (1830 change from *those* to *these*; also Oliver Cowdery initially in  $\mathcal{P}$ )  
 and upon the top  
 of [*those* 0 | *these* > *those* 1 | *these* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] ridges of earth  
 he caused that there should be timbers

Alma 60:16 (1830 change from *those* to *these*)  
 were it not for [*those* 01PS | *these* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] kingmen

3 Nephi 19:28 (1830 change of *these* to *those*;  $\mathcal{C}$  is extant here and reads *these*)  
 Father I thank thee  
 that thou hast purified [*these* 01PS | *those* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]  
 which I have chosen because of their faith

Since either demonstrative determiner will work in all these cases (including the one in Mosiah 28:1), it is quite possible that all six changes were accidental rather than intentional. We should also note that there are two additional cases where either the 1830 typesetter or Oliver Cowdery (the scribe in  $\mathcal{P}$ ), is the one responsible for mixing up these two determiners: 3 Nephi 1:22 and 3 Nephi 10:17. See the discussion under each of those passages.

The critical text will rely on the earliest textual sources for determining whether the plural demonstrative determiner should be *these* or *those*. Here in Mosiah 28:1, the earliest source is the printer's manuscript and it reads *those*. The 1908 RLDS edition restored the original *those* to the RLDS text, but the LDS text has maintained the 1830 *these*.

**Summary:** In accord with the reading of the printer's manuscript, restore *those* in Mosiah 28:1 ("that they might with **those** whom they had selected go up to the land of Nephi").

■ **Mosiah 28:2**

*that perhaps they **might** bring them to the knowledge of the Lord their God  
 and convince them of the iniquity of their fathers  
 and that perhaps they **might** cure them of their hatred towards the Nephites  
 that they **might** also be brought to rejoice in the Lord their God  
 that they **might** become friendly to one another  
 and that there **should** be no more contentions in all the land  
 which the Lord their God [*hath* >js *had* 1 | *hath* A | *had* BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] given them*

In standard English we expect the past-tense subjunctive form *had* following conditional modals like *might* and *should*, which are historically past-tense subjunctive forms. Joseph Smith, in his editing for the 1837 edition for this passage, made the change from the original present-tense *hath* to the past-tense *had*. Elsewhere the text uses only present-tense forms of the perfect auxiliary *have* when referring to the Lord's having given the land as a land of inheritance:

Enos 1:10  
 I will visit thy brethren  
 according to their diligence in keeping my commandments  
 I **have** given unto them this land and it is a holy land



3 Nephi 15:13

and behold this is the land of your inheritance  
and the Father **hath** given it unto you

3 Nephi 21:22

and they shall come in unto the covenant  
and be numbered among this the remnant of Jacob  
unto whom I **have** given this land for 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

Of course, all of these examples are found in present-tense contexts, not past-tense conditional contexts. It is possible that in Mosiah 28:2 the *hath* in  $\mathcal{P}$  is an error for *had*. But since *hath* is strange yet not impossible, it seems more reasonable to assume that it is the original reading here in Mosiah 28:2. The critical text will assume as much and restore the difficult but earliest extant reading, “all the land which the Lord their God **hath** given them”. There is another example where the original text used the present-tense *hath* in a conditional context; in this instance, the *hath* was initially changed to *had* when Oliver Cowdery copied the text from  $\mathcal{C}$  into  $\mathcal{P}$ :

1 Nephi 3:18

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

*Summary:* Restore in Mosiah 28:2 the present-tense *hath* despite its difficulty (“that there should be no more contentions in all the land which the Lord their God **hath** given them”).

### ■ Mosiah 28:3

*yea even the very thoughts that any soul should endure endless torment  
did cause them to quake and tremble*

In current English we expect the singular phrase “the very thought” rather than the plural “the very thoughts” (the reading here in Mosiah 28:3). There is one another example of “the very thought(s)” in the Book of Mormon text. There too the original text read in the plural:

Alma 36:14

yea and in fine so great had been my iniquities  
that the very [*thoughts* 01ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPS | *thought* CGHKRT]  
of coming into the presence of my God  
did rack my soul with inexpressible horror

In this case, the 1840 edition introduced the singular reading, but this reading did not enter the LDS text until 1920. The 1908 RLDS edition restored the plural to the RLDS text since  $\mathcal{P}$  reads in

the plural. Likewise, the critical text will restore the original plural *thoughts* to Alma 36:14 and retain the plural use in Mosiah 28:3.

*Literature Online* <lion.chadwyck.com> provides many examples of “the very thoughts”, with most of them occurring in the 1600s and 1700s, but there are also some examples from the late 1500s and the first half of the 1800s. Here are some examples (with regularized spelling) by well-known writers where we would expect the singular in modern English:

William Shakespeare (1594)

O how this villainy doth fat me with **the very thoughts of it**

John Bunyon (1682)

he counted **the very thoughts of goodness** the most burdensome thing in the world

Daniel Defoe (1719)

but I discovered so much abhorrence at **the very thoughts of it**

*Summary:* Maintain the plural *thoughts* in the phrase “the very thoughts” here in Mosiah 28:3; the plural will also be restored in Alma 36:14.

■ **Mosiah 28:4**

*nevertheless they suffered much anguish of soul because of their iniquities*

[& 1 | *and* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQS | RT] *suffering much*

[ 1 ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQS | *and* RT] *fearing that they should be cast off forever*

The editors for the 1920 LDS edition shifted the position of the conjunction *and* in order to eliminate the difficulty of parsing what could be interpreted as two improperly connected participial clauses at the end of this sentence. There may indeed be some primitive error in the printer’s manuscript (the earliest extant reading here), but there is also evidence that the earliest reading could be the original reading.

Note first of all that the 1920 editing for this verse creates an oddity in that the resulting text refers simply to “suffering much”. There are 11 other occurrences in the text of “suffering much”, but in each case there is always some additional information as to what the suffering is. Sometimes the word *much* is adverbial, other times adjectival (in which case there is a following noun):

- 1 Nephi 16:19 they did suffer much for the want of food
- 1 Nephi 16:35 and we have suffered much afflictions hunger thirst and fatigue
- 1 Nephi 17:6 notwithstanding we had suffered many afflictions  
and much difficulty
- 1 Nephi 18:17 and having suffered much grief because of their children
- 2 Nephi 1:24 yea and he hath suffered much sorrow because of you
- 2 Nephi 2:1 thou hast suffered afflictions and much sorrow
- Mosiah 21:11 but they were driven back again suffering much loss
- Mosiah 28:4 nevertheless they suffered much anguish of soul
- Alma 17:5 they did suffer much both in body and in mind
- Alma 25:6 after having suffered much loss and so many afflictions
- Alma 60:28 we have suffered so much loss

The earliest reading at the end of Mosiah 28:4 seems to mean that ‘they suffered much fear that they should be cast off forever’. Of course, the text has the gerundive form *fearing* rather than the basic noun form *fear*. However, there are examples in the text where a gerundive noun does follow *much*:

3 Nephi 2:10  
notwithstanding the **much preaching and prophesying**  
which was sent among them

3 Nephi 4:14  
and being weary because of his **much fighting**  
he was overtaken and slain

Thus one way to interpret *fearing* in Mosiah 28:4 is as a gerundive noun (meaning ‘fear’) rather than as a present participle.

The use of the *and* before “suffering much” separates off the participial clause, yet the *and* does give the sense of ‘also’. The original text here is not that difficult to process and has been kept unchanged in the RLDS editions. It should also be noted that the original text had several examples of this same kind of separated present participial clause at the end of the sentence, as in the following nearby examples:

Mosiah 23:13–14  
even so I desire that ye should stand fast in this liberty  
wherewith ye have been made free  
and that ye trust no man to be a king over you  
**and also trusting** no one to be your teachers nor your ministers  
except he be a man of God

Mosiah 28:20  
he took the plates of brass and all the things which he had kept  
and conferred them upon Alma which was the son of Alma  
yea all the records and also the interpreters  
and conferred them upon him  
**and commanding** him that he should keep and preserve them

Notice, in particular, how the example in Mosiah 23:13–14 first uses the verb *trust* as a finite verb (“that ye should trust no man”), then follows it with the present participial *trusting* (“and also trusting no one”). Similarly, here in Mosiah 28:4, we first have the finite verb *suffered* (“they suffered much anguish”), which is then followed by the present participial *suffering* (“and suffering much fearing”). For other examples of this kind of separated present participial usage, see the discussion under Mosiah 23:13–14.

**Summary:** Restore the earliest reading in Mosiah 28:4, with the *and* before *suffering* but not before *fearing*; the word *fearing* should be interpreted as a gerundive noun meaning ‘fear’, not as the head of a present participial clause.

## ■ Mosiah 28:5

*and it [came 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST | did come HK] to pass that  
they did plead with their father many days  
that they might go up [to 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST | H | NULL > to K] the land of Nephi*

Here the 1874 RLDS edition accidentally introduced two errors into the text. First, *came* was replaced with *did come*, probably because of the following *did plead*. The 1892 RLDS edition followed this reading, but the 1908 RLDS edition restored the original *came* to the RLDS text. Theoretically, either *came* or *did come* is possible, but “it did come to pass” actually occurs only once in the original Book of Mormon text (in Helaman 11:20: “and thus it **did come** to pass that the people of Nephi began to prosper again in the land”). The 1874 RLDS edition made a similar error later on in the text:

Ether 2:6

*and it [came 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST | did come HK] to pass that  
they did travel in the wilderness*

The second change in the 1874 RLDS edition for Mosiah 28:5 involved the loss of *to* in “to the land of Nephi”. The resulting typo (which creates the very odd “that they might go up the land of Nephi”) was originally copied as such into the 1892 RLDS edition but was later corrected in that edition.

**Summary:** Maintain in Mosiah 28:5 the original *came* in “it came to pass” as well as the *to* in “go up to the land of Nephi”.

## ■ Mosiah 28:6

*[And >js NULL 1 | And ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST]  
[it came to pass that >js NULL 1 | it came to pass that A | BCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST]  
king Mosiah went and inquired of the Lord*

Here Joseph Smith accidentally crossed out the *and* when he crossed out the “it came to pass” phrase in his editing for the 1837 edition. The 1837 edition itself retained the *and* since some sort of connective element is expected. For a similar example where Joseph Smith initially deleted the *and* when he crossed out “it came to pass”, see Mosiah 22:9–10. For a general discussion of Joseph’s occasional removal of “it came to pass”, see under COME TO PASS in volume 3. The critical text will restore all original instances of “it came to pass” that have been deleted from the standard text.

**Summary:** Restore in Mosiah 28:6 the instance of “and it came to pass” that Joseph Smith deleted in his editing for the 1837 edition.

■ **Mosiah 28:6**

*and it came to pass that king Mosiah went and inquired of the Lord  
if he [should 1APRST | would BCDEFGHIJKLMNOQ] let his sons  
go up among the Lamanites to preach the word*

Here the 1837 edition replaced the modal original *should* with *would*, with the result that the meaning of the text was altered. With *should*, the pronoun *he* most naturally refers to king Mosiah; but with *would*, the pronoun *he* refers to the Lord. The 1908 RLDS and 1920 LDS editions restored the original *should*. The 1837 change was probably accidental.

**Summary:** Maintain the modal auxiliary *should* in Mosiah 28:6; the question is whether king Mosiah should let his sons go preach to the Lamanites.

■ **Mosiah 28:10**

*for there was not any of his sons which would accept of the kingdom*

One may wonder here if the prepositional verb “accept of” is correct. In modern English we expect “accept the kingdom” rather than “accept of the kingdom”. There is only one other occurrence of the verb *accept* in the Book of Mormon, and its complement reads without the preposition *of*:

3 Nephi 9:19  
for I will accept none of your sacrifices and your burnt offerings

But there are a few examples of “accept of” in the King James Bible:

Genesis 32:20  
peradventure he will accept of me  
Leviticus 26:41 (similarly in verse 43)  
and they then accept of the punishment of their iniquity

The 1952 Revised Standard Version, for instance, translates the Genesis passage into modern English as “perhaps he will accept me” — that is, without any *of*. The Oxford English Dictionary, under the verb *accept*, indicates that for some senses the word “*accept* is frequently followed by *of*”, as in these examples:

Thomas North (1580)  
They sent defiance to each other . . .  
Both of them accepted of it.

Thomas Jefferson (1792)  
There are some hopes they will accept of peace.

Thus there is nothing inappropriate about the phraseology “accept of” in Mosiah 28:10.

**Summary:** Accept in Mosiah 28:10 the use of *of* in “for there was not any of his sons which would accept of the kingdom”.

■ **Mosiah 28:11**

*therefore he took the records which were engraven  
[upon 1A | on BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] the plates of brass  
and also the plates of Nephi*

The 1837 edition replaced the preposition *upon* with *on* (accidentally, it would seem). The Book of Mormon text definitely prefers the preposition *upon* when referring to the act of engraving (up)on plates. Even so, all but three of the examples with *upon* are found in the small plates of Nephi. In fact, the small plates have no examples with *on*, only 23 examples with *upon*:

- *the small plates of Nephi*
  - “to engrave(n) **upon** plates”      23 times
  - “to engrave(n) **on** plates”      0 times

Elsewhere the usage is almost evenly divided between *upon* and *on* (here I include Mosiah 28:11):

- *Mormon’s abridgment of the large plates of Nephi*
  - “to engrave(n) **upon** plates”      3 times
  - “to engrave(n) **on** plates”      5 times

Since either *upon* or *on* is possible with the verb *engrave(n)*, the critical text will in each case follow the earliest reading (thus *upon* here in Mosiah 28:11).

There are four preceding occurrences of “engraven on plates” in the book of Mosiah, which may explain why the 1837 compositor set *on* in Mosiah 28:11 instead of the original *upon*:

- Mosiah 1:3      the records which were engraven **on** the plates of brass
- Mosiah 1:16      the records which were engraven **on** the plates of brass
- Mosiah 10:16      the records which were engraven **on** the plates of brass
- Mosiah 21:27      and they were engraven **on** plates of ore

Except for the preposition *on*, the first three read precisely the same as in Mosiah 28:11; thus the change to *on* in Mosiah 28:11 is not surprising. The 1837 compositor made the same error of changing *upon* to *on* in one other place:

- Mormon 1:4
  - and ye shall engrave [*upon* 1APS | *on* BCDEFGHIJKLMNOQRT] the plates of Nephi
  - all the things that ye have observed concerning this people

The 1908 RLDS edition restored the original *upon* in Mormon 1:4 but not in Mosiah 28:11. Of course, *upon* itself is archaic for modern English speakers, which may be another reason the 1837 compositor accidentally replaced *upon* with *on* in Mosiah 28:11 and Mormon 1:4.

**Summary:** Restore the original preposition *upon* in Mosiah 28:11 (“the records which were engraven **upon** the plates of brass”), similarly for Mormon 1:4 (“ye shall engrave **upon** the plates of Nephi”).

## ■ Mosiah 28:11–12

*therefore he took the records  
 which were engraven upon the plates of brass and also the plates of Nephi  
 and all the things which he had kept and preserved  
 according to the commandments of God  
 [ 1 |, ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST ]  
 [& >]s NULL 1 | and A | BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST ] 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 delivered to him by the hand of Limhi  
 and this he done because of the great anxiety of his people . . .*

The *and* that was originally at the beginning of the *after*-clause was removed by Joseph Smith in his editing for the 1837 edition. But no matter what one does, Mormon’s text here ends up creating an incomplete thought. At the beginning of this verse, in reference to king Mosiah, Mormon writes “therefore he took the records”; but then Mormon gets diverted from telling us what Mosiah did with the records and starts discussing the translation of the Jaredite record. Finally, in verse 20 Mormon returns to his original idea that he introduced at the beginning of verse 11 and completes what he originally wanted to say about Mosiah transferring all the records to Alma:

Mosiah 28:20

And now as I said unto you  
 that after king Mosiah had done these things  
 he took the plates of brass and all the things which he had kept  
 and conferred them upon Alma which was the son of Alma

The removal of the *and* from before the *after*-clause in verse 11 doesn’t really help anyway since verses 11–19 lead to a diversion from what Mormon originally intended to say. One advantage of keeping the *and* is that it forces the reader to keep waiting for some semantic closure (which finally comes in verse 20). In the original Book of Mormon chapter system, verse 20 occurred at the beginning of a chapter (namely, Mosiah XIII). When Orson Pratt versified the LDS text for the 1879 edition and redid the chapter system, he put the first part of the original chapter XIII at the end of his new chapter 28. Apparently, his idea was to make sure that the topic introduced in verse 11 of his chapter 28 would be semantically completed within the same chapter.

**Summary:** Restore the *and* in Mosiah 28:11; this additional *and* helps to maintain the incomplete nature of the textual diversion in verses 11–19; only in verse 20 is the topic that Mormon introduced in verse 11 finally completed.

## ■ Mosiah 28:16

*and whosoever has [§2 the > §1 these 1 | these ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST ] things  
 is called seer*

Scribe 2 of  $\mathcal{P}$  here wrote *the things*, which Oliver Cowdery later corrected to *these things*, probably when he proofed  $\mathcal{P}$  against  $\mathcal{G}$ . It is possible that Oliver’s correction is due to editing on his

part, but it is not unreasonable to assume that the original text (and  $\mathcal{O}$  itself) read *these things* (in other words, Oliver corrected  $\mathcal{P}$  to agree with  $\mathcal{O}$ ). Elsewhere in the text, *the things* is always postmodified (usually by a relative clause or a prepositional phrase)—except in a single case:

Mosiah 8:13

now Ammon saith unto him  
 I can assuredly tell thee O king  
 of a man that can translate the records  
 for he hath wherewith that he can look  
 and translate all records that are of ancient date  
 and it is a gift from God  
 and **the things** are called interpreters  
 and no man can look in them except he be commanded  
 lest he should look for that which he had not ought and he should perish  
 and whosoever is commanded to look in them  
 the same **is called seer**

What is striking here is that this passage deals with the very same topic as Mosiah 28:16—namely, the interpreters, “those two stones which was fastened into the two rims of a bow” (Mosiah 28:13). Both passages state that the person using the interpreters “is called seer” (note that these passages do not read “is called **a** seer”, which is what we expect in modern English). And most strikingly, Mosiah 8:13 uses *the things* to refer to the interpreters, not *these things*—which is precisely what scribe 2 of  $\mathcal{P}$  wrote in Mosiah 28:16: “and whosoever has **the things** is called seer”. The obvious similarity of these two passages strongly suggests that *the things* is the correct reading in Mosiah 28:16.

In the discussion under Jacob 1:1, I listed many cases where the scribes mixed up *the* and *these*. In the list, I provided the only example where scribe 2 of  $\mathcal{P}$  seems to have mixed up *the* and *these*—namely, here in Mosiah 28:16! So if  $\mathcal{O}$  actually read *the things* in Mosiah 28:16 and scribe 2 of  $\mathcal{P}$  copied it correctly, then we have no examples where scribe 2 mixed up *these* and *the*. Instead, the problem would seem to have been Oliver Cowdery’s, not scribe 2’s. One possibility then is that Oliver mistakenly thought that *the things* was wrong in Mosiah 28:16 since this is the very kind of error he himself was used to making—and usually correcting. So maybe Oliver changed *the things* to *these things* in  $\mathcal{P}$  even though  $\mathcal{O}$  read *the things*. Further, we should note that earlier in Mosiah 28:14, there is an example of *these things*:

Mosiah 28:14

now **these things** was prepared from the beginning  
 and was handed down from generation to generation  
 for the purpose of interpreting languages

Thus it is quite possible that Oliver’s correction later in verse 16 was triggered by this preceding occurrence of *these things*. Notice that in Mosiah 8:13 there is no nearby preceding *these things* to prompt any such change in *the things* found there. Of course, one could argue the opposite: namely, the preceding occurrence of *these things* in Mosiah 28:14 means that verse 16 should also read *these things*. In fact, one could go further: the occurrence of *the things* in Mosiah 8:13 may be a mistake for *these things*; that is, the original text there read “and **these things** are called interpreters”.

Ultimately, it is very difficult to decide the original reading for either Mosiah 8:13 or Mosiah 28:16. Of some importance here, I believe, is the following: except for here in Mosiah 28:16 there



is no evidence that scribe 2 of  $\mathcal{P}$  ever mixed up *these* and *the*; on the other hand, Oliver Cowdery had a persistent problem with these two determiners (there are 11 clear examples listed in the discussion under Jacob 1:1). In addition, the similarity between Mosiah 8:13 and Mosiah 28:16 is striking. The critical text will therefore assume that both passages originally read *the things* and that Oliver Cowdery edited *the things* to *these things* in Mosiah 28:16, being prompted by the earlier occurrence of *these things* two verses earlier (namely, in Mosiah 28:14).

**Summary:** Restore *the things* in Mosiah 28:16, which is what scribe 2 wrote in  $\mathcal{P}$ ; this reading is supported by the use of *the things* in Mosiah 8:13, a passage that deals with the very same topic; Oliver Cowdery apparently emended *the things* to *these things* in Mosiah 28:16 because the preceding text in Mosiah 28:14 read *these things*.

■ **Mosiah 28:17**

*now after Mosiah had finished translating these records  
 behold it gave an account of the people which was destroyed  
 from the time that they were destroyed  
 back to the building of the great tower  
 at the time the Lord confounded the language of the people  
 and they were scattered abroad upon the face of all the earth  
 yea and even from that time*  
 [ 1ABCDEFHGHIJKLMNOPQS | back RT ] *until the creation of Adam*

The editors for the 1920 LDS edition added a second instance of the adverb *back* in this passage, apparently because they wanted to make sure that readers would understand that this use of “from time X until event Y” went backwards in time. Earlier this verse explicitly uses the adverb *back* for an initial instance of “from time X to event Y” (namely, “from the time that they were destroyed **back** to the building of the great tower”). One could argue that with already one instance of *back*, the text does not need to repeat the *back* later on in the same passage (the use of “yea and even” would imply as much). On the other hand, it is also possible that the original text actually had a second *back* in this passage and that it was somehow lost during the early transmission of the text. Yet there is no evidence elsewhere in the text for the loss or addition of the word *back*.

There is one other place in the text where we have a case of reversed sequencing of events, and in that instance there is no *back* either, not even earlier in the passage:

Helaman 8:16  
 and now behold Moses did not only testify of these things  
 but also all the holy prophets  
**from** his day even **to** the days of Abraham

The text here refers to all the holy prophets from Moses to Abraham. Yet Abraham preceded Moses, just as the day of creation preceded the tower of Babel. Helaman 8:16 thus provides an independent example of reversed sequencing of events—and without any preceding use of *back* to help the reader. Instead, the reader is simply required to figure out the sequencing from general knowledge. Note further that in Helaman 8:16 the 1920 LDS edition did not insert a *back* (which

would have given “from his day even **back** to the days of Abraham”). The probable reason for not inserting the word *back* in Helaman 8:16 was because the editors were not prompted to do so by any preceding occurrence of *back* in that passage. In Mosiah 28:17, on the other hand, the use of *back* earlier in the verse provided the impetus for making the emendation.

The critical text will therefore reject the extra *back* that was inserted in Mosiah 28:17; the example from Helaman 8:16 shows that readers are expected to figure out whether the sequence of events is reversed or not. The general case in the text is that the sequencing of events goes forward in time, and in most of these instances the adverb *down* is used, as in the following sampling:

1 Nephi 5:13

and also the prophecies of the holy prophets  
**from** the beginning even **down to** the commencement of the reign of Zedekiah

The Words of Mormon 1:3

and I found these plates which contained this small account of the prophets  
**from** Jacob **down to** the reign of this king Benjamin

Alma 40:18

nay but it meaneth the reuniting of the soul with the body  
of those **from** the days of Adam **down to** the resurrection of Christ

Alma 47:35

and all the dissenters of the Nephites  
**from** the reign of Nephi **down to** the present time

Helaman 6:29

and he hath brought it forth  
**from** the beginning of man even **down to** this time

Ether 1:5

but behold I give not the full account  
but a part of the account I give  
**from** the tower **down until** they were destroyed

Moroni 10:3

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

Notice that the example in Ether 1:5 takes the opposite direction of what we have in Mosiah 28:17. In some sense, *back* and *down* are being used contrastively in these expressions involving sequencing of events. Even so, there are cases of forward sequencing where *down* is not used, as in one more example that deals with the tower of Babel:

Ether 1:3

and as I suppose that the first part of this record  
which speaketh concerning the creation of the world and also of Adam  
and an account **from** that time even **to** the great tower

(For another example of forward sequencing without *down*, see 3 Nephi 26:3.) Thus there are a few cases where neither *back* nor *down* are used; in such instances, the reader must figure out the direction of the sequencing. The critical text will therefore follow the earliest reading for each case of forward or reversed sequencing; *back* and *down* will not be added to those cases where the text does not explicitly state the direction of the sequencing.

**Summary:** Remove in Mosiah 28:17 the adverb *back* that the 1920 edition added to the LDS text; as in Helaman 8:13, *back* is not needed to specify that this passage is a case of reverse sequencing; similarly, *down* can be used to specify forward sequencing, but it is not necessary (as in Ether 1:3).

■ **Mosiah 28:20**

*he took the plates of brass and all the things which he had kept  
and conferred them upon Alma which was the son of Alma  
yea all the records and also the interpreters  
and conferred them upon him  
and [CommanDing >js CommanDed 1 | commanding A |  
commanded BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] him  
that he should keep and preserve them*

As discussed earlier under Mosiah 23:13–14, sometimes sentence-final present participial clauses are separated from the preceding part of the sentence by the conjunction *and*. Here is one of these examples; for another example in this chapter, see Mosiah 28:4. As in other instances, the initial *and* before the participial *commanding* implies the notion of ‘also’ (see the discussion under Mosiah 28:4).

Here in Mosiah 28:20, Joseph Smith removed this instance of the separated present participial clause by changing the nonfinite verb form *commanding* to the finite *commanded*. The critical text will, of course, restore the original “and **commanding** him that he should keep and preserve them”. Another possible emendation would have been to delete the *and*, which is what the committee for the 1920 LDS edition did when they edited Mosiah 28:4 (see there). But in most cases, editing has replaced the present participle with a finite verb form (see the examples listed under Mosiah 23:13–14).

**Summary:** Restore in Mosiah 28:20 the original present participial clause; also maintain the conjunction *and* that detaches this nonfinite clause from the preceding finite clause (“and conferred them upon him **and commanding him** that he should keep and preserve them”); such usage can be found elsewhere in the text.

# Mosiah 29

## ■ Mosiah 29:1

*now when Mosiah had done this  
he sent **out** [through 1PS | throughout ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRT] all the land  
among all the people  
desiring to know their will concerning who should be their king*

The 1830 typesetter changed “he sent **out through** all the land” to “he sent **out throughout** all the land”, thus creating in essence a double *out*. The 1908 RLDS edition restored the earliest extant text, the reading in  $\mathcal{P}$ . A more consistent emendation for the 1830 edition would have been to change the text to simply read “he sent **throughout** the land”. There are numerous examples in the text of *throughout* occurring with *land* (54 times), but in no case does *out* occur with *throughout* (except here in Mosiah 29:1 as introduced in the 1830 edition). But there is one case where “through the land” appears to have the meaning ‘throughout the land’:

Mosiah 29:43  
and there was continual peace **through** the land

There is also evidence in the text that the *out* of *throughout* has sometimes been dropped:

Alma 5:1 (error by scribe 2 of  $\mathcal{P}$ , corrected by Oliver Cowdery)

Now it came to pass that  
Alma began to declare the word of God unto the people  
first in the land of Zarahemla  
and from thence [§2 *throght* > §1 *throughout* 1 |  
*throughout* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] all the land

Alma 16:1 (initial error in  $\mathcal{P}$  by Oliver Cowdery)

there was a cry of war heard  
[*through* > *throughout* 1 | *throughout* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] the land

Mormon 2:8 (1840 typesetting error)

therefore there was blood and carnage spread  
[*throughout* 1ABDEFIJLMNOPQRST | *through* CGHK] all the face of the land

It is therefore possible that the case of “through the land” in Mosiah 29:43 is an error for “throughout the land”.

The Oxford English Dictionary shows, however, that *through* can mean ‘throughout’, as in the following examples (see definition 3 under *through* as well as the reference to that definition under *throughout*):

William Shakespeare (1591)

We will make thee famous **through** the World.

*Les Termes de la Ley* (1624)

That there should be but one scantling of weights and measures  
**through** all the Realm.

James Thomson (1727)

And Thule bellows **through** her utmost isles.

Thus the original occurrences of *through* in Mosiah 29:1 and Mosiah 29:43 are possible and will therefore be maintained in the critical text.

*Summary:* Restore the original “through all the land” in Mosiah 29:1; the *throughout* is unnecessary since this phrase is already preceded by *out*; also maintain the occurrence of “through the land” in Mosiah 29:43 since such usage can be found in the history of the English language.

■ **Mosiah 29:3**

*now Aaron had gone up to the land of Nephi  
therefore the king could not confer **the kingdom upon him***

□ NULL

1\*

□ **neither** *would Aaron take **upon him the kingdom***

1<sup>c</sup>ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST

**neither** *was any of the sons of Mosiah  
willing to take upon them the kingdom*

Here Hyrum Smith, while copying from  $\mathcal{O}$  into  $\mathcal{P}$ , skipped from the first *neither* to the second one, with help from the virtual identity of “the kingdom upon him” with “upon him the kingdom” (they differ only in word order). The omitted clause was supplied by Oliver Cowdery when he later proofed  $\mathcal{P}$  against  $\mathcal{O}$ . The additional clause is not necessary, although it does fit better with the following reference to all the sons of Mosiah being unwilling to accept the kingship. There would have been no motivation for Oliver to have consciously emended the text here, so  $\mathcal{O}$  undoubtedly had the clause “neither would Aaron take upon him the kingdom”.

*Summary:* Maintain in Mosiah 29:3 the corrected reading in  $\mathcal{P}$  with the clause “neither would Aaron take upon him the kingdom”.

■ **Mosiah 29:4**

*yea even a [wrting > NULL 1 | ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST] written word  
sent he among the people*

Here in the printer’s manuscript, Hyrum Smith initially wrote *writing* in  $\mathcal{P}$  (accidentally spelled as *wrting*), but he immediately crossed out the word and wrote inline *written word*. The original manuscript undoubtedly read this way given that there are no other occurrences in the text of the noun phrase “written word(s)”. There are, on the other hand, occurrences of the noun *writing*

preceded by the indefinite article: “a new writing” in 1 Nephi 16:29 and “a writing of divorcement” in 3 Nephi 12:31 (as in Matthew 5:31). There would have been no motivation for Hyrum to emend the text here in Mosiah 29:4 except to correct his copying error.

**Summary:** Maintain Hyrum Smith’s immediately corrected reading in  $\mathcal{D}$  for Mosiah 29:4: “yea even **a written word** sent he among the people”.

#### ■ Mosiah 29:5

*behold O ye my people or my brethren*

**for** *I esteem you as such*

[*for* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPS | RT] *I desire that ye should consider the cause*

*which ye are called to consider*

**for** *ye are desirous to have a king*

In the 1920 LDS edition, the conjunction *for* in front of “I desire” was deleted in order to create an independent clause for this passage. One could view the *for* here as the result of an early error in the text, perhaps the result of there being two other instances of the conjunction *for* in this passage. The 1920 edition made the same emendation later in the text:

Ether 1:34

and the brother of Jared

being a large and a mighty man

and [*being* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPS | RT] a man highly favored of the Lord

[*for* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPS | RT] Jared his brother said unto him . . .

In this instance, the 1920 edition also deleted a repeated *being*, but ultimately the purpose for deleting the conjunction *for* was to create an independent clause for the passage. Note in this second example that there is no other *for* in the passage that could have prompted the *for* that does occur. In fact, both Mosiah 29:5 and Ether 1:34 are similar in that the *for* comes between a preceding subordinate clause and the following main clause. In Mosiah 29:5, we have the parenthetical clause “for I esteem you as such”, which modifies the noun phrase “my brethren”; in Ether 1:34, we have the conjunctive present participial clause “being a large and a mighty man and being a man highly favored of the Lord”, which modifies the preceding noun phrase “the brother of Jared”. These two examples suggest that the *for* is being intentionally used to separate the preceding parenthetical clause from the following main clause. For this reason, the critical text will restore the *for* in both Mosiah 29:5 and Ether 1:34.

It should also be pointed out that the conjunction *for* is frequently repeated in the Book of Mormon, including the following case where we get six occurrences in a row:

Moroni 7:5–8

**for** I remember the word of God which saith

by their works ye shall know them

**for** if their works be good

then they are good also

**for** behold God hath said

a man being evil cannot do that which is good

**for** if he offereth a gift or prayeth unto God  
except he shall do it with real intent  
it profiteth him nothing  
**for** behold it is not counted unto him for righteousness  
**for** behold if a man being evil giveth a gift  
he doeth it grudgingly

The multiple use of the conjunction *for* often seems to be acting more as a simple separator between clauses rather than as a chain of explanation between the clauses.

David Calabro (personal communication) provides another type of example where *for* is used more as a simple separator—namely, in the narrative-initial clausal construction “for it came to pass”:

1 Nephi 1:3–4

and I know that the record which I make to be true  
and I make it with mine own hand  
and I make it according to my knowledge  
**for it came to pass**  
in the commencement of the first year of the reign of Zedekiah king of Judah  
my father Lehi having dwelt at Jerusalem in all his days . . .

1 Nephi 10:22 – 11:1

and the Holy Ghost giveth authority that  
I should speak these things and deny them not  
**for it came to pass** that after I had desired  
to know the things that my father had seen . . .

Mosiah 26:5–6

and now in the reign of Mosiah  
they were not half so numerous as the people of God  
but because of the dissensions among the brethren  
they became more numerous  
**for it came to pass** that they did deceive many with their flattering words  
which were in the church  
and did cause them to commit many sins

Ether 6:1–2

And now I Moroni proceed to give the record of Jared and his brother  
**for it came to pass** after that the Lord had prepared the stones  
which the brother of Jared had carried up into the mount . . .

**Summary:** Restore in Mosiah 29:5 the use of the conjunction *for* between the preceding parenthetical clause “for I esteem you as such” and the following main clause “I desire that ye should consider the cause”; Ether 1:34 provides a similar example of this use of the conjunction *for* as a clausal separator.

## ■ Mosiah 29:6

now I declare unto you that he to whom

[*that* >jg NULL 1 | ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *the kingdom doth rightly belong*  
*hath declined and will not take upon him the kingdom*

In Mosiah 29:6, the printer’s manuscript reads “he to whom **that** the kingdom doth rightly belong”. Hyrum Smith, the scribe here, may have accidentally added an extra *that* as he copied the text from  $\mathcal{O}$  to  $\mathcal{P}$ . The 1830 typesetter undoubtedly thought that this reading in  $\mathcal{P}$  represented a simple error, so he omitted the extra *that*, giving the form that would be correct in standard English: “he to whom the kingdom doth rightly belong”.

This unusual usage in  $\mathcal{P}$  is, however, supported by the nearby example of *whosoever that*. In this other instance, the scribe in  $\mathcal{P}$  was the unknown scribe 2:

Mosiah 26:22

for behold this is my church

whosoever [*that* >js NULL 1 | *that* A | BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] is baptized

shall be baptized unto repentance

As discussed under Mosiah 26:22, there is evidence for the occurrence of *whoso that* in late Middle English. Similarly, there is evidence for *who that* and *whom that* in late Middle English. The online Oxford English Dictionary provides, for instance, the following examples (including two with the specific form *to whom that*):

John Wycliffe (about 1380)

In departyng of meritis to whom **pat** hem likip.

‘in departing of merits to whom they like’

Geoffrey Chaucer (about 1386)

I wol been his to whom **pat** I am knyt.

‘I will be his to whom I am knit’

John Gower (1390)

I syh there Aristotle also, Whom **that** the queene of Grece so Hath bridled . . .

‘I saw there Aristotle also / whom the queen of Greece hath so bridled . . .’

John Lydgate (1413)

Wel thou wost who **that** me hath abused . . .

‘well thou knowest who hath abused me’

John Lydgate (1426)

I am she By whom **that** ye yknowe be ffrom other bestys . . .

‘I am she by whom ye are known from other beasts’

Henry Lovelich (about 1450)

I am he Of whom **that** thow In thy Maister Cyte A Chirche . . . dost Make.

‘I am he of whom thou in thy master city a church . . . dost make’



Some of these examples of *who(m) that* are generic in reference (that is, they have the meaning ‘who(m)soever’), such as the Wycliffe example (and perhaps the Chaucer one). But the rest of these examples are specific in reference. We can therefore find evidence in the history of English for the kind of usage found in the earliest reading *to whom that* in Mosiah 29:6. (I am grateful to Don Chapman for help in interpreting these citations.)

All the examples with specific reference appear in texts written within about a century of Early Modern English. Nonetheless, this usage may have extended itself up into Early Modern English, perhaps dialectally. The use of *that* after subordinate words was very frequent in Early Modern English, and this usage seems characteristic of that time period. In the original Book of Mormon text, we apparently have two examples of *that* following a *wh*-word (*whosoever that* in Mosiah 26:22 and *to whom that* in Mosiah 29:6). To be sure, there are many more instances in the original text of *that* following a subordinate conjunction (such as *after that*, *because that*, *before that*, *since that*, *for that*, and *than that*). For a complete list of examples of this more general type, see under SUBORDINATE CONJUNCTIONS in volume 3.

**Summary:** Restore the archaic use of *that* after *to whom* in Mosiah 29:6 (“he **to whom that** the kingdom doth rightly belong”).

#### ■ Mosiah 29:6

*he to whom that the kingdom doth rightly belong hath declined  
and will not take upon [him 1ABCDEFHIJKLMNOPQRST | G] the kingdom*

Here the 1858 Wright edition accidentally omitted the pronoun *him*. This error was corrected in the subsequent 1874 RLDS edition. We note here, by the way, the occurrence of the nonreflexive *him* rather than the reflexive *himself* that is expected in modern English. As described under Mosiah 25:23, the Book of Mormon generally prefers nonreflexive object pronouns. With respect to the verb phrase “to take upon oneself something”, the text has 44 instances with the nonreflexive pronoun and only 3 with the reflexive (Mosiah 15:9, Mosiah 25:12, and Helaman 11:24).

**Summary:** Maintain in Mosiah 29:6 the earliest text with its nonreflexive *him* (“and will not take upon him the kingdom”).

#### ■ Mosiah 29:7

*and now if there should be another appointed in **his** stead  
behold I fear there would rise contentions among you  
and who knoweth but what my [Sons >% Son 1 | son ABCDEFHIJKLMNOPQRST]  
to whom the kingdom doth belong should turn to be angry  
and draw away a part of this people after **him***

Hyrum Smith, the scribe here in  $\mathfrak{P}$ , initially wrote the plural *Sons*, then immediately corrected it to the singular *Son* by erasing the plural *s*. The use of *his* near the beginning of this verse and of *him* later on in the verse argues that the singular is correct (although one could, I suppose, argue

that the *him* is an error for *them*). Earlier in this chapter, the text explicitly refers to Aaron as the son that the people wanted to succeed king Mosiah (see verses 1–3). And later in this chapter (see verses 8–9), Mosiah once more refers to this son and what could happen if he were made king. The use of the singular *son* in Mosiah 29:7 is undoubtedly correct.

**Summary:** Maintain in Mosiah 29:7 the singular *son*, the immediately corrected reading in  $\mathcal{P}$ ; the singular refers to Aaron and is supported by usage elsewhere in this chapter.

#### ■ Mosiah 29:7

*and now if there **should** be another appointed in his stead  
 behold I fear there **would** rise contentions among you  
 and who knoweth but what my son to whom the kingdom doth belong  
**should** turn to be angry and draw away a part of this people after him  
 which [will 1 | would ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] cause wars and contentions among you  
 which **would** be the cause of shedding much blood and perverting the way of the Lord*

Here the 1830 edition changed the modal verb *will* to *would*. The occurrence of *will* does seem somewhat jarring with respect to the preceding occurrences of *should* and *would* and, in particular, the following *would*, all of which are conditional modals. In this passage Mosiah is speaking hypothetically about how Aaron might change his mind and the difficulties that might result from such a change of mind. The use of the *will* implies more certainty than *would*; yet we expect the same level of certainty since the two modal verbs refer to causing “wars and contentions” and “the shedding of much blood”, both of which are related.

One obvious possibility is that the original text read *would* for both *which*-initial relative clauses, which would mean that the first instance of *would* was accidentally changed to *will*. Yet there is no nearby use of *will* that could be responsible for such a change. Moreover, there are no examples in the manuscripts where *will* and *would* were ever mixed up. The scribe here in  $\mathcal{P}$  is Hyrum Smith, who is not a particularly good scribe. But we have so little of his hand in  $\mathcal{P}$  that we cannot say much about his error tendencies, at least with respect to modal verbs.

Ultimately, the issue comes down to how egregious the use of *will* is in this passage. Given the paucity of manuscript evidence for mixing up *will* and *would*, the safest solution would be to restore the earliest reading, the somewhat difficult *will*. In other words, the critical text will follow the reading in  $\mathcal{P}$ : “which **will** cause wars and contentions among you”.

**Summary:** Restore the modal verb *will* in Mosiah 29:7, the reading of the printer’s manuscript; although the *will* here is somewhat difficult (given the surrounding conditional modals *would* and *should*), the critical text will follow the earliest reading since the less subjective nature of *will* is not excessively difficult to interpret.

## ■ Mosiah 29:7

*and now if there should be another appointed in his stead  
 behold I fear there would rise contentions among you  
 and who knoweth but what my son to whom the kingdom doth belong  
 should **turn** to be angry and **draw away** a part of this people after him  
 which will cause wars and contentions among you  
 which would be the cause of shedding much blood and perverting the way of the Lord  
 yea and **destroy** the souls of much people*

Paul Thomas (personal communication, 6 December 2003) suggests that in this passage the verb form *destroy* should be changed to *destroying*. In other words, the last predicate should be conjoined with the immediately preceding gerundives (“**shedding** much blood and **perverting** the way of the Lord”). But one could argue that what we have here is a long parenthetical statement (composed of two *which*-initial relative clauses) that intervenes before a third conjoined verb phrase:

Mosiah 29:7 (repunctuated)

and who knoweth but what my son to whom the kingdom doth belong  
 should **turn** to be angry and **draw away** a part of this people after him  
 — which will cause wars and contentions among you /  
 which would be the cause of shedding much blood  
 and perverting the way of the Lord—  
 yea and **destroy** the souls of much people

In other words, the text essentially reads “and who knoweth but what my son . . . should turn to be angry and draw away a part of this people after him . . . yea and destroy the souls of much people”. In the current LDS text, commas are used to separate off the intervening two *which*-initial relative clauses. Using dashes instead of commas would facilitate the reading of the original text.

**Summary:** Maintain the current use of the base verb form *destroy* in Mosiah 29:7; this verb form is conjoined with the preceding base verb forms *turn* and *draw away*; placing dashes around the two conjoined relative clauses would help the reader process the complex syntax of this passage.

## ■ Mosiah 29:7

*yea and destroy the souls  
 of [mtch >jg many 1 | much A | many BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] people*

Here the 1830 compositor initially rejected the occurrence of *much* before the semantically plural *people* and replaced it with *many*. He penciled in the change in  $\mathcal{P}$ , crossing out the *much* (written as *mtch* by Hyrum Smith) and supralinearly writing *many*. Yet the compositor ended up actually setting *much* in the 1830 edition itself. Elsewhere he set two other cases of *much people* without change, so his ultimate decision to leave the *much* in Mosiah 29:7 is consistent:

Alma 2:2	now this Amlici had by his cunning drawn away <b>much</b> people after him
Ether 8:2	he did flatter <b>much</b> people because of his cunning words

The example in Alma 2:2 of *much people* has never been edited, but the *much* in Ether 8:2 was replaced with *many* by Joseph Smith in his editing for the 1837 edition (he marked that change in  $\mathcal{P}$ ). Similarly, here in Mosiah 29:7, the 1837 edition accepted the change of *much* to *many* that the 1830 typesetter had marked in  $\mathcal{P}$ .

As discussed under Enos 1:21, the original text sometimes used *much* with plural nouns. Some cases have remained in the text; others have been edited to *many*. Besides the few instances of *much people* in the original text, there are 14 of *many people*, so both are possible. The King James Bible has 25 instances of *much people* and 20 of *many people*.

**Summary:** Restore the original *much* in Mosiah 29:7 (“the souls of much people”).

■ **Mosiah 29:8**

*neither should we have [any 1ABCGHKPRST | a DEFIJLMNOQ] right to destroy another*

The 1841 British edition replaced the nonassertive determiner *any* with the indefinite article *a*. The 1920 LDS edition restored the original *any* to the LDS text, by reference to one of the early editions. Either reading is, of course, possible. We have examples of both types elsewhere in the text, such as “neither is there **any** end of their treasures . . . neither is there **any** end of their chariots” (2 Nephi 12:7, citing Isaiah 2:7) versus “neither hath he **a** shadow of turning from the right to the left” (Alma 7:20). In each case we follow the earliest textual sources.

**Summary:** Maintain the use of *any* in Mosiah 29:8: “neither should we have **any** right to destroy another” (the reading of the earliest textual sources).

■ **Mosiah 29:9**

*which would cause him and also [this 1ABCDEFGHJKLMNOPQRST | his κ] people to commit much sin*

The 1892 RLDS edition accidentally replaced *this* with *his* in this passage. The use of *his* would work theoretically, but the sources otherwise read *this* here. Also note the seven occurrences of “this people” elsewhere in this first part of chapter 29: verses 7, 10, 11 (three times), and 13 (two times). Here in verse 9, the 1908 RLDS edition restored the original *this* to the RLDS text, probably by reference to  $\mathcal{P}$ .

**Summary:** Maintain in Mosiah 29:9 the earliest reading with its use of *this* rather than *his* (“and also **this** people”).

■ **Mosiah 29:11**

*according to the commandments of [the LorD goD > goD 1 | God ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]*

Here Hyrum Smith initially wrote “the commandments of the Lord”; then he immediately crossed out *the Lord* and wrote *God* inline. It is also possible to interpret the correction in  $\mathcal{P}$  as

indicating that Hyrum Smith initially wrote *the Lord God* and then almost immediately crossed out *the Lord* (there is no change in the level of ink flow). Of course, three readings are possible here: *the Lord*, *God*, and *the Lord God*. The critical text will follow the corrected reading in  $\mathcal{P}$ . For other instances of this kind of error in the manuscripts, see under 1 Nephi 3:21 and Mosiah 1:4.

*Summary:* Maintain in Mosiah 29:11 the corrected reading in  $\mathcal{P}$ , “the commandments of **God**”.

■ **Mosiah 29:12**

*now it is better that a **man** should be judged of God than of **man**  
for the judgments of God are always just  
but the judgments of [men > man 1 | man ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] are not always just*

Hyrum Smith originally wrote *men*, then almost immediately overwrote the *e* with an *a*. His initial *men* was probably influenced by the plural *men* that occurs within the following sentence, in verse 13: “that ye could have just **men** to be your kings”. The singular *man* is consistent with the two preceding occurrences of *man* in this passage. Either reading would theoretically work in “the judgments of man/men”, so there would have been no motivation for Hyrum to have consciously emended the text here. The critical text will therefore follow the corrected reading in  $\mathcal{P}$ , the singular *man*.

*Summary:* Maintain in Mosiah 29:12 the corrected singular *man* in  $\mathcal{P}$ : “but the judgments of man are not always just”.

■ **Mosiah 29:13**

*therefore if it [§3 were > was > §1 were 1 | were ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] possible  
that ye could have just men to be your kings . . .*

Here Hyrum Smith initially wrote “if it were possible”; then he corrected the *were* to *was* by overwriting the *ere* of *were* with *as*. Later, when proofing  $\mathcal{P}$  against  $\mathcal{O}$ , Oliver Cowdery corrected the *was* back to *were*: he crossed out Hyrum’s *was* and supralinearly inserted *were*. It appears that Hyrum himself decided to edit the subjunctive *were* to the indicative *was*. As discussed under Mosiah 10:14, the manuscript evidence is substantial that Oliver did not edit nonstandard *was* to *were*. In all probability, his correction to *were* here in Mosiah 29:13 was the result of proofing. This conclusion is supported by nine occurrences of “if it **were** possible” elsewhere in the text, but none of “if it **was** possible”. It appears that Hyrum initially copied the text correctly here in Mosiah 29:13, but then he decided that *it were* sounded ungrammatical and changed the *were* to *was*. This was the first instance where Hyrum was required to copy a subjunctive *were*. The only other subjunctive *were* he copied was the inverted *were it* found a few verses later in Mosiah 29:19: “and **were it** not for the interposition of their all-wise Creator”. In this second case of subjunctive *were*, Hyrum did not emend the *were* to *was* (perhaps because “and was it not” would have sounded like the beginning of a yes-no question rather than a conditional *were*-clause). The critical text will maintain the subjunctive *were* in Mosiah 29:13 (and in Mosiah 29:19).

*Summary:* Retain in Mosiah 29:13 the subjunctive *were* (“if it were possible”); Hyrum Smith initially wrote *were* in  $\mathcal{P}$ ; his decision to edit the *were* to *was* was later reversed by Oliver Cowdery when proofing  $\mathcal{P}$  against  $\mathcal{C}$ .

■ **Mosiah 29:13**

*therefore if it were possible that*

[*ye* 1ABCDEFGHIKPS | *you* FIJLMNOQRT] *could have just men to be your kings . . .*

The 1852 LDS edition accidentally replaced the archaic subject pronoun *ye* with the standard English *you* (in earlier English, *you* occurred only as the object pronoun form). The Book of Mormon text normally has *ye* in subject position, as here in Mosiah 29:13 originally. Under 2 Nephi 7:1, I noted that the earliest textual sources will in each case determine whether the subject pronoun form should be *ye* or *you*. For complete discussion, see under YE in volume 3.

*Summary:* Restore in Mosiah 29:13 the original subject pronoun *ye* in “ye could have just men to be your kings”.

■ **Mosiah 29:13**

*therefore if it were possible that ye could have just men*

*to be your* [*JuDges* > NULL 1 | ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *kings . . .*

Initially in the printer’s manuscript, Hyrum Smith wrote “ye could have just men to be your judges”, which he immediately corrected by crossing out *judges* and writing inline the correct *kings*. Here Hyrum seems to have been influenced by the preceding use of *judges* in verse 11, especially the phrase “wise men to be judges”:

Mosiah 29:11

nevertheless let us appoint **judges** to judge this people according to our law  
and we will newly arrange the affairs of this people  
for we will appoint **wise men to be judges**

In this chapter, king Mosiah is arguing for replacing kings with judges, so clearly *kings* is correct.

*Summary:* Maintain in Mosiah 29:13 the corrected reading in  $\mathcal{P}$ : “if it were possible that ye could have just men to be your **kings**”.

■ **Mosiah 29:13**

*if this could* [*Be* > NULL 1 | ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]

[*allway* 1 | *always* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]

[*Be* 1 | *be* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *the case*

*then it would be expedient that ye should*

[*allway* > *always* 1 | *always* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *have kings to rule over you*

There are two different scribal errors that Hyrum Smith made in this verse. First, he twice wrote the standard adverbial *always* (which ends in *s*) as the *s*-less adverbial *alway* (he spelled it as *allway*).

In the second instance of *allway*, he virtually immediately corrected his *allway* by adding the *s*, but in the first instance he left the *s*-less form in the manuscript. Of course, the 1830 compositor set *always*. Earlier in verse 12, Hyrum twice wrote the adverb as *always* and without correction. Oliver Cowdery once wrote *always* initially as *alway* but quickly corrected it to *always* (in 3 Nephi 18:7). Otherwise the scribes consistently wrote this adverb with the *s*.

The Oxford English Dictionary indicates that the *s*-less form *alway* is basically an archaic form that survives in poetry, as in this example from Richard Chenevix Trench’s *Poems from Eastern Sources* (1842): “and boldly use the children’s prayer **alway**”. The *s*-less form *alway* is found in the King James Bible, occurring 23 times (versus 62 times for *always*). The *s*-less form that Hyrum wrote could possibly reflect some dialectal influence or even his familiarity with the King James Bible. More likely, he accidentally omitted the *s* at the end of *always* as he copied the text from  $\mathcal{C}$  into  $\mathcal{P}$ .

The second scribal error that Hyrum Smith made in this passage occurred when he initially wrote the first part of the verse without the word *always* (“if this could be [the case]”). It’s also possible that he started to write “if this could be [always the case]” (that is, with a different word order). In any event, he crossed out the initial *be* and wrote *always be* inline (but with *allway* instead of the correct *always*). The original syntax undoubtedly read as corrected in  $\mathcal{P}$ .

**Summary:** Maintain in Mosiah 29:13 the immediately corrected syntax in  $\mathcal{P}$ : “if this **could always be** the case”; also maintain the form *always*, not the possibly archaic or dialectal *alway* that was accidentally produced twice here by Hyrum Smith in  $\mathcal{P}$  (spelled as *allway*).

■ **Mosiah 29:14**

*and even I myself have labored with all the power  
[and of > and 1 | and APRST | of BCDEFGHIJKLMNOQ] faculties which I have possessed  
to teach you the commandments of God  
and to establish peace throughout the land*

Here in the printer’s manuscript, Hyrum Smith initially wrote an intrusive *of* (“with all the power and **of** faculties which I have possessed”); almost immediately Hyrum crossed out this extra *of*. However, the 1837 edition accidentally reintroduced the *of*, not as an extra word but in place of the preceding *and*, thus “with all the power **of** faculties which I have possessed”. The 1908 RLDS edition restored the original *and* to the RLDS text, probably by reference to  $\mathcal{P}$ . In the 1920 LDS edition, the original *and* was restored to the LDS text, probably by reference to the 1830 edition.

The most reasonable source for the tendency to write *of* after *power* is because *power of* is so frequent in the text (occurring 153 times in the earliest text). The original use of *and* in Mosiah 29:14 is clearly supported by Nephi’s parallel language in the small plates of Nephi:

<p><i>1 Nephi 15:25</i></p> <p>yea I did exhort them with all the energies of my soul <b>and</b> with all the faculty which I possessed that they would give heed to the word of God</p>	<p><i>Mosiah 29:14</i></p> <p>and even I myself have labored with all the power <b>and</b> faculties which I have possessed to teach you the commandments of God</p>
--	--



Semantically, the reference to *energies* in 1 Nephi 15:25 parallels the use of *power* in Mosiah 29:14. And in both passages, the first noun phrase is followed by a conjoined noun phrase that refers to the faculties that the speaker possesses.

**Summary:** Maintain in Mosiah 29:14 the original reading “with all the power **and** faculties which I have possessed”.

■ **Mosiah 29:14–15**

*nor no manner of iniquity  
and [whoreDoms >% whosoever 1 | whosoever ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]  
hath committed iniquity  
him have I punished*

Hyrum Smith initially wrote “no manner of iniquity and whoredoms” here in  $\mathcal{P}$ . He immediately erased the word *whoredoms* and overwrote the erasure with the word *whosoever* and then continued inline with “hath committed iniquity”, undoubtedly the reading of the original manuscript. Hyrum’s visual misreading here is clearly the result of him expecting the phraseology “no manner of iniquity and whoredoms”. Such usage can be found later in this chapter: “and the committing of whoredoms and all manner of iniquities” (Mosiah 29:36). But it is doubtful that this particular passage affected what Hyrum wrote earlier in verses 14–15 unless he had been reading ahead in the original manuscript (which is possible).

**Summary:** Maintain in Mosiah 29:15 the original reading “and **whosoever** hath committed iniquity him have I punished”.

■ **Mosiah 29:15**

*and whosoever [hath >js has 1 | hath A | has BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] committed iniquity  
him have I punished*

- **according to the crime which he hath committed** 1\*A
- **according to the crime which he has committed** 1<sup>c</sup> PST
- NULL BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQR

**according to the law**  
*which [hath 1A | has BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] been given to us by our fathers*

In his editing of this passage for the 1837 edition, Joseph Smith changed three instances of *hath* to *has* (although the third one was not explicitly marked by him in  $\mathcal{P}$  but probably was made in the 1830 copy that served as the copytext for the 1837 edition). Yet one of these instances of *has* never made it into the 1837 edition since the 1837 typesetter accidentally skipped from the first “according to the” to the second one. The 1908 RLDS edition restored the missing words “according to the crime which he has committed” to the RLDS text (probably by reference to  $\mathcal{P}$ ); the 1981 LDS edition restored it to the LDS text. The 1908 RLDS edition and the 1981 LDS edition adopted the change to *has* because of its occurrence in  $\mathcal{P}$ , as emended by Joseph. For further discussion regarding the editing of *hath* to *has*, see under INFLECTIONS in volume 3.



*Summary:* Maintain the restored text in Mosiah 29:15; the 1837 edition accidentally omitted the words “according to the crime which he hath/has committed”.

■ **Mosiah 29:18**

*yea remember [§3 NULL > §1 King 1 | king ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRT | King PS] Noah  
his wickedness and his abominations*

Here in Mosiah 29:18, it appears that Hyrum Smith omitted the title *king* from before *Noah* when he copied the text from  $\mathcal{C}$  into  $\mathcal{P}$ . Oliver Cowdery restored *king* when he proofed  $\mathcal{P}$  against  $\mathcal{C}$ . The text allows for examples of both *king Noah* and *Noah* (that is, without any preceding *king*); elsewhere there are 23 instances of *king Noah* and 8 of *Noah*. The text uses *Noah* without a title the first three times he is mentioned in the text, once in Mosiah 7:9 and twice in Mosiah 11:1. The text then turns to using only *king Noah* up through Mosiah 19 (12 times). In Mosiah 20–21, there is some variation, with one occurrence of “the priests of **king** Noah” (in Mosiah 20:3) but two of “the priests of Noah” (both in Mosiah 21:23). Then we get nine straight occurrences of *king Noah* until the end of Mosiah 23. So when we arrive at Mosiah 29:18, we have not had a reference to king Noah since the end of chapter 23. One could argue that the sudden appearance of *Noah* alone here in Mosiah 29:18 bothered Oliver as he proofed  $\mathcal{P}$  against  $\mathcal{C}$  and that even though  $\mathcal{C}$  read without *king*, he decided on his own to add it.

The problem with this proposal is that there is no independent evidence that any of the scribes ever emended any instance of “king <name>” to simply the name or vice versa. In fact, here in Mosiah 29:18 is the only case where the text shows any variation with respect to whether *king* should precede the name of a king. As a related example, consider *king Mosiah* versus *Mosiah*. Initially, Mosiah is referred to as simply *Mosiah* (seven times), but once he becomes king (in Mosiah 6:4), he is subsequently referred to as *king Mosiah* in Mosiah 6–7 (four times). King Mosiah is not referred to again until Mosiah 22, and then we get considerable variation between *Mosiah* and *king Mosiah*. And for those instances in  $\mathcal{P}$  where Oliver Cowdery was the scribe, we find that he never once emended the text by adding *king* to *Mosiah*, nor did he ever remove an instance of *king* from before *Mosiah*:

Mosiah 22:14	and it came to pass that <b>Mosiah</b> received them with joy
Mosiah 24:25	and <b>king Mosiah</b> did also receive them with joy
Mosiah 25:1	and now <b>king Mosiah</b> caused that all the people should be gathered together
Mosiah 25:5	and it came to pass that <b>Mosiah</b> did read . . . the records of Zeniff
Mosiah 25:7	and now when <b>Mosiah</b> had made an end of reading the records . . .
Mosiah 25:14	and now it came to pass that when <b>Mosiah</b> had made an end of speaking and reading to the people . . .

Note especially that the *Mosiah* in Mosiah 22:14 is the first occurrence of *Mosiah* after a rather long interval during which king Mosiah has not been referred to, yet Oliver did not feel impelled to supply the title *king*. The probable reason is that  $\mathcal{C}$  itself did not read *king Mosiah* at that point. After scribe 2 of  $\mathcal{P}$  took over for Oliver Cowdery in Mosiah 25:14, not once did he emend any instance of *Mosiah* to *king Mosiah* (or vice versa), similarly for Hyrum Smith, who briefly substituted for

scribe 2 at five different places in  $\mathcal{P}$ . Thus it seems more likely that Oliver Cowdery’s correction of *Noah* to *king Noah* in Mosiah 29:18 was because  $\mathcal{G}$  read *king Noah*, not because Oliver felt that *king* was missing before *Noah* and needed to be supplied.

**Summary:** Follow in Mosiah 29:18 Oliver Cowdery’s correction in  $\mathcal{P}$  where he inserted the title *king* before *Noah*; Oliver was most likely correcting to  $\mathcal{G}$ , which is not extant for this part of the text.

■ **Mosiah 29:18**

*yea remember king Noah*  
*his wickedness and his* [§3 *abomination* > §1 *abominations* 1 |  
*abominations* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]  
*and also the wickedness and **abominations** of his people*

Oliver Cowdery, in proofing  $\mathcal{P}$  against  $\mathcal{G}$ , added the plural *s* to Hyrum Smith’s original singular *abomination*. Since the parallel language that follows uses the plural (“and also the wickedness and **abominations** of his people”), one could argue that Oliver consciously emended the text here rather than correcting to  $\mathcal{G}$ . The earliest text has 40 invariant instances of the plural *abominations* conjoined with *wickedness*. But there are three instances where the earliest text clearly has the singular *abomination* conjoined with *wickedness*:

1 Nephi 14:4	all those who will work wickedness and <b>abomination</b> before him
Helaman 4:11	had it not been for their wickedness and their <b>abomination</b>
Mormon 3:11	because of their wickedness and <b>abomination</b>

There is one other case with conjoined *wickedness* where there is some early variation in number for *abomination*:

Helaman 13:17  
 yea because of their wickedness  
 and their [*abomination* 1 | *abominations* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]

This example may be in that part of the text for which the 1830 edition was set from the original manuscript rather than from the printer’s manuscript. Internal evidence suggests that in Helaman 13:17 the original text read in the plural (“because of their wickedness and their **abominations**”). For discussion, see under that passage.

There is one place in the manuscripts where we have clear evidence of Oliver Cowdery struggling with determining the number for *abomination*:

Jacob 2:28 (printer’s manuscript)  
 & whoredoms is [*a bominations* > *abominations* > *abomination* 1] before me

Here Oliver initially wrote *abominations*, then almost immediately corrected it to *abomination* by crossing out the plural *s*. As discussed under Jacob 2:28, the textual evidence argues that the singular is the original reading. But other than this example, Oliver seems to show no inclination to emend the number for *abomination*. Thus his correction of *abomination* to *abominations* here in Mosiah 29:18 is probably the result of his proofing  $\mathcal{P}$  against  $\mathcal{G}$ .

*Summary:* Maintain in Mosiah 29:18 Oliver Cowdery’s correction of *abomination* to *abominations* since generally Oliver was not inclined to emend the number of *abomination*.

■ **Mosiah 29:18–19**

*and also because of their iniquities they were brought into bondage  
and were it not for the interposition of their all-wise Creator  
—and this because of their sincere repentance—*

*they must unavoidably [§2 remain > §1 remained 1 | remained ABCDP | remain EFIJLMNOQRT |  
have remained GHKS] in bondage until now*

In this passage, scribe 2 of  $\mathcal{P}$  took over for Hyrum Smith after Hyrum had written *they must*. Scribe 2 wrote *unavoidably remain*, which ended up creating for this past-tense context what seems to be a difficult reading: “they must unavoidably remain in bondage until now”. Here king Mosiah is referring to the people of king Noah (subsequently, the people of king Limhi); he is basically saying that these people would still be in captivity if it hadn’t been for the intervention of the Lord. The use of “until now” at the end seems to require the perfect “must have remained”. When we consider other places in the Book of Mormon text where the phrase “until now” occurs, we find that in each case the surrounding passage is either in the simple past tense (one time) or in the present perfect (five times):

- Mosiah 1:6 from the time they **left** Jerusalem until now
- Mosiah 2:35 and also all that **hath been spoken** by our fathers until now
- Mosiah 7:20 that same God . . . **hath kept and preserved** his people even until now
- Alma 9:22 and **having been kept and preserved** until now
- Alma 30:32 I **have labored** even from the commencement of the reign  
of the judges until now with mine own hands for my support
- Alma 36:24 from that time even until now **I have labored** without ceasing

On the other hand, as David Calabro points out (personal communication), there are a few instances of “until now” in the King James Bible for which we get the present tense instead of the expected present perfect:

- Matthew 11:12 (not “hath suffered violence”)  
and from the days of John the Baptist until now  
the kingdom of heaven **suffereth** violence
- Romans 8:22 (not “hath groaned and travailed”)  
the whole creation **groaneth** and **travaileth** in pain together until now
- 1 John 2:9 (not “hath been in darkness”)  
he that saith he is in the light and hateth his brother  
**is** in darkness even until now

In fact, the Revised Standard Version (1952), a conservative revision of the King James text, translates the first two of these passages with the present perfect:

Matthew 11:12 (RSV)

from the days of John the Baptist until now  
the kingdom of heaven **has suffered** violence

Romans 8:22 (RSV)

the whole creation **has been groaning** in travail together until now

(In the case of 1 John 2:9, the RSV replaces *even until now* with *still*, which permits the present-tense *is* to be maintained: “he who says he is in the light and hates his brother **is** in the darkness **still**”). In accord with the King James usage, one could argue that what Hyrum Smith and scribe 2 of  $\mathcal{P}$  jointly wrote here in Mosiah 29:19 was actually correct.

The problem is that Oliver Cowdery, when he proofed  $\mathcal{P}$  against  $\mathcal{G}$ , corrected *remain* to *remained*. But in his proofing, Oliver Cowdery did not add the expected perfect auxiliary *have*; thus he ended up creating in  $\mathcal{P}$  an even more difficult reading: “they must unavoidably **remained** in bondage until now”. Now the question here is whether Oliver was correcting  $\mathcal{P}$  against  $\mathcal{G}$  or consciously editing the text. The problem with the second alternative is that if Oliver had been editing, he would have probably added the *have* in addition to the past-tense ending *-ed*. It seems more likely that here Oliver was correcting  $\mathcal{P}$  to agree with  $\mathcal{G}$ . Obviously, Oliver did not notice the incongruity of *must remained*, his corrected reading in  $\mathcal{P}$ . Similarly, the early editions kept the difficult corrected reading with *remained*. Finally, the 1849 LDS edition, edited by Orson Pratt, restored *remain*, undoubtedly because the modal verb *must* needs to be followed by the base verb form *remain* rather than the past participle *remained*. On the other hand, the 1858 Wright edition inserted *have* before *remained*, thus retaining Oliver Cowdery’s corrected *remained* (the reading of the 1840 edition, which was the copytext for the 1858 edition). The *have* was removed from the 1908 RLDS edition (it was not in  $\mathcal{P}$ ). But the 1953 RLDS edition restored the *have* since it seems necessary.

The question remains: why did Oliver Cowdery miss the *have* in his proofing? One possibility is that his copytext, the original manuscript, was missing the *have*, and therefore  $\mathcal{G}$  read precisely as Oliver corrected  $\mathcal{P}$ : “they must unavoidably **remained** in bondage until now”. The actual original text, which one could presume Joseph Smith correctly dictated, may have read “they must **have** unavoidably **remained** in bondage until now”. The phrase *must have* would have most likely been pronounced as /mʌstəv/. But given that the following word *unavoidably* /ənəvɔɪdəbli/ began with two schwa syllables, including one of the form /əv/, the scribe in  $\mathcal{G}$  may have missed the contracted /əv/ attached to the preceding *must*, thus writing down Joseph’s dictation in  $\mathcal{G}$  as “they must unavoidably remained in bondage until now”. Scribe 2 of  $\mathcal{P}$  tried to deal with this difficult reading by omitting the *-ed* ending, just as Orson Pratt (or the 1849 compositor) did for the 1849 LDS edition. In other words, Oliver restored the *-ed* ending in  $\mathcal{P}$  since it was in  $\mathcal{G}$ .

Now if *have* was in the original text for Mosiah 29:19, then the *have* could have come either immediately before or after *unavoidably*. When we consider other cases of “modal + perfect *have*”, we find evidence for placing the adverb either immediately before or immediately after the perfect auxiliary *have* (given that a choice is possible):

□ adverb before the perfect *have*

2 Nephi 1:4	we should <b>also have</b> perished
Alma 9:11	we should <b>unavoidably have</b> been cut off
Alma 26:9	these our dearly beloved brethren . . . would <b>still have</b> been racked with hatred
Alma 26:9	and they would <b>also have</b> been strangers
Alma 50:25	there would <b>also have</b> been peace
Helaman 15:15	they never would <b>again have</b> dwindled in unbelief

□ adverb after the perfect *have*

2 Nephi 3:11	my word which shall <b>have already</b> gone forth among them
Mosiah 21:31	now they would <b>have gladly</b> joined with them
Alma 56:19	they might <b>have perhaps</b> destroyed our little army
Alma 60:5	while it might <b>have otherwise</b> been

The adverb in Alma 9:11 is the same *unavoidably* that appears here in Mosiah 29:19, thus supporting the 1858 word order in Mosiah 29:19. Even so, the other word order is clearly possible. And what is perhaps more significant, placing the original *have* before *unavoidably* explains more readily how the *have* (as the contracted /əv/) could have been lost as the scribe in  $\mathcal{C}$  took down Joseph Smith's dictation.

Another possible interpretation for the two readings in  $\mathcal{P}$  has to do with the fact that after writing *they must*, Hyrum Smith turned the copywork over to scribe 2 of  $\mathcal{P}$ , who wrote *unavoidably remain* (which Oliver Cowdery later corrected to *unavoidably remained*). If the *have* was in the original manuscript, it could have been accidentally omitted at that very point where scribe 2 of  $\mathcal{P}$  took over for Hyrum. When Oliver came to proof this passage in  $\mathcal{P}$ , he noticed that *remain* should read as *remained*, which he then corrected; but in making this correction, he could have missed seeing the *have* that preceded *unavoidably* in  $\mathcal{C}$ . If the *have* had come after *unavoidably*, it is less likely that he would have missed it in correcting  $\mathcal{P}$ . So it appears more likely that the original *have* preceded *unavoidably* (providing  $\mathcal{C}$  had the *have*).

As noted above, the initial reading in  $\mathcal{P}$  ("they must unavoidably remain in bondage until now") is possible. Yet  $\mathcal{C}$  seems to have differed in some way from that reading, thus motivating Oliver to correct the reading in  $\mathcal{P}$ . The original reading that best explains what happened when  $\mathcal{C}$  was copied into  $\mathcal{P}$  is that the original text read "they must have unavoidably remained in bondage until now". We cannot be sure whether the *have* was actually written down in  $\mathcal{C}$ , but the critical text will assume that it was in the original text itself.

**Summary:** Restore in Mosiah 29:19 Oliver Cowdery's corrected *remained* in  $\mathcal{P}$ ; in addition, the perfect auxiliary *have* seems to have been omitted before the adverb *unavoidably*, either when the scribe in  $\mathcal{C}$  took down Joseph Smith's dictation or when scribe 2 of  $\mathcal{P}$  took over for Hyrum Smith in copying the text from  $\mathcal{C}$  into  $\mathcal{P}$ ; the most plausible reading for the original text in this passage (the one that best explains the two incongruous readings in  $\mathcal{P}$ ) is "they must **have** unavoidably **remained** in bondage until now".

■ Mosiah 29:20

*but behold he did deliver them*

*because they did humble*

[*themselves* >% *themselves* 1 | *themselves* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *before him*

Scribe 2 of  $\mathcal{P}$  originally wrote the nonstandard reflexive form *themselves*, which he immediately corrected by erasure to *themselves*. This scribe wrote *themselves* in three other places in  $\mathcal{P}$ :

- Alma 1:32            did Indulge [*themselves* > *themselves* 1] in sorceries
- Alma 2:6            they did assemble [*themselves* > *themselves* 1] together
- Alma 4:5            that united [*themselves* > *themselves* 1] to the Church of God

In each of these three other cases, scribe 2's *f* was only partially written, then overwritten with the *v* and followed inline by the *es*. Thus these three corrections were also immediate. According to the Oxford English Dictionary, "in standard English *themselves* was the normal form to about 1540, but disappeared about 1570" (see under *themselves* in the OED). The form *themselves* is found in today's colloquial speech, especially in generic uses (as in "someone hurt themselves"), but none of the four manuscript examples of *themselves* are generic. It appears that scribe 2 of  $\mathcal{P}$  was simply used to writing *self* rather than *selves* (as in the singular forms *myself*, *thyselves*, *himselves*, *herselves*, *itself*, and *yourselves*), thus his tendency to accidentally start writing *self* for *selves*.

**Summary:** Maintain the standard reflexive form *themselves* instead of *themselves* throughout the text; scribe 2 of  $\mathcal{P}$  tended to write *themselves* as a scribal slip.

■ Mosiah 29:20

*but behold he did deliver them*

*because they did humble themselves before him*

and [ $\mathcal{S}2$  NULL >  $\mathcal{S}1$  *because* 1 | *because* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *they cried mightily unto him*

*he did deliver them out of bondage*

Oliver Cowdery supralinearly added the conjunction *because* when he proofed  $\mathcal{P}$  against  $\mathcal{C}$ . The corrected reading provides an example of chiasmus in the text:

- (a) but behold he did deliver them
- (b) **because** they did humble themselves before him
- (b') **and because** they cried mightily unto him
- (a') he did deliver them out of bondage

Without the second *because*, the text reads rather awkwardly, but not impossibly.

This kind of immediate repetition of semantically related *because*-clauses is found elsewhere in the text:

1 Nephi 2:1  
 blessed art thou Lehi  
**because** of the things which thou hast done  
**and because** thou hast been faithful and declared unto this people  
 the things which I commanded thee  
 behold they seek to take away thy life

Jacob 4:14

for God hath taken away his plainness from them and delivered unto them  
 many things which they cannot understand  
**because** they desired it  
**and because** they desired it  
 God hath done it that they may stumble

Alma 18:6

for he had slew many of them  
**because** their brethren had scattered their flocks at the place of water  
**and thus because** they had had their flocks scattered  
 they were slain

Mormon 1:17

but I were forbidden that I should preach unto them  
**because** of the hardness of their hearts  
**and because** of the hardness of their hearts  
 the land was cursed for their sake

Note that the examples in Jacob 4:14 and Alma 18:6 are chiasitic, just like in Mosiah 29:20.

*Summary:* Maintain the corrected reading in  $\mathcal{D}$  for Mosiah 29:20, with its chiasitic use of the two *because*-clauses.

■ **Mosiah 29:21**

*and behold now I say unto you*

[§2 *yea* > §1 *ye* 1 | *Ye* APS | *ye* BCDEFGHIJKLMNOQRT] *cannot*

[§2 *death* > *remove* > §1 *dethrone* 1 | *dethrone* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST] *an iniquitous king*  
*save it be through much contention and the shedding of much blood*

Here scribe 2 of  $\mathcal{D}$  spelled *ye* as *yea*, which Oliver Cowdery corrected when he proofed  $\mathcal{D}$  against  $\mathcal{C}$ . Two other examples of this misspelling in  $\mathcal{D}$  are found in this chapter of Mosiah; these two are in the hand of Hyrum Smith:

Mosiah 29:5            *yea* are calleD to consiDDer

Mosiah 29:29        [*yea* > *ye* 1] Shall cause that . . .

In the second instance, Hyrum corrected his initial *yea*. It seems rather surprising that these two scribes are suddenly misspelling *ye* as *yea*—not every instance but excessively since nowhere else do they make this spelling error. One wonders here if the scribe in  $\mathcal{C}$  might have been someone other than Oliver Cowdery and that this scribe frequently misspelled *ye* as *yea*. Only once in any of his manuscript work did Oliver accidentally write *yea* instead of *ye*, and in that instance it was an initial error in  $\mathcal{C}$  that he immediately corrected to *ye* by erasure:

Alma 54:7            except [*yea* >% *ye* 0] repent

So the chances are quite small that Oliver would be responsible in  $\mathcal{C}$  for misspelling *ye* as *yea* several times within the same part of the text.



Support for the possibility that Oliver Cowdery is not the scribe in  $\mathcal{O}$  for this part of the text comes from Oliver’s second correction in this passage: scribe 2 of  $\mathcal{P}$  originally misread the verb *dethrone* as *death*. This misreading seems quite impossible unless the verb *dethrone* was misspelled in  $\mathcal{O}$  as *deathrone* (or some similar variant where the initial *de* was misspelled as *dea*). Such a misspelling would explain why scribe 2 initially copied the word into  $\mathcal{P}$  as simply *death*. Scribe 2 quickly figured out that *death* would not work; but since he couldn’t figure out what  $\mathcal{O}$  actually read, he simply decided to emend *death* to *remove*. The verb *remove* is semantically possible, yet nowhere else does the Book of Mormon text refer to removing someone from office. When Oliver proofed  $\mathcal{P}$  here, he was able to recognize *deathrone* (or some similar variant) as *dethrone*; so he corrected scribe 2’s *remove* to the correct *dethrone*. Oliver typically spelled the word as *dethroan* in  $\mathcal{O}$  and as *dethrone* in  $\mathcal{P}$ , but he never misspelled the initial *de* in *dethrone* (or in any other word) as *dea*:

	SPELLING IN $\mathcal{O}$	SPELLING IN $\mathcal{P}$
Mosiah 29:21	<not extant>	dethrone
Alma 24:20	dethroaning	<miscopied as <i>destroying</i> >
Alma 47:4	dethroan	dethrone
Alma 47:8	dethron	dethrone
Alma 47:16	dethroning	dethroneing
Alma 51:5	dethroaned	dethroned
Ether 9:27	<not extant>	dethrone

So it seems doubtful that Oliver was responsible for a misspelling such as *deathrone* in  $\mathcal{O}$ . Of course, none of these initial miswritings in  $\mathcal{P}$  affects our interpretation of the text for this passage; but they do seem to provide some evidence that the scribe in  $\mathcal{O}$ , for at least the first half of Mosiah 29, was someone other than Oliver Cowdery.

**Summary:** Maintain in Mosiah 29:21 Oliver Cowdery’s corrected reading in  $\mathcal{P}$ : “**ye** cannot **dethrone** an iniquitous king”.

■ **Mosiah 29:25**

*therefore choose **you** by the voice of this people judges*

The text here has the second person pronoun form *you* with the imperative *choose*. Historically, *you* is the object form for the pronoun *ye*. But elsewhere the Book of Mormon text has *choose ye*, not *choose you*:

Alma 30:8  
 for thus saith the scripture  
 choose **ye** this day whom ye will serve

Ether 6:24  
 choose **ye** out from among our sons a king even whom ye will



The usage here in Mosiah 29:25 agrees with the King James Bible usage (which consistently has *choose you*):

Joshua 24:15	choose <b>you</b> this day whom ye will serve
I Samuel 17:8	choose <b>you</b> a man for you and let him come down to me
I Kings 18:25	choose <b>you</b> one bullock for yourselves and dress it first

Notice that the example from Alma 30:8 cites Joshua 24:15, yet the Book of Mormon has *ye* instead of the *you* of the King James Bible.

David Calabro points out (personal communication) that the King James Bible consistently has *you* rather than *ye* because in the Hebrew the expression “choose you” literally reads “choose **for** you”, thus the objective pronoun form *you* is appropriate as the indirect object in the English translation. But the Book of Mormon text seems to treat the *ye* and *you* as the expressed second person subject for the imperative *choose*, thus allowing either *ye* or *you*. For some discussion regarding the variation between *ye* and *you* as the subject pronoun form, see under 2 Nephi 7:1; for a complete discussion, see under YE in volume 3. There is clearly no strong evidence within the Book of Mormon text to emend *you* to *ye* in Mosiah 29:25 or the opposite in Alma 30:8 and Ether 6:24. In each case we will follow the earliest textual sources in determining whether the second person pronoun form in commands should be *ye* or *you*.

**Summary:** Retain in Mosiah 29:25 the second person pronoun form *you* in “choose you by the voice of this people judges”, the reading of all the (extant) textual sources; elsewhere the Book of Mormon has two examples of “choose ye” rather than the biblically styled “choose you”.

■ **Mosiah 29:25**

*therefore choose you  
by the voice of [the >+ this 1 | this ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] people  
judges that ye may be judged according to the laws which hath been given you by our fathers*

Normally the Book of Mormon text uses the expression “the voice of the people” (24 times), including one near the beginning of this chapter (in verse 2) and four more afterwards in this chapter (in verses 26–29). Here in verse 25, scribe 2 of  $\mathcal{D}$  initially wrote this phrase as “the voice of **the** people”, but apparently upon rereading his copy, he corrected *the people* to *this people* (with heavier ink flow, perhaps as a result of redipping his quill).

The phrase “the voice of **this** people” is quite possible, although infrequent in the text. There is only one other occurrence of this phrase in the text:

Alma 10:19  
if the time should come that the voice of **this** people should choose iniquity . . .  
they would be ripe for destruction

**Summary:** Maintain in Mosiah 29:25 scribe 2’s correction in  $\mathcal{D}$  of “the voice of **the** people” to “the voice of **this** people”.

## ■ Mosiah 29:28

*and now if ye have judges  
 [& 1 | and ABCDEFGIJKLMNOPQRST | that HK] they do not judge you according to the law  
 which has been given  
 ye can cause that he may be judged of a higher judge*

Here the 1874 RLDS edition accidentally replaced the coordinating conjunction *and* with the subordinating *that*. The 1908 RLDS edition restored the original *and* to the RLDS text. There is nothing inappropriate, of course, with having full clauses conjoined within a single *if*-clause, as in the following example also dealing with the Nephite judicial system:

Alma 11:2

now if **a man oweth** another and **he would not pay** that which he did owe  
 he was complained of to the judge

**Summary:** Accept the original reading in Mosiah 29:28 with its *if*-clause that allows the conjoining of two full clauses (“if ye have judges **and** they do not judge you according to the law . . .”).

## ■ 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 ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] may be judged  
 of a higher judge*

The earliest reading, in the printer’s manuscript, has the singular pronoun *he* even though the preceding text refers to *judges* and uses the plural pronoun *they* to refer to those judges. The 1830 typesetter rejected the conflict between the two earlier plural forms and the following singular *he* by editing the *he* to *they*. He even penciled in this change in  $\mathcal{P}$ . In support of this emendation, the plural usage continues in the following verse:

Mosiah 29:29

if your higher **judges** doth not judge righteous judgments  
 ye shall cause that a small number of your lower **judges**  
 should be gathered together and **they** shall judge your higher **judges**

Yet it is doubtful that the earlier *he* in verse 28 is a mishearing or misreading of *they*. As discussed under 1 Nephi 10:18–19, the original text sometimes permits shifts in number when the pronoun is generic, as here in Mosiah 29:28.

**Summary:** Restore the singular generic pronoun *he* in Mosiah 29:28; mixed usage in the number of generic pronouns is occasionally found in the original Book of Mormon text.

■ **Mosiah 29:29**

*if your higher judges doth not judge righteous judgments  
ye shall cause that a small number of your lower judges should be gathered together  
and they shall judge your higher judges*

There are two examples in the Book of Mormon text of the plural *judgments* in the phrase “judge righteous judgments”. The other example occurs later on in this chapter: “and he did judge righteous judgments” (verse 43). But one might wonder if the plural *judgments* might be an error for the singular *judgment* because of the corresponding language in the King James Bible: “judge not according to the appearance but judge righteous judgment” (John 7:24). However, the plural “righteous judgments” does occur in the King James Bible (five times in Psalm 119). Further, Revelation 16:7 and 19:2 refer to the judgments of God as true and righteous.

The singular “righteous judgment” does occur in the Book of Mormon; but when it does, it is always preceded by the indefinite article *a*:

Mosiah 3:10	that <b>a</b> righteous judgment might come upon the children of men
Alma 41:14	ye shall have <b>a</b> righteous judgment restored unto you again
Helaman 14:29	<b>a</b> righteous judgment might come upon them

So there is no textual evidence except the familiar usage of John 7:24 to suggest that the two occurrences of the plural “judge righteous judgments” (both here in Mosiah 29) might be wrong.

**Summary:** Retain the plural *judgments* in the phrase “judge righteous judgments”, which occurs twice in Mosiah 29 (verses 29 and 43).

■ **Mosiah 29:30**

*and I [CommandeD >jg Command >js Command 1 | command ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] you  
to do these things in the fear of the Lord  
and I [CommandeD >jg Command 1 | command ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] you  
to do these things and that ye have no king  
that if these people commit sins and iniquities  
they shall be answered upon their own heads*

Here the original reading in the printer’s manuscript has two instances of the same difficult reading—namely, the past-tense form *commanded* rather than the expected present-tense *command*. What is especially difficult here is that neither of these occurrences of the past-tense *commanded* were corrected by Oliver Cowdery when he proofed  $\mathcal{P}$  against  $\mathcal{O}$ . This suggests that  $\mathcal{O}$  itself read *commanded* both times. So the question here is whether the past-tense usage can be justified in any way. The past-tense definitely does not seem to work, especially given that throughout this part of the chapter, from verse 26 through verse 32, king Mosiah otherwise uses only the present tense in discussing his proposed change in government. Thus the repeated past-tense *commanded* seems quite incongruous. But at the same time, one is hard-pressed to explain the origin of the error, if it is one.

The 1830 typesetter, John Gilbert, rejected the past-tense ending for both cases of *commanded* and with a pencil crossed out the *-ed* ending both times in  $\mathcal{P}$ . Joseph Smith, in his editing for the

1837 edition, also crossed out the *-ed* ending for the first instance, using his typical heavier black ink (thus overwriting there the 1830 typesetter’s original crossout in pencil). All the printed editions have continued with the two present-tense occurrences of *command*.

One argument worth considering here is that the scribe in  $\mathcal{O}$  for this part of Mosiah 29 may not have been Oliver Cowdery but some other scribe who was not particularly adept. See, for instance, the discussion under verse 21, which argues that this unknown scribe tended to misspell *ye* as *yea* and also seems to have misspelled *dethrone* as *deathrone*. One could by extension assume that this scribe of  $\mathcal{O}$  accidentally added the plural *-ed* endings to the verb *command*. In fact, one might wonder if the repetition of “and I commanded you to do these things” in this verse involves some kind of dittography. Of course, Hyrum Smith, the scribe here in  $\mathcal{P}$  (and also not particularly adept as a scribe), might be responsible for these difficulties in tense and repetition.

One further possibility is that Joseph Smith himself, when he dictated the text here, accidentally added the *-ed* twice. I have noticed that in reading off “and I command you to do these things”, I naturally tend to add the *-ed* since it creates a fully rhythmic alternating sequence of unstressed and stressed syllables:

ǎnd Í cǒmmándĕd yóu tǒ dó thĕse thĭngs

Thus there might have been a natural tendency to accidentally supply the *-ed* ending here. It is even possible, of course, that the scribe in  $\mathcal{O}$  added the rhythmically satisfying *-ed* ending as he tried to take down Joseph’s dictation. Thus prosody could explain the origin of the two difficult past-tense forms here.

David Calabro (personal communication) has suggested the possibility that the first occurrence of *commanded* could be correct but the second was originally *command*; yet because of the nearly identical phraseology of “and I command(ed) you to do these things”, the following instance of *command* was accidentally changed to *commanded*. Another possibility is that one or both of these instances of *commanded* may have originally read in the perfect, as *have commanded*, so that there was a loss of one or two *have*’s in the early transmission of the text. Thus there seems to be a plethora of ways to emend the two instances of *commanded*.

Yet there may be a way to justify the use of the past-tense *commanded*. Here in verse 30 king Mosiah may not be referring to the present moment, but to some future time when the people may need to judge their own judges, as described in the immediately preceding verses:

Mosiah 29:28–29

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 may be judged of a higher judge  
if your higher judges doth not judge righteous judgments  
ye shall cause that a small number of your lower judges  
should be gathered together  
and they shall judge your higher judges  
according to the voice of the people

Verse 30 then refers to the fact that the people should keep in mind that king Mosiah commanded them to do **these things** in the fear of the Lord—that is, the first *these things* in Mosiah 29:30 refers to how the people should judge their own judges. But king Mosiah also wants them to keep

in mind that he commanded them to set up this system of judges and to not have a king. Thus we get a seemingly unnecessary repetition of “and I commanded you to do these things”:

Mosiah 29:30

and I commanded you to do these things in the fear of the Lord  
and I commanded you to do these things and that ye have no king  
that if these people commit sins and iniquities  
they shall be answered upon their heads

In fact, the second *that*-clause (“that if these people commit sins and iniquities / they shall be answered upon their heads”) seems to be referring back to what king Mosiah previously stated in verse 27 regarding the future:

Mosiah 29:27

and if the time cometh that the voice of the people doth choose iniquity  
then is the time that the judgments of God will come upon you  
yea then is the time he will visit you with great destruction  
even as he hath hitherto visited this land

In others words, verse 30 applies to possible future events described in verses 27–29, not to the present moment. Thus the use of both instances of the past-tense *commanded* can be justified from the perspective of the future.

Given this interpretation, we can accept the two past-tense uses of *commanded* in Mosiah 29:30. In fact, a well-designed paragraphing system for the text could place all of verses 27–30 in its own separate paragraph, thus helping the reader to realize that verse 30 is a comment on the immediately preceding verses 27–29.

**Summary:** Restore in Mosiah 29:30 the original two occurrences of the past-tense form *commanded*; in verse 30 king Mosiah is referring to the future (explicitly referred to in verses 27–29), and he wants the people in those future days to remember that he commanded them to maintain the rule of judges and to follow its system of safeguards.

#### ■ Mosiah 29:30–31

*that if these people commit sins*  
*and [iniquity >% iniquities 1 | iniquities ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]*  
**they shall be answered upon their own heads**  
*for behold I say unto you*  
*the sins of many people have been caused by the iniquities of their kings*  
*therefore their iniquities are answered upon the heads of their kings*

Hyrum Smith, the scribe here in  $\mathcal{D}$ , initially wrote the singular *iniquity* in verse 30, then immediately corrected it to the plural by erasing the *y*, overwriting the erasure with an *i*, and writing *es* inline. The following plural *they* and the parallel use of *iniquities* later on in verse 31 support the plural *iniquities* in verse 30. Theoretically, *they* and the subsequent use of *iniquities* in verse 31 could be considered the source for editing *iniquity* to the plural, but evidence elsewhere in the text supports the plural *iniquities*. As discussed under 2 Nephi 24:21, the scribes frequently mixed up the number for *iniquity*, so Hyrum’s error here is not unusual. Furthermore, when directly

conjoined with the plural *sins*, we always get the plural *iniquities* (ten times), never the singular *iniquity* (here I include Mosiah 29:30 in the list):

Mosiah 13:28	the sins and iniquities of his people
Mosiah 18:1	his sins and iniquities
Mosiah 21:30	so many sins and iniquities against God
Mosiah 29:30	sins and iniquities
Alma 36:13	all my sins and iniquities
Alma 37:10	in sins and iniquities
Alma 60:33	their sins and iniquities
Helaman 13:26	your sins and iniquities
3 Nephi 6:20	the sins and iniquities of the people
Mormon 7:5	all your sins and iniquities

In the case of Alma 37:10, the 1830 typesetter accidentally replaced the plural *sins* with the singular *sin* (for discussion, see under that passage). There is also one occurrence of singular *sin* conjoined with singular *iniquity*: “but teach them an everlasting hatred against **sin** and **iniquity**” (Alma 37:22). The critical text will in each case follow the earliest textual sources in determining the number for the word *iniquity*.

There is considerable evidence (all in Mosiah 29) that Hyrum Smith frequently mixed up the number for nouns. Twice he initially wrote plurals instead of singulars: *sons* instead of *son* in verse 7 and *men* instead of *man* in verse 12. In verses 16 and 31, he initially wrote the singular *king* instead of the correct *kings* (see below under Mosiah 29:31 for discussion). And in verse 18, he wrote *abomination* instead of *abominations* (there Oliver Cowdery made the correction in  $\mathcal{P}$ ). So this example in verse 30 of initial *iniquity* instead of *iniquities* is one more example of this error tendency on Hyrum’s part.

**Summary:** Accept in Mosiah 29:30 Hyrum Smith’s immediate correction in  $\mathcal{P}$  of *iniquity* to *iniquities*; the plural most probably reflects the reading of the original manuscript since the text has either all plural conjuncts or all singular ones for the phrase “sin(s) and iniquity/iniquities”.

#### ■ Mosiah 29:31

*the sins of many people have been caused by the iniquities  
of their [king > kings 1 | kings ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]  
therefore their iniquities are answered upon the heads of their kings*

Here we have in  $\mathcal{P}$  an initial slip by Hyrum Smith, who virtually immediately corrected the singular *king* to the plural by inserting the plural *s* inline. Note the occurrence of the plural *kings* in the following clause. A similar instance of Hyrum omitting the plural *s* for *kings* is found earlier in this chapter:

Mosiah 29:16  
it is not expedient that ye should have a king  
or [king > kings 1 | kings ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]  
to rule over you

The plural is required in verse 16. We will therefore follow the corrected reading in verse 31 as well: “the iniquities of their **kings**”.

*Summary:* Maintain in Mosiah 29:31 the plural *kings* (the almost immediately corrected reading in  $\mathcal{P}$ ).

■ **Mosiah 29:32**

*and now I desire that this*  
 [*unequaility* 1 | *inequality* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]  
*should be no more in this land*

There are six occurrences of *inequality* in the current Book of Mormon text, although in the earliest sources (the manuscripts) the word consistently reads as *unequality*, here in Mosiah 29:32 and in each of the five other places:

Alma 4:11–12

Alma seeing the wickedness of the church  
 and seeing also that the example of the church  
 began to lead those who were unbelievers  
 on from one piece of iniquity to another  
 thus bringing on the destruction of the people  
 yea seeing great [*unequaility* 1 | *inequality* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]  
 among the people  
 some lifting themselves up with their pride / despising others  
 turning their backs upon the needy and the naked . . .

Alma 4:15

and now it came to pass that  
 Alma having seen the afflictions of the humble followers of God  
 and the persecutions which was heaped upon them by the remainder of his people  
 and seeing all their [*unequaility* 1 | *inequality* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]  
 he began to be very sorrowful

Alma 16:16

and there was no [*unequaility* 1 | *inequality* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]  
 among them  
 for the Lord did pour out his Spirit on all the face of the land  
 for to prepare the minds of the children of men  
 or to prepare their hearts to receive the word  
 which should be taught among them at the time of his coming

Alma 28:13

and thus we see how great  
 the [*unequaility* 01 | *inequality* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] of man is  
 because of sin and transgression and the power of the devil  
 which comes by the cunning plans  
 which he hath devised to ensnare the hearts of men

3 Nephi 6:13–14

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  
 and thus there became  
 a great [*unequality* 1 | *inequality* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] in all the land  
 insomuch that the church began to be broken up

We notice also that all three scribes in  $\mathcal{P}$  (Oliver Cowdery, scribe 2, and Hyrum Smith) wrote *unequality* rather than *inequality*. (Hyrum wrote the one here in Mosiah 29:32, scribe 2 the two occurrences in Alma 4, and Oliver Cowdery the remaining three instances, including one that is extant in  $\mathcal{G}$ .) The 1830 typesetter replaced all these instances of *unequality* with the standard *inequality*.

Earlier English tolerated both *inequality* and *unequality*, just as it did the corresponding adjectives *inequal* and *unequal* (see under each of these words in the Oxford English Dictionary). Nowadays we have only the inconsistently formed pair *inequality* and *unequal* in standard English, but earlier the other two also existed. The OED lists citations for *inequal* ‘unequal’ that date from 1386 to 1831. The nonstandard *unequality* has maintained itself longer, with citations in the OED from 1541 through 1973. Numerous examples of *unequality* can be found in today’s English, as in the title for an essay available for purchase on the Internet: “Unequality Towards Women” (found 5 August 2005 on <www.google.com>). The critical text will assume that the manuscript use of *unequality* is intended and represents the original text, although there is some possibility that Joseph Smith or his scribes consistently replaced *inequality* with *unequality*.

One may wonder if any of the Book of Mormon instances of *unequality* (or *inequality*) might be an error for the orthographically and phonetically similar *iniquity*. Yet the larger context for each of these six instances of *unequality/inequality* refers to some division among the people. Here in Mosiah 29:32 the division is between the king and the people he rules, as described in the preceding two verses:

Mosiah 29:30–31

and I commanded you to do these things  
 and that ye have no king  
 that if these people commit sins and iniquities  
 they shall be answered upon their own heads  
 for behold I say unto you  
 the sins of many people have been caused by the iniquities of their kings  
 therefore their iniquities are answered upon the heads of their kings

Elsewhere the division described by the word *unequality/inequality* refers to varying degrees of righteousness or wickedness among the people.

It should also be noted that none of the manuscript examples of *unequality* have ever been accidentally written as *iniquity*. And when we consider the numerous occurrences of the word *iniquity* in the text (a total of 226, including the plural *iniquities*), there is not one case where the



scribe (or a typesetter, for that matter) has accidentally changed *iniquity* to *inequality* (or *iniquities* to *inequalities*).

**Summary:** Restore all six instances of *unequality* in place of the standard *inequality*, in Mosiah 29:32 as well as in Alma 4:12, Alma 4:15, Alma 16:16, Alma 28:13, and 3 Nephi 6:14; none of these examples of *unequality* appear to be an error for the orthographically and phonetically similar *iniquity*.

■ **Mosiah 29:32**

*especially among this [my 1ABCDEFHIJKLMNOPQRST | G] people*

As discussed under Mosiah 24:13, the original Book of Mormon text has nine examples of “this my people”, including here in Mosiah 29:32. The 1858 Wright edition accidentally skipped the *my* in this passage. The 1874 RLDS edition restored the *my*, probably by reference to the 1840 edition.

**Summary:** Maintain the original occurrence of “this my people” in Mosiah 29:32.

■ **Mosiah 29:32**

*so long as the Lord [Seas 1 | seeth A | sees BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] fit  
that we may live and inherit the land*

Hyrum Smith wrote *sees* (spelled as *Seas*) in the printer’s manuscript, but the 1830 typesetter changed the verb form to *seeth*. Elsewhere, the text only has examples of *seeth*:

2 Nephi 27:27	who seeth us
2 Nephi 27:34	but when he seeth his children . . .
Mosiah 3:19	all things which the Lord seeth fit to inflict upon him
Mosiah 23:21	the Lord seeth fit to chasten his people
Alma 29:8	all that he seeth fit that they should have
3 Nephi 13:4	thy Father which seeth in secret
3 Nephi 13:6	thy Father which seeth in secret
3 Nephi 13:18	thy Father which seeth in secret
3 Nephi 28:29	when the Lord seeth fit in his wisdom . . .

The first two examples are quotations from Isaiah 29; the three in 3 Nephi 13 are found in Matthew 6 (the Sermon on the Mount). The familiar use of *seeth* in Matthew 6 may have led the 1830 typesetter to expect the *-(e)th* inflection ending here in Mosiah 29:32, especially since the text is referring to the Lord, which might have called for a more biblically sounding language. The five other examples (including Mosiah 29:32) refer to the Lord seeing fit to do something, but this specific expression is not actually biblical. Thus variation is quite possible, with four instances of “the Lord **seeth** fit” and one of “the Lord **sees** fit”. But since there are no other instances of *sees* in the text, the possibility remains that Hyrum’s *sees* is an error for *seeth*.

The 1837 edition restored the original *sees*, probably because *Œ* read that way. One could also interpret the 1837 change as the result of Joseph Smith’s frequent replacement of the archaic *-(e)th*

ending with the standard modern English *-(e)s* ending (for discussion, see under INFLECTIONS in volume 3). Yet elsewhere, Joseph left unaltered all other instances of *seeth*, which argues that the 1837 change in Mosiah 29:32 was most likely a restoration of the reading in  $\mathcal{P}$ . Since *sees* is obviously possible in English, the critical text will maintain it here in Mosiah 29:32, even though it could be a scribal error for *seeth*.

**Summary:** Maintain the use of *sees* in Mosiah 29:32; this is the only place in the text where *sees* shows up; elsewhere, the text prefers the biblical *seeth*.

■ **Mosiah 29:33**

*and many more things did king Mosiah write unto them  
unfolding unto them all the trials and troubles  
[ 1 | of ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST ] a righteous king  
yea all the travails of soul for their people*

The reading in  $\mathcal{P}$  (in Hyrum Smith’s hand) is obviously defective: “all the trials and troubles a righteous king”. The 1830 typesetter supplied the necessary *of*; Oliver Cowdery seems to have missed it when he proofed  $\mathcal{P}$  against  $\mathcal{C}$  (unless  $\mathcal{C}$  also lacked it). The *of* is supported by the semantic equivalence of the following *yea*-phrase: “yea all the travails **of** soul for their people”. Another example of “trials and troubles” being postmodified by a prepositional phrase headed by *of* is found in Alma 36:27: “and I have been supported under trials and troubles **of** every kind”.

**Summary:** Maintain in Mosiah 29:33 the obviously necessary preposition *of* supplied by the 1830 typesetter: “all the trials and troubles **of** a righteous king”.

■ **Mosiah 29:33**

*yea all the [travels 1 | travails ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] of soul for their people*

As discussed under 2 Nephi 29:4, the correct reading here in Mosiah 29:33 is *travails*, the 1830 typesetter’s interpretation of *travels* (Hyrum Smith’s spelling in  $\mathcal{P}$  for the word).

■ **Mosiah 29:34**

*but that the [burDen 1 | burdens A | burden BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] should come  
upon all the people*

The 1830 edition changed the singular *burden* to the plural *burdens*. This change is probably accidental since there is nothing inappropriate about the singular usage in this passage. The 1837 edition restored the singular by reference to  $\mathcal{P}$ . For a similar example where the 1837 edition relied on  $\mathcal{P}$  to restore an earlier reading, see the discussion regarding the inflected form *sees* nearby in verse 32.

The probable reason the 1830 compositor set *burdens* is that all eight prior occurrences of the noun *burden(s)* in the book of Mosiah are in the plural:

Mosiah 12:5	they shall have burdens lashed upon their backs
Mosiah 18:8	and are willing to bear one another's burdens
Mosiah 21:3	and began to put heavy burdens upon their backs
Mosiah 21:15	they began to ease their burdens
Mosiah 24:14	and I will also ease the burdens which is put upon your shoulders
Mosiah 24:15	the burdens which was laid upon Alma and his brethren were made light
Mosiah 24:15	that they could bear up their burdens with ease
Mosiah 24:21	and eased their burdens

There is one additional instance in the text of the plural noun *burdens*: “that your burdens may be light” (Alma 33:23). Besides five instances of the singular *burden* in Isaiah quotations, there are two more instances of *burden/burthen* in the Book of Mormon text:

Alma 62:29	and thus were the Nephites relieved from a great burthen
Ether 10:10	he did ease the burden of the people

In Alma 62:29, the 1906 and 1981 LDS editions emended the archaic *burthen* to *burden*.

**Summary:** Maintain the singular *burden* in Mosiah 29:34 (“that the burden should come upon all the people”).

#### ■ Mosiah 29:36

*yea all his iniquities and abominations  
and all the wars and contentions and **bloodshed**  
and the stealing and the plundering  
and the committing of whoredoms and all manner of iniquities  
which cannot be enumerated*

One wonders here if the singular *bloodshed* might be an error for the plural *bloodsheds*. Elsewhere in the original text, when *bloodshed(s)* is conjoined with other nouns, we always get agreement in number with some immediately conjoined noun (in the following list, each case involving textual variation in number is marked with an asterisk):

- *bloodshed* conjoined with a singular noun
 

Omni 1:3	we had many seasons of serious <b>war</b> and bloodshed
Omni 1:24	a serious <b>war</b> and much bloodshed between the Nephites and the Lamanites
* Alma 45:11	yea <b>famine</b> and bloodshed
Alma 55:19	he did not delight in <b>murder</b> or bloodshed
Alma 62:35	the cause of so much <b>war</b> and bloodshed
* Mormon 8:8	one continual round of <b>murder</b> and bloodshed
Ether 14:21	the scene of bloodshed and <b>carnage</b>

- *bloodsheds* conjoined with a plural noun
  - 2 Nephi 1:12      bloodsheds and great **visitations** among them
  - 2 Nephi 6:15      and by **earthquakes** and by bloodsheds
  - \* 2 Nephi 10:6      **pestilences** and bloodsheds
  - \* Jacob 7:24      in **wars** and bloodsheds
  - Alma 35:15      for the **wars** and the bloodsheds and the **contentions**
  - Alma 62:39      they had had **wars** and bloodsheds
  - \* Helaman 6:17      they had not been stirred up to anger to **wars** nor to bloodsheds

(For discussion of the instances showing variation in number, see under each individual passage.) Mosiah 29:36 is the only place in the original text where the singular *bloodshed* is combined with plural nouns: “all the **wars** and **contentions** and bloodshed”. As noted under 2 Nephi 10:6, there has been a noticeable tendency in the history of the text to replace the plural *bloodsheds* with the singular form, so perhaps the same error occurred in Mosiah 29:36 early on in the transmission of the text. Even so, the use of the singular *bloodshed* will work, so perhaps what we have here is a unique reading in the text. The critical text will accept the earliest reading here in Mosiah 29:36 since it is possible, even though it differs from all other conjoined occurrences of *bloodshed(s)*.

**Summary:** Maintain in Mosiah 29:36 the singular *bloodshed* since it will work, even though everywhere else there is number agreement between *bloodshed(s)* and an immediately conjoined noun.

■ **Mosiah 29:36**

*telling them that these things ought not to be  
that they was expressly repugnant  
to the [command > commandments 1 | commandments ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] of God*

Here scribe 2 of  $\mathcal{P}$  originally wrote *command* followed by a space and the *o* of the following *of*. Then he immediately overwrote the space and the *o* with an *m* and continued inline with *ents*. There has been some tendency in the manuscripts for the scribes to accidentally replace *commandment(s)* with *command(s)*. For a list of examples, see under Alma 30:7. Jacob is the only writer in the Book of Mormon (based on the original text) that refers to “the commands of God”. Otherwise, we get “the commandment(s) of God” or “the commandment(s) of the Lord”. See the discussion under Jacob 2:10 regarding Jacob’s use of *commands*.

**Summary:** Maintain in Mosiah 29:36 “the commandments of God”, the immediately corrected reading in  $\mathcal{P}$ .

■ **Mosiah 29:40**

*and they did wax strong in love  
[towards 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQPRT | toward s] Mosiah*

Here the 1953 RLDS edition replaced *towards* with *toward*. This change was undoubtedly unintended since nowhere else did that edition replace *towards* with *toward*. As discussed under 1 Nephi 5:22,

the critical text will follow in each case the earliest textual sources in determining the form of *toward(s)*. In most instances, the earliest sources support *towards*, as here in Mosiah 29:40.

■ **Mosiah 29:40**

*yea for that lucre which [doth 1 ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST | doeth E] corrupt the soul*

Here the compositor for the 1849 LDS edition accidentally set *doth* as *doeth*, as if the verb *do* was the main verb rather than the auxiliary verb. In virtually every case in the Book of Mormon text, the auxiliary form is *doth* and the main verb form is *doeth*. For a summary discussion, see under Mosiah 4:18. Also see under INFLECTIONAL ENDINGS in volume 3.

**Summary:** Maintain the auxiliary form *doth* in Mosiah 29:40, which is consistent with usage elsewhere in the text.

■ **Mosiah 29:40**

*neither had he delighted in*

[§2 NULL >- §1 the 1 | the ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *shedding of blood*

Scribe 2 of the printer’s manuscript initially wrote “delighted in shedding of blood”, without the definite article *the*. Somewhat later, Oliver Cowdery, probably while proofing against the original manuscript, supralinearly inserted the definite article *the*.

Elsewhere the earliest text has examples of the fully nominalized gerundive “**the shedding of blood**” (22 times) and of the fully verbalized gerundive “shedding blood” (4 times). In Mosiah 29, there are three instances of “(the) shedding (of) blood”. Besides the one in verse 40, there are two preceding ones:

Mosiah 29:7	which would be the cause of <b>shedding much blood</b>
Mosiah 29:21	save it be through much contention and the <b>shedding of much blood</b>

The first takes the fully verbalized form, while the second is fully nominalized.

There is also one instance in the earliest text of “**the shedding the blood**”, which was changed to “**the shedding of the blood**” when the text was copied from  $\mathfrak{G}$  into  $\mathfrak{P}$ :

Alma 56:13  
and now these are the cities which the Lamanites have obtained possession of  
by the shedding [NULL 0] *of* 1 ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] the blood  
of so many of our valiant men

The earliest reading in Alma 56:13 represents an intermediate gerundive form that is occasionally found in the earliest text. For further discussion of this intermediate type, see under 1 Nephi 17:32; also see the general discussion under GERUNDIVES in volume 3. See under Alma 56:13 for further discussion regarding the nominalized and verbalized forms for “(the) shedding (of) blood”.

The important point here is that there are no examples elsewhere in the text of the nominalized “shedding **of** blood” without there also being a preceding definite article *the*; that is, if the

preposition *of* occurs, then there is a preceding *the*. But it is very doubtful that Oliver Cowdery would have been aware of such a detail: the gerundive “shedding of blood” without a preceding *the* is possible in English, yet it occurs nowhere else in the Book of Mormon text. Thus the odds are that Oliver’s insertion of the *the* in Mosiah 29:40 represents the reading of the original manuscript, not his editing of the text.

**Summary:** Retain in Mosiah 29:40 the definite *the* in the phrase “**the** shedding of blood”; Oliver Cowdery’s inserted *the* is probably the reading of the original manuscript (no longer extant here).

■ **Mosiah 29:42**

*and it came to pass that Alma was appointed to be  
the [ 1APS | first BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRT ] chief judge*

The 1837 edition introduced *first* in front of “chief judge”. Joseph Smith did not mark this change in the printer’s manuscript, yet the change does appear to be a conscious one and could well be Joseph’s. Since *Ɔ* does not have the *first*, the 1908 RLDS edition removed it from the RLDS text. It is very doubtful that the original manuscript was the source for Joseph supplying the *first* in the 1837 edition since there is no specific evidence that he ever used the original manuscript in his editing for that edition. It appears that the source for adding the ordinal *first* was the occurrence of “the first and chief judge” nearby in verse 44 and twice in the preface to the book of Alma (which immediately follows verse 47):

Mosiah 29:44	and Alma was the first <b>and</b> chief judge
Alma preface	The account of Alma . . . the first <b>and</b> chief judge over the people of Nephi
Alma preface	according to the record of Alma the first <b>and</b> chief judge

The phrase “first chief judge” occurs nowhere else in the text. So if the 1837 change in verse 42 is accepted in the standard text (but not in the critical text), perhaps it should be emended from “first chief judge” to “first **and** chief judge”, at least to be more consistent with the three nearby examples.

The use of the *and* in “the first and chief judge” does appear to be intentional, especially since it occurs three times at the transition between the books of Mosiah and Alma. We also find a similar use of *and* in the original text for another example involving a conjoined adjective (in this instance, *great* rather than *first*):

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

Despite these examples, there is an occurrence of “second chief judge” in the text, which clearly implies that “first chief judge” is possible:

Alma 50:37

and it came to pass that in that same year  
that the people of Nephi had peace restored unto them  
that Nephiah the **second chief judge** died

Everywhere else, however, the text refers simply to the “chief judge” without a preceding ordinal; some of these occurrences refer to the chief judge over all the Nephites (as in Alma 4:17 and Alma 27:20) and others to the chief judge over a particular land (as in Alma 14:4 and Alma 30:21). In none of these examples is there any reference to a first or second chief judge. Consequently, there is no crucial need to have added *first* in Mosiah 29:42.

These examples with the preceding ordinal number seem to be using *first* and *second* in the sense of sequencing in time. There appears to be no use of *first* with *judge* in the sense of ‘supreme’ or ‘highest’. Instead, the word *chief* seems to take on this role in the text.

**Summary:** Delete the intrusive *first* from Mosiah 29:42 since it was not there originally, nor is it necessary; the intrusive *first*, if maintained in the standard published text, should perhaps read “first **and** chief judge” to make the text consistent with the three nearby occurrences of “first **and** chief judge”.

■ **Mosiah 29:42**

*and it came to pass that  
Alma was appointed to be the chief judge  
he being also the high priest  
his father having [conferring >% conferred 1 | conferred ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]  
the office upon him*

Here scribe 2 of Ø initially wrote the past participle *conferred* as a present participle, *conferring* (his spelling has only a single *r*). He immediately erased the incorrect *-ing* ending and overwrote it with the correct *-ed* ending. This error was undoubtedly influenced by the immediately preceding *having*. For similar examples of this kind of error, see the discussion under Mosiah 12:2.

**Summary:** Maintain in Mosiah 29:42 the past participial form *conferred*, the immediately corrected reading in Ø.

■ **Mosiah 29:42**

*and it came to pass that  
Alma was appointed to be the chief judge  
he being also the high priest  
his father having conferred the office upon him  
and [had 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPS | having RT] given him the charge  
concerning all the affairs of the church*

Here the 1920 LDS edition replaced the finite verb form *had* with the present participle *having*. However, there is some evidence that the original text allowed this kind of construction—namely, a present participial clause followed by a conjoined finite predicate. For discussion, see under



Mosiah 23:1. The passage there originally read “now Alma **having** been warned of the Lord that the armies of king Noah would come upon them and **had** made it known to his people”.

*Summary:* Restore the finite verb form *had* in Mosiah 29:42 since such usage seems to be intended.

■ **Mosiah 29:45–46**

*and now it came to pass that his father died  
being eighty and two **years old** . . .  
and it came to pass that Mosiah died also  
in the thirty and third **year** of his reign  
**being sixty and three years** [ 1 | *old* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]  
making in the whole five hundred and nine **years** from the time Lehi left Jerusalem*

Here in verse 46, the 1830 typesetter added the word *old* after “sixty and three years”, which is consistent with the age specification in the previous verse: “being eighty and two years **old**”. In the Book of Mormon text, a specification of age is always followed by either the word *old* or the phrase *of age* (I exclude from the following list the one case here in Mosiah 29:46 where *old* was added in the 1830 edition):

Mosiah 29:45	his father died <b>being</b> eighty and two years <b>old</b>
Alma 43:17	and he <b>was</b> only twenty and five years <b>old</b>
3 Nephi 28:3	after that ye <b>are</b> seventy and two years <b>old</b>
Mormon 1:2	I <b>being</b> about ten years of <b>age</b>
Mormon 1:3	when ye <b>are</b> about twenty and four years <b>old</b>
Mormon 1:6	I <b>being</b> eleven years <b>old</b>
Mormon 1:15	and I <b>being</b> fifteen years of <b>age</b>
Ether 7:4	and when Corihor <b>was</b> thirty and two years <b>old</b>
Ether 9:24	his wife died <b>being</b> an hundred and two years <b>old</b>
Ether 9:24	until he <b>was</b> an hundred and forty and two years <b>old</b>

The verb in all these cases is *be*. Whenever the *be* verb is finite (*was* or *are*), the form is “X years **old**” (five times), but when the *be* verb is the present participial *being*, we can get either *old* or *of age* (three times for *old* and two times for *of age*). This last finding suggests the possibility that the original text for Mosiah 29:46 could have read as either “being sixty and three years **old**” or “being sixty and three years **of age**”. Further, the four examples in Mormon 1 show that *of age* and *old* can occur in close proximity. Ultimately, it is difficult to tell which reading was the original one in Mosiah 29:46. But “X years **old**” is clearly more frequent in the text, and “X years **of age**” otherwise appears only in Mormon 1. Moreover, skipping one word (*old*) is more probable than skipping two (*of age*). For instance, in those parts of  $\mathcal{P}$  for which scribe 2 of  $\mathcal{P}$  acted as the scribe (from Mosiah 25:14 through Alma 13:20, excluding those few pages where Hyrum Smith acted as scribe), we get the following statistics for the number of words interlinearly supplied and their frequencies. I distinguish here between scribe 2’s own corrections versus Oliver Cowdery’s corrections (when he proofed  $\mathcal{P}$  against  $\mathcal{C}$ ):



*Mosiah 29*

SCRIBE	LENGTH OF INSERTION	FREQUENCY
scribe 2 of Ø	1 word	26 times
	3 words	1 time
Oliver Cowdery	1 word	50 times
	3 words	2 times
	4 words	1 time
	13 words	1 time

Thus the odds are considerably greater that scribe 2 of Ø would have accidentally dropped one word rather than two or more words (76 times versus 5 times).

These factors support the 1830 typesetter’s emendation to “sixty and three years **old**” in Mosiah 29:46. Of course, it is also possible that the missing word or words here could have occurred as the dictation of the text was written down in Ø. This would explain why Oliver missed inserting *old* or *of age* when he proofed Mosiah 29:46. Ultimately, the critical text will follow the 1830 emendation, chiefly because there does seem to be something missing when describing someone as being “X years”. The use of *old* or *of age* would be lacking if the clause read something like “his age was X years”, but that kind of expression is never found in the Book of Mormon. Statistically, the odds are higher that the single word *old* was lost here rather than the two-word phrase *of age* (at least if scribe 2 of Ø was responsible for the loss).

**Summary:** Follow in Mosiah 29:46 the 1830 typesetter’s addition of the word *old* in the phrase “being sixty and three years old”; either *old* or *of age* is expected after the specification of the number of years a person has lived; for this part of the text, textual evidence suggests that *old* is the more likely candidate.

[THIS PAGE LEFT INTENTIONALLY BLANK]

Alma

# Alma Narrative Structure

## ■ book title for Alma

[§2 NULL >- §1 *the Book of Alma* ——— *the Son of Alma* 1]  
*THE BOOK OF ALMA / THE SON OF ALMA* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]

Scribe 2 of  $\mathcal{P}$  accidentally omitted the title for the book of Alma, probably because of its visual similarity to the preface of the book, which immediately follows:

book title for Alma

**The Book of Alma the Son of Alma**  
**The account of Alma who was the Son of Alma**

Oliver Cowdery, in his proofing of  $\mathcal{P}$  against  $\mathcal{C}$ , restored the title. The full title of the third book of Nephi is similar in that it too contains a genealogical description:

book title for 3 Nephi

The Book of Nephi the Son of Nephi  
which was the Son of Helaman

**Summary:** Oliver Cowdery’s inserted title for the book of Alma, with its additional specification “the Son of Alma”, was undoubtedly in the original manuscript but was accidentally omitted by scribe 2 of  $\mathcal{P}$  when he copied the text from  $\mathcal{C}$  into  $\mathcal{P}$ .

# Alma Preface

## ■ Alma preface

*The account of Alma who was the son of Alma*

[ 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOQR |, PST]

*the first*

[ 1PST |, ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOQR]

*and chief judge over the people of Nephi*

*and also the high priest over the church*

The 1830 compositor set a comma after the phrase *the first* but none before it, as if this phrase was being used to distinguish between the son (Alma the second) and the father (Alma the first). Such usage is found nowhere else in the text. Nor do we find such usage as “Alma the older (or elder)” versus “Alma the younger”. As discussed under Mosiah 29:42, the original text had three occurrences of “Alma . . . the first and chief judge”. In this phraseology, *first* modifies the following *judge* rather than the preceding *Alma*.

The 1908 RLDS edition moved the comma from after *the first* to before it, thus correctly interpreting “the first and chief judge” as a conjunctive noun phrase. The 1981 LDS edition made the same punctuation change in the LDS text.

**Summary:** The placement of the comma between *Alma* and *the first* in the current LDS and RLDS editions (but no comma after *the first*) correctly combines *first* and *chief judge* into a single conjunctive phrase; usage elsewhere in the text supports this reading.

# Alma 1

## ■ Alma 1:1

*Now it came to pass that  
in the first year of the reign of the judges over the people of Nephi  
from this time forward  
king Mosiah having gone the way of all the earth  
having warred a good warfare  
walking uprightly before God  
leaving [§2 no one >+ §1 none 1 | none ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] to reign in his stead . . .*

Scribe 2 of  $\mathcal{P}$  copied the text from  $\mathcal{C}$  into  $\mathcal{P}$  as “leaving **no one** to reign in his stead”. Oliver Cowdery, presumably when he proofed  $\mathcal{P}$  against  $\mathcal{C}$ , corrected *no one* to *none*. This change here does not appear to be due to editing since in all other passages that refer to an inability to find someone to rule, *no one* is the pronominal form, not *none*:

Mosiah 28:10

now king Mosiah had **no one** to confer the kingdom upon

Alma 10:19

yea well did Mosiah say  
who was our last king  
when he was about to deliver up the kingdom  
having **no one** to confer it upon . . .

Helaman 2:1

behold there was **no one** to fill the judgment seat

In none of these passages did Oliver emend *no one* to *none*, which argues that the change here in Alma 1:1 was simply because scribe 2 of  $\mathcal{P}$  mistakenly wrote *no one* and Oliver corrected it to *none*, the reading in  $\mathcal{C}$ . This means that there is variation in the text between *no one* and *none* in this context, with three occurrences of *no one* and one of *none*.

Elsewhere the manuscripts have numerous examples of both *no one* and *none*, of which the vast majority are invariant in the textual history. There are three other cases for which there is textual variation between *no one* and *none*:

Alma 6:5

now I would that ye should understand  
that the word of God was liberal unto all  
that [*no one was >js none were 1 | no one was A |  
none were BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST*] deprived of the privilege  
of assembling themselves together to hear the word of God

Mormon 8:14

for he truly saith that

[§2 *none* > §1 *no one* 1 | *no one* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] shall have them  
to get gain

Mormon 8:15

for [*no one* 1PS | *none* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOQRT] can have power  
to bring it to light  
save it be given him of God

Joseph Smith was responsible for the change in Alma 6:5. The two other instances, in Mormon 8:14–15, are more difficult to analyze since for that part of the text both  $\mathcal{P}$  and the 1830 edition are firsthand copies of  $\mathcal{O}$ . See under Alma 6:5 and Mormon 8:14–15 for discussion. Also see the general discussion under NEGATION in volume 3.

*Summary:* Accept in Alma 1:1 Oliver Cowdery’s correction in  $\mathcal{P}$  of *no one* to *none*; since *no one* is preferred elsewhere when referring to finding someone to rule, the unique use of *none* in Alma 1:1 probably represents the reading of the original manuscript, no longer extant here.

#### ■ Alma 1:1

*Now it came to pass that*

*in the first year of the reign of the judges over the people of Nephi  
from this time forward*

*—king Mosiah having gone the way of all the earth*

*having warred a good warfare*

*walking uprightly before God*

*leaving none to reign in his stead—*

*nevertheless he [ 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPS | had RT] established laws*

*and they were acknowledged by the people*

*therefore they were obliged to abide by the laws which he had made*

The committee for the 1920 LDS edition inserted *had* before *established*, thus changing the reading from the simple past to the past perfect. This change was made because the immediately preceding text states that Mosiah had died and thus the past perfect “had established” seemed more appropriate. The acknowledgment of the laws occurred when they were first established, yet the 1920 edition did not change “they **were** acknowledged” to “they **had been** acknowledged”. The 1920 reading is supported by the use of both the simple past and the past perfect in the last sentence of this verse: “therefore they **were** obliged to abide by the laws which he **had** made”.

We can find examples of past events being followed by either the simple past or the past perfect, as in the following instances:

Mosiah 27:8 (simple past)

now the sons of Mosiah was numbered among the unbelievers

and also one of the sons of Alma was numbered among them

he being called Alma after his father

nevertheless he **became** a very wicked and an idolatrous man

Alma 50:37–38 (past perfect)

and it came to pass that in that same year  
that the people of Nephi had peace restored unto them  
that Nephiah the second chief judge died  
having filled the judgment seat with perfect uprightness before God  
nevertheless he **had refused** Alma to take possession  
of those records and those things . . .

Thus in Alma 1:1, either the simple past (“he established laws”) or the past perfect (“he had established laws”) is textually acceptable. The critical text will follow the original text (without the *had*), even though modern English speakers probably prefer the past perfect in this context.

**Summary:** Restore in Alma 1:1 the original simple past tense (“nevertheless he **established** laws”), which is in agreement with the following conjoined clause (“and they **were acknowledged** by the people”).

### ■ Alma 1:1

*nevertheless he established laws*

*and they were acknowledged*

[§2 before >+ §1 by 1 | by ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *the people*

Here in the printer’s manuscript, Oliver Cowdery corrected scribe 2’s *before* to *by*. This correction seems to have occurred when Oliver proofed  $\mathfrak{P}$  against  $\mathfrak{C}$ . The use of *before* suggests that the laws were acknowledged by someone else in front of the people, not by the people themselves. Clearly, the people were the ones who acknowledged the laws that Mosiah established, as is stated later on in this chapter:

Alma 1:14

therefore thou art condemned to die  
according to the law which has been given us by Mosiah our last king  
and they have been acknowledged by this people  
therefore this people must abide by the law

Note here the specific language referring to the laws established by Mosiah: “they have been acknowledged **by** this people”. It is theoretically possible that Oliver made the change in verse 1 after copying verse 14, but this seems doubtful since there is no independent evidence of Oliver making conscious emendations based on specific readings that far away. In any event, *before* seems to be an error. There is one passage that refers to acknowledging something before someone: “acknowledge your unworthiness **before** God at all times” (Alma 38:14). Ultimately, such a reading seems inappropriate for Alma 1:1, even if Oliver edited verse 1 after reading verse 14.

**Summary:** Maintain Oliver Cowdery’s corrected preposition in Alma 1:1 (“they were acknowledged **by** the people”).



## ■ Alma 1:3

*and they ought not to labor with their [own 1APS | BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRT] hands*

The 1837 edition dropped the adjective *own* before *hands*. The 1908 RLDS text restored the *own*, the reading of the printer's manuscript. This 1837 change appears to be accidental since the text has 14 other occurrences of "own hands" and none of these have ever lost the *own* throughout the textual history. Moreover, Joseph Smith did not mark the deletion of this *own* in his editing of  $\mathcal{P}$  for the 1837 edition.

When the verb is *labor*, we normally have "own hands" (seven times, including here in Alma 1:3), but it is also possible for the *own* to be lacking (two times, each marked below with an asterisk):

* 2 Nephi 5:17	that they should labor with their hands
Mosiah 2:14	I myself have labored with mine <b>own</b> hands
Mosiah 18:24	the priests . . . should labor with their <b>own</b> hands
Mosiah 27:4	laboring with their <b>own</b> hands
Mosiah 27:5	all their priests and teachers should labor with their <b>own</b> hands
Alma 1:3	they ought not to labor with their <b>own</b> hands
Alma 17:14	that they might not labor for them with their <b>own</b> hands
* Alma 24:18	they would labor abundantly with their hands
Alma 30:32	I have labored . . . with mine <b>own</b> hands

For each case of "to labor with one's (own) hands", we follow the earliest textual sources.

**Summary:** Restore in Alma 1:3 the *own* that the 1837 edition accidentally dropped from "they ought not to labor with their **own** hands".

## ■ Alma 1:7

*but the man withstood him  
admonishing him*

*with the [§2 words > §1 words 1 | words ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] of God*

While proofing  $\mathcal{P}$  against  $\mathcal{O}$ , Oliver Cowdery apparently expected the singular "the word of God" and started to correct the text by crossing out scribe 2's *words*. When he realized that  $\mathcal{O}$  actually read *words* (namely, in the plural), Oliver supralinearly inserted what he had crossed out, the plural *words*. As noted under 1 Nephi 16:24, both the singular and plural for "the word(s) of God" are possible. The singular dominates, with 91 occurrences in the original text, including a nearby one in verse 3 that may have triggered Oliver's initial reaction against the plural "the words of God" in verse 7:

Alma 1:3  
and he had gone about among the people  
preaching to them that which he termed to be **the word of God**

But there are three other occurrences in the earliest text of the plural "the words of God":

Alma 1:9  
now because Gideon withstood him with **the words of God**  
he was wroth with Gideon

Alma 3:18

now the Amlicites knew not that they were fulfilling **the words of God**

Alma 8:30

and it came to pass that Alma went forth  
and also Amulek among the people to declare **the words of God** unto them

The first of these examples (in verse 9 of this chapter) refers to the same event as in verse 7—namely, Gideon admonishing Nehor “with the words of God”. Thus the plural usage is self-supporting for these two verses. For one other example involving variation for “the word(s) of God”, see Alma 5:11.

*Summary:* Maintain in Alma 1:7 the plural usage in “the **words** of God”.

### ■ 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*

As discussed under 2 Nephi 1:27, the object pronoun form *him* when acting as the subject complement has been frequently edited to the subject pronoun form *he*, in accord with the prescriptions of standard English grammar. (For further discussion of this kind of editing, see under SUBJECT COMPLEMENT in volume 3.) Here in Alma 1:8, the 1837 edition also changed the relative pronoun *that* to *who*, which is permissible from an editing point of view. There are 84 occurrences of *he that* in the original text, but only a single occurrence of *he who* (in 2 Nephi 24:6, an Isaiah quote). In the current LDS text, the imbalance remains, with 87 occurrences of *he that* and 10 of *he who*. Most of the current examples of *he who* were originally *he which*. The vast majority of cases of original *he that* have remained unchanged. The *that* was also retained in the following two cases where *him* was edited to *he*:

Alma 39:15 (Joseph Smith’s editing for the 1837 edition)  
behold I say unto you that  
it is [him 0A | him >js he 1 | he BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]  
**that** surely shall come to take away the sins of the world

Mormon 8:16 (editing for the 1920 LDS edition)  
and blessed be [him 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPS | he RT]  
**that** shall bring this thing to light

There is one instance of *it that* in  $\mathcal{P}$  that Joseph Smith edited to *he who*, but the 1837 edition ended up retaining the original *that* (yet making the change from *it* to *he*):

2 Nephi 8:9 (Joseph Smith’s editing for the 1837 edition)  
art thou not [it 0APS | it >js he 1 | he BCDEFGHIJKLMNOQRT]  
[that 0ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPS | that >js who 1] hath cut Rahab  
and wounded the dragon

More generally, there are other places where Joseph changed *that* to *who*. For some examples, see the discussion under Mosiah 4:7. For a general discussion of Joseph's uneven editing of *that* to *who*, see under WHICH in volume 3. The critical text will in each case restore the original relative pronoun unless there is clear evidence of some kind of error or conscious emendation in the text.

**Summary:** Restore in Alma 1:8 the original object pronoun form *him* and the relative pronoun *that* (“it was **him that** was an instrument in the hands of God”).

#### ■ Alma 1:10

*and the man who slew him was taken by the people of the church  
and was brought before Alma to be judged  
according to the [crime 1ABCDEFGHIKPS | crimes FIJLMNOQRT] which he had committed*

Here the 1852 LDS edition introduced the plural *crimes*. Nonetheless, Nehor is being tried here for a single crime (namely, the murder of Gideon). Nehor's establishment and promotion of his own religion was not a crime under Nephite law (as discussed in Alma 30:7–11).

**Summary:** Restore in Alma 1:10 the singular *crime*, which makes better sense since Nehor is being judged for only one crime, the murder of Gideon.

#### ■ Alma 1:11

*and it came to pass that he stood before Alma  
and [pled 1 | plead ABCDEFGHKPS | pleaded IJLMNOQRT] for himself with much boldness*

The earliest text uses the past-tense form *pled*; the 1830 compositor spelled this past-tense form as *plead*, which even today is recognized as an alternative spelling for *pled* (according to Merriam-Webster's Collegiate Dictionary). The 1879 LDS edition replaced this instance of the past-tense form *plead* with the alternative *pleaded*, probably because *plead* was misinterpreted as the present-tense form (and was therefore thought to be an error).

In most printed editions of the Book of Mormon, the past-tense form for the verb *plead* has normally been spelled as the potentially confusing *plead* rather than the transparent spelling *pled*:

Alma 22:20

and they [*fled* >jg *pled* 1 | *plead* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRS | *pled* T]  
with the queen

Alma 47:15

they [*plead* 0ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST | *pled* 1] with Amalickiah

Ether 8:6

and he [*pled* 1 | *plead* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST] with them

The printer's manuscript always spelled the past-tense form as *pled*, but the 1830 compositor consistently set it as *plead*. The 1981 LDS edition changed the instance of *plead* in Alma 22:20 to *pled*, but left the two other instances of the past-tense *plead*. The original manuscript is extant for Alma 47:15 and reads *plead*, which was copied as *pled* into  $\mathcal{P}$ . For the case in Alma 22:20,  $\mathcal{P}$  actually

read *fled*, which suggests that the original manuscript there probably read *pled* rather than *plead*. John Gilbert (the 1830 compositor) corrected *fled* to *pled* in  $\mathcal{P}$ , but then set *plead* (as he did everywhere else).

In the original text, there are no occurrences of the alternative past-tense form *pleaded*. The use of the spelling *plead* for the past tense can cause potential reading problems, thus the critical text will spell all occurrences of the past-tense form as *pled* and not *plead*, reserving that spelling for the forms of the verb *plead* that are pronounced /plid/. Further, since the original text never used the past-tense form *pleaded*, the original *pled* should be restored in Alma 1:11.

**Summary:** Restore the original past-tense form *pled* in Alma 1:11; use the spelling *pled* throughout the text for the past-tense form of the verb *plead*, thus avoiding the alternative but confusing *plead* for the past-tense form.

#### ■ Alma 1:14

*therefore thou art condemned to die  
according to **the law** which has been given us by Mosiah our last king  
and [they have 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPS | it has RT] been acknowledged by this people  
therefore this people must abide by **the law***

In English, we can use the singular noun form *law* to refer to the legal structure as a whole, or we can use the plural *laws* to refer to the particular statutes. In this passage, we have a mixture of these two uses. The text starts out with the singular *law* (“according to the law which has been given us by Mosiah”). The final clause in this passage also uses the singular *law*: “therefore this people must abide by the law”. But in the middle, we have the plural *they have* (“they have been acknowledged by this people”). The 1920 LDS edition emended the plural *they have* to *it has*. Interestingly, this passage in verse 14 repeats the information that is found at the beginning of this chapter, and there the plural is used:

Alma 1:1  
nevertheless he established **laws**  
and **they were** acknowledged by the people

In fact, the language is virtually identical:

Alma 1:1                    **and they were**            **acknowledged by the people**  
Alma 1:14                 **and they have been** **acknowledged by this people**

One might argue that the singular *law* is intended the first time it occurs in verse 14 since the following relative clause has the third person singular *has*: “the law which **has** been given us by Mosiah”. Normally in the Book of Mormon text *has* is associated with third person singular subjects (especially in the editing of the text that Joseph Smith introduced in the 1837 edition). However, there are occasional uses in the earliest text where *has* occurs with plural subjects, as in the two following cases involving the relative pronoun *which*:

Mosiah 8:17  
but a seer can know of **things** which **has** passed  
and also of things which is to come

Alma 57:36

yea and I trust that the souls of **them** which **has** been slain  
have entered into the rest of their God

These readings suggest the possibility that the original text for Alma 1:14 may have read “according to **the laws** which **has** been given us by Mosiah our last king”, with the result that the following plural *they have* would not have been so jarring (and would have led to the editing of only the *has to have*).

In virtually every case, the word *law(s)* has been transmitted in the text without variation in number. The only example of variation occurred when Oliver Cowdery once wrote the singular *law* in  $\mathcal{O}$  in place of the plural *laws*, but only momentarily:

3 Nephi 6:4

and they had formed their [*law* > *laws* 1 | *laws* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]  
according to equity and justice

Thus we can find some minor support for emending the first *law* in Alma 1:14 to *laws*.

Although there are no other passages that switch between singular *law* and plural *laws* or in the number for pronominal reference to *law(s)*, there are other passages in the original text that switch the number for various nouns and pronouns, as in the following examples:

1 Nephi 5:21

and we had obtained **the record** which the Lord had commanded us  
and searched **them** and found that **they** were desirable

1 Nephi 10:19

for **he** that diligently seeketh shall find  
and the mysteries of God shall be unfolded to **them**

1 Nephi 17:48

and whoso shall lay **their** hands upon me  
shall wither even as a dried reed  
and **he** shall be as naught before the power of God

2 Nephi 33:4

and the **things** which I have written in weakness  
will he make strong unto them  
for **it** persuadeth them to do good  
**it** maketh known unto them of their fathers  
and **it** speaketh of Jesus

Mosiah 28:17

now after Mosiah had finished translating **these records**  
behold **it** gave an account of the people which was destroyed

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** may be judged of a higher judge

Alma 5:25

or also ye cannot suppose that  
 such **an one** can have place in the kingdom of heaven  
 but **they** shall be cast out  
 for **they** are the children of the kingdom of the devil

Helaman 13:31

and behold the time cometh that he curseth **your riches**  
 that **it** becometh slippery  
 that ye cannot hold **them**

Note especially the last passage, which first shifts from the plural *riches* to the singular pronoun *it* and then to the plural pronoun *them*. These examples show that shifting in number occurred fairly frequently in the original text. Therefore, the shift here in Alma 1:14 from the singular *law* to the plural *they* and then back to the singular *law* appears to be possible, especially when earlier in verse 1 the same use of the plural *they* is used to refer to the laws that the people acknowledged. The critical text will therefore restore *they have* in Alma 1:14.

*Summary:* Restore the original plural *they have* in Alma 1:14 since switches in number for nouns and pronouns can be found elsewhere in the text.

#### ■ Alma 1:15

*and they carried him upon the top of the hill Manti*

As discussed under 2 Nephi 4:24–25, the preposition *upon*, found in every extant textual source for Alma 1:15, should be interpreted as *up on*. This passage describes motion upwards (“they carried him **up**”) that ends in a final stationary destination (“**on** the top of the hill Manti”). They were not carrying Nehor around on top of the hill Manti.

#### ■ Alma 1:15

*and there he was caused or rather did acknowledge  
 between the heavens and [the 1ABCDEFIJLMNOPQRST | GHK] earth  
 that what he had taught to the people was contrary to the word of God*

Here the 1858 Wright edition omitted the repeated definite article *the*. The first two RLDS editions followed this shortened reading, but the 1908 RLDS edition restored the repeated *the*. Elsewhere in the text, when the nouns *heaven(s)* and *earth* are conjoined as noun phrases, if *heaven(s)* takes the definite article *the*, then the *the* is repeated for *earth*:

2 Nephi 2:14	and he hath created all things both <b>the</b> heavens and <b>the</b> earth
3 Nephi 9:15	I created <b>the</b> heavens and <b>the</b> earth
3 Nephi 26:3	and <b>the</b> heavens and <b>the</b> earth should pass away
Mormon 9:11	and it is that same God which created <b>the</b> heavens and <b>the</b> earth
Mormon 9:17	by his word <b>the</b> heaven and <b>the</b> earth should be

Here in Alma 1:15 the noun phrases are conjoined within a prepositional phrase headed by *between* (of course, the *between* is not repeated). The other examples of the conjoined *heaven(s)* and *earth* serve as either a subject or a direct object noun phrase, not the object of a preposition. Yet in all these cases, the *the* is repeated. Thus the original reading in Alma 1:15 is the consistent reading and will be retained in the critical text since it is also the reading of the earliest textual sources. See the general discussion under CONJUNCTIVE REPETITION in volume 3.

**Summary:** Maintain the repeated *the* in Alma 1:15 (“between the heavens and **the** earth”).

#### ■ Alma 1:17

*and now the law could have no power on any man  
for [their >]s his 1 | their A | his BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] belief*

Here we have a generic use of the singular *man* that takes the plural possessive pronoun *their* in the earliest text. In his editing for the 1837 edition, Joseph Smith replaced the plural *their* with the singular *his*, in agreement with the singular *man*. Elsewhere the text sometimes uses *their* with a singular generic word. For some examples involving the generic *whoso(ever)*, see under 1 Nephi 17:48; for examples involving *every man*, see under 2 Nephi 29:11. The critical text will restore the original *their* here in Alma 1:17.

**Summary:** Restore the plural possessive *their* in Alma 1:17, the reading in the earliest textual sources; in the original text, the plural pronominal form frequently refers to a singular generic word.

#### ■ Alma 1:18

*and they durst not steal for fear of the law  
for such were punished  
neither durst they rob nor murder  
for he that [Murdereth >]s Murdered 1 | murdered ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]  
was punished unto death*

Here the earliest text has the present-tense *murdereth* rather than the expected past-tense *murdered*. The rest of the passage is in the past tense: *durst* (two times) and *was punished* (once). The 1830 typesetter replaced the present-tense *murdereth* with *murdered*; and when Joseph Smith came to edit the text here for the 1837 edition, he marked in Ø the change in tense. One possibility is that *murdereth* could be an early transmission error for *murdered*. Note that the two preceding occurrences of the modal verb *durst* could be interpreted as being in either the past tense or in the present tense. In the Book of Mormon text, *durst* is usually in the past tense, but there are some instances in the present tense (see the discussion under Alma 1:33). In other words, *murdereth* may be a transmission error that entered the text because *durst* was interpreted as a present-tense verb form.

Despite this argument, there is one other passage dealing with legal judgment that switches between present-tense and past-tense verb forms in describing Nephite judicial practice as established by king Mosiah (here each original present-tense form is indicated with an arrow):

Alma 11:1–3 (original text, with *wages* emended to *his wages* in verse 1)  
 now it **was** in the law of Mosiah  
 that every man which **was** a judge of the law  
 —or which **was** appointed to be judges—  
 should receive his wages according to the time  
 which they **labored** to judge those  
 which **were** brought before them to be judged  
 → now if a man **oweth** another  
 and he would not pay that which he **did** owe  
 he **was** complained of to the judge  
 and the judge **executed** authority and sent forth officers  
 that the man should be brought before him  
 → and he **judgeth** the man according to the law  
 → and the evidences which **are** brought against him  
 → and thus the man **is** compelled  
 → to pay that which he **oweth** or be striped  
 or be cast out from among the people as a thief and a robber  
 → and the judge **receiveth** for his wages according to his time

Each of the present-tense forms in this long passage have long since been edited to past-tense forms (in either the 1830 or 1837 edition); for discussion of this specific editing (as well as the emendation of *wages* to *his wages*), see under Alma 11:1–3. The present-tense forms occur so frequently in Alma 11:1–3 that it is obvious that the original text sometimes intentionally used the present tense to describe legal procedures, as if they were taking place in present time. Since the occurrence in  $\mathcal{P}$  of the present-tense *murdereth* for Alma 1:18 is consistent with the frequent present-tense usage in Alma 11:1–3, the critical text will restore the present-tense form in Alma 1:18. Nonetheless, there remains the possibility that *murdereth* is an error that was introduced into the text because the two preceding occurrences of *durst* were interpreted as present-tense conditional forms.

**Summary:** Restore the present-tense *murdereth* in Alma 1:18 since such usage is found in the similar description in Alma 11:1–3 of the Nephite legal system as established by Mosiah.

#### ■ 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 argued under 1 Nephi 15:16, the original text here in Alma 1:24 read “they were **numbered** no more among the people of God”. Usage elsewhere in the text consistently states that when people’s names are blotted out, the people are no longer numbered as members of the church (four passages are listed under 1 Nephi 15:16). In support of this conjectural emendation, we have the accidental change of *numbered* to *remembered* in 1 Nephi 15:16 (which therefore shows that the verb *number* can be visually misread as the verb *remember*). It is much more reasonable that people were no longer numbered rather than no longer remembered.

**Summary:** Emend Alma 1:24 to read “they were **numbered** no more among the people of God”.



## ■ Alma 1:25

and they **bore** with patience the persecution which was heaped upon them

We do not have the original manuscript here; the printer's manuscript reads *bore*, which has been maintained in all the printed editions. It is possible that the original text read *bare* here and this past-tense form was miswritten as the modern past-tense form *bore*. In the earliest textual sources, nearly all the past-tense forms for the verb *bear* read *bare* rather than *bore*. But here in Alma 1:25, the earliest extant source reads *bore*. Since *bore* is possible, the critical text will maintain it in this instance, even though it could be an error for *bare*. Such an error in transmission apparently occurred in 1 Nephi 11:7 (see the discussion for that verse). Another example of possible original *bore* is in Alma 53:13 (see the discussion there as well).

We find a similar situation for the past tense of *swear* in the Book of Mormon text: a mixture of the archaic *sware* and the more modern *swore* in the earliest textual sources, with a tendency in the history of the text to replace *sware* with *swore*. For discussion, see under Enos 1:14. For a general discussion of the variation involving *bare/bore* and *sware/swore*, see under PAST TENSE in volume 3.

**Summary:** Maintain in Alma 1:25 the use of *bore* as the past tense of the verb *bear*; here the earliest textual source, the printer's manuscript, reads *bore*; the modern form *bore* may be a mistake for *bare*, but it is nonetheless possible.

## ■ Alma 1:26

and [ 1BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST | now A ] when their priests left their labor  
to impart the word of God unto the people  
the people also left their labors to hear the word of God

Here the 1830 typesetter accidentally added the narrative connector *now*, perhaps because of its frequent usage in the nearby preceding text, although in none of these cases do we have a preceding *and*:

verse 21	now there was a strict law among the people of the church that . . .
verse 23	now this was in the second year of the reign of Alma
verse 25	now this was a great trial to those that did stand fast in the faith

Of course, *and now* is very frequent as a narrative connector in the Book of Mormon, occurring about 650 times in the text. For another example where *now* was accidentally added after *and*, see under Mosiah 19:5; there Oliver Cowdery momentarily added the *now* as he was copying from  $\mathcal{O}$  into  $\mathcal{P}$ . In each case involving *and* and *now* as narrative connectors, the critical text will follow the earliest textual reading. Here in Alma 1:26, the 1837 edition removed the intrusive *now*, probably because Joseph Smith noticed that  $\mathcal{P}$  itself lacked the *now* when he compared  $\mathcal{P}$  with the 1830 edition in preparation for the 1837 edition.

**Summary:** Maintain in Alma 1:26 the original connector *and* without the *now* that the 1830 typesetter accidentally added.

## ■ Alma 1:26

*and when [their 1 | the ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] priests left their labor  
to impart the word of God unto the people  
the people also left their labors to hear the word of God*

The 1830 typesetter changed *their priests* to *the priests*. One possible explanation for the change is that the typesetter was influenced by the two occurrences of *the people* in the following text, especially the second occurrence of *the people*, which would have occurred just below in the next manuscript line of ☉. Both clauses have the same basic syntax and are visually similar:

**their priests      left their labor   to impart   the word of God**  
**the   people also left their labors to hear   the word of God**

Thus the change in the first clause of *their priests* to *the priests* could have been caused by the syntactic and visual similarity of the two clauses.

Another possibility is that the original text actually read *the priests* and that early on in the transmission of the text the definite article *the* was changed to *their* because of the following *their labor*. We have evidence for such an error tendency elsewhere in the manuscript transmission of the text:

2 Nephi 20:5

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

Alma 23:7

[*their > the 1 | the ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST*] weapons of **their** rebellion

Alma 48:5

[*the 0ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST | their > the 1*] weakest parts of **their** cities

Alma 51:6

their rights and [*the 0ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST | their > the 1*] privileges  
of **their** religion

Also see the discussion under 1 Nephi 10:3 and 3 Nephi 2:12.

Despite this error tendency, there is substantial evidence elsewhere in the text for the priests of a people to be referred to as “**their** priests”:

2 Nephi 28:4

and their priests shall contend one with another

Mosiah 23:17

therefore he consecrated all their priests and all their teachers

Mosiah 25:21

every church having their priests and their teachers

Mosiah 27:5

and all their priests and teachers should labor  
with their own hands for their support

Alma 23:16

the king consulted with Aaron and many of their priests

Alma 30:28

lest they should offend their priests

Alma 35:5

now their rulers and their priests and their teachers  
did not let the people know concerning their desires

Notice, in particular, the example in Mosiah 27:5 in which *their priests* is followed by two instances of *their* (“with **their** own hands for **their** support”). Thus there is inherently nothing

wrong with “their priests left their labor” in Alma 1:26, although it is always possible that the *their* is an error influenced by the following *their labor*. The critical text will here accept the earliest reading of the text since it works quite well.

We note that the text refers to the priests as having “left their **labor**” but the people as having “left their **labors**”. One wonders if the disagreement in number for *labor* might be an error. The plural *labors* for the people is probably correct since later in the verse the people are referred to as returning “unto their labors”:

Alma 1:26

and when the priest had imparted unto them the word of God  
they all returned again diligently unto their **labors**

On the other hand, the text can refer to the **labor** of the priests (that is, in the singular):

Mosiah 18:26

and the priests was not to depend upon the people for their support  
but for their **labor** they were to receive the grace of God

The text permits variation in referring to the **labor** or the **labors** of people, as in Alma’s statement to Korihor:

Alma 30:33

and notwithstanding **the many labors** which I have performed in the church  
I have never received so much as even one senine **for my labor**

Thus the critical text will allow the variation involving *labor(s)* in Alma 1:26.

*Summary:* Restore in Alma 1:16 *their priests*, the reading of the printer’s manuscript (the earliest extant text here); also maintain the variation in the number for *labor*: “their priests left their **labor** . . . the people also left their **labors**”).

■ **Alma 1:26**

*and when their priests left their labor  
to impart the word of God unto the people  
the people also left their labors to hear the word of God  
and when the priest had imparted unto them the word of God  
they all returned again diligently unto their labors  
**and the priest**  
not esteeming himself above his hearers  
for the preacher was no better than the hearer  
neither was the teacher any better than the learner  
and thus they were all equal  
and they did all labor  
every man according to his strength*

Alison Coutts has suggested (personal communication, 2 June 2005) that there might be an *also* missing after the phrase “and the priest” in Alma 1:26 (that is, “and the priest also”). Here we apparently have an instance of the Hebraistic delayed conjoined subject (although it is also possible

to interpret “and the priest not esteeming himself above his hearers” as an incomplete participial clause). Most examples in the Book of Mormon text of the delayed conjoined subject have the *also*, but most lack a verb:

1 Nephi 3:28	and <b>also was</b> Lemuel
1 Nephi 4:28	and <b>also</b> Lemuel and Sam
The Words of Mormon 1:18	and <b>also</b> the prophets
Mosiah 11:15	and <b>also</b> his people
Alma 8:30	and <b>also</b> Amulek
Alma 16:15	and <b>also</b> many more which had been chosen . . .
Alma 19:33	and <b>also</b> did all the servants of Lamoni
Alma 21:11	and <b>also</b> Ammah and his brethren
Alma 27:19	and <b>also</b> the joy of Aaron of Omner and Himni
Alma 27:25	and <b>also</b> Alma with him
Alma 54:13	and <b>also</b> my people
Alma 62:9	and <b>also</b> those kingmen which had been taken . . .
Alma 63:2	and <b>also did</b> his brother
Helaman 5:4	and his brother Lehi <b>also</b>
Helaman 9:38	and <b>also was</b> Nephi
3 Nephi 3:19	and <b>also was</b> the chief judge
3 Nephi 20:1	and <b>also</b> his disciples
Ether 2:16	and <b>also</b> his brethren
Ether 9:3	and <b>also</b> his sons and his daughters and all his household
Ether 15:28	and <b>also</b> his men

Note that in all but one of these examples, the *also* comes before the subject noun phrase, which would suggest an alternative emendation for Alma 1:26: “and also the priest”. Despite these examples supporting an *also*, there is evidence that sometimes the *also* is omitted from this Hebrew-like construction:

Mosiah 27:32	and now it came to pass that Alma began from this time forward to teach the people <b>and those which were with Alma at the time the angel appeared unto them</b>
Ether 7:7	and it came to pass that Kib dwelt in captivity <b>and his people</b> under Corihor his son until he became exceeding old

Also note that for these two examples, the delayed conjoined subject lacks a verb, just as in Alma 1:26. For further discussion of the delayed conjoined subject, see under HEBRAISMS in volume 3.

**Summary:** Retain in Alma 1:26 the Hebraistic delayed conjoined subject “and the priest”; similar examples without either *also* or a verb can be found elsewhere in the text.

## ■ Alma 1:29

*and now because of the steadiness of the church  
they began to be exceeding rich  
having abundance of all things whatsoever they stood in need*

One wonders here if the preposition *of* might be missing from the end of “whatsoever they stood in need”; that is, perhaps an original *of* was accidentally lost from “whatsoever they stood in need **of**”. Elsewhere in the text, whenever there is a noun complement for the verb phrase “to stand in need (of)”, we get the preposition *of*:

Mosiah 4:16	those that stand in need <b>of</b> your succor
Mosiah 18:9	those that stand in need <b>of</b> comfort
Alma 4:13	those who stood in need <b>of</b> their succor

It is also possible to get an infinitive clause as the complement:

Alma 39:10	ye stand in need to be nourished by your brothers
------------	---

And there are cases where there is no complement at all:

Mosiah 4:16	unto him that standeth in need
Mosiah 18:28	to those priests that stood in need
Alma 1:30	to those who stood in need
Alma 34:28	to those which stand in need

But when this phrase appears in a relative clause where the complement is a relative pronoun (in fact, always some form of *whatsoever*), there is no *of* at all:

Alma 1:29	having abundance of all things <b>whatsoever</b> they stood in need
Alma 7:23	asking for <b>whatsoever</b> things ye stand in need
Mormon 9:27	ask the Father . . . for <b>what</b> things <b>soever</b> ye shall stand in need

Thus the *of* appears to be intentionally omitted in these three passages. The critical text will retain this unusual usage.

Also note here the rather unusual variation in the placement of the word *things* with respect to *whatsoever*: not only before and after *whatsoever*, but even between the *what* and the *soever*! The online Oxford English Dictionary has one example of this phraseology, dating from Early Modern English:

Thomas Willsford (1660)  
**What things soever** a Merchant delivers . . . whether for Proper, Factorage,  
 or Company-account in money or wares . . . is Creditor.

David Calabro points out (personal communication) that *what things soever* also occurs three times in the King James Bible (Mark 11:24, John 5:19, and Romans 3:19). The use of “what things soever” in Mormon 9:27 is obviously intended.

**Summary:** Accept the use of “to stand in need” without the preposition *of* in Alma 1:29, Alma 7:23, and Mormon 9:27; also accept the construction “what things soever” in Mormon 9:27.

## ■ Alma 1:29

and now because of the steadiness of the church  
 they began to be exceeding rich  
 having abundance of all things whatsoever they stood in need:  
 [ 1 | an ABCDGHKT | and EFIJLMNOQR | An PS ] abundance of flocks and herds  
 and fatlings of every kind  
 and also abundance of grain and of gold and of silver and of precious things  
 and abundance of silk and fine-twined linen and all manner of good homely cloth

Here we have a sequence of four occurrences of the word *abundance*. The 1830 typesetter added the indefinite article *an* before the second instance of *abundance*, perhaps to relieve the abruptness of the listing following the initial instance of *abundance* (“having abundance of all things whatsoever they stood in need”). The 1849 LDS edition changed the *an* to an *and*, perhaps because the last two occurrences of *abundance* are conjoined with an *and* (“**and** also abundance of grain . . . **and** abundance of silk”). It’s even possible that the additional *and* was a typo that the 1849 typesetter introduced into the text (that is, he simply misread *an* as *and*). The reading with *and* was followed in the LDS text until the 1981 edition, when the 1830 *an* was restored. The RLDS text has maintained the *an* even though the printer’s manuscript is missing it.

Elsewhere in the text, there are no occurrences of “an abundance”; there are eight other occurrences without any determiner, seven in the set phrase “in abundance” and one with an adjective (“in great abundance”, in 2 Nephi 5:15). There is a single occurrence where *abundance* is preceded by the definite article *the*, yet this instance is found in an Isaiah quote: “for **the** abundance of milk they shall give” (2 Nephi 17:22, citing Isaiah 7:22). Undoubtedly, the original reading in Alma 1:29 without any determiner for all four occurrences of *abundance* is correct.

Further, internal evidence argues that there should be no *and* before the second instance of *abundance*. In this passage, we first have a general statement (“having abundance of **all things** whatsoever they stood in need”), which is then followed by a list of three specific categories: (1) pastured animals, (2) means of measuring value (grain, precious metals, and other “precious things”), and (3) types of cloth. Grain and precious metals are included in the same category since there was a fixed equivalence between various grains (barley is explicitly mentioned) and gold and silver, as described later in the book of Alma:

Alma 11:7, 15  
 a senum of silver was equal to a senine of gold  
 and either for **a measure of barley**  
 and also for **a measure of every kind of grain . . .**  
 a shiblon is half of a senum  
 therefore a shiblon for a half **a measure of barley**

Thus the internal structure of Alma 1:29 argues that there should be no *and* for the first of the three specific categories that follow the initial general statement.

**Summary:** Restore in Alma 1:29 the original reading as found in the printer’s manuscript, with no *an* before any of the four occurrences of *abundance*; in addition, there should be no *and* before the second occurrence of *abundance* since that occurrence is the first in a list of three specific categories of goods.

## ■ Alma 1:30

*and thus in their prosperous circumstances  
they did not send away any which was naked*

[NULL >js or 1 | or ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *that was hungry*

**or** *that was athirst*

**or** *that was sick*

**or** *that had not been nourished*

As he was setting the type here, the 1830 compositor added the conjunction *or* before the second conjunctive relative clause in this passage (“that was hungry”). In his editing for the 1837 edition, Joseph Smith also added the *or* to the printer’s manuscript. The first relative clause in this passage begins with *which* (“which was naked”). This relative clause is then followed by a group of conjoined relative clauses that all begin with *that*, so one could argue that the first relative clause functions separately from the following group of relative clauses. Yet there are other examples in the text where we get variation in the relative pronoun in conjuncts of relative clauses. One example is found in Mosiah 15:21: “yea even a resurrection of those **that** have been **and which** are **and which** shall be” (see the discussion under 2 Nephi 26:4). In the example from Mosiah 15:21, the first relative pronoun (*that*) differs from the following two (both were originally *which* but have now been edited to *who*); we have the same basic variation in Alma 1:30 except that the first relative pronoun is *which* and the following ones are *that*. Also note that in Mosiah 15:21 all the relative clauses are separated from each other by the conjunction *and*.

It is possible here in Alma 1:30 that *or* could have been deleted sometime early on in the transmission of the text. The fact that Oliver Cowdery did not supply it when he proofed  $\mathcal{P}$  suggests that it was also missing from  $\mathcal{C}$ . There is considerable evidence that *or* could sometimes be lost in the early transmission of the text, usually only temporarily:

Mosiah 25:23 (initial omission by scribe 2 of  $\mathcal{P}$ )

and it came to pass that whosoever was desirous to take upon them  
the name of Christ [NULL > or 1 | or ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] of God

Alma 23:1 (initial omission by Oliver Cowdery in  $\mathcal{P}$  of all the *or*’s except the last one)

that they should not lay their hands on Ammon  
[NULL > or 1 | or ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] Aaron  
[or 0ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST | NULL > or 1] Omner  
**or** Himni

Mormon 6:10 (omission by the 1830 typesetter)

and it came to pass that my men were hewn down  
yea [or 1 | ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] even my ten thousand  
which were with me

Moroni 4:1 (initial omission by the 1830 typesetter, corrected in press)

and the elder  
[or 1BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST | NULL > or A] priest did minister it

One additional possible case involving the early loss of *or* may have occurred in Alma 58:18, where spacing considerations between extant fragments suggests there was an *or* originally in  $\mathcal{C}$  but that it was omitted when Oliver Cowdery copied from  $\mathcal{C}$  into  $\mathcal{P}$ :

Alma 58:18

I caused that my men  
[or 0| 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST] those which were with me  
should retreat into the wilderness

For discussion, see under that passage.

Usage elsewhere in the text supports two possibilities for cases involving at least three conjoined phrases or words dealing with suffering: either there are conjunctions throughout the conjunctive structure or there is only one conjunction, just before the last conjunct (there are two examples of the latter case, each marked below with an asterisk); in all these examples, the conjunction is *and*, not *or*:

Jacob 2:19

and ye will seek them for the intent to do good :  
to clothe the naked  
**and** to feed the hungry  
**and** to liberate the captive and administer relief  
to the sick and the afflicted

\* Mosiah 4:26

I would that ye should impart of your substance to the poor  
every man according to that which he hath  
such as feeding the hungry  
clothing the naked  
visiting the sick  
**and** administering to their relief both spiritually and temporally  
according to their wants

Alma 4:12

turning their backs upon the needy and the naked  
**and** those which were hungry  
**and** those which were athirst  
**and** those which were sick and afflicted

\* Helaman 4:12

yea it was because of their oppression to the poor  
withholding their food from the hungry  
withholding their clothing from the naked  
**and** smiting their humble brethren upon the cheeks

3 Nephi 17:9 (two conjunctive structures, one within another)

all the multitude with one accord did go forth  
with their sick **and** their afflicted **and** their lame  
**and** with their blind  
**and** with their dumb  
**and** with all they that were afflicted in any manner



3 Nephi 26:15

after having healed all their sick and their lame  
**and** opened the eyes of the blind  
**and** unstopped the ears of the deaf  
**and** even had done all manner of cures among them  
**and** raised a man from the dead  
**and** had shewn forth his power unto them  
**and** had ascended unto the Father

4 Nephi 1:5 (two conjunctive structures, one within another)

they did heal the sick  
**and** raise the dead  
**and** cause the lame to walk **and** the blind to receive their sight  
**and** the deaf to hear

Mormon 8:37

for behold ye do love money and your substance  
and your fine apparel and the adorning of your churches  
more than ye love the poor **and** the needy **and** the sick **and** the afflicted

Mormon 8:39

why do ye adorn yourselves with that which hath no life  
and yet suffer the hungry **and** the needy **and** the naked **and** the sick  
**and** the afflicted to pass by you

Note especially the similarity of the listing in Alma 4:12 with that of Alma 1:30 (both include the words *naked*, *hungry*, *athirst*, and *sick*). These examples support the decision of the 1830 typesetter to add the conjunction *or* in Alma 1:30.

Perhaps the strongest support for adding the *or* in Alma 1:30 comes from the parallel language in Christ's parable of the sheep and the goats, where every subject complement is separated off by the conjunction *or*:

Matthew 25:44 (King James Bible)

then shall they also answer him saying Lord  
when saw we thee an hungred **or** athirst **or** a stranger **or** naked **or** sick  
**or** in prison  
and did not minister unto thee

Ultimately, the question in Alma 1:30 is whether the *or* is needed. My sense is that the conjunction is necessary and that somehow it was lost early in the transmission of the text, perhaps when the scribe in Ⓒ took down Joseph Smith's dictation. The earliest reading (in the printer's manuscript) seems quite implausible. The critical text will therefore follow the 1830 typesetter's decision to place an *or* between the first two relative clauses: "they did not send away any which was naked **or** that was hungry".

**Summary:** Accept in Alma 1:30 the 1830 typesetter's decision to emend the text by adding the conjunction *or* so that every relative clause conjunct is separated from its neighbor by an *or*: "they did not send away any which was naked **or** that was hungry or that was athirst or that was sick or that had not been nourished".

## ■ Alma 1:30

having no [respects >js respect 1 | respects A | respect BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] to persons  
as to those who stood in need

The earliest text here reads *respects* rather than the expected singular *respect*. Joseph Smith emended the plural to the singular in his editing for the 1837 edition. A similar instance is found later in the book of Alma:

Alma 16:14  
unto them they did impart the word of God  
without any [respects >js respect 1 | respects A | respect BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]  
of persons  
continually

We note here that the preposition after *respect(s)* varies: *to* in Alma 1:30 and *of* in Alma 16:14. We also find this same variation textually between *to* and *of* in a passage near the end of the Book of Mormon:

Moroni 8:12  
if not so  
God is a partial God  
and also a changeable God  
and a respecter [to 1ABCEFGIJKLMNOPQRST | of DHK] persons

Here the noun is *respecter*, the agent form derived from the verb *respect*.

David Eddington has suggested (personal communication, 20 December 2004) that the preposition in Moroni 8:12 should read *of* instead of *to*. The preposition in modern English is definitely *of*, as indicated by the two editions (the 1841 British edition and the 1874 RLDS edition) that independently changed the preposition in Moroni 8:12 to *of*. Nonetheless, the occurrence of *to* here in Alma 1:30 provides further support that the Book of Mormon use of *to* with *respect(s)* and *respecter* is intended.

There is evidence in earlier English for both the prepositions *to* and *of* in these expressions, although most examples use the preposition *of*. For instance, the online Oxford English Dictionary provides eight instances of “respect **of** persons”, but there is one instance of “respect **to** persons”. That single occurrence is found under *partiary* in the OED and dates from an Early Modern English dictionary of difficult words, *Glossographia*:

Thomas Blount (1656)  
*Partiary* (*partiarius*), a partaker, a follower, a copartner: It may  
also be used adjectively for partial, or that hath respect **to** persons.

*Literature Online* <lion.chadwyck.com> provides numerous examples of “respect **to** persons”, including the following from near the time of the Book of Mormon translation:

John Leacock (1776)	“they have no respect to persons”
Thomas Odiorne (1821)	“without respect to persons”
Margaret Oliphant (1863)	“to show any respect to persons”

One early example of “respect **to** persons” is found in the King James Bible (1611):

James 2:9  
but if ye have respect **to** persons  
ye commit sin

The King James Bible also has examples with the preposition *of*, with eight of “respect of persons” and one involving the noun *respector*:

Acts 10:34  
of a truth I perceive that God is no respecter **of** persons

The evidence argues that either *to* or *of* may be used with *respect* and *respector*.

The one other question is whether we ever get the plural form *respects* in this construction, such as “**respects** of persons” (as in Alma 16:14) or “**respects** to persons” (as in Alma 1:30). According to *Literature Online* <lion.chadwyck.com>, there is one example of the plural usage “**respects** of persons” in Francis Bacon’s *Resuscitatio*, dating from 1657. Mark Davies has provided me with the citation for this instance of the plural *respects*:

This latter sort, for the most part, are Men, of young years, and superficiall Understanding; Carried away, **with partiall respects of Persons**; Or with the Enticing Appearance, of Godly Names, and Pretences: Pauci res ipsas . . .

The plural usage appears to be possible, even though the only example I have been able to find thus far of this usage dates from the 1600s. But as discussed under Mosiah 19:24, there is evidence that the vocabulary of the original Book of Mormon text dates from the 1500s and 1600s. In any event, the plural *respects* is clearly used twice in the earliest Book of Mormon text (“having no **respects** to persons” here in Alma 1:30 and “without any **respects** of persons” in Alma 16:14); on the other hand, there are no instances at all of the singular noun *respect* in the earliest text.

**Summary:** Restore the unusual use of the plural *respects* in Alma 1:30 (“respects to persons”) as well as in Alma 16:14 (“respects of persons”); also accept the unusual use of the preposition *to* in Alma 1:30 (“respects **to** persons”) and in Moroni 8:12 (“respector **to** persons”).

#### ■ Alma 1:32

*for those who did not belong to their church did indulge themselves  
in sorceries and in idolatry or idleness  
and in babblings and in envyings and **strife***

John Gee has suggested (personal communication, 10 November 2004) that the plural *strifes* would be more consistent here with the preceding conjoined plural noun *envyings*. Elsewhere whenever *strife(s)* is conjoined with other nouns, the original text prefers the plural *strifes* as a conjoined noun rather than the singular *strife*:

2 Nephi 26:21  
and there are many churches built up  
which causeth envyings and **strifes** and malice

Alma 4:9

yea there was envyings and [*strifes* 1PS | *strife* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOQRT]  
and malice and persecutions and pride

Alma 16:18

now those priests which did go forth among the people  
did preach against all [*lieings* 1 | *lyings* ABCDEFGIJKLMNOQRST | *lying* HK]  
and deceivings and envyings and **strifes** and malice and revilings

Helaman 13:22

but they do swell with great pride unto boasting  
and unto great [*swelling* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOQRST | *swellings* Q]  
[*envyings* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOQRST | *envying* > *envyings* F]  
**strifes** malice persecutions and murders  
and all manner of iniquities

3 Nephi 21:19

and it shall come to pass that  
all lyings and deceivings and envyings  
and [*strife* >+ *strifes* 1 | *strifes* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOQRST]  
and [*priestcraft* 1 | *priestcrafts* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOQRST]  
and whoredoms shall be done away

3 Nephi 30:2

turn all ye Gentiles from your wicked ways  
and repent of your evil doings . . .  
and of your murders and your priestcrafts and your envyings  
and your [*strife* >+ *strifes* 1 | *strifes* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOQRST]  
and from all your wickedness and abominations

4 Nephi 1:16

and there were no envyings nor **strifes**  
nor tumults nor whoredoms  
nor [*lyeings* >% *lyeing* 1 | *lyings* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOQRST]  
nor murders nor no manner of lasciviousness

Mormon 8:21

and he that shall breathe out wrath and **strifes**  
against the work of the Lord  
and against the covenant people of the Lord

Mormon 8:36

and there are none save a few only  
which do not lift themselves up in the pride of their hearts  
unto the wearing of very fine apparel  
unto envying and [*strife* 1 | *strifes* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOQRST]  
and malice and [*persecutions* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMOPQRST | *persecution* N]  
and all manner of [*iniquity* 1PS | *iniquities* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOQRT]

The singular is what we normally expect in modern English, which can be seen in the tendency to replace the plural *strifes* with *strife*. In Alma 4:9, the 1830 typesetter made the change. In 3 Nephi 21:19 and in 3 Nephi 30:2, scribe 2 of  $\mathfrak{D}$  initially wrote the singular in each case, then with heavier

ink flow added the plural *s*. For this part of the text, the 1830 edition was set from  $\mathcal{O}$ , not  $\mathcal{P}$ , and it reads *strifes* for both of these 3 Nephi passages, which means that  $\mathcal{O}$  probably read the same as the 1830 edition since  $\mathcal{P}$  as corrected also reads in the plural. Finally, in Mormon 8:36 the 1830 edition was still being set from  $\mathcal{O}$ , and it reads *strifes*. But in this instance, scribe 2 of  $\mathcal{P}$  wrote *strife* but never corrected it to *strifes*. The odds are that  $\mathcal{O}$  also read *strifes* in Mormon 8:36 (see the discussion under that passage). If so, we have three independent cases where scribe 2 of  $\mathcal{P}$  wrote *strife* instead of the correct *strifes*. This tendency on scribe 2's part suggests that in Alma 1:32 he could have also made the same mistake of writing *strife* instead of *strifes*.

On the other hand, the singular *strife* is possible in English. We should not automatically discount this possibility—namely, that in Alma 1:32 the original text read uniquely as *strife* rather than as *strifes* in a conjoining of nouns. The singular *strife* actually occurs in the text—in fact, twice in a later passage:

Helaman 11:23

and in the seventy and ninth year there began to be **much strife**  
 but it came to pass that Nephi and Lehi and many of their brethren  
 which knew concerning the true points of doctrine  
 having many revelations daily  
 therefore they did preach unto the people  
 insomuch that they did put an end to **their strife** in that same year

The critical text will therefore retain the earliest reading of *strife* in Alma 1:32, even though there is a distinct possibility that this singular represents a fourth time when scribe 2 of  $\mathcal{P}$  wrote *strife* rather than the correct *strifes*.

**Summary:** Maintain in Mosiah 1:32 the singular *strife*, although this may be a scribal error for the plural *strifes*; elsewhere, the Book of Mormon text prefers the plural *strifes* whenever it is conjoined with other nouns in a list.

#### ■ Alma 1:32

*for those who did not belong to their church did indulge themselves  
 in sorceries and in idolatry or idleness  
 and in babblings and in envyings and strife  
 [& > And 1| ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRT| And PS]  
 wearing costly apparel  
 being lifted up in the pride of their own eyes  
 persecuting lying thieving robbing  
 committing whoredoms and murdering and all manner of wickedness*

In this passage, Mormon describes the behavior of nonmembers by first referring to a list of nouns, from *sorceries* to *strife*. Sometimes the noun is preceded by the preposition *in*, but in any event, the nouns are all separated by subordinate conjunctions (either *and* or *or*): “in sorceries **and** in idolatry **or** idleness **and** in babblings **and** in envyings **and** strife”. The passage then presents a list of present participial clauses, with no conjunctions at all separating these participial clauses: “wearing costly apparel / being lifted up in the pride of their own eyes / persecuting / lying / thieving / robbing / committing whoredoms and murdering and all manner of wickedness” (the last clause has three

nouns, including the gerundive *murdering*, that are separated by the conjunction *and*). Although the phraseology “committing murdering” sounds strange (we expect “committing murder” or “committing murders”), the Book of Mormon text does allow such constructions, as apparently in the original text for Mosiah 28:4: “suffering much fearing”.

The earliest text here in Alma 1:32 has an *and* separating the list of nouns from the list of participial clauses. It appears that the 1830 compositor consciously decided to remove this extra *and*, probably because subordinate present participial clauses typically follow main clauses without any conjunction (at least in standard English). Yet the original text of the Book of Mormon sometimes allows *and* to separate present participial clauses from a preceding main clause (for some examples, see the discussion under Mosiah 28:4). The critical text will therefore restore the separating *and* here in Alma 1:32. The 1908 RLDS edition, in fact, restored the *and* to the RLDS text (in accord with the reading in  $\mathcal{P}$ ).

Another way to interpret this passage, as pointed out by David Calabro (personal communication) is to treat “wearing costly apparel” as a gerundive phrase that is conjoined with the immediately preceding “in envyings and strife”. In such a case, the *and* between “envyings and strife” and “wearing costly apparel” would be expected. Under this interpretation, the following attached sequence of present participial clauses would now begin without an *and*, which is the more expected construction in the Book of Mormon text. This interpretation means that it doesn’t matter whether *wearing* is a gerundive noun or a present participle: the critical text will still restore the original *and*.

**Summary:** Restore in Alma 1:32 the coordinating conjunction *and* that the 1830 typesetter omitted from before “wearing costly apparel”.

#### ■ Alma 1:32

*being lifted up in the pride of their own eyes*  
 [*persecuting* 1PST | ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQR] *lying thieving robbing*  
*committing whoredoms and murdering and all manner of wickedness*

The 1830 typesetter accidentally omitted the present participial *persecuting* here in this list of participial clauses. Clearly there would have been no motivation for either adding the word earlier on in the transmission of the text or for omitting it in the 1830 edition. In accord with the reading in  $\mathcal{P}$ , the 1908 RLDS edition correctly restored the word to the RLDS text. For the same reason, the 1981 LDS edition restored *persecuting* to the list.

**Summary:** Maintain in Alma 1:32 the original inclusion of *persecuting* in the list of evil acts.

#### ■ Alma 1:32

*nevertheless the law was put in force upon all those who did transgress it*  
*inasmuch as it [were 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPS | was RT] possible*

Here the committee for the 1920 LDS edition seems to have consciously decided to change the subjunctive *were* to the indicative *was* (the change is marked in the committee’s copy of the 1911

large-print edition). Elsewhere the earliest text has five occurrences of “as it were possible” and one of “as it was possible”:

Jacob 1:4	and touch upon them as much as it <b>were</b> possible
Mosiah 21:18	the people of Limhi kept together . . . as much as it <b>was</b> possible
Alma 54:3	to obtain as many prisoners . . . as it <b>were</b> possible
Alma 61:5	with as many men as it <b>were</b> possible that I could get
Mormon 2:7	we did gather in our people as fast as it <b>were</b> possible
Mormon 2:21	we did gather in our people as much as it <b>were</b> possible

As discussed under 1 Nephi 17:31, there are examples in the earliest text of both “save it **were**” and “save it **was**”, although the one with the subjunctive form *were* is considerably more frequent. The critical text will, in each case, follow the earliest textual reading. Thus here in Alma 1:32, the original “inasmuch as it **were** possible” will be restored. On the other hand, the unique occurrence in Mosiah 21:18 of “as much as it **was** possible” will be retained. For further discussion, see under MOOD in volume 3.

*Summary:* Restore in Alma 1:32 the earliest reading: “inasmuch as it **were** possible”.

### ■ Alma 1:33

*and it came to pass that by thus exercising the law upon them  
every man suffering according to that which he had done  
they [became 1ABDEFIJLMNOQRT | become CGHKPS] more still  
and durst not commit any wickedness if it were known*

It would appear that the 1840 compositor mis-set the past-tense form *became* as *become*. The preceding text clearly indicates that this passage is in the past tense: “and it **came** to pass that by thus exercising the law upon them every man suffering according to that which he **had done**”. The incorrect present-tense form *become* has remained throughout the RLDS textual tradition, first being copied as such into the 1858 Wright edition and from there into the RLDS text proper. The present tense *become* has been retained because the following conjoined predicate reads “and **durst** not commit any wickedness if it **were** known”. The verb *durst* can be interpreted as either a past-tense modal or a present-tense conditional modal (and the *were* is clearly a conditional form rather than a past-tense use of the *be* verb). Most of the time, *durst* is a past-tense form in the Book of Mormon text (32 times), not only here in Alma 1:33 but also three times earlier in this chapter:

Alma 1:16–18

- and they **went** forth preaching false doctrines
- and this they **did** for the sake of riches and honor
- nevertheless they **durst** not lie—if it **were** known—for fear of the law
- for liars **were** punished
- therefore they **pretended** to preach according to their belief
- and now the law **could** have no power on any man for their belief
- and they **durst** not steal for fear of the law
- for such **were** punished
- neither **durst** they rob nor murder

But there are clear examples of *durst* being used as a conditional modal in a present-tense context:

1 Nephi 22:29

and now I Nephi **make** an end

→ for I **durst** not speak further as yet concerning these things

Alma 18:11

now I surely **know** that this **is** the Great Spirit

and I **would** desire him that he **come** in unto me

→ but I **durst** not

Alma 30:27–28 (three times)

and thus ye **lead** away this people

after the foolish traditions of your fathers

and according to your own desires

and ye **keep** them down—even as it **were**—in bondage

that ye **may** glut yourselves with the labors of their hands

→ that they **durst** not look up with boldness

→ and that they **durst** not enjoy their rights and privileges

→ yea they **durst** not make use of that which **is** their own

lest they **should** offend their priests

which **do** yoke them according to their desires

Alma 61:7

and they **have** come unto us

insomuch that those which **have** rose up in rebellion against us

**are** set at defiance

yea insomuch that they **do** fear us

→ and **durst** not come out against us to battle

There is support for such usage in the history of the English language; see the discussion in the Oxford English Dictionary under inflections for the verb *dare* (section A5).

Amazingly, there is even one example in the earliest text where *durst* serves as the base form of the verb, as part of a double modal, “shall durst”:

Alma 12:14

we shall not be found spotless

and our thoughts will also condemn us

and in this awful state

we shall not [*dearst* >js *dare* 1 | *durst* A | *dare* BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]

look up to our God

Not surprisingly, Joseph Smith edited this instance of *durst* to *dare* in his editing for the 1837 edition. See under Alma 12:14 for discussion of this interesting case of *durst*. Also see under MODALS in volume 3.

**Summary:** Accept in Alma 1:33 the past-tense form *became* since the preceding clause is in the past tense and the following *durst* should be interpreted as a past-tense modal.



# Alma 2

## ■ Alma 2:4

*he being a wicked man  
would deprive them of their rights and privileges of the church  
[&c 1ABCD | &c. EFGHIKLMNOQ | etc. JPS | RT]  
for it was his intent to destroy the church of God*

The 1920 LDS edition removed the *etc.* here from the text. The apparent purpose of the original passage with the *etc.* was to explain that Amlici was trying to deprive the people of all their rights and privileges. Here Mormon wants to emphasize Amlici’s intention of destroying the church, so the *etc.* is used to suggest a more extensive attack on the people’s freedoms but without specifically listing those other freedoms. Those freedoms are more fully listed in many places later on in the book of Alma in reference to the exhortations of Moroni, the chief captain over the Nephite armies, as in Alma 43:9, Alma 43:26, Alma 43:47, Alma 44:5, and Alma 48:13; see especially the words of Moroni’s title of liberty in Alma 46:12. Thus the use of *etc.* here in Alma 2:4 makes a difference in meaning. The critical text will restore the original *etc.* Also see the general discussion under ETC. in volume 3.

In this passage there appears to be some difficulty with the awkward expression “their rights and privileges of the church”. What we expect for this phrase is the definite article *the* before *privileges* since *privileges* is postmodified by an *of*-initial prepositional phrase, as in the following example:

Alma 51:6  
for the freemen had sworn or covenanted to maintain their rights  
and [*the* 0ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST | *their* > *the* 1] privileges of their religion  
by a free government

In this example, Oliver Cowdery initially wrote in  $\mathcal{P}$  “their rights and **their** privileges of their religion”, but then he virtually immediately corrected the *their* to *the* ( $\mathcal{C}$  is extant here and reads *the*). In this example, we see the tendency to replace the definite article *the* in “the privileges” with *their* because of the preceding and following instances of *their* (“**their** rights and the privileges of **their** religion”). This same error appears to have taken place in one other place, in this instance when Oliver Cowdery took down Joseph Smith’s dictation for a very similar passage:

3 Nephi 2:12  
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

In this second instance, the proposed error was not emended until the 1920 LDS edition. For discussion, see under that passage.

The original text for these two examples involving *rights* and *privileges* (namely, “their rights and **the** privileges of X”) suggests that Alma 2:4 should be emended to read “their rights and **the** privileges of the church”. There is especially strong evidence from scribal errors for this emendation. In particular, scribe 2 of  $\mathcal{P}$  (the main scribe for this part of  $\mathcal{P}$ ) frequently omitted the definite article *the*, including instances where it was obviously necessary; in about half the cases, this error was caught only later by Oliver Cowdery in his proofing of  $\mathcal{P}$  against  $\mathcal{C}$  or by the compositor when he set the type for the 1830 edition:

Mosiah 29:23 (corrected by scribe 2 of  $\mathcal{P}$ )

yea laws after [NULL > *the* 1 | *the* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] manner  
of his own wickedness

Mosiah 29:40 (corrected by Oliver Cowdery)

neither had he delighted  
in [§2 NULL >– §1 *the* 1 | *the* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] shedding of blood

Alma 2:22 (corrected by the 1830 compositor)

these were they which went out with their men to watch  
[ 1 | *the* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] camp of the Amlicites

Alma 2:23 (corrected by scribe 2 of  $\mathcal{P}$ )

and it came to pass that on the morrow they returned  
into [NULL > *the* 1 | *the* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] camp of the Nephites

Alma 4:20 (corrected by scribe 2 of  $\mathcal{P}$ )

and confined himself wholly to the high priesthood of the holy order of God  
to the testimony of [NULL > *the* 1 | *the* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] word  
according to the spirit of revelation and prophecy

Alma 8:4 (corrected by Oliver Cowdery)

and he began to teach  
[§2 NULL > §1 *the* 1 | *the* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] people  
throughout all the land of Melek

Alma 10:25 (corrected by Oliver Cowdery)

that ye will not understand  
[§2 NULL > §1 *the* 1 | *the* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] words which are spoken

3 Nephi 20:20 (corrected by scribe 2 of  $\mathcal{P}$ )

and except they repent it shall fall upon them  
saith [NULL > *the* 1 | *the* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] Father

3 Nephi 24:13 (1830 edition set from  $\mathcal{C}$ ; uncorrected error by scribe 2 of  $\mathcal{P}$ )

your words have been stout against me  
saith [ 1 | *the* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] Lord

Mormon 4:10 (corrected by scribe 2 of  $\mathcal{P}$ )

and it came to pass that  
[NULL > *the* 1 | *the* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] three hundred  
and sixty and sixth year had passed away

Mormon 4:23 (corrected by Oliver Cowdery)  
 and now I Mormon seeing that  
 [§2 NULL > §1 *the* 1 | *the* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] Lamanites  
 were about to overthrow the land . . .

(For two other possible examples where *the* was omitted by scribe 2 of  $\mathcal{P}$ , see Mormon 8:17 and Mormon 8:37.) Based on this evidence from scribal practice as well as from the language in other passages, the critical text will emend Alma 2:4 to read “he being a wicked man would deprive them of their rights and **the** privileges of the church”.

*Summary:* Maintain in Alma 2:4 the original use of *etc.*; emend the phrase “their rights and privileges of the church” by adding *the* before *privileges*; there is considerable evidence that scribe 2 of  $\mathcal{P}$  frequently omitted the definite article *the*; usage elsewhere in the text also supports the occurrence of *the* before *privileges* when postmodified by a prepositional phrase.

#### ■ Alma 2:11–12

*now the people of Amlici were distinguished by the name of Amlici  
 being called [Amlikites 1 | Amlicites ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]  
 and the remainder were called Nephites or the people of God  
 therefore the people of the Nephites was aware  
 of the intent of the [Amlikites 1 | Amlicites ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]  
 and therefore they did prepare for to meet them*

The spelling of the name *Amlici* and the associated name *Amlicite* involves considerable complexity. *Amlici* appears 16 times (from Alma 2:1 through Alma 2:31). Unfortunately, the original manuscript is not extant for any of this portion of the text, but in the printer’s manuscript the name is consistently spelled as *Amlici* and without any miswriting or immediate correction, as in the first occurrence in  $\mathcal{P}$ :

Alma 2:1  
 for a certain man being called **Amlici**  
 he being a very cunning man . . .

On the other hand, the first two occurrences in  $\mathcal{P}$  of *Amlicites* (in Alma 2:11–12) are spelled *Amlikites*. But afterwards, for 25 more occurrences (from Alma 2:13 through Alma 3:20), we have a consistent *Amlicites* in  $\mathcal{P}$ , again without any miswriting or immediate correction. Once more, there is no extant portion of the original manuscript for these chapters.

This evidence, taken all together, suggests that the current spellings *Amlici* and *Amlicites* are correct. But there is a need to explain why the first two occurrences of *Amlicites* were spelled as *Amlikites* in  $\mathcal{P}$ . It would seem that the *k* in this spelling was probably also in  $\mathcal{O}$ , which would suggest that Joseph Smith pronounced *Amlicites* (as well as its base morpheme, the name *Amlici*) with a /k/ sound rather than with the /s/ sound proposed in the Pronouncing Guide at the back of the 1981 LDS edition (and similarly in the Pronouncing Vocabulary at the end of the 1920 LDS edition). The /k/ pronunciation does seem to be directly supported by two distinct Book of Mormon names that take the same stem form *am-l-k* and a third name where the /k/ is spelled *ck*:

<b>Amaleki</b>	the record keeper mentioned in the book of Omni and the Words of Mormon; also the name of one of Ammon's men (Mosiah 7:6)
<b>Amulek</b>	Alma's missionary companion from Ammonihah (Alma 8–16, 31–35, and referenced in Helaman 5 and Ether 12)
<b>Amalickiah</b>	the Nephite rebel and usurper of the Lamanite throne (Alma 46–62); also <i>Amalickiahite</i> , a follower of Amalickiah (Alma 46, 49)

The name *Amalickiah* should be interpreted as *Amalick+iah*, where *-iah* is the theophoric ending *Jah* that refers to Jahweh (that is, Jehovah)—as in the biblical names *Isaiah*, *Jeremiah*, and *Zedekiah* (which are also referred to in the Book of Mormon). It should also be noted that there are pairs of Book of Mormon names that suggest that both *c* and *k* could serve as alternative spellings for the same sound (or similar sounds):

Corihor	Korihor
Cumeni, Cumenihah, Kishcumen	Kumen, Kumenonhi

(The original spelling for the compound name is *Kishcumen*, not *Kishkumen*, the systematic misspelling introduced by Oliver Cowdery when he copied the text from  $\mathfrak{C}$  into  $\mathfrak{D}$ ; see the discussion under Helaman 1:9.) Of course, for all these pairs of similar names, the letter *c* or *k* is followed by a nonpalatalizing vowel (*a*, *o*, or *u*). In modern English, when the following vowel is a historically palatalizing vowel (*e*, *i*, or *y*), the letter *c* typically takes on the /s/ pronunciation, at least in words borrowed from the Romance languages, while the letter *k* maintains its /k/ pronunciation.

What may have happened in the early transmission of the text is that when the name *Amlici* first showed up in the text (in Alma 2:1), Joseph Smith spelled out this name for his scribe, probably Oliver Cowdery. But when the name *Amlicite* first showed up (later in verse 11), Joseph could have assumed that Oliver would spell it as *Amlicite* based on *Amlici*, which he had already told him how to spell. But Oliver might have not paid enough attention to the morphological connection between *Amlici* and *Amlicite* and therefore in  $\mathfrak{C}$  spelled *Amlicite* more phonetically as *Amlikite* (or perhaps even *Amlickite*), at least for the first two occurrences of *Amlicite*, until he realized that he might be making a mistake and asked Joseph for the spelling of *Amlicite*. For the rest of this part of the text, from Alma 2:13 through Alma 3:20, Oliver correctly wrote the name of Amlici's followers as *Amlicites*.

There is one additional Book of Mormon name, *Amalekite*, that could be included in the above list of names taking the form *am-l-k*. The printer's manuscript (and every published edition) uses the term *Amalekite(s)* to refer to a group of religious apostates, 14 times in Alma 21–27 and 5 times in Alma 43. Yet the original manuscript and other evidence suggest that these Amalekites were not an otherwise unidentified group of religious dissidents, but were in fact Amlici's own group, the Amlicites.

To begin with, we note that for the initial occurrence of *Amalekites* in Alma 21 (as well as the initial occurrence in Alma 43), the text assumes the reader is already familiar with this group of dissidents:

Alma 21:2

now the Lamanites  
and the [*Amalekites* 1ABCEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST | *Amelekites* D]  
and the people of Amulon had built a great city which was called Jerusalem

Alma 43:6

and now as the [*Amaleckites* 0 | *Amalekites* 1ABCEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]  
were of a more wicked and a murderous disposition than the Lamanites were . . .

Moreover, the current text for Alma 21:4 indicates that “many of the Amalekites and the Amulonites were after the order of the Nehors”, which agrees with the earlier statement in Alma 2:1 that Amlici was “after the order of the man that slew Gideon by the sword who was executed according to the law” — that is, Nehor (as identified in Alma 1:15). And in Alma 43 these Amalekites are listed along with the Zoramites and Amulonites (the descendants of the priests of king Noah) as dissenters from the Nephites:

Alma 43:13

and all those which had dissented from the Nephites  
which were [*Amalickites* 0 | *Amalekites* 1ABCEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]  
and Zoramites and the descendants of the priests of Noah

The current spelling *Amalekites* may be due to the occurrence of the name *Amaleki* earlier on in the Book of Mormon text (which is the name of the record keeper in the book of Omni and the Words of Mormon as well as the name of one of Ammon’s men, mentioned in Mosiah 7:6). The name *Amalekites* is also found in the King James Bible and refers to one of the original peoples in the land of Canaan. It is possible that this biblical name had some influence in producing the spelling *Amalekites* in the printer’s manuscript for Alma 21–27.

The earliest manuscript evidence for the 14 occurrences from Alma 21:2 through Alma 27:12 provides support for identifying these Amalekites as Amlicites. The printer’s manuscript consistently spells these 14 occurrences (as well as the 5 occurrences in Alma 43) as *Amalekites*. But this is not the case when we look at the extant occurrences of this term as found in the original manuscript for Alma 21–27. The first 8 occurrences (from Alma 21:2 through Alma 23:14) are not extant, but the spelling for the 9th, 11th, and 13th occurrences is *Amelicites* (not *Amalekites*, the corresponding spelling in the printer’s manuscript):

NUMBER	LOCATION	SPELLING IN ☞
9	Alma 24:1	Amelicites
10	Alma 24:1	<not extant>
11	Alma 24:28	Amelicites
12	Alma 24:29	Am(     )
13	Alma 27:2	Amelic(   )

The spelling *Amelicite(s)* differs from *Amlicite(s)* by only the intrusive *e*.

The earlier spellings *Amlici* and *Amlicites* (in Alma 2–3) are found only in the printer’s manuscript, but if the original manuscript had read *Amelici* and *Amelicites*, it seems doubtful that Oliver Cowdery would have copied these names without the *e*. The intrusive *e* found later on (in both the original and printer’s manuscripts) may have been influenced by other names (such as

*Amaleki*, *Amulek*, and *Amulon*, where a vowel is found between the *m* and the *l*). Note, in particular, that the name *Amulek* occurs 67 times in Alma 8–16 (that is, after Alma 2–3), where the name *Amlici* (along with *Amlicite*) was first introduced, but before the return of *Amlicite* to the narrative in Alma 21–27.

As already noted, the spelling of *Amlicites* for the five occurrences in Alma 43 is *Amalekites* in the printed editions as well as in the printer’s manuscript. *Amalekites*, the consistent spelling in  $\mathcal{P}$  for Alma 21–27 and Alma 43, is found only once in  $\mathcal{C}$  (namely, in Alma 43:44, the very last occurrence of the name in the text). In the original manuscript for Alma 43, we find that the spelling varies considerably and has moved even further away from the original *Amlicites*. In particular, its spellings seem very much like the spelling for the soon-to-appear *Amalickiah* and its related forms (which occur 68 times from Alma 46:3 through Alma 62:35):

LOCATION	SPELLING IN $\mathcal{C}$
Alma 43:6	Amaleckites
Alma 43:6	Amelekites
Alma 43:13	Amalickites
Alma 43:20	Amelickites
Alma 43:44	Amalekites

In fact, in the original manuscript Oliver Cowdery frequently misspelled *Amalickiah* as *Ameleckiah* (28 times) and *Amelickiah* (21 times). For further discussion of the spelling of *Amalickiah*, see under Alma 46:5.

Woodrow Huntamer has argued (personal communication, 1 July 2003 and 7 July 2003) that these Amalekites existed prior to the Amlicites: Alma 17:6 indicates that the four sons of Mosiah left in the first year of the reign of the judges, and Alma 21:1–4 refers to Aaron and his fellow missionaries as preaching to the Amalekites after separating from Ammon. No intervening missionary work on Aaron’s part is mentioned, so one might naturally assume that Aaron tried to preach to these Amalekites at the beginning of his missionary work. The problem with the emendation *Amlicite(s)* for *Amalekite(s)* is that there is no mention of the Amlicites until the fifth year of the reign of the judges, when Amlici first appears in the narrative (see Alma 2:1–11). And even if Amlicites existed earlier, they did not unite with the Lamanites until the fifth year (as described in Alma 2–3).

One possible solution to this conflict in the sequencing of events is to note that the Amalekites (as described in Alma 21:4) were after the order of the Nehors, as was Amlici himself. Nehor “began to establish a church after the manner of his preaching” (Alma 1:6) in the first year of the reign of the judges, the same year that the four sons of Mosiah left on their mission to the Lamanites. Thus the reference in Alma 21:4 to meeting the Amalekites (that is, Amlicites) may be an anachronistic use of the name *Amlicite(s)* in the original text to refer to followers of Nehor who later became identified as Amlicites. In fact, Alma 21:4 essentially makes that point later on in the verse: “for many of the Amalekites [Amlicites] and the Amulonites were after the order of the Nehors”.

Another possible explanation may derive from the fact that Mormon’s account of the four sons’ missionary work is highly abbreviated. The sons of Mosiah spent 14 years among the Lamanites (as stated in Alma 17:4), yet the events described by Mormon in Alma 17–24 seem to cover only a few years. So perhaps as readers we should not automatically assume that the city of Jerusalem was the first place where Aaron preached. The text in Alma 21:4 simply states that after

arriving in the city of Jerusalem, Aaron “firstly began to preach to the Amalekites [Amlicites]”. There is no explicit statement about how long and where Aaron and his companions might have worked prior to reaching the city of Jerusalem.

The emendation of *Amlicite(s)* for *Amalekite(s)* was first suggested by Lyle Fletcher in an unpublished paper he wrote on this question in the early 1990s. John A. Tvedtnes, on pages 324–325 in *The Most Correct Book: Insights from a Book of Mormon Scholar* (Salt Lake City, Utah: Cornerstone, 1999), proposes that the Amalekites might be the Amlicites and provides considerable evidence to show that these Amalekites were Nephite dissenters.

**Summary:** Accept the spelling *Amlicites* instead of the *Amlikites* found in the printer’s manuscript for Alma 2:11–12; change all 19 occurrences of *Amalekite(s)* in Alma 21–27 and Alma 43 to *Amlicite(s)*.

### ■ Alma 2:13

*and thus **they were** prepared to meet the Amlicites at the time of their coming  
and [there was 1A | there were BCDGHIJKLMNOPQRST | they were E | they were > there were F]  
appointed captains and higher captains and chief captains  
according to their numbers*

Here we have a typo in the 1849 LDS edition where the typesetter, it would appear, misread *there were* as *they were* (the text had earlier been edited for the 1837 edition from *there was* to *there were*). The source for this typo was probably the preceding *they were* (“and thus **they were** prepared to meet the Amlicites”). The correct reading with *there was* was restored in the second printing of the 1852 LDS edition, probably by reference to the 1840 edition.

**Summary:** Maintain the use of *there was* in Alma 2:13, the reading of the earliest textual sources.

### ■ Alma 2:15

*and it came to pass that  
the Amlicites came [up 1A | BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] **upon** the hill Amnihu*

The 1837 edition omitted the adverbial *up* that precedes the related preposition *upon* in the original text. This deletion was probably accidental since most other occurrences of *up upon* have been retained in the current LDS and RLDS texts:

1 Nephi 11:33	he was lifted <b>up upon</b> the cross
2 Nephi 18:7	the Lord bringeth <b>up upon</b> them the waters of the river
Mosiah 10:8	they came <b>up upon</b> the north of the land of Shilom
Alma 16:11	their dead bodies were heaped <b>up upon</b> the face of the earth
Helaman 3:9	whatsoever tree should spring <b>up upon</b> the face of the land
Helaman 14:11	for this intent I have come <b>up upon</b> the walls of this city
3 Nephi 3:20	let us go <b>up upon</b> the mountains
3 Nephi 8:10	the earth was carried <b>up upon</b> the city of Moronihah
3 Nephi 8:18	they were broken <b>up upon</b> the face of the whole earth
3 Nephi 20:17	thy hand shall be lifted <b>up upon</b> thine adversaries



Alma 2

3 Nephi 21:13	their hand shall be lifted <b>up upon</b> their adversaries
3 Nephi 27:14	that I might be lifted <b>up upon</b> the cross
3 Nephi 27:14	after that I had been lifted <b>up upon</b> the cross
Mormon 2:15	and heaped <b>up</b> as dung <b>upon</b> the face of the land
Ether 4:1	until after that he should be lifted <b>up upon</b> the cross
Ether 13:6	a new Jerusalem should be built <b>up upon</b> this land

In three other cases, the *up of up upon* has been omitted but within differing textual sources for the most part, thus showing that there has been a tendency to accidentally omit the *up*:

Alma 62:22 (loss in the 1830 edition)

and it came to pass that Moroni caused that his men should march forth  
and come [*up* 1 | ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] **upon** the top of the wall

3 Nephi 20:2 (loss by scribe 2 of  $\mathcal{P}$ , supplied by Oliver Cowdery; also omitted in the 1874 RLDS edition)

and he commanded them that they should arise  
and stand [ $\S$ 2 NULL >  $\S$ 1 *up* 1 | *up* ABCDEFGIJKLMNOQRT | HKPS]  
**upon** their feet

Ether 13:8 (loss in the 1830 edition)

wherefore the remnant of the house of Joseph  
shall be built [*up* 1PS | ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOQRT] **upon** this land

The critical text will therefore restore all four of these original instances of *up upon* to the text.

These examples of the loss of *up* bring up the question of whether there might be other cases of *upon* that are errors for an original *up upon*. In such cases, an *up* could have been lost early in the transmission of the text, perhaps as Joseph Smith dictated the text to his scribe or later when the text was copied from  $\mathcal{G}$  into  $\mathcal{P}$ . It is also possible that a change of *up upon* to *upon* could result from the archaic *upon* being replaced by *on*, thus giving *up on* (which could then be interpreted as one word, *upon*). We have independent evidence for frequent mix-ups between *upon* and *on* in the textual history. For two examples, see the discussion under Mosiah 28:11; for a more extensive list of examples, see nearby under Alma 2:38.

The important point to remember here is that it will be difficult to discover such errors in the early transmission of the text since *up upon* and *up on* are semantically equivalent. And in many instances, it is also difficult to determine whether *upon* is a case of *up on* or vice versa. Consequently, the critical text will generally refrain from emending these cases unless there is specific textual or semantic support for making the change. Under 2 Nephi 4:24–25, I list three instances where *upon* should be emended to *up on*. Yet in each of these proposed cases of original *up on*, one could further argue on semantic grounds that the *upon* (the spelling in all the extant textual sources) is an error for *up upon*. But since *up on* is semantically equivalent to *up upon*, there would be no motivation for emending *up on* to *up upon* without specific evidence from the earliest textual sources.

**Summary:** Restore in Alma 2:15 the original phraseology *up upon* (“the Amlicites came **up upon** the hill Amnihu”).



## ■ Alma 2:15

*the Amlicites came up upon the hill* [ 1ABDEFIJLMNOQRT | *of* CGHKPS] *Amnihu*

The 1840 edition introduced the preposition *of* between *hill* and *Amnihu*. The RLDS textual tradition has here maintained the intrusive *of*. This insertion could be due to Joseph Smith’s minor editing for the 1840 edition, but there is a greater probability that the *of* was accidentally added by the 1840 typesetter since elsewhere in the text there has been no tendency (in any edition, much less the 1840) for *of* to be added or deleted in the expression “the hill (of) X”. In most cases, the text reads without the *of* (in 13 out of 15 cases):

the hill Amnihu	Alma 2:15
the hill Comron	Ether 14:28, Ether 14:28
the hill Cumorah	Mormon 6:4, Mormon 6:6, Mormon 6:11
the hill Ephraim	Ether 7:9
the hill <b>of</b> Jerusalem	2 Nephi 20:32
the hill Manti	Alma 1:15
the hill Onidah	Alma 32:4
the hill Ramah	Ether 15:11
the hill Riplah	Alma 43:31, Alma 43:35
the hill Shim	Mormon 4:23
the hill <b>of</b> Shim	Ether 9:3

The instance of “the hill of Jerusalem” is a quotation from Isaiah 10:32, which reads with the *of* in the King James text.

We do not have the original manuscript, only the printer’s manuscript, for the reading “the hill **of** Shim” in Ether 9:3, but this reading contrasts with the expected “the hill Shim”, which does occur (in Mormon 4:23). It could well be that the reading in Ether 9:3 is an error, especially since it does sound rather odd given the otherwise consistent use of “the hill X” for Book of Mormon geography.

This problem is related to the optional use of *of* in other expressions, especially “the land of X” versus “the land X”, which occasionally shows variation in the history of the text. See, for instance, under 1 Nephi 17:7 for the use of *of* in the phrase “the land (of) Bountiful”. Similar variation can be found for the expression “the city (of) X”; see under 1 Nephi 11:13 for discussion of the phrase “the great city (of) Jerusalem”. Since variation is possible, the critical text will permit not only the occurrence of “the hill **of** Shim” in Ether 9:3 but also the lack of the *of* in “the hill Shim” for Mormon 4:23. Similarly, the original “the hill Amnihu” will be maintained here in Alma 2:15.

**Summary:** Maintain the phraseology “the hill Amnihu” in Alma 2:15; most of the time the Book of Mormon text omits the *of* in the expression “the hill (of) X”.

## ■ Alma 2:15

*the Amlicites came up upon the hill Amnihu  
which was [ 1ABCGHKPRST | the DEFIJLMNOQ ] east of the river Sidon  
which ran by the land [of 1ABCGHKPRST | DEFIJLMNOQ ] Zarahemla*

In this verse the 1841 British edition introduced two secondary readings. The first was the accidental addition of *the* before *east*, creating the very strange noun phrase “**the** east of the river Sidon”. Even more strange is that this awkward reading was maintained in the LDS text until the 1920 edition. Whenever a cardinal direction is the head noun in a prepositional phrase and the direction is immediately followed by the preposition *of*, the definite article *the* occurs before the direction:

- *as the head noun in a prepositional phrase* (a sampling from 20 occurrences)

Mosiah 9:14	away <b>on the south</b> of the land of Shilom
Mosiah 10:8	they came up <b>upon the north</b> of the land of Shilom
Alma 2:34	which was <b>on the west</b> of the river Sidon
Alma 6:7	and went over <b>upon the east</b> of the river Sidon

But when the cardinal direction acts as the subject complement (as here in Alma 2:15) or when it postmodifies another noun, the direction always occurs without the *the*:

- *as the subject complement* (a sampling from 8 occurrences)

Alma 31:3	a land . . . which <b>was east of</b> the land of Zarahemla
Alma 50:7	their own lands which <b>were south of</b> the land of Zarahemla
Alma 50:9	the east wilderness which <b>was north of</b> the lands of their own possessions

- *as the postmodifier for a noun* (2 occurrences)

Mosiah 11:13	to be built on <b>the hill north of</b> the land Shilom
Alma 2:17	to slay the Amlicites upon <b>the hill east of</b> Sidon

Of course, these results correspond to modern English usage.

The second 1841 change in this passage was also accidental—namely, the loss of the preposition *of* from “the land of Zarahemla”. As noted under 1 Nephi 17:7, either reading, with or without the *of*, is theoretically possible. But it actually turns out that in the original text of the Book of Mormon there are only instances of “the land of Zarahemla” (105 times). Here in Alma 2:15, the 1920 LDS edition restored the *of* to the LDS text. Elsewhere there are four cases where *of* has been accidentally omitted from “the land of Zarahemla”. In each of these other cases, the omission was limited to a single textual source:

PASSAGE	SOURCE OF OMISSION
Alma 22:27	1841 British edition
Alma 31:3	initially by Oliver Cowdery in Ⓞ
3 Nephi 3:23	1981 LDS edition
Mormon 1:6	1874 RLDS edition

For discussion, see each passage. The critical text will maintain the consistent use of *of* in the phrase “the land of Zarahemla”, although theoretically “the land Zarahemla” is possible. For discussion of the phrase “the land (of) X”, especially when X is the name of a person, see under Alma 27:23 regarding the phrase “the land (of) Nephi”.

*Summary:* Maintain the consistently used phrase “the land **of** Zarahemla” in Alma 2:15 and elsewhere in the text; also maintain in Alma 2:15 the word *east* without any preceding *the* (“which was east of the river Sidon”).

#### ■ Alma 2:16

now **Alma** [*he* >js NULL 1 | *he* A | BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] **being** the chief judge  
and the governor of the people of Nephi  
therefore he went up with his people

Here in his editing for the 1837 edition, Joseph Smith removed the redundant pronoun *he* that immediately follows the subject noun *Alma*. A similar instance of this kind, where the name and the pronoun are followed by a present participial clause, occurs later in this chapter, and Joseph also removed this instance of the redundant pronoun:

Alma 2:30  
and it came to pass that  
**Alma** [*he* >js NULL 1 | *he* A | BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] **being** a man of God  
being exercised with much faith . . .

There is one more example of this kind of editing on Joseph’s part:

Helaman 1:16  
**Coriantumr** [*he* 0A | *he* >js NULL 1 | BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]  
**being** a mighty man  
could stand against the Nephites

But in two cases, such redundant pronominal forms have been left unchanged in the text:

Alma 63:5  
**Hagoth he being** an exceeding curious man  
therefore he went forth and built him an exceeding large ship

Ether 10:9  
**Morionton he being** a descendant of Riplakish  
gathered together an army of outcasts

Obviously, these instances of a name acting as subject and being immediately followed by a redundant pronominal form of the name are all intended and will therefore be maintained in the critical text. For discussion of similar redundancies, see under SUBJECT REPETITION in volume 3.

*Summary:* Restore the redundant pronoun subject *he* in Alma 2:16 (“now Alma **he** being the chief judge . . . therefore he went up with his people”); such usage is found elsewhere in the original (and current) text.

## ■ Alma 2:17

*and they began to slay the Amlicites  
upon the hill east of [Sidon 1BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST | Sidom A]*

Here the 1830 compositor set *Sidom* rather than *Sidon*, the reading in  $\mathcal{P}$ . The 1837 edition restored the correct *Sidon*. *Sidon* is the name of the river, with 37 occurrences, while *Sidom* is a land, with 7 occurrences. The first actual occurrence of *Sidom* is in Alma 15:1, so the error here in Alma 2:17 is simply a visual misreading of  $\mathcal{P}$ . The first occurrence of *Sidon* is earlier in verse 15 of this chapter. The only other variation in the text with respect to the name *Sidon* is found twice in the original manuscript, where Oliver Cowdery wrote *Sidon* as *Siden* but more as a slip of the pen than intentionally (in Alma 43:40 and initially in Alma 43:51). All other occurrences of *Sidon* in the text are invariant in the manuscripts and printed editions. *Sidon* is definitely the correct name for the river.

The use of *Sidon* here in Alma 2:17 without any identifying specification makes it sound like a land. Elsewhere, the text almost always describes *Sidon* as either “the river *Sidon*” (27 times) or “the waters of *Sidon*” (8 times). There is one more occurrence of *Sidon* without any noun modifier: “neither durst they cross **the head of Sidon** over to the city of Nephiah” (Alma 56:25). Elsewhere the text has “the head of **the river Sidon**” (4 times).

**Summary:** Maintain the spelling *Sidon* for the name of the river; the earliest textual evidence supports this spelling.

## ■ Alma 2:18

*nevertheless the Lord did strengthen the hand of the Nephites  
that they slew the Amlicites with [a 1ABCDEFGHijklNPS | MOQRT] great slaughter*

Here the 1905 LDS edition accidentally dropped the indefinite article *a* in the phrase “with a great slaughter”. This omission has been maintained up through the present LDS edition (1981). Elsewhere in the Book of Mormon, phrases involving *great* and *slaughter* all have an article, either the indefinite *a/an* (six times) or the definite *the* (four times):

Mosiah 10:20	with <b>a</b> great slaughter
Alma 59:7	with <b>an</b> exceeding great slaughter
Alma 60:5	great has been <b>the</b> slaughter among our people
Alma 62:38	with <b>a</b> great slaughter
Helaman 1:27	with <b>a</b> great slaughter
Helaman 4:11	<b>the</b> great slaughter which was among them
3 Nephi 4:11	great and terrible was <b>the</b> slaughter thereof
3 Nephi 4:11	so great <b>a</b> slaughter among all the people of Lehi
3 Nephi 4:24	<b>the</b> great slaughter which had been made among them
Mormon 4:21	with <b>an</b> exceeding great slaughter

In none of these cases do we find *slaughter* without a determiner. The critical text will restore the indefinite article *a* here in Alma 2:18 (“with a great slaughter”).

**Summary:** Restore the indefinite article *a* before *great slaughter* in Alma 2:18.

## ■ Alma 2:18

*nevertheless the Lord did strengthen the hand of the Nephites*

**that they** *slew the Amlicites with a great slaughter*

[*that* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST | *and* HK] **they** *began to flee before them*

The 1874 RLDS edition replaced the subordinate conjunction *that* with the coordinating *and*, perhaps unintentionally. The 1908 RLDS edition restored the original *that*. Here we have a resultive relationship between the two *that*-clauses: the Nephites slaughtered the Amlicites, with the result that the remaining Amlicites started to flee. Similar examples can be found in the text where pairs of *that*-clauses are asyndetically conjoined, as in the following example where the second pronoun *they* has a different referent from the first *they* (just as here in Alma 2:18):

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

Thus the critical text will maintain in Alma 2:18 the two conjoined *that*-clauses for which there is no connecting *and*.

*Summary:* Maintain the subordinate conjunction *that* in Alma 2:18; sequences of asyndetically conjoined *that*-clauses can be found elsewhere in the text.

## ■ Alma 2:22

*these were they which went out with their men to watch*

[ 1 | *the* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *camp of the Amlicites*

Here we have an obvious error in  $\mathcal{P}$ , the omission of the definite article *the* before *camp*. The original scribe here is the unknown scribe 2 of  $\mathcal{P}$ . Oliver Cowdery, when he proofed  $\mathcal{P}$  against  $\mathcal{O}$  seems to have missed noticing that the *the* was lacking. Although it is possible that  $\mathcal{O}$  itself lacked the *the*, a more reasonable explanation is that scribe 2 of  $\mathcal{P}$  simply omitted it when he copied the text from  $\mathcal{O}$  into  $\mathcal{P}$ . Note that later on in this chapter, scribe 2 once more omitted the *the* before *camp*, but this time he caught his error and virtually immediately inserted it supralinearly:

Alma 2:23

and it came to pass that on the morrow they returned

into [NULL > *the* 1 | *the* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] camp of the Nephites

in great haste

This other example strongly suggests that earlier in verse 22 scribe 2 of  $\mathcal{P}$  made the same copying error, although there he neglected to correct his copy.

The noun *camp*, whether in the singular or plural, always takes some kind of determiner or possessive premodifier in the text. If *camp* is followed by a prepositional phrase headed by *of*, the determiner is always the definite article *the*. In the following list, I exclude the example from

Alma 2:22 where the *the* is missing in  $\mathcal{D}$ ; there is one earlier example of this construction in this verse and it has the *the* in  $\mathcal{D}$  (marked below with an asterisk):

* Alma 2:22	those which he had sent out to watch <b>the camp of</b> the Amlicites
Alma 2:23	they returned into <b>the camp of</b> the Nephites
Alma 2:24	we followed <b>the camp of</b> the Amlicites
Alma 43:28	when <b>the camp of</b> the Lamanites should come
Alma 50:27	the people . . . fled to <b>the camp of</b> Moroni
Alma 50:28	the people of Lehi had fled to <b>the camp of</b> Moroni
Alma 50:31	she fled and came over to <b>the camp of</b> Moroni
Alma 50:35	Teancum . . . returned to <b>the camp of</b> Moroni
Alma 51:33	Teancum and his servant . . . went into <b>the camp of</b> Amalickiah
Alma 57:30	the spies of our armies which had been sent out to watch <b>the camp of</b> the Lamanites
Alma 62:36	Teancum . . . did go forth into <b>the camp of</b> the Lamanites

In other words, the decision of the 1830 typesetter to supply the definite article *the* in Alma 2:22 was undoubtedly correct.

*Summary:* Accept in Alma 2:22 the 1830 typesetter’s obviously correct emendation, the addition of the definite article *the* in “**the** camp of the Amlicites”.

#### ■ Alma 2:24

*in the land of* [*Minen* > *Minon* 1 | *Minon* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]

Scribe 2 of  $\mathcal{D}$  initially wrote the name *Minon* as *Minen*. Then almost immediately he overwrote the *e* with an *o*, presumably the reading of the original manuscript. Scribe 2 frequently miswrote *o*’s as *e*’s. For instance, earlier on this page of  $\mathcal{D}$  (near the end of line 6 on page 174), scribe 2 initially wrote *two* as *twe*; then almost immediately he corrected the *e* by overwriting it with an *o*. In the following example, scribe 2’s *e/o* once more involves a name:

3 Nephi 27:8  
for if a church be called in [*Meses* 1 | *Moses*’ ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] name  
then it be [*moses* 1 | *Moses*’ ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] church

Book of Mormon names can end in either *en* or *on*, but there are only two examples with *en* (namely, *Kishcumen* and *Kumen*) while there are 21 that end in *on* (including common ones like *Ammon*, *Ammoron*, *Amulon*, *Gaddianton*, *Jershon*, *Morionton*, *Mormon*, *Moron*, *Parhoron*, and *Shiblon*). The most reasonable solution here in Alma 2:24 is to follow scribe 2’s corrected reading in  $\mathcal{D}$  since there would have been no motivation for him to have edited *Minen* to *Minon*.

*Summary:* Maintain the corrected spelling in  $\mathcal{D}$  for the land *Minon*, mentioned only here in Alma 2:24.

## ■ Alma 2:25

*and they are upon our brethren in that land  
and they are fleeing before them with their flocks and their wives and their children  
towards our city  
and **except** we make haste  
they **obtain** possession of our city  
and our fathers and our wives and our children **be** slain*

One might think that the clause “they **obtain** possession of our city” could be an error for “they **will** obtain possession of our city” or “they **shall** obtain possession of our city”. But actually, here we have an instance of the subjunctive rather than the indicative mood. Note, in particular, the subjunctive *be* in the following clause: “and our fathers and our wives and our children **be** slain”. There are two examples elsewhere in the Book of Mormon text of this kind of subjunctive usage for the main clause following an *except*-clause (although in both of these other cases, there is no overt distinction between the subjunctive and indicative verb forms since the subject is the third person plural pronoun *they* or the first person singular pronoun *I*):

2 Nephi 26:30

behold the Lord hath forbidden this thing  
wherefore the Lord God hath given a commandment  
that all men should have charity which charity is love  
and **except** they should have charity  
they **were** nothing  
wherefore if they should have charity  
they would not suffer the laborer in Zion to perish

Alma 60:30

behold I wait for assistance from you  
and **except** ye do administer unto our relief  
behold I **come** unto you even into the land of Zarahemla  
and **smite** you with the sword  
insomuch that ye can have no more power  
to impede the progress of this people in the cause of our freedom

Normally, in such cases we expect a future modal, either *will* or *shall* (or *are* in the case of 2 Nephi 26:30 as if it read “except they should have charity / they **are** nothing”). A good example where *will* and *shall* are used in the subsequent main clause is found in Abinadi’s prophecy to the people of king Noah:

Mosiah 11:20–25

and **except** they repent  
I **will** visit them in mine anger  
  
and **except** they repent and turn to the Lord their God  
behold I **will** deliver them into the hands of their enemies . . .  
  
**except** this people repent and turn to the Lord their God  
they **shall** be brought into bondage and none **shall** deliver them . . .  
  
and **except** they repent in sackcloth and ashes and cry mightily to the Lord their God  
I **will** not hear their prayers neither **will** I deliver them out of their afflictions

Of course, the unusual use of the subjunctive in Alma 2:25 is clearly intentional since no modal verb is used with either *obtain* or *be*. The critical text will therefore retain this striking use of the subjunctive.

**Summary:** Maintain the subjunctive usage in the main clause of Alma 2:25: “and except we make haste / they **obtain** possession of our city / and our fathers and our wives and our children **be** slain”.

### ■ Alma 2:27

*the Lamanites and the Amlicites  
being as numerous almost as it were  
as the [sands > Sands 1 | sands ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] of the sea  
came upon them to destroy them*

David Calabro suggests (personal communication) that the plural *sands* here in Alma 2:27 is an error for *sand*; that is, he proposes that the original text read “the **sand** of the sea”, not “the **sands** of the sea” (the reading of the printer’s manuscript). Elsewhere the Book of Mormon text has three other occurrences of “the **sand** of the sea” but none of “the **sands** of the sea”:

- 1 Nephi 12:1  
and I beheld multitudes of people  
yea even as it were in number as many as the **sand** of the sea
- 2 Nephi 20:22 (quoting Isaiah 10:22)  
for though thy people Israel be as the **sand** of the sea  
yet a remnant of them shall return
- Mormon 1:7  
and the people were as numerous almost as it were  
the [§2 sands > §1 sand 1 | sand ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] of the sea

The last example shows that scribe 2 of  $\mathcal{P}$  (also the scribe in  $\mathcal{P}$  for Alma 2:27) wrote “the **sands** of the sea”, but in that instance Oliver Cowdery, in his proofing of  $\mathcal{P}$  against  $\mathcal{O}$ , corrected the plural *sands* to the singular *sand*. Also note that the 1830 edition reads in the singular. For this part of the text (from Helaman 13 through the end of Mormon), the 1830 edition was set from  $\mathcal{O}$ , not  $\mathcal{P}$ ; thus it is probable that  $\mathcal{O}$  read “the **sand** of the sea” in Mormon 1:7 and that scribe 2 of  $\mathcal{P}$  accidentally wrote the plural “the **sands** of the sea”, which Oliver corrected to “the **sand** of the sea”. We should note, however, that here in Alma 2:27 Oliver Cowdery did not correct the plural *sands* to *sand* when he proofed  $\mathcal{P}$  against  $\mathcal{O}$ . It is therefore possible that  $\mathcal{O}$  itself read in the plural.

Consistent with the singular *sand* in Isaiah 10:22 (listed above), the current King James Bible has only the singular “the sand of the sea” (nine other times). However, the plural is found in the Apocrypha, which was in the original 1611 King James Bible:

The Prayer of Manasses  
for I have sinned above the number of the **sands** of the sea

The Apocrypha also has one other occurrence of the singular: “who can number the **sand** of the sea”, in Ecclesiasticus 1:2.



The plural usage is fairly common in English. *Literature Online* <lion.chadwyck.com> provides 31 citations of “the sands of the sea”, with dates from 1589 to 1996 (including the one from the 1611 King James Apocrypha). It also provides 24 citations of the singular “the sand of the sea”, dating from the 1611 King James Bible to 1990. This variation argues that either singular *sand* or plural *sands* is possible in Alma 2:27. Since the plural usage is possible, the critical text will maintain the single occurrence of “the sands of the sea” in Alma 2:27, even though this plural *sands* may very well be an error for the singular *sand*.

**Summary:** Retain in Alma 2:27 the use of the plural *sands* in “the sands of the sea”, the reading in  $\mathcal{P}$  and in all the printed editions; this plural reading is possible in English, although the occurrence in Alma 2:27 could be an error for “the sand of the sea”, especially since scribe 2 of  $\mathcal{P}$  seems to have accidentally written “the sands of the sea” in Mormon 1:7.

### ■ Alma 2:27–28

*and behold as they were crossing the river Sidon*

*the Lamanites and the Amlicites*

**being** as numerous almost as it were as the sands of the sea

[§2 *comeing* > §1 *came* 1 | *came* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *upon them to destroy them nevertheless the Nephites being strengthened by the hand of the Lord*

**having** prayed mightily to him that he would deliver them out of the hands of their enemies therefore the Lord did hear their cries and did strengthen them

Here scribe 2 of  $\mathcal{P}$  wrote two immediately conjoined present participial clauses but without any conjoining *and*: “**being** as numerous almost as it were as the sands of the sea / **coming** upon them to destroy them”. Oliver Cowdery, when he proofed  $\mathcal{P}$  against  $\mathcal{O}$ , changed the second present participle *coming* to the finite past-tense verb form *came* since the subject “the Lamanites and the Amlicites” needed a finite verb form. We cannot be sure here whether Oliver’s change to *came* was a restoration of the reading in  $\mathcal{O}$  or an independent attempt on his part to remove a sentence fragment. There is evidence that scribe 2 of  $\mathcal{P}$  could write a present participle instead of the correct finite verb form:

3 Nephi 22:16 (quoting Isaiah 54:16, which reads *bringeth*)

behold I have created the smith that bloweth the coals in the fire

and that [*bringing* > *bringeth* 1 | *bringeth* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] forth an instrument for his work

In this example, scribe 2 of  $\mathcal{P}$  caught his error and corrected *bringing* to *bringeth*; the 1830 edition, which was set from  $\mathcal{O}$  rather than  $\mathcal{P}$  for that part of the text, also reads *bringeth*. We should also note that in this example from 3 Nephi 22 there was no nearby present participle that might have triggered scribe 2’s initial writing of *bringing*. In Alma 2:27, there is the preceding *being* and the following *being strengthened* and *having prayed* that could have readily influenced scribe 2 to write *coming* instead of the correct *came*.

There is one other example in the text where scribe 2 of  $\mathcal{P}$  incorrectly wrote a present participle:

Mosiah 29:42

and it came to pass that Alma was appointed to be the chief judge  
 he **being** also the high priest  
 his father **having** [*conferring* >% *confered* 1 | *conferred* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]  
 the office upon him

Although in Mosiah 29:42 there is a preceding *being* (just as in Alma 2:27), the more probable cause for the error *conferring* (spelled as *confering*) was the immediately preceding *having*. Occasionally, Oliver Cowdery and Hyrum Smith also incorrectly wrote the present participle instead of the correct finite verb form; for examples, see the discussion under Mosiah 12:2.

One could argue that in Alma 2:27 the present participle *coming* is actually correct despite its ungrammaticality. There are, for instance, a number of examples in the original text where a present participial clause is conjoined by means of the conjunction *and* to a preceding finite clause (for four examples, see under Mosiah 23:13–14). But here in Alma 2:27, there is no preceding finite verb form, nor is there a conjunction *and* between the two present participial clauses. Thus we end up with a highly unusual construction that cannot be found elsewhere in the text. For this reason, the critical text will accept Oliver Cowdery’s correction of *coming* to *came* in Alma 2:27, under the assumption that he was probably correcting  $\mathcal{P}$  to agree with the reading in  $\mathcal{C}$ .

**Summary:** Accept in Alma 2:27 Oliver Cowdery’s correction in  $\mathcal{P}$  of the present participle *coming* to the simple past-tense *came*; in this case Oliver was probably correcting to  $\mathcal{C}$  rather than grammatically emending the text.

#### ■ Alma 2:28

*having prayed mightily to him* [NULL > *that* 1 | *that* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]  
*he would deliver them out of the hands of their enemies*

Here scribe 2 of  $\mathcal{P}$  initially omitted the subordinate conjunction *that* but soon inserted it (there is no change in the level of ink flow for the supralinear insertion). Elsewhere, there are 20 examples where the verb *pray* takes a *that*-clause as its direct object complement, and in no instance is the *that* lacking. For some verbs, such as *say*, the *that* can be ellipted, as in 1 Nephi 2:11, where the *that* was accidentally lost when  $\mathcal{C}$  was copied into  $\mathcal{P}$ : “and this they said **that** he had done because of the foolish imaginations of his heart”. But when the verb is *pray*, the *that* seems to be required. Scribe 2’s correction here in  $\mathcal{P}$  is undoubtedly the original reading.

**Summary:** Accept in Alma 2:28 scribe 2’s virtually immediate insertion of *that* in  $\mathcal{P}$ ; his correction was undoubtedly the reading of the original manuscript.

#### ■ Alma 2:28

*and the Lamanites and* [*the* 1ABDEFIJLMNOQRT | CGHKPS] *Amlicites*  
*did fall before them*

The 1840 edition deleted the definite article *the* before *Amlicites* in the phrase “the Lamanites and the Amlicites”. The RLDS text has maintained this reading (since the RLDS text derives from the

1840 edition). It is doubtful that this 1840 change was the result of editing on the part of Joseph Smith. In the original text, the definite article is always repeated in phrases where *Lamanites* is conjoined with *Amlicites* (or *Amalekites*), for a total of eight times, including one in the immediately preceding verse: “the Lamanites and **the** Amlicites being as numerous almost as it were as the sands of the sea” (Alma 2:27). We get the same repeated *the* when *Nephites* and *Lamanites* are conjoined; see the discussion under Enos 1:24. Also see the general discussion under CONJUNCTIVE REPETITION in volume 3.

*Summary:* Accept in Alma 2:28 the repeated *the* in the phrase “the Lamanites and **the** Amlicites” since the text consistently repeats the *the* in this construction (just as it does with “the Nephites and **the** Lamanites”).

### ■ Alma 2:30

*and it came to pass that*

Alma [*he* >js NULL 1 | *he* A | BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *being a man of God*

*being exercised with much faith*

[& *he* >js NULL 1 | *and he* A | BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *cried saying . . .*

Here we have two instances where Joseph Smith removed the redundant subject pronoun *he* in his editing for the 1837 edition. The first one is like the *he* that Joseph deleted earlier in verse 16:

Alma 2:16

now Alma [*he* >js NULL 1 | *he* A | BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]

being the chief judge and the governor of the people of Nephi

therefore he went up with his people

As discussed under Alma 2:16, the redundant *he* before the present participle *being* will be restored in both verses 16 and 30.

When deleting the second redundant *he* in verse 30, Joseph Smith also deleted the preceding *and*. His purpose here was not only to remove a redundancy but also to avoid a non-English Hebrew-like construction where *and* precedes the main clause after a present participial clause. Such examples are fairly prevalent in the original text when the participial clause involves some additional clausal element. Here in Alma 2:30, we have the additional present participial clause “being exercised with much faith”. Here are two similar examples elsewhere in the original text:

<sup>1</sup> Nephi 4:21–22

and **he supposing** 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

Alma 19:14

now **Ammon seeing** the Spirit of the Lord poured out

according to his prayers upon the Lamanites his brethren

which had been the cause of so much mourning among the Nephites

or among all the people of God

because of their iniquities and their traditions

**and Ammon** fell upon his knees

Like Alma 2:30, this Hebraistic construction has been removed from the text for these two examples (see under each of these passages for discussion). The critical text will restore the original reading here in Alma 2:30 and elsewhere. For further discussion, see under HEBRAISMS in volume 3.

**Summary:** Restore in Alma 2:30 the original Hebraistic *and* that occurs after the present participial clause and before the main clause; also restore the two redundant occurrences of the subject pronoun *he* in this verse.

#### ■ Alma 2:30

*O Lord have mercy and spare my life  
that I may be an instrument in thy hands  
to save and [protect 1PS | preserve ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRT] this people*

The 1830 typesetter accidentally replaced *protect* with *preserve*, the more common expression in the Book of Mormon. The 1908 RLDS edition restored the original verb *protect* to the RLDS text. Elsewhere there are six passages where the text specifically refers to “preserving people”:

Omni 1:2	I fought much with the sword to preserve my people
Mosiah 7:20	and hath kept and preserved his people even until now
Alma 2:21	that he might preserve his people from being destroyed
Alma 3:8	that thereby the Lord God might preserve his people
Alma 48:16	but in doing good in preserving his people
3 Nephi 4:29	may the Lord preserve his people in righteousness

The change of *protect* to *preserve* in verse 30 was probably influenced by the occurrence of *preserve* earlier in verse 21.

There is one other passage that refers to “protecting people”:

3 Nephi 4:30  
may the God of Abraham and the God of Isaac and the God of Jacob  
**protect** this people in righteousness  
so long as they shall call on the name of their God for protection

Thus there is no strong reason to argue that the occurrence of *protect* in Alma 2:30 (“to save and protect this people”) is incorrect. Note also that the phrase “save and preserve” is redundant, unlike “save and protect”.

**Summary:** Restore in Alma 2:30 the earliest attested reading “to save and **protect** this people”.

#### ■ Alma 2:31

*[now 1 | Now ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST | And J] when Alma had said these words  
he contended again with Amlici*

The 1888 LDS edition accidentally replaced the conjunctive *now* with *and*. This edition was set from the 1879 edition. In that edition, the preceding two verses (29 and 30) and the following verse (32) each begin with *And*, which may have influenced the 1888 typesetter to accidentally set

*And* instead of *Now* in verse 31. The 1888 edition never served as a copytext, so this particular *and* at the beginning of verse 31 was never copied into any subsequent LDS edition. Either reading would work here, so we follow the earliest reading, *now*.

**Summary:** Maintain the conjunctive *now* at the beginning of Alma 2:31 (“now when Alma had said these words . . .”).

### ■ Alma 2:31

*now when Alma had said these words*

*he contended again* [§2 NULL > §1 *with* 1 | *with* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *Amlici*

Here Oliver Cowdery added the preposition *with* when he proofed scribe 2’s text in  $\mathcal{P}$ . One may wonder if Oliver’s correction was based on the reading in  $\mathcal{C}$  or if he decided on his own that there was a missing preposition here and that it should be *with* (perhaps  $\mathcal{C}$  itself read incorrectly here without any preposition). This second possibility suggests an alternative emendation: namely, “he contended again **against** Amlici”, which would have obviously been more susceptible to scribal omission because of the similarity of *again* and *against*. The original text has six instances of *again against*:

Alma 44:11	ye will not return again against us to war
Alma 44:19	that they never would come to war again against them
Helaman 11:30	they did go forth again against this band of robbers
3 Nephi 2:18	they did come forth again against the people of Nephi
Mormon 4:16	and the Lamanites did not come again against the Nephites
Mormon 5:6	the Lamanites did come again against us to battle

Moreover, for half of these, there has been a loss in the printed editions of the *again*: in the 1892 RLDS edition for Alma 44:19, in the 1837 edition for 3 Nephi 2:18, and in the 1874 RLDS edition for Mormon 4:16. But there has been no loss of the *against* when preceded by *again*. The *against*, of course, is more crucial to the syntax, which probably explains the tendency to lose the *again* rather than the *against*.

There is clear evidence in the manuscripts that the scribes could occasionally omit the preposition *with* or *against*. In each case, the manuscript was corrected:

- 2 Nephi 1:23 (initial error by Oliver Cowdery in  $\mathcal{C}$ )
  - shake off the chains
  - [NULL >+ *with* 0 | *with* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST] which ye are bound
- Alma 10:28 (error by scribe 2 of  $\mathcal{P}$ , corrected by Oliver Cowdery)
  - and now he saith that he hath not spoken
  - [§2 NULL > §1 *against* 1 | *against* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST] it
- 3 Nephi 14:2 (initial error by Oliver Cowdery in  $\mathcal{P}$ )
  - for with what judgment ye judge
  - ye shall be judged
  - and [NULL > *with* 1 | *with* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST] what measure ye mete
  - it shall be measured to you again

3 Nephi 20:19 (initial error by scribe 2 of  $\mathcal{P}$ )  
 for I will make my people  
 [NULL > *with* 1 | *with* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] whom  
 the Father hath covenanted . . .

There are more examples of *with* than *against* being omitted (three to one), but of course *with* is much more frequent in the text than *against* (at a ratio of roughly three to one), which means that the rate of omission is about the same for both these prepositions.

When we consider the verb *contend*, we have examples of both *with* and *against* when referring to fighting an enemy, with 38 examples of *with* and 9 of *against*. However, elsewhere in Alma 2, the text always uses “contend with”, never “contend against”, in describing the fighting of Alma and the Nephites on the one side, and Amlici and the Amlicites as well as the Lamanites and their king on the other side:

Alma 2:17  
 and the Amlicites did **contend with** the Nephites with great strength

Alma 2:29  
 Alma fought with Amlici with the sword face to face  
 and they did **contend** mightily one **with** another

Alma 2:32 (two times)  
 and he also **contended with** the king of the Lamanites  
 but the king of the Lamanites fled back from before Alma  
 and sent his guards to **contend with** Alma

Alma 2:33  
 but Alma with his guards  
**contended with** the guards of the king of the Lamanites

Alma 2:34  
 that thereby his people might have room to cross  
 and **contend with** the Lamanites and the Amlicites  
 on the west side of the river Sidon

Thus Oliver Cowdery’s inserted *with* in verse 31 is consistent with usage throughout Alma 2. And even if the *with* is the result of Oliver’s own emendation (supposing  $\mathcal{O}$  was also missing the preposition), it was probably the correct reading in the original text. If  $\mathcal{O}$  had the preposition and it had been *against*, there is no strong reason why Oliver would have rejected *against* in favor of *with*. Elsewhere we find no examples of textual variation between *with* and *against*, which implies that Oliver would never have replaced *against* with *with*. The critical text will therefore accept the *with* that Oliver inserted here in Alma 2:31 since it probably represents the original reading here (as well as the reading in  $\mathcal{O}$ ). Oliver’s *with* is most probably the result of him making sure that  $\mathcal{P}$  read according to  $\mathcal{O}$ .

**Summary:** Accept in Alma 2:31 Oliver Cowdery’s supralinearly inserted *with*, most probably the reading of  $\mathcal{O}$ ; elsewhere in this chapter, the text consistently uses the preposition *with* when referring to someone contending against an opponent in battle.

## ■ Alma 2:33

*until he slew and [drave 1 | drove ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] them back*

The printer's manuscript has the archaic *drave*, which the 1830 typesetter changed to the modern *drove*. Based on the earliest textual sources, there are eight occurrences in the original text of the past-tense form of the verb *drive*, of which two take the archaic *drave* in the earliest textual sources (each marked below with an asterisk):

Mosiah 11:17	and <b>drove</b> many of their flocks out of the land
Mosiah 11:18	or they <b>drove</b> them back for a time
Mosiah 21:8	the Lamanites did beat them and <b>drove</b> them back
* Alma 2:33	until he slew and <b>drave</b> them back
Alma 3:23	and <b>drove</b> the remainder of them out of the borders of their land
Alma 42:2	yea he <b>drove</b> out the man
* Alma 50:7	and <b>drave</b> all the Lamanites . . . into their own lands
Ether 13:29	and <b>drove</b> him back again to the valley of Gilgal

Both instances of *drave* were edited to the modern *drove* by the 1830 typesetter.

In Alma 42:2, when copying from  $\mathcal{C}$  into  $\mathcal{P}$ , Oliver Cowdery accidentally misread *drove* as *drew*, an error that has been consistently maintained in the subsequent history of the text. In Mosiah 21:8, *drive* was corrected to *drove* by Oliver Cowdery in  $\mathcal{P}$ , with *drove* being retained in all the printed editions (for discussion, see under that passage). It is also possible that in Mosiah 11:18, the original text actually read *drave* there instead of *drove* (for discussion, see under that passage).

The archaic form *drave* was commonly used in Early Modern English but has now been replaced by *drove*. According to the Oxford English Dictionary (see under the verb *drive*), *drave* was the northern form in Britain and *drove* the southern form. The King James Bible prefers *drave* over *drove* (13 to 9). Thus either *drave* or *drove* is possible in the Book of Mormon text. The critical text will follow the earliest textual sources in each case, which means that *drave* will be restored here in Alma 2:33 as well as in Alma 50:7. For further discussion of *drave* as well as similar past-tense forms like *bare* and *sware*, see under PAST TENSE in volume 3.

**Summary:** Restore the archaic past-tense form *drave* in Alma 2:33 and Alma 50:7.

## ■ Alma 2:33–34

*but Alma with his guards contended with the guards of the king of the Lamanites  
until he slew and drave them back  
and thus he cleared the ground or rather the bank which was on the west of the river Sidon  
throwing the bodies of the Lamanites  
[which >]s whom he 1 | which A | who BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] had been slain  
into the waters of Sidon*

Here Joseph Smith supralinearly inserted the subject pronoun *he* as if he intended to emend the relative clause “which had been slain” to “whom he had slain”. Such a change would actually have been consistent with the preceding text that speaks of Alma himself as having slain and driven back

the Lamanites and cleared the ground of their dead bodies: “until **he** slew and **drave** them back and thus **he** cleared the ground or rather the bank . . . throwing the bodies of the Lamanites . . . into the waters of Sidon”. But after inserting the pronoun *he*, Joseph apparently decided that he should not make that change. Thus he left the passive auxiliary form *been* in  $\mathcal{P}$ , but he neglected to cross out his inserted *he* and correct *whom* to *who*. The 1837 edition maintained the original passive in this relative clause. That edition did make the grammatical change of the relative pronoun *which* to the subject form *who* (not the object form *whom*, as marked in  $\mathcal{P}$ ). For a general discussion of the editing of *which* to *who(m)*, see under WHICH in volume 3.

*Summary:* Maintain in Alma 2:34 the original passive form of the relative clause “which had been slain”.

### ■ Alma 2:34

*throwing the bodies of the Lamanites which had been slain  
into the waters of* [ $\mathfrak{S}2$  *the river* >  $\mathfrak{S}1$  NULL 1 | ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *Sidon*

Scribe 2 of  $\mathcal{P}$  wrote “the waters of the river Sidon”. Somewhat later, Oliver Cowdery corrected this phrase to read “the waters of Sidon”, which is consistent with other usage in the text. There are seven other occurrences of “the waters of Sidon” but none of “the waters of the river Sidon”:

Alma 3:3	and now as many of the Lamanites and the Amlicites which had been slain . . . were cast into the waters of Sidon
Alma 4:4	and many were baptized in the waters of Sidon
Alma 43:40	and they were driven by Lehi into the waters of Sidon
Alma 43:40	and they crossed the waters of Sidon
Alma 43:50	and they fled even to the waters of Sidon
Alma 44:22	they did cast their dead into the waters of Sidon
Mormon 1:10	the war began to be among them in the borders of Zarahemla by the waters of Sidon

Here in Alma 2:34, we have the first occurrence in the text of “the waters of Sidon”, but earlier in this verse the text reads “on the west **of the river Sidon**”. This usage seems to have led scribe 2 to accidentally write “into the waters **of the river Sidon**”. The phrase “the river Sidon” is very frequent in the Book of Mormon text (occurring 27 times), yet it never occurs when referring to “the waters” of that river, probably because *waters* and *river* are of the same semantic class. It is doubtful, however, that Oliver Cowdery would have been aware of these systematic differences; he probably made this correction in  $\mathcal{P}$  because  $\mathcal{O}$  actually read without *the river*.

*Summary:* Accept in Alma 2:32 Oliver Cowdery’s correction in  $\mathcal{P}$  of scribe 2’s “the waters of **the river Sidon**” to “the waters of Sidon”; Oliver’s correction was most probably based on the reading of  $\mathcal{O}$  and is consistent with all other usage in the text.



## ■ Alma 2:36–37

*and the Nephites did pursue them with their might and did slay them  
yea they were met on every hand and slain and driven  
until they were scattered on the west and on the north  
until they had reached the wilderness*

[ 1 |, ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST ] *which was called Hermounts*

Generally, the word *wilderness* is used in the Book of Mormon to refer to large expanses of uninhabited land, often filled with wild animals. On two occasions, specific regions of wilderness are assigned names, *Hermounts* (here in Alma 2:37) and *Bountiful*:

Alma 22:31

thus the land on the northward was called Desolation  
and the land on the southward was called Bountiful  
it being the wilderness which was filled with all manner of wild animals  
of every kind

The name *Bountiful* appears to be the Nephite name of the wilderness that the Jaredites designated as a game reserve prior to their destruction. The Jaredites themselves lived in the land of Moron, to the north, which was near the land that was later referred to as the land Desolation by the Nephites: “now the land of Moron where the king dwelt was near the land which is called Desolation by the Nephites” (Ether 7:6).

In both Alma 2:37 and Alma 22:31, the relative clause headed by *which* is intended to be restrictive rather than nonrestrictive. The structure of the present participial clause in Alma 22:31 requires a restrictive interpretation (“it being **the** wilderness **which** was filled with all manner of wild animals of every kind”); thus in the printed editions no comma has ever been added after *wilderness* in Alma 22:31. On the other hand, the printed editions all have a comma after *wilderness* in Alma 2:37, which makes the following relative clause (“which was called Hermounts”) nonrestrictive. The wilderness of Hermounts is to the west and north of Zarahemla and does not refer to the wilderness of Bountiful. John Sorenson’s analysis of the battle with the Lamanites and Amlicites places the wilderness of Hermounts “not much greater than ten miles” from the river Sidon; see pages 61–62 of Sorenson’s *Mormon’s Map* (Provo, Utah: FARMS, 2000). Consequently, the wilderness of Hermounts should be treated as a distinct wilderness. The critical text will therefore treat the relative clause “which was called Hermounts” as restrictive.

**Summary:** Remove in Alma 2:37 the comma that the 1830 typesetter placed after the word *wilderness*; the relative clause “which was called Hermounts” is restrictive.

## ■ Alma 2:38

*many died in the wilderness of their wounds  
and were devoured by those beasts and also the vultures of the air*

One wonders here if the original text read “and were devoured **by** those beasts and **also by** the vultures of the air”. The reading in  $\mathcal{P}$  seems rather awkward without any repeated *by*. One might propose that a repeated *by* was accidentally lost in the early transmission of the text. Evidence in

support of this possibility can be found later on in the text. In the following passage, the repeated preposition *by* has been accidentally deleted at least once, perhaps twice, in the transmission of the text:

3 Nephi 7:15  
 and it came to pass that  
 Nephi having been visited **by** angels  
 and **also** [ 1EFIJLMNOQRT | *by* ABCDGHKPS] the voice of the Lord  
 therefore having seen angels . . .

For this part of the text (from Helaman 13 through the end of Mormon), the 1830 edition was set from the original manuscript. And in the 1830 edition we have the repeated *by* (“**by** angels and **also by** the voice of the Lord”). On the other hand, the printer’s manuscript is missing the repeated *by*, which suggests the possibility that Oliver Cowdery, when he copied from  $\mathcal{C}$  into  $\mathcal{P}$ , accidentally omitted the repeated *by* in 3 Nephi 7:15. Of course, the opposite possibility must be kept in mind: the 1830 typesetter could have added the *by* because the phraseology “by angels and also the voice of the Lord” was awkward. Interestingly, we do know that the repeated *by* was accidentally omitted by the typesetter for the 1849 LDS edition. His copytext, the 1841 British edition, had the repeated *by*. Subsequent LDS editions have continued with the reading without the repeated *by*, thus unintentionally maintaining the reading of the printer’s manuscript.

Elsewhere the Book of Mormon text repeats the preposition *by* in conjuncts that have *also*:

Title Page  
 written **by** way of commandment  
 and **also by** the spirit of prophecy

Alma 15:16  
 he being rejected **by** those which were once his friends  
 and **also by** his father and his kindred

Helaman 15:11  
 until the time shall come  
 which hath been spoken of **by** our fathers  
 and **also by** the prophet Zenos and many other prophets

Mormon 3:10  
 and they did swear **by** the heavens  
 and **also by** the throne of God

Ether 8:14  
 they all sware unto him **by** the God of heaven  
 and **also by** the heavens  
 and **also by** the earth and by their heads

Only in the case of Alma 2:38 is the *by* not repeated when the conjunct has *also*. Since we know that the 1849 LDS edition omitted the repeated *by* in 3 Nephi 7:15, the same error could have occurred in the early transmission of Alma 2:38. Clearly, both Alma 2:38 and 3 Nephi 7:15 read much better when the *by* is repeated.

There is considerable evidence that scribes and printers have had difficulty maintaining the repeated *by*, although in all the following examples there is no *also* in the conjunct:

Alma 16:10 (omitted in the 1830 edition)

and their carcasses were mangled **by** dogs  
and [*by* 1 | ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] wild beasts of the wilderness

Alma 24:1 (initially omitted by Oliver Cowdery in  $\mathcal{P}$ )

and the Lamanites . . . which had not been converted  
and had not taken upon them the name of Anti-Nephi-Lehi  
were stirred up **by** the Amlicites  
and [*by* 0ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST | NULL > *by* 1] the Amulonites  
to anger against their brethren

Helaman 5:41 (initially omitted by Oliver Cowdery in  $\mathcal{P}$ ; also omitted in the 1837 edition)

you must repent and cry unto the voice  
even until ye shall have faith in Christ  
which was taught unto you **by** Alma and Amulek  
and [NULL > *by* 1 | *by* A | BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] Zeezrom

Helaman 6:22 (initially omitted by Oliver Cowdery in  $\mathcal{P}$ )

he should not be injured **by** his brother  
nor [NULL > *by* 1 | *by* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] those  
who did belong to his band who had taken this covenant

3 Nephi 10:14 (omitted in the 1840 edition)

let him search them and see and behold  
if all these deaths and destructions **by** fire and **by** smoke and **by** tempests  
and [*by* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST | CGHK] whirlwinds  
and **by** the opening of the earth to receive them  
and all these things is not unto the fulfilling of the prophecies  
of many of the holy prophets

Moreover, it is probably the case that in 3 Nephi 7:15 the omitted *by* in  $\mathcal{P}$  is the result of Oliver Cowdery once more accidentally omitting the repeated *by* (see under that passage for a complete discussion). For another example where a repeated preposition after *and also*—one different than *by*—has been omitted, see Alma 18:36, which originally read “he began **to** the creation of the world **and also to** the creation of Adam” (the 1837 edition omitted the repeated *to*). Thus we can see that there is a good chance here in Alma 2:38 that the lack of a repeated *by* in the conjunctive phrase “by those beasts and also the vultures of the air” is the result of a loss of the *by* early on in the transmission of the text, perhaps in  $\mathcal{C}$  itself since Oliver did not supply the *by* when he proofed  $\mathcal{P}$  against  $\mathcal{C}$ .

Ultimately the question becomes just how important the occurrence of an *also* is to the repetition of a preposition. In over 90 percent of the cases involving *and also*, the preposition is repeated (or there is an equivalent preposition, such as *to* for *unto*). But in six cases in the earliest text, there is no repeated preposition. Besides the example here in Alma 2:38 (where the *by* is not repeated), we have these examples involving other prepositions:

Mosiah 1:16 (*concerning* not repeated, two times)  
 and moreover he also gave him charge **concerning** the records  
 which were engraven on the plates of brass  
**and also** the plates of Nephi  
**and also** the sword of Laban

Alma 5:24 (*with* not repeated)  
 do ye suppose that such an one can have a place to sit down  
 in the kingdom of God  
**with** Abraham **with** Isaac and **with** Jacob  
**and also** all the holy prophets

Alma 17:12 (*of* not repeated)  
 and it came to pass that the hearts **of** the sons of Mosiah  
**and also** those which were with them  
 took courage to go forth unto the Lamanites

Alma 51:30 (*of* not repeated)  
 that he might take possession **of** the land Bountiful  
**and also** the land northward

Ether 12:41 (*of* not repeated)  
 that the grace **of** God the Father  
**and also** the Lord Jesus Christ  
 and the Holy Ghost which beareth record of them  
 may be and abide in you forever

These examples suggest that it is not necessary for the preposition to be repeated after *and also*. The critical text will therefore maintain the earliest (and current) reading for Alma 2:38—that is, without the repeated preposition (“and were devoured **by** those beasts **and also** the vultures of the air”). It is quite possible that the original text had a repeated *by* here and that it was lost early in the transmission of the text. But it is also worth noting that there has been no tendency to add the preposition in any of the cases where it is not repeated.

**Summary:** Maintain in Alma 2:38 the reading without the repetition of the preposition *by* after *and also* (“and were devoured **by** those beasts **and also** the vultures of the air”); despite its awkwardness, such phraseology without the repeated preposition after *and also* is occasionally found in the earliest text.

#### ■ Alma 2:38

*and their bones have been found and have been heaped*  
 [up on 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOQRT | upon KPS] the earth

The 1892 RLDS edition reinterpreted the phrase *up on* as the single preposition *upon*. The RLDS text has subsequently maintained this reading. The LDS text has maintained the earliest form, *up on*. Typically we expect the preposition *upon* with the verb or noun *heap*:

Jacob 3:10	and their sins be heaped <b>upon</b> your heads at the last day
Alma 1:25	the persecution which was heaped <b>upon</b> them
Alma 4:15	the persecutions which was heaped <b>upon</b> them

Alma 2

Alma 5:30 or that heapeth **upon** him persecutions  
Alma 28:11 while the bodies of many thousands are moldering in heaps  
**upon** the face of the earth

Most pertinent, however, is the fact that when the verb *heap* is used in the passive to describe the piling up of corpses, we have not only *upon* but also *up* with it:

Alma 16:11 their dead bodies were heaped **up upon** the face of the earth  
Mormon 2:15 and heaped **up** as dung **upon** the face of the land

These last two examples suggest that the phrase *up on* in Alma 2:38 could be an error for *up upon*; that is, the original text here may have read “their bones have been found and have been heaped **up upon** the earth”. Such a conjecture would mean that early on in the transmission of the text either *up* was lost (and *upon* was reinterpreted as *up on*) or *upon* was replaced by *on* (leading directly to *up on*).

As noted in the nearby discussion regarding *up upon* in Alma 2:15, there are four clear examples in the history of the text where the *up* of *up upon* was lost, including one by scribe 2 of  $\mathcal{P}$  in 3 Nephi 20:2. On the other hand, there is also evidence in the textual history for the tendency to mix up *upon* and *on*, especially since these two pronouns are generally synonymous:

Mosiah 28:11 (*upon* > *on*, 1837 edition)  
therefore he took the records which were engraven  
[*upon* 1A | *on* BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] the plates of brass

Alma 3:14 (*upon* > *on*, 1837 edition)  
and I will set a mark  
[*upon* 1APS | *on* BCDEFGHIJKLMNOQRT] them

Alma 16:2 (*on* > *upon*, 1837 edition)  
for behold the armies of the Lamanites had come in  
[*on* 1A | *upon* BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] the wilderness side

Alma 19:29 (*on* > *upon*, 1874 RLDS edition)  
have mercy [*on* 1ABCDEFGHIJLMNOQRT | *upon* HKPS] this people

Alma 22:30 (*upon* > *on*, 1840 edition)  
and it bordered [*upon* 1ABCDEFGHIJLMNOPQRST | *on* CGHK] the land  
which they called Desolation

Alma 51:20 (*upon* > *on*, 1874 RLDS edition)  
and were compelled to hoist the title of liberty  
[*upon* 1ABCDEFGHIJLMNOPQRST | *on* HK] their towers

Helaman 3:9 (*upon* > *on*, 1906 LDS edition)  
and they did suffer whatsoever tree should spring up  
[*upon* 01ABCDEFGHIJKLMOPQRST | *on* N] the face of the land  
that it should grow up

Helaman 5:26 (*on* > *upon*, initially by Oliver Cowdery in  $\mathcal{P}$ )  
ye cannot lay your hands  
[*upon* > *on* 1 | *on* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] us to slay us

3 Nephi 20:2 (*upon* > *on*, initially by scribe 2 of  $\mathcal{P}$ )  
 and they arose up  
 and stood [*on* > *upon* 1 | *upon* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] their feet

Mormon 1:4 (*upon* > *on*, 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 (*upon* > *on*, 1874 RLDS edition)  
 but did struggle for their lives without calling  
 [*upon* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST | *on* HK] that being  
 who had created them

Ether 2:9 (*upon* > *on*, 1874 RLDS edition)  
 and the fullness of his wrath cometh  
 [*upon* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST | *on* HK] them  
 when they are ripened in iniquity

Most of the mix-ups occurred in typesetting the editions and show the tendency for the archaic *upon* to be replaced by *on*. There are two instances that involve scribes (in Helaman 5:26 and 3 Nephi 20:2). The second of these shows scribe 2 of  $\mathcal{P}$  replacing *upon* with *on*, which is what could have happened in Alma 2:38.

Yet we need to remember that *upon* and *on* are generally synonymous, so if *up upon* can occur in the text, so can *up on*, as in the following two examples:

Alma 43:34	the Lamanites came <b>up on</b> the north of the hill
3 Nephi 4:16	but they came <b>up on</b> all sides to lay siege

These two examples thus argue that in Alma 2:38 the reading “their bones . . . have been heaped **up on** the earth” is acceptable. For this reason, the critical text will not emend *up on* to *up upon* here. Since “heaped up upon” can occur, so can “heaped up on”.

**Summary:** Retain in Alma 2:38 the earliest reading with *up on* (“their bones . . . have been heaped **up on** the earth”); although *up on* could be an error for *up upon*, the use of *on* instead of *upon* is possible.

# Alma 3

## ■ 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—  
[& >js NULL 1 | and A | BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] after they had finished burying their dead  
they all returned to their lands*

The original text here has an extra *and* after an intervening parenthetical statement (“now the number of the slain were not numbered because of the greatness of their number”). In the original text, there are a number of Hebrew-like examples where *and* occurs between a long initial subordinate clause and its following main clause, as in the following example later on in the book of Alma:

Alma 16:21

and now **after** the church having been established throughout all the land  
having got the victory over the devil  
and the word of God being preached in its purity in all the land  
and the Lord pouring out his blessings upon the people  
[& >js NULL 1 | and A | BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] thus ended  
the fourteenth year of the reign of the judges over the people of Nephi

In many instances (as in Alma 3:1 and Alma 16:21), the *and* was removed by Joseph Smith in his editing for the 1837 edition. The critical text will restore all these Hebrew-like instances of *and* that Joseph Smith removed in his editing. For further discussion, see under HEBRAISMS in volume 3.

The example here in Alma 3:1 is unusual in two respects. First of all, its main clause actually begins with a subordinate clause: “after they had finished burying their dead / they all returned to their lands”. Yet this kind of subordinate construction can be found elsewhere in the original text:

Alma 32:38

and **when** the heat of the sun cometh and scorcheth it  
[& 0 | & >js NULL 1 | and A | BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]  
**because** it hath no root  
it withereth away

This example, just like in Alma 3:1, originally had an *and* between the initial subordinate clause and the following main clause that begins with a subordinate clause.

The other unusual aspect of Alma 3:1 is that the second *after*-clause is completely redundant:

after having buried those which had been slain . . .  
and after they had finished burying their dead

Obviously, this redundancy is fully intended and is not the result of some kind of scribal error.

*Summary:* Restore the Hebrew-like use of *and* that originally occurred in Alma 3:1 (“**and** after they had finished burying their dead / they all returned to their lands”).

#### ■ Alma 3:1

*they all returned to their lands and to their houses*  
*and [to > their 1 | their ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] wives and their children*

Here scribe 2 of  $\mathcal{P}$  initially wrote *to* as if to write “and **to** their wives and their children”, but then he overwrote the *o* of *to* with an *h* and continued writing inline *eir*, thus replacing *to* with *their*. Clearly, his correction was immediate. He expected the preposition *to* (which had just occurred twice in “**to** their lands and **to** their houses”) to occur before “their wives and children”. But the preposition is not always repeated in this context, as can be seen in the previous chapter:

Alma 2:25  
and they are fleeing before them  
**with** their flocks and their wives and their children towards our city

*Summary:* Maintain in Alma 3:1 the immediately corrected reading in  $\mathcal{P}$  for which the preposition *to* does not occur before “their wives and their children”.

#### ■ Alma 3:4

*for they had marked themselves with red*  
*in their [foreheads 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMOPQRST | forehead N]*

The 1906 LDS large-print edition accidentally replaced the plural *foreheads* with the singular *forehead* (misspelled as *forhead*). Elsewhere, the text consistently uses the plural *foreheads* (all occurrences are in this chapter and refer to the same topic):

Alma 3:13  
now we will return again to the Amlicites  
for they also had a mark set upon them  
yea they set the mark upon themselves  
yea even a mark of red **upon their foreheads**

Alma 3:18  
now the Amlicites knew not that they were fulfilling the words of God  
when they began to mark themselves **in their foreheads**

*Summary:* Maintain the three occurrences of the plural *foreheads* in Alma 3.



## ■ Alma 3:5

*and they were naked*  
*save it were **skin** which was girded about their loins*

The occurrence here of *skin* without the indefinite article *a* seems strange. The text is obviously referring to animal skin; but without any modification for the noun *skin*, one tends to initially misread *skin* as referring to the Amlicites' own skin. Usage elsewhere in the text suggests that the indefinite article *a* is missing before *skin* in Alma 3:5:

Enos 1:20  
 and wandering about in the wilderness  
 with **a short skin** girded about their loins

Alma 43:20  
 but they were naked  
 save it were **a skin** which was girded about their loins

3 Nephi 4:7  
 and they were girded about after the manner of robbers  
 and they had **a lambskin** about their loins

Except for the *a*, the phraseology in Alma 3:5 is virtually the same as in Alma 43:20: “but they were naked save it were **a skin** which was girded about their loins”. This usage with the indefinite article is also supported by the language in Mark 1:6 in the King James Bible: “and John was clothed with camel’s hair and with a girdle of **a skin** about his loins”.

There is also evidence that scribe 2 of  $\mathcal{P}$  sometimes omitted the indefinite article *a*:

Alma 5:3 (*a* virtually immediately added by scribe 2)  
 behold I say unto you that he began to establish  
 [NULL > *a* 1 | *a* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] church in the land  
 which was in the borders of Nephi

Alma 11:15 (*a* virtually immediately added by scribe 2; also omitted in the 1830 edition)  
 therefore a shiblon  
 for [NULL > *a* 1 | ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] half a measure of barley

3 Nephi 22:6 (*a* added by Oliver Cowdery when proofing  $\mathcal{P}$  against  $\mathcal{C}$ )  
 for the Lord hath called thee as a woman forsaken and grieved in spirit  
 and [§2 NULL > §1 *a* 1 | *a* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] wife of youth

Mormon 9:15 (*a* virtually immediately added by scribe 2)  
 and God has not ceased to be  
 [NULL > *a* 1 | *a* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] God of miracles

In the last two instances, the 1830 edition was set from  $\mathcal{C}$ , not  $\mathcal{P}$ , thus providing additional support that the *a* was in the original text for both these cases. Further, 3 Nephi 22:6 is a quotation from Isaiah 54:6, which has the *a* before *wife* in the King James Bible. Clearly, scribe 2 may have omitted an *a* in Alma 3:5. In accord with the consistency of the text elsewhere, the critical text will emend the text by adding the indefinite article *a* before *skin* in Alma 3:5.

*Summary:* In accord with usage elsewhere in the text, emend Alma 3:5 to read “save it were **a skin** which was girded about their loins”.

■ **Alma 3:6**

*which was a curse upon them  
because of their [ transgressions >% transgression 1 |  
transgression ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRT | transgression s ]  
and their rebellion against their brethren*

As discussed under Mosiah 27:13, the text is evenly divided between the singular and plural for *transgression* when immediately preceded by *their*. We therefore follow the earliest textual sources in determining the number for *their transgression(s)*. Here in Alma 3:6, scribe 2 of  $\mathcal{P}$  initially wrote the plural, then immediately erased the final *s*. As noted under Mosiah 27:13, this scribe tended to incorrectly write the plural *transgressions* in place of the singular. The critical text will maintain the singular *transgression* here in Alma 3:6.

*Summary:* Retain in Alma 3:6 the singular *transgression*, the corrected reading in  $\mathcal{P}$ .

■ **Alma 3:7**

*and the Lord God set a mark upon them  
yea upon Laman and Lemuel and also the sons of Ishmael  
and [the 1APS | BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRT] Ishmaelitish women*

The 1837 edition deleted the definite article *the* before “Ishmaelitish women”. This deletion was most probably a typo since the resultant reading is quite awkward. The 1908 RLDS edition restored the *the* to the RLDS text. Here in Alma 3:7, the critical text will follow the reading of the printer’s manuscript. The English language virtually requires the definite article in this context. A similar example is found in Alma 19:16: “even until they had all fallen to the earth save it were one of **the** Lamanitish women whose name was Abish” (although here the definite article is clearly required because of the preceding *one of*).

*Summary:* Restore the definite article *the* in Alma 3:7: “yea upon Laman and Lemuel and also the sons of Ishmael and **the** Ishmaelitish women”.

■ **Alma 3:10**

*therefore [whomsoever 1ABDEFIJLMNOQ | whosoever CGHKPRST] suffered himself  
to be led away by the Lamanites  
[were 1ABDEFIJLMNOQ | was CGHKPRST] called under that head  
and there was a mark set upon him*

Here the earliest text reads *whomsoever*. Prescriptive grammar requires the subject form *whosoever* since *whosoever* serves as the subject in the nominal clause proper: that is, “whosoever suffered

himself to be led away by the Lamanites” (just as in “**he** suffereth himself to become subject unto man in the flesh” in 2 Nephi 9:5). For a brief discussion of this prescriptive rule, see under Mosiah 26:22. Here in Alma 3:10, the nominal clause itself serves as the subject of the larger sentence, so there is no question that the prescriptively correct form is *whosoever*, not *whomsoever*. Even so, the critical text will restore the earliest reading, *whomsoever*, since it appears to be intended. For a more complicated case involving *whomsoever*, see the nearby discussion under Alma 3:17.

The 1840 edition made the grammatical change from *whomsoever* to *whosoever* in Alma 3:10, with the result that *whosoever* has continued in the RLDS textual tradition. The 1920 LDS edition introduced this change into the LDS text. The 1840 edition also changed the number of the verb, from the plural *were* to the singular *was*, a change that has followed the same textual history as the change to *whosoever*. The nominal clause has the singular *himself*, which agrees with the singular *him* in the following independent clause (“and there was a mark set upon **him**”). The plural *were* seems to be due to the immediately preceding plural noun *Lamanites*. For other examples of this type of subject-verb agreement based on proximity, see under 1 Nephi 13:23 (“a record of the **Jews** which **contain** the covenants”) and Jarom 1:14 (“the record of our **wars are** engraven”). Also see the general discussion under SUBJECT-VERB AGREEMENT in volume 3. The critical text will restore the original *were* here in Alma 3:10.

*Summary:* Restore in Alma 3:10 the original relative pronoun *whomsoever* and the plural *were*, despite their ungrammaticality.

#### ■ Alma 3:10

*therefore whomsoever suffered himself to be led away by the Lamanites  
were called [under IACGHIJKLMNOPQRST | BDE | NULL > under F] that head*

The 1837 edition accidentally omitted the preposition *under* in this passage. The resulting “were called that head” was copied into the first three British editions but not the 1840 edition. The second printing of the 1852 British edition restored the *under*, most probably by reference to the 1840 edition. Apparently, the reading “were called that head” did not seem that difficult. For a discussion of the use of the term *head* with the meaning ‘category’, see under Jacob 1:4. The use of *under* with *head* is found elsewhere in the text: “and **under this head** ye are made free” (Mosiah 5:8). The critical text will, of course, maintain the phrase “under that head” here in Alma 3:10.

*Summary:* Maintain in Alma 3:10 the occurrence of *under* in “were called under that head”.

#### ■ Alma 3:11

*and it came to pass that whosoever would not believe in the tradition of the Lamanites  
but [believed IABCDEFHGHIJKLMNOPQRT | believe S] those records . . .*

The 1953 RLDS edition introduced the infinitive form *believe* instead of the correct past-tense *believed*, as if the conjoined predicate was of the form “but would believe those records”. There is actually evidence for this kind of conjoining of predicates in the text:

Mosiah 17:2

therefore he began to plead with the king  
that he **would not be angry** with Abinadi  
but **suffer** that he might depart in peace

Here the conjoined predicate is missing the *would* and is equivalent to “but **would suffer** that he might depart in peace”. Otherwise, conjoined predicates include the entire verb phrase and are in the past tense:

Mosiah 19:12

now there were many that **would not leave** them  
but **had rather stay and perish** with them

3 Nephi 6:13

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

The critical text will, of course, maintain the earlier reading in Alma 3:11 where the conjoined predicate is complete and in the past tense (“but believed those records”). The 1953 change is probably unintended since the resulting phraseology is rather awkward. The source for the error appears to have been the preceding infinitive form *believe* in “whosoever would not believe”.

**Summary:** Maintain in Alma 3:11 the past-tense form *believed* in “but believed those records”, which is conjoined with the preceding “would not believe in the tradition of the Lamanites”.

### ■ Alma 3:12

*and it is they which have kept the records  
which are true  
of their people and also of the people of the Lamanites*

Here we have an example of a complex prepositional phrase (“of their people and also of the people of the Lamanites”) that has been displaced. The relative clause “which are true”, referring to the records, intervenes between *records* and the postmodifying conjunctive prepositional phrase headed by *of*. None of the printed editions have placed any punctuation (such as commas, dashes, or parentheses) around the nonrestrictive relative clause “which are true”. Such punctuation would help the reader process this rather difficult construction. For other examples of displaced prepositional phrases in the text, see the discussion under Mosiah 26:23; also see the more extensive list of examples under DISPLACED PREPOSITIONAL PHRASES in volume 3.

**Summary:** Use punctuation to show that the nonrestrictive relative clause “which are true” intervenes between *records* and the postmodifying “of their people and also of the people of the Lamanites”.

## ■ Alma 3:14

*thus the word of God is fulfilled*

*for these are the words*

*which he [saith >js said 1 | saith A | said BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] to Nephi  
behold the Lamanites have I cursed*

Here we have one more example of the historical present in the Book of Mormon: namely, the use of the present-tense *saith* rather than the expected past-tense *said*. In this instance, the historical present gives the sense that these words of God, although spoken in the past to Lehi, still hold. Joseph Smith removed this instance and most others of the historical present from the Book of Mormon text, even though such usage is found in the King James Bible. For additional discussion, see under 1 Nephi 2:1. For a complete list of examples in the original text, see under HISTORICAL PRESENT in volume 3.

**Summary:** Restore the use of the historical present *saith* in Alma 3:14 and elsewhere whenever it is supported by the earliest textual sources.

## ■ Alma 3:14

*and I will set a mark [upon 1APS | on BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRT] them*

*that they and their seed may be separated from thee and thy seed*

*from this time henceforth and forever except they repent . . .*

There has been considerable variation in the history of the text between the prepositions *upon* and *on* (for a list of examples, see under 1 Nephi 12:4). Here in Alma 3:14, the 1837 edition replaced the archaic *upon* with *on*, probably accidentally since elsewhere the text uses only *upon* when referring to a mark being set “(up)on someone” and none of these instances of *upon* have ever been changed to *on*. All the other examples are in this same chapter of Alma:

Alma 3:6	according to the mark which was set <b>upon</b> their fathers
Alma 3:7	and the Lord God set a mark <b>upon</b> them
Alma 3:10	and there was a mark set <b>upon</b> him
Alma 3:13	for they also had a mark set <b>upon</b> them
Alma 3:13	yea they set the mark <b>upon</b> themselves
Alma 3:13	yea even a mark of red <b>upon</b> their foreheads
Alma 3:15	I will set a mark <b>upon</b> him that mingleth his seed with thy brethren
Alma 3:16	I will set a mark <b>upon</b> him that fighteth against thee and thy seed

Clearly the use of *upon* is correct in verse 14. The 1908 RLDS text restored the original preposition, as will the critical text.

**Summary:** Restore the original preposition *upon* in Alma 3:14, thus making the entire text consistent for the phrase “to set a mark **upon** someone”.

## ■ Alma 3:16

*and again*

[ 1 | : ABCDGHKPRST | , EFIJLMNOQ ]

[ *will I* 1 | *I will* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST ] *set a mark upon him*  
*that fighteth against thee and thy seed*

The printer's manuscript has the impossible word order *will I set* after the initial connective phrase *and again*. The *and again* here means 'and again I say'. This expression is found explicitly at the beginning of the next verse: "and again I say: he that departeth from thee shall no more be called thy seed" (Alma 3:17). Clearly, the *again* in verse 16 does not modify the verb *set*; the text is not saying that the Lord will set a mark **a second time** on those who fight against Nephi and his descendants. (For the various uses of the word *again* in the Book of Mormon text, see the discussion under 2 Nephi 5:11.) We should also note here that the preceding verse also uses *and again* as a narrative connector:

Alma 3:15

and again

[ 1E | : ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST ]

I will set a mark upon him that mingleth his seed with thy brethren

The only time we have the inverted word order after the connective phrase *and again* is when the sentence is a yes-no question, as in Mosiah 5:14: "and again: doth a man take an ass which belongeth to his neighbor and keep him". In this case, the inverted order is required regardless of whether *and again* is there or not.

Thus here in Alma 3:16 the inverted order *will I set* in the printer's manuscript must be a scribal error. The 1830 typesetter switched the word order in verse 16 to the correct *I will set* and also set a colon after *and again* (just like he did in verse 15). We have no other evidence for this specific kind of error in the textual history for the Book of Mormon, although there is evidence that Oliver Cowdery occasionally switched the word order when the sentence began with an adverbial phrase:

2 Nephi 25:16 (Oliver Cowdery initially wrote "will the day come" in  $\mathcal{C}$ )

and then at that time

[ *will the day* >+ *the day will* 0 | *the day will* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST ] come  
 that it must needs be expedient that . . .

Helaman 15:3 (Oliver Cowdery started to write "he hath chastened" in  $\mathcal{D}$ )

yea in the days of their iniquities

[ *he* > *hath* 1 | *hath* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST ] he chastened them

3 Nephi 18:32 (Oliver Cowdery initially wrote "ye shall continue" in  $\mathcal{D}$ )

for unto such

[ *ye shall* >+ *shall ye* 1 | *shall ye* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST ]  
 continue to minister

There are no examples of scribe 2 of  $\mathcal{D}$  making this kind of error. Even so, the reading in  $\mathcal{D}$  is clearly unacceptable and must be the result of some scribal slip, either when  $\mathcal{C}$  was written down

or when it was copied into  $\mathcal{P}$ . The critical text will maintain the 1830 typesetter’s emendation of *will I set* to *I will set*.

**Summary:** Retain in Alma 3:16 the 1830 printer’s emendation of the word order from *will I set* to *I will set* (“and again: **I will set** a mark upon him”).

#### ■ Alma 3:17

*and I will bless thee*

[&c 1 | &c. ABCDEFGHIKLMNOQ | *etc.* JPS | RT]

*and whomsoever shall be called thy seed*

*henceforth and forever*

The *etc.* here was removed from the 1920 LDS edition, perhaps because it awkwardly intervenes between *thee* (referring to Nephi) and the nominal *whomsoever*-clause that follows. The *etc.* seems to be referring to Nephi’s own seed, while the following nominal clause “whomsoever shall be called thy seed” refers to those who descend from others, not literally Nephi’s seed, that followed Nephi, as explained elsewhere in the text:

Mormon 1:8–9

and it came to pass that in this year

there began to be a war between **the Nephites**

**which consisted of the Nephites and the Jacobites**

**and the Josephites and the Zoramites**

and this war was between the Nephites and the Lamanites

and the Lemuelites and the Ishmaelites

now the Lamanites and the Lemuelites and the Ishmaelites were called Lamanites

and the two parties were Nephites and Lamanites

Similar explanations regarding the general terms *Nephite* and *Lamanite* are found in Jacob 1:13–14 and 4 Nephi 1:36–38. The original use of *thee etc.* in Alma 3:17 therefore seems to refer to Nephi and his seed (the Nephites proper) while “whomsoever shall be called thy seed” refers at least to the Jacobites and the Josephites and the Zoramites. The descendants of Sam were considered Nephi’s seed (as implied by 2 Nephi 4:11) and are therefore never separately listed in the text. In addition, the people of Zarahemla were eventually numbered as Nephites (as explained in Mosiah 25:13). And sometimes converted Lamanites were also counted as Nephites; for instance, the people of Ammon were “numbered among the people of Nephi” (the original reading in Alma 27:27). Apparently the *etc.* in Alma 3:17 refers to Nephi’s actual seed.

**Summary:** Restore the original use of *etc.* in Alma 3:17; it probably refers to Nephi’s literal descendants, as distinct from all the rest who would be called Nephites (the Jacobites, the Josephites, the Zoramites, etc.).

## ■ Alma 3:17

*and I will bless thee etc.*

*and [whomsoever 1ABDEFIJLMNOPQRST | whosoever CGHK] shall be called thy seed  
henceforth and forever*

The earliest text here reads *whomsoever*. The nominal clause headed by *whomsoever* serves as a direct object in the larger sentence and is conjoined with the preceding *thee etc.* Thus the text means ‘I will bless whomsoever shall be called thy seed’. In prescriptive grammar, the decision between *whosoever* and *whomsoever* is supposed to be according to its grammatical role within the nominal clause, not its role within the larger sentence. In accord with this rule, the 1920 LDS edition replaced *whosoever* with *whomsoever* earlier in the text:

Mosiah 26:22

*and [whosoever 1ABCDEFGHJKLMNOPS | whomsoever RT] ye receive  
shall believe in my name*

In Mosiah 26:22 the original *whosoever* serves as the direct object within the nominal clause (just as *whom* would be the direct object in the corresponding relative clause “the person **whom** ye receive”). According to the prescriptive rule, the correct form in Alma 3:17 should be *whosoever* since *whosoever* is the subject in the nominal clause (as in “the person **who** shall be called thy seed”). The 1840 edition made the grammatical change to *whosoever*, but it was reversed to the original *whomsoever* in the 1908 RLDS edition. The 1920 LDS edition did not make the change to *whosoever*, although according to the strict prescriptive rule, it should have. Of course, the critical text will in each case restore the earliest reading, thus ignoring this rather esoteric prescriptive rule that not even the 1908 RLDS editors nor the 1920 LDS editors were able to fully control. Also see the nearby discussion under Alma 3:10, where the choice in editing was more transparent. For a complete discussion, see under PRONOUNS and WHICH in volume 3.

**Summary:** Maintain the original occurrence of *whomsoever* in Alma 3:17, despite its supposed ungrammaticality (according to a rather difficult and quite artificial prescriptive rule of grammar).

## ■ Alma 3:18

*nevertheless [as 1 | ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST] they had come out  
in open rebellion against God*

[ 1 |; ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST]

*therefore it was expedient that the curse should fall upon them*

Here the 1830 typesetter removed the subordinate conjunction *as*, thus making the original subordinate clause into a main clause. He also placed a semicolon between that clause and the following main clause (“therefore it was expedient that the curse should fall upon them”). The original construction (“*as*-clause + *therefore* + main clause”) is found elsewhere in both the original and the current text; see the discussion and list of examples under Mosiah 23:12. Here in Alma 3:18 the critical text will restore the original *as* and remove the semicolon that would then lead to premature closure; the expected punctuation is a comma.



*Summary:* Restore in Alma 3:18 the original subordinate construction with its conjunction *as* and with no semicolon before the following main clause, thus “nevertheless as they had come out in open rebellion against God / therefore it was expedient that the curse should fall upon them”.

### ■ Alma 3:19

*now I would that ye should see that they brought upon themselves the curse  
and even so [doeth 1HK | doth ABCDEFGIJKLMNOPQRST] every man that is cursed  
[bringeth 1 | bring ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] upon himself his own condemnation*

As noted in the discussion under Mosiah 4:18, this is the only passage in the text that does not use *doeth* and *doth* according to standard biblical style; namely, we expect *doth* whenever *do* acts as an auxiliary verb, but *doeth* whenever *do* is the main verb. This is also the only example where the auxiliary verb *do* is separated by some distance from its main verb (namely, *bring*), with the result that in the original text here both *do* and *bring* take on the forms of finite main verbs. Thus the earliest text reads “and even so **doeth** every man that is cursed **bringeth** upon himself his own condemnation”. The 1830 typesetter decided to emend these two verbs to the expected forms, *doth* and *bring*, as if the sentence read more simply as “and even so **doth** every man . . . **bring** upon himself his own condemnation”. Such an emendation agrees, for instance, with Mosiah 14:1, for which we get the correct *do* form: “yea even **doth** not Isaiah **say**: who hath believed our report”).

David Calabro has suggested (personal communication) that the verb form *bringeth* might be an error for *bringing*; in other words, the original text here read “and even so **doeth** every man that is cursed / **bringing** upon himself his own condemnation”. Another possibility is that there was originally a subject *he* pronoun before *bringeth*; that is, the original text read “and even so **doeth** every man that is cursed: **he bringeth** upon himself his own condemnation”. Yet both these conjectural emendations seem rather strained, although not impossible. They do have the virtue that they each propose a single error as the source for the difficult reading in  $\mathcal{D}$ . But the actual meaning of the passage seems to be reflected in the 1830 emendation.

Historically, the *doth* form is an unstressed form of the verb *do*, which is what we would normally expect for the auxiliary verb form of *do*. On the other hand, *doeth* is the stressed form of the verb, which is what we expect when *do* is the main verb. Here in Alma 3:19 the relative isolation of the *do* verb makes one tend to expect the stressed form *doeth* even though this *do* verb is an auxiliary verb. Interestingly, the relative isolation of *doth* led the 1874 RLDS edition to accidentally revert to the original *doeth* (yet the 1830 *bring* was left unchanged). The 1908 RLDS edition restored the grammatically correct 1830 reading “doth . . . bring”.

The critical text will restore the two original finite verb forms, *doeth* and *bringeth*, since their use in  $\mathcal{D}$  could be intended. Clearly, the complex subject “every man that is cursed” has something to do with the repeated occurrence of the *-eth* inflectional ending in this passage. There may be some primitive error here in Alma 3:19, but thus far no fully satisfactory emendation has been proposed.

*Summary:* Restore the intended, but grammatically incorrect, use of “doeth . . . bringeth” in Alma 3:19; the complex noun phrase “every man that is cursed” (which ends in a postmodifying relative clause) seems to have led to this unique use of two finite verb forms.

## ■ Alma 3:25

now all **these** things were done

yea all [§2 those >+ §1 these 1 | these ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] wars and contentions  
was commenced and ended in the fifth year of the reign of the judges

Here scribe 2 of  $\mathcal{P}$  wrote *those* wars, which was probably a visual error for *these* wars. Somewhat later, while proofing the printer's manuscript against the original, Oliver Cowdery corrected *those* to *these*, which makes the text consistent with the phrase "all these things" that occurs in the immediately preceding clause. There are many examples in the history of the text, especially in the manuscripts, where *these* and *those* have been mixed up. The instance here appears to be the only one where scribe 2 of  $\mathcal{P}$  switched these two demonstratives. There are 12 clear cases where Oliver Cowdery mixed up *these* and *those*, none of which seem to involve any sort of editing on his part; in all these cases, he was simply trying to write down the correct demonstrative, but he was not always successful. In 7 of the cases, he corrected his error (each of these corrected cases is marked below with an asterisk). In 8 of the 12 cases, he replaced *those* with *these*, but in 4 cases he replaced *these* with *those*:

- *those* replaced by *these*

\* Alma 35:6

and it came to pass that  
after they had found out the minds of all the people  
[*these* > *those* 0 | *those* 1 ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]  
which were in favor of the words  
which had spoken by Alma and his brethren  
were cast out of the land

Alma 37:29

and ye shall also teach them that  
[*those* 0 | *these* 1 ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] people were destroyed  
on account of their wickedness

Alma 45:2

believest thou the words which I spake unto thee concerning  
[*those* / *these* 0 | *these* 1 | *those* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] records  
which have been kept

\* Alma 50:2

and upon the top of  
[*those* 0 | *these* > *those* 1 | *these* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] ridges of earth  
he caused that there should be timbers yea works of timbers  
built up to the height of a man round about the cities

\* Alma 52:4

and it came to pass that  
he did command that his people should maintain  
[*these* >% *those* 0 | *those* 1 ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] cities  
which they had taken by the shedding of blood

\* Alma 57:11

therefore it became expedient that we should take  
[*these* > *those* 0 | *those* 1 ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] provisions  
and send them to Judea

Alma 57:16

and now in those critical circumstances  
it became a very serious matter to determine concerning  
[*those* 0 | *these* 1 ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] prisoners of war

\* Alma 58:3

yea and it became expedient that we should employ our men to the maintaining  
[*these* > *those* 0 | *those* 1 ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] parts of the land  
of the which we had retained of our possessions

□ *these* replaced by *those*

Alma 25:1

and behold now it came to pass that  
[*these* 0 | *those* 1 ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] Lamanites were more angry

Alma 57:20

and as the remainder of our army were about to give way before the Lamanites  
behold [*these* 0 | *those* 1 ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] two thousand and sixty  
were firm and undaunted

\* Helaman 5:49

and there were about three hundred souls which saw and heard  
[*those* > *these* 1 | *these* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] things

\* Helaman 6:25

now behold it is  
[*those* > *these* 1 | *these* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] secret oaths and covenants  
which Alma commanded his son should not go forth unto the world

For a list of six clear cases where the 1830 typesetter switched these two demonstratives, see under Mosiah 28:1.

When we consider other cases where the plural demonstrative *these* or *those* is repeated in a following *yea*-clause, we find that the demonstrative remains unchanged. In other words, there are no examples elsewhere in the text where an initial *these* is followed by *those* in the *yea*-clause or vice versa:

□ *these* repeated

Alma 5:53

can ye withstand **these** sayings  
**yea** can ye lay aside **these** things

Alma 24:14

and the great God has had mercy on us  
and made **these** things known unto us that we might not perish  
**yea** and he hath made **these** things known unto us beforehand  
because he loveth our souls as well as he loveth our children

Alma 37:9

were it not for these things that **these** records do contain  
which are on these plates  
Ammon and his brethren could not have convinced so many thousands  
of the Lamanites of the incorrect tradition of their fathers  
**yea these** records and their words brought them unto repentance

Alma 41:7

**these** are they that are redeemed of the Lord  
**yea these** are they that are taken out  
that are delivered from that endless night of darkness

3 Nephi 10:14–15

let him search them and see  
behold if . . . all **these** things is not unto the fulfilling of the prophecies  
of many of the holy prophets  
behold I say unto you  
**yea** many have testified of **these** things at the coming of Christ  
and were slain because they testified of **these** things

3 Nephi 23:1

and now behold I say unto you  
that ye had ought to search **these** things  
**yea** a commandment I give unto you  
that ye search **these** things diligently

Ether 8:23

wherefore O ye Gentiles  
it is wisdom in God that **these** things should be shewn unto you  
that thereby ye may repent of your sins  
and suffer not that **these** murderous combinations shall get above you  
which are built up to get power and gain  
and the work yea even the work of destruction come upon you  
**yea** even the sword of the justice of the eternal God  
shall fall upon you to your overthrow and destruction  
if ye shall suffer **these** things to be

□ *those* repeated

Mosiah 18:9

yea and are willing to mourn with **those** that mourn  
**yea** and comfort **those** that stand in need of comfort

Alma 46:15

and **those** who did belong to the church were faithful  
**yea** all **those** who were true believers in Christ  
took upon them gladly the name of Christ

Alma 52:25

and thus they did and slew all **those** who had been left to protect the city  
**yea** all **those** who would not yield up their weapons of war

Alma 52:40

and now the number of prisoners which were taken  
exceeded more than the number of **those** which had been slain  
**yea** more than **those** which had been slain on both sides

Alma 60:17

and this because of the great wickedness of **those**  
who are seeking for power and authority  
**yea** even **those** kingmen

Alma 61:3

but behold there are **those** who do joy in your afflictions  
yea insomuch that they have risen up in rebellion against me  
and also those of my people which are freemen  
**yea** and **those** which have risen up are exceeding numerous

Alma 62:2

but he did also mourn exceedingly  
because of the iniquity of **those** who had driven Parhoron  
from the judgment seat  
**yea** in fine because of **those** who had rebelled against their country  
and also their God

Alma 62:9

and the men of Pachus received their trial according to the law  
and also **those** kingmen which had been taken and cast into prison  
and they were executed according to the law  
**yea** those men of Pachus and **those** kingmen  
whosoever would not take up arms in the defense of their country  
but would fight against it  
were put to death

Thus internal evidence argues that in Alma 3:25 scribe 2 of  $\mathcal{P}$ 's reading "all **these** things were done / yea all **those** wars and contentions was commenced and ended" is an error. Scribe 2 seems to have accidentally replaced the second *these* with *those*. The critical text will assume as much and accept Oliver's emendation here in Alma 3:25 as the reading of the original manuscript (no longer extant for this part of the text).

**Summary:** Retain in Alma 3:25 Oliver Cowdery's correction of *those* to the repeated demonstrative *these* in the following *yea*-clause: "yea all **these** wars and contentions was commenced and ended in the fifth year of the reign of the judges".

## ■ Alma 3:26

*that **they** might reap **their** rewards according to **their** works  
 whether they were good or whether they were bad  
 to reap eternal happiness or eternal misery according to the spirit  
 which [he >js they 1 | he A | they BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] listed to obey  
 whether it be a good spirit or a bad one*

Here we have another example involving number switching in the generic pronoun. The passage begins with the plural pronouns *they* and *their* but ends up switching to the singular *he*. One possible reason for this is that the initial occurrences of *they* and *their* in this verse refer to the generic person (“that **they** might reap **their** rewards according to **their** works”) but subsequently the passage uses the plural *they* to refer to *works* (“whether **they** were good or whether **they** were bad”). In any event, the singular *he* was changed to *they* by Joseph Smith in his editing for the 1837 edition.

Number switching for generic pronouns was fairly common in the original text. For a nearby example, see Mosiah 29:28. For additional discussion, see under 1 Nephi 10:18–19. The critical text will in each of these instances maintain the reading of the earliest textual sources, thus *he* here in Alma 3:26.

**Summary:** Restore in Alma 3:26 the singular *he*, the reading of the earliest text; mixture of number for the generic pronoun was fairly common in the original text.

## ■ Alma 3:27

*and thus [ended 1JPS | endeth ABCDEFGHIKLMNOQRT] the fifth year  
 of the reign of the judges*

Throughout the history of the text, there has been some tendency to replace the past-tense *ended* with *endeth* when the passage refers to the end of a certain period of time. In English the present-tense form is actually expected in narrative accounts since it gives an immediacy to the account. Here in Alma 3:27, the 1830 error of *endeth* was corrected in the 1888 LDS edition and the 1908 RLDS edition. But because the 1888 edition never served as a copytext for any subsequent LDS edition, the current LDS text has retained the present-tense *endeth* in this instance.

Besides the instance of *endeth* here in Alma 3:27 (which the 1830 typesetter was responsible for), we have five other cases of this error. No one edition is responsible for introducing all these errors:

Alma 4:5 (error in the 1837 edition; corrected in the 1906 LDS edition,  
 the 1908 RLDS edition, and the 1981 LDS edition)

and thus [ended 1ANPST | endeth BCDEFGHIJKLMOQR] the seventh year  
 of the reign of the judges over the people of Nephi

Alma 4:10 (error in the 1874 RLDS edition; corrected in the 1908 RLDS edition)

and thus [ended 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST | endeth HK] the eighth year  
 of the reign of the judges

Alma 28:7 (error in the 1837 edition; corrected in the 1888 LDS edition, the 1906 LDS edition, and the 1908 RLDS edition)  
and thus [*ended* 01AJNPS | *endeth* BCDEFGHIKLMOQRT] the fifteenth year of the reign of the judges over the people of Nephi

Alma 51:37 (error in the 1849 LDS edition; never corrected in the LDS text)  
and thus [*ended* 01ABCDGHKPS | *endeth* EFIJLMNOQRT] the twenty and fifth year of the reign of the judges over the people of Nephi

Alma 51:37 (error in the 1849 LDS edition; never corrected in the LDS text)  
and thus [*ended* 01ABCDGHKPS | *endeth* EFIJLMNOQRT] the days of Amalickiah

In the original text, there were no examples of the present-tense *endeth*. In 50 cases where the text refers to the ending of a period of time or of a person's life, the original text consistently uses the past-tense form *ended* rather than the present-tense *endeth*. Moreover, in each instance, the surrounding text is in the past tense, so the use of *ended* is also consistent in that regard. In each of the four instances where *endeth* entered the RLDS text, the 1908 edition restored the original *ended*. Of the five instances where *endeth* has entered the LDS text, only the one in Alma 4:5 has been removed from the current text. The critical text will, of course, have only *ended*, the consistent reading of the earliest text.

It should be noted, however, that the present tense is not impossible in referring to the end of a period of time in the Book of Mormon, as in the following unique example:

Alma 28:9  
and this is the account of the wars and contentions among the Nephites  
and also the wars between the Nephites and the Lamanites  
and the fifteenth year of the reign of the judges **is ended**

Besides the 50 examples of the simple past-tense form *ended*, there are two other past-tense uses of the verb *end* that refer to the end of a period of time:

Helaman 6:1  
and it came to pass that  
when the sixty and second year of the reign of the judges **had ended**  
all these things had happened

Helaman 11:21  
and it came to pass that the seventy and sixth year **did end** in peace  
and the seventy and seventh year began in peace

**Summary:** Restore the original past-tense *ended* in Alma 3:27, Alma 28:7, and twice in Alma 51:37; the present-tense form *endeth* is never found in the original text of the Book of Mormon (although there is one present-tense occurrence of *is ended*, in Alma 28:9).

# Alma 4

## ■ Alma 4:1–3

*Now it came to pass in the sixth year of the reign of the judges over the people of Nephi there was no contentions nor wars in the land of Zarahemla  
[& >js but 1 | and A | but BCDEFGHK | But IJLMNOPQRST] the people  
[being >js were 1 | being A | were BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] afflicted  
yea greatly afflicted for the loss of their brethren  
and also for the loss of their flocks and herds  
and also for the loss of their fields of grain  
which was trodden under foot and destroyed by the Lamanites  
—and so great was their afflictions that every soul had cause to mourn  
and they believed that it was the judgments of God sent upon them  
because of their wickedness and their abominations—  
therefore they were awakened to a remembrance of their duty*

At the beginning of this chapter, we have a narrative use of the conjunction *and* that works fine as long as it is followed by the original nonfinite present participial clause (“the people being afflicted . . .”). This participial clause is not immediately completed by a finite clause, although considerably later (after three prepositional phrases, one relative clause, and two parenthetical finite clauses) we get a *therefore*-clause that serves as the completing clause for the initial participial clause.

In his editing for the 1837 edition, Joseph Smith decided that the present participial clause should be made into a finite main clause; thus he changed the present participle *being* into the finite verb form *were*. But such a change made the original narrative connector *and* seem odd since if there were no contentions or wars, then why should the people be afflicted? In the original syntax, there is no narrative conflict since the participial clause forces the reader to wait for the explanation of what the people’s afflictions led to. But in the emended syntax, there needs to be some immediate contrast between the first thought (there not being any wars or contentions) and the second thought (the people being afflicted). Thus Joseph edited the *and* to *but*.

The critical text will restore the original narrative conjunction *and* and the present participle *being*. Support for such complexity in the original text can be found elsewhere:

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—



**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

For discussion of how Joseph Smith edited this passage, see under 1 Nephi 3:17.

*Summary:* Restore in Alma 4:2 the *and* and the *being* that Joseph Smith edited to *but* and *were*; the original text is rather difficult since closure is not achieved until after some delay (including the intervention of two related but parenthetical main clauses); usage elsewhere in the text supports the original complex syntax in Alma 4:1–3.

### ■ Alma 4:3

*and so great* [*was* >js *were* 1 | *was* A | *were* BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]  
*their* [*affliction* >+ *afflictions* 1 | *afflictions* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]  
*that every soul had cause to mourn*

Here scribe 2 of  $\mathcal{D}$  originally wrote the singular *affliction* (miswritten as *affliction*). Perhaps he was influenced by the preceding occurrence of *was* (thus “and so great **was** their affliction”). Scribe 2 corrected the singular *afflictions* to the plural by supralinearly inserting the plural *s*. (The *s* itself is written with somewhat heavier ink flow, but the insert mark itself is not; perhaps scribe 2 redipped his quill in the middle of his correction.) The plural *afflictions* was probably the reading of the original manuscript.

The original text clearly allows plural subject nouns to occur after a singular form of the verb *be*, as in these two examples with the phraseology “so great was X”:

1 Nephi 17:2

and so great [*was* 0 | *was* >js *were* 1 | *were* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]  
 the blessings of the Lord upon us  
 that while we did live upon raw meat in the wilderness  
 our women did give plenty of suck for their children

Mosiah 24:10

and it came to pass that  
 so great [*was* >js *were* 1 | *was* A | *were* BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]  
 their afflictions  
 that they began to cry mightily to God

The second of these has *afflictions* as its plural subject. More generally, the text allows examples of both singular *affliction* and plural *afflictions*; see, for instance, the discussion of the phrase “great affliction(s)” under Mosiah 11:27. For a general discussion, see under SUBJECT-VERB AGREEMENT in volume 3.

*Summary:* In Alma 4:3 the plural *afflictions* should be maintained; in addition, the singular verb form *was* will be restored in the critical text (“and so great was their afflictions”).

## ■ Alma 4:5

*there was about three thousand five hundred souls  
that united themselves to the church of God*

David Calabro (personal communication) wonders if a conjunction *and* might be missing from the compound number here—namely, he suggests that the original text might have read “about three thousand **and** five hundred souls”. The loss of *and* could have resulted from the scribe’s eye skipping over the *and* because *thousand* itself ends in *and*. Of course, if the *and* had been written as an ampersand (Oliver Cowdery’s practice), that single character could have also been skipped as the scribe copied from  $\mathcal{C}$  into  $\mathcal{P}$ .

Elsewhere the Book of Mormon text has one (and only one) *and* in every compound number involving *thousand*:

Mosiah 9:18	three thousand <b>and</b> forty-three
Alma 2:19	twelve thousand five hundred thirty <b>and</b> two souls
Alma 2:19	six thousand five hundred sixty <b>and</b> two souls
Alma 24:22	a thousand <b>and</b> five of them
Alma 57:19	two thousand <b>and</b> sixty
Alma 57:20	these two thousand <b>and</b> sixty
Alma 57:25	my two thousand <b>and</b> sixty
Alma 63:4	five thousand <b>and</b> four hundred men
3 Nephi 17:25	about two thousand <b>and</b> five hundred souls

The example in 3 Nephi 17:25 is very similar to Alma 4:5, yet in that instance there is an *and* after the *thousand*.

It is important to keep in mind that in English the *and* is not necessary; in fact, in modern English it is not expected. Of course, one could argue that the expected lack of the *and* in modern English may have been the reason the *and* was lost here in Alma 4:5. But since the *and* is not required, the critical text will maintain the earliest reading without any *and* here in Alma 4:5 (that is, “about three thousand five hundred souls”). This is a unique reading in the text, but unique readings do occur. Of course, the possibility remains that this reading could be an instance where *and* was accidentally lost.

For another example where *and* may have been lost from a compound number, see under Mormon 2:2. There the printer’s manuscript reads “three hundred & twenty six years” while the 1830 edition reads “three hundred and twenty **and** six years”. For this part of the text, both  $\mathcal{P}$  and the 1830 edition are firsthand copies of  $\mathcal{C}$ .

**Summary:** Accept in Alma 4:5 the reading without *and* between the two numbers (“about three thousand five hundred souls”), even though there is some chance that the original text had the *and* between *three thousand* and *five hundred*.

■ Alma 4:5

*and thus [ended 1ANPST | endeth BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQR] the seventh year of the reign of the judges over the people of Nephi*

As discussed under Alma 3:27, the original text permitted only the past tense in the expression “thus ended <a certain period of time>”. The original *ended* will be maintained here in Alma 4:5. In this instance, the 1837 edition replaced *ended* with *endeth*. The correct *ended* was restored to the LDS text in the 1906 and 1981 LDS editions and to the RLDS text in the 1908 RLDS edition.

■ Alma 4:5

*and there was continual peace  
in all [the land >% that time 1 | that time ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]*

Scribe 2 of  $\mathcal{P}$  initially wrote “there was continual peace in all the land”, but then immediately corrected his error by erasure and writing “that time”. There are 24 occurrences of “peace in (all) the land” in the Book of Mormon, including a nearby one in Alma 3:24: “and then they returned again and began to establish **peace in the land**”. The unexpected “peace in all that time” was undoubtedly the reading in  $\mathcal{G}$ ; there would have been no motivation for scribe 2 to have edited the text here. The critical text will therefore maintain the corrected reading in  $\mathcal{P}$ : “and there was continual peace in all that time”.

There is only one other instance in the text where “peace in” is immediately followed by a reference to time:

Helaman 11:22  
and also they had **peace in** the seventy and eighth year  
save it were a few contentions

*Summary:* Maintain in Alma 4:5 the corrected reading in  $\mathcal{P}$ , “in all that time”.

■ Alma 4:6

*and in all these things  
[were thy >% were they 1 | were they ABCDEFGIJKLMNOPQRST | they were HK] lifted up  
in the pride of their eyes*

The 1874 RLDS edition switched the word order in this passage from *were they* to *they were*. The 1908 RLDS edition restored the original word order. Either order is possible after a prepositional phrase such as “in all these things”. For some discussion of the word order after sentence-initial adverbial elements, see under 2 Nephi 25:16.

*Summary:* Maintain in Alma 4:6 the original inverted word order *were they* after the sentence-initial adverbial “in all these things”.

## ■ Alma 4:8

*and they began to persecute those that did not believe  
according to their own [will >- wills 1 | will ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] and pleasure*

Here scribe 2 of  $\mathcal{P}$  initially wrote “according to their own **will** and **pleasure**”, which is what we expect in modern English. However, somewhat later he inserted the plural *s* at the end of *will*. The word *will* is found here at the end of the line in  $\mathcal{P}$ , with the inserted *s* somewhat above the line and written with a weaker ink flow. There is clearly no reason for scribe 2 to have corrected *will* to *wills* except that the original manuscript must have read in the plural. The 1830 compositor, however, set the fully singular “will and pleasure” for this passage.

We find further support for the plural usage later on in the book of Alma. Here the scribe in  $\mathcal{P}$  was the same scribe 2:

Alma 12:31

to act according to their

[*will* > *wills* >% *will* > *wills* 1 | *wills* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]

and [*pleasure* > *pleasures* 1 | *pleasures* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]

Once more scribe 2 initially wrote “will and pleasure”, what we expect in modern English. He soon corrected the text by inserting an *s* after *will* and one after *pleasure*. Not liking the result, he erased the *s* that he had just inserted after *will*, then decided that the *s* was indeed in the text and wrote a second time the *s* after *will*. Clearly, the original manuscript here read “wills and pleasures”. The fully plural reading in Alma 12:31 suggests that in Alma 4:8 the original text may have also read as “wills and pleasures”. Interestingly, the difficult reading in Alma 12:31 has never been edited to the singular “will and pleasure” in any of the printed editions.

When referring to one individual, the Book of Mormon text has only the singular “will and pleasure”:

1 Nephi 16:38	according to <b>his</b> will and pleasure
2 Nephi 10:22	according to <b>his</b> will and pleasure
2 Nephi 25:22	according to the will and pleasure <b>of God</b>
Jacob 4:9	according to <b>his</b> will and pleasure
Jacob 5:14	according to <b>his</b> will and pleasure
Mosiah 7:33	according to <b>his</b> own will and pleasure
Alma 17:20	according to <b>his</b> will and pleasure

There are only two instances where the text refers to the “will(s) and pleasure(s)” of more than one individual—namely, in Alma 4:8 and Alma 12:31. Thus the plural usage seems intentional when referring to more than one person.

Early Modern English provides quite a few examples of such plural usage. *Literature Online* <lion.chadwyck.com> gives the following examples of the plural usage when referring to the will and pleasure of more than one person. All of these examples date from the 1500s through the 1700s (spelling here regularized):

- *wills and pleasures*

George Wither (1643)	to <b>their</b> legal wills and pleasures
Percy Herbert (1661)	not only by the wills and pleasures of <b>their</b> peremptory governors
Samuel Butler (about 1670)	at the wills and pleasures of <b>their</b> mothers
Robert Dixon (1683)	it is <b>our</b> special wills and pleasures
Edward Taylor (about 1700)	<b>their</b> wills and pleasures are their rule
Edward Ward (1708)	as best suit <b>their</b> wills and pleasures
James Beattie (1766)	and contradict <b>their</b> wills and pleasures
  
- *wills and pleasure*

Percy Herbert (1661)	to reign and govern after <b>their</b> wills and pleasure
----------------------	---
  
- *will and pleasures*

Henry Wootan (1578)	wholly to the will and pleasures of <b>their</b> parents
---------------------	--

Thus there is nothing inappropriate about the fully plural “their wills and pleasures” in Alma 12:31. Of course, the fairly frequent occurrence in Early Modern English of “their wills and pleasures” suggests that the singular *pleasure* in Alma 4:8 could be an error for *pleasures*. But the 1661 example from Percy Herbert provides evidence that even “their wills and pleasure” is possible. Note, by the way, that Herbert is also responsible for an example of the fully plural “their wills and pleasures”. Given these citations, the critical text will restore the original “their own wills and pleasure” in Alma 4:8 and maintain the even more difficult but intended “their wills and pleasures” in Alma 12:31.

It is worth noting here that the King James Bible never uses the phrase “will(s) and pleasure(s)”, in the singular or plural. There are, however, three instances involving both *will* and *pleasure* that are similar in meaning to “will(s) and pleasure(s)”:

Ephesians 1:5

having predestinated us unto the adoption of children by Jesus Christ to himself  
according to the good **pleasure** of his **will**

Ephesians 1:9

having made known unto us the mystery of his **will**  
according to his good **pleasure** which he hath purposed in himself

Philippians 2:13

for it is God which worketh in you  
both to **will** and to do of *his* good **pleasure**

The plural “wills and pleasure(s)” may represent one more example of Early Modern English in the Book of Mormon text, usage that had become archaic by the 1800s, as evidenced by the tendency of scribe 2 of  $\mathfrak{D}$  and the 1830 compositor to replace the plural with the singular in this expression.

**Summary:** Restore in Alma 4:8 the corrected reading in  $\mathfrak{D}$ , “their own **wills** and pleasure”; also maintain the fully plural “their **wills** and **pleasures**” in Alma 12:31; such plural usage seems to have occurred fairly frequently in Early Modern English, providing it referred to the will and pleasure of more than one person.

## ■ Alma 4:9

*and thus in [the > this 1 | this ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] eighth year  
of the reign of the judges  
there began to be great contentions among the people of the church*

Scribe 2 of  $\mathcal{P}$  initially wrote “the eighth year”, but then he immediately corrected the *the* to *this*. The use of *this* with the number of the year does occur elsewhere, and in each case the year was originally referred to a few verses earlier:

3 Nephi 2:11, 13

and it came to pass in **the thirteenth year**  
there began to be wars and contentions throughout all the land . . .  
and it came to pass that before **this thirteenth year** had passed away  
the Nephites were threatened with utter destruction

3 Nephi 4:5, 15

and it came to pass that in **the nineteenth year**  
Giddianhi found that it was expedient  
that he should go up to battle against the Nephites . . .  
and it came to pass that **this nineteenth year** did pass away

4 Nephi 1:22, 24

and it came to pass that **two hundred years** had passed away . . .  
and now in **this two hundred and first year**  
there began to be among them those which were lifted up in pride

Mormon 3:1, 4

and it came to pass that the Lamanites did not come to battle again  
until **ten years more** had passed away . . .  
and it came to pass that after **this tenth year** had passed away . . .

And for Alma 4:9, the original reference to the eighth year occurs earlier in verse 6:

Alma 4:6, 9

and it came to pass in **the eighth year** of the reign of the judges  
that the people of the church began to wax proud . . .  
and thus in **this eighth year** of the reign of the judges . . .

It is possible that the original text here in Alma 4:9 actually read “this the eighth year”—that is, perhaps scribe 2 of  $\mathcal{P}$  should have inserted the *this* rather than replace the *the* with *this*. There are a couple examples of *this the* involving periods of time:

3 Nephi 4:7, 11

and it came to pass that they did come up to battle  
and it was in **the sixth month** . . .  
and the battle commenced in **this the sixth month**

3 Nephi 6:17

and thus in the commencement of **the thirtieth year**  
—the people having been delivered up for the space of a long time  
to be carried about by the temptations of the devil

whithersoever he desired to carry them  
 and to do whatsoever iniquity he desired they should—  
 and thus in the commencement of **this the thirtieth year**  
 they were in a state of awful wickedness

But neither of these two examples are as similar to the language in Alma 4:6, 9 as are the two examples of the form “the Xth year . . . this Xth year” in 3 Nephi 2:11, 13 and 3 Nephi 4:5, 15. The critical text will therefore accept the corrected reading in  $\mathcal{P}$  for Alma 4:9: “and thus in **this** eighth year of the reign of the judges”.

**Summary:** Retain in Alma 4:9 the phraseology “this eighth year”, the corrected reading in  $\mathcal{P}$ ; such usage is strongly supported by the text in 3 Nephi 2:13 and 3 Nephi 4:15.

#### ■ Alma 4:9

*there began to be great contentions  
 among the [NULL > People of the 1 | people of the ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] church*

Initially Scribe 2 omitted the reference to the people here in Alma 4:9, but almost immediately he supralinearly inserted *People of the* (there is no change in the level of ink flow). Elsewhere, whenever the text refers to “contention(s) among X”, the noun phrase X directly refers to people (40 times); in fact, in 22 cases the word *people* is explicitly used. Thus it is highly probable that the original text here in Alma 4:9 read “there began to be great contentions among **the people of the church**”. If the original text had lacked “the people of”, we would more reasonably expect the preposition *in* rather than *among*. Although there are no examples of “contention(s) in the church”, there is one example of “dissensions **in** the church” (Helaman 4:1), in contrast to six examples of “dissensions **among** the people”. The critical text will maintain the corrected reading in Alma 4:9 (“among the people of the church”).

**Summary:** Maintain in Alma 4:9 the corrected reading “great contentions among **the people of the church**”, the highly probable reading of the original manuscript (no longer extant here).

#### ■ Alma 4:9

*yea there was envyings and [strifes 1PS | strife ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOQRT]  
 and malice and persecutions and pride*

Here the 1830 typesetter replaced the plural *strifes* with the singular *strife*. In accord with the reading in  $\mathcal{P}$ , the 1908 RLDS edition restored the plural to the RLDS text. As explained under Alma 1:32, the original text almost always has the plural *strifes* whenever it is conjoined with other nouns in a list, as here in Alma 4:9. The critical text will restore the plural *strifes* in this passage since it is the earliest extant reading.

**Summary:** Restore *strifes* in Alma 4:9 since the earliest textual source has the plural; examples elsewhere in the text support the plural *strifes* in this context.

## ■ Alma 4:10

*and thus [ended 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST | endeth HK] the eighth year  
of the reign of the judges*

As discussed under Alma 3:27, the original text permitted only the past tense in the expression “thus ended <a certain period of time>”. The original *ended* will be maintained here in Alma 4:10. In this case, the 1874 RLDS edition replaced *ended* with *endeth*; the correct reading was restored in the 1908 RLDS edition.

## ■ Alma 4:11–12

*and it came to pass in the commencement of the ninth year  
Alma [seeing >js said >js saw 1 | seeing A | saw BCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST] the wickedness  
of the church  
and [§2 NULL > §1 seeing >js saw 1 | seeing A | he saw BCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST] also  
that the example of the church began to lead those who were unbelievers  
on from one piece of iniquity to another  
thus bringing on the destruction of the people  
yea [seeing >js he saw 1 | seeing A | he saw BCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST] great inequality  
among the people . . .*

Here the original text starts out with a series of three present participial clauses: “Alma seeing . . . and seeing . . . yea seeing”. When copying from  $\mathcal{O}$  into  $\mathcal{P}$ , scribe 2 of  $\mathcal{P}$  seems to have accidentally omitted the second *seeing* (thus giving “Alma seeing the wickedness of the church **and also that** the example of the church . . .”). This reading is not impossible. When proofing  $\mathcal{P}$  against  $\mathcal{O}$ , Oliver Cowdery inserted *seeing* before *also that*. Since the initial reading in  $\mathcal{P}$  is possible, it appears that Oliver’s correction was probably the reading in  $\mathcal{O}$  and not the result of conscious editing on his part.

In his editing for the 1837 edition, Joseph Smith changed all three of these nonfinite clauses to finite clauses by replacing *seeing* with *saw*; in the second and third cases, the pronoun *he* was also added, thus giving in the 1837 edition “Alma saw . . . and he saw . . . yea he saw”. (Initially, Joseph replaced the first *seeing* with *said*, but this is clearly an error, one that seems to have resulted from the frequency with which he had been editing the historical present-tense *saith* to *said* in  $\mathcal{P}$ , specifically 98 times prior to Alma 4.) Joseph’s multiple editing of *seeing* to *saw* removed a difficult reading from the text. In the original text, the long sequence of present participial clauses is followed by three more present participial clauses and then a sequence of three conjoined noun phrases with relative clauses:

Alma 4:12 (continuing)

some lifting themselves up with their pride  
despising others  
turning their backs upon the needy and the naked  
and those which were hungry and those which were athirst  
and those which were sick and afflicted

The original construction never achieves closure; so at the transition from verse 12 to 13, the text abruptly ends and a new main clause begins:



Alma 4:13 (starting over)

now this was a great cause for lamentations among the people

Another notable example of such a long incomplete construction is found at the beginning of the book of Enos; in that instance, the incomplete text suddenly ends and then the text starts anew with a main clause (“and I will tell you”):

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

before that I received a remission of my sins

For further discussion of this passage, see under Enos 1:3. The critical text will maintain all these instances where the original syntax ran on without achieving normal closure.

*Summary:* Despite its difficulty for modern readers, the original incomplete sequence of present participial clauses should be restored in Alma 4:11–12; such usage is found elsewhere in the original text of the Book of Mormon.

#### ■ Alma 4:12

*yea seeing great [unequality 1 | inequality ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] among the people*

As discussed under Mosiah 29:32, the original text used the archaic (or dialectal) *unequality* rather than the standard *inequality*. The 1830 typesetter systematically corrected the text towards the standard *inequality*. The critical text will maintain *unequality*, the consistent reading of the manuscripts. See Alma 4:15 for another example in this chapter.

#### ■ Alma 4:13

*feeding [the 1ABCEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST | D] hungry*

*and suffering all manner of afflictions for Christ's sake which should come*

*according to the spirit of [ 1ABCEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST | the DE] prophecy*

Here the typesetter introduced an odd error into the 1841 British edition. He dropped the expected *the* before *hungry* but inserted an unnecessary *the* before *prophecy* later on in the verse. Here is how these lines appear as finally printed in that edition:

ing their substance to the poor and the needy ; feeding  
hungry ; and suffering all manner of afflictions, for  
Christ's sake, who should come according to the spirit of  
the prophecy, looking forward to that day, thus retaining

The extra word spacing in the second line seems to indicate the loss of the word *the* at the beginning of the line and a concomitant increase in the word spacing for that line. Yet the missing *the* shows up at the beginning of the fourth line. What seems to have happened here is that the type had been set up through the third line, but that the beginning of lines two and three became loose, with the word *the* falling out. In correcting the type, the *the* was accidentally put at the beginning of the fourth line rather than at the beginning of the second line, where it belonged. Then the typesetter readjusted the word spacing in the second line. Note that the initial word in line three, *Christ's*, remained slightly indented, a sign that the type had become loose.

The 1849 LDS edition was set from the 1841 British edition. The reading “feeding hungry” was clearly defective, so Orson Pratt (the editor of the 1849 edition) supplied the *the* there, giving “feeding the hungry”. But he did not recognize that the extra *the* in “according to the spirit of **the** prophecy” was an error; thus the intrusive *the* was not removed from the LDS text until the next LDS edition (in 1852). Pratt may have interpreted the text here as referring to the spirit of some particular prophecy, with the result that he left the extra *the* in the text.

*Summary:* Maintain in Alma 4:13 the original placement of the definite article *the* before *hungry* rather than before *prophecy*.

#### ■ Alma 4:14

*looking forward to that day*

*thus [retained >+ retaining 1 | retaining ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] a remission of their sins*

*being filled with great joy*

Scribe 2 of  $\mathcal{P}$  started to write “thus retained a remission of sins”. He had just started to write the final *d* of *retained* when he aborted it, redipped his quill (thus increasing somewhat the ink flow for the subsequent correction), overwrote the *d* with *in*, and then continued inline writing the final *g* before going on with “a remission of their sins” (also inline). The initial *retained* was probably an unintended scribal slip and was therefore immediately corrected. The surrounding text also has present participial verb phrases, *looking forward* and *being filled*, which supports the corrected reading “thus **retaining** a remission of their sins”. The critical text will, of course, accept the corrected reading in  $\mathcal{P}$ .

*Summary:* Accept in Alma 4:14 scribe 2’s immediate correction in  $\mathcal{P}$  of *retained* to *retaining*; the surrounding use of the present participles *looking* and *being* support *retaining*.

#### ■ Alma 4:14

*being filled with great joy because of the resurrection of the dead*

*according to the will and power and deliverance of Jesus Christ*

*from the [§2 pains >- §1 bands 1 | bands ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] of death*

Scribe 2 wrote “the pains of death” in the printer’s manuscript. Later, apparently while proofing against the original manuscript, Oliver Cowdery replaced *pains* with *bands*. The phrase “the bands of death” occurs 14 times in the original text, and all refer to death being overcome by Christ’s atonement, as in Alma 10:41: “therefore the wicked remain as though there had been no redemption

made except it be the loosing of the bands of death”. On the other hand, “the pains of death” refers to actual physical suffering that humans undergo while dying and is found three times in the text:

Mosiah 17:15	many shall suffer the pains that I do suffer even <b>the pains of death</b> by fire
Mosiah 17:18	and then ye shall suffer as I suffer <b>the pains of death</b> by fire
3 Nephi 28:8	and ye shall never endure <b>the pains of death</b>

Clearly, the atonement of Christ does not save us from the pains of death. Oliver Cowdery’s correction in Alma 4:14 is consistent with Book of Mormon usage and doctrine; here he was most probably proofing the text against the original manuscript rather than emending the text.

**Summary:** Retain in Alma 4:14 Oliver Cowdery’s “the bands of death” since it undoubtedly represents the reading of the original manuscript and is consistent with similar usage in the Book of Mormon.

#### ■ Alma 4:15

*having seen the [afflictions >% affliction > afflictions 1 | afflictions ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]  
of the humble followers of God  
and the persecutions which was heaped upon them by the remainder of his people . . .*

The plural *afflictions* appears to be the correct reading here. Scribe 2 of  $\mathcal{P}$  initially wrote the plural *afflictions*, then immediately erased the plural *s*, perhaps because he expected the singular. But he soon decided that the plural was correct, probably when he looked more closely at the original manuscript. In any event, he overwrote the erased *s* with another *s*. All printed editions have maintained the plural form here. Since either reading will work, the critical text will accept the plural *afflictions* here in Alma 4:15. For further discussion regarding the phrase “the affliction(s) of X”, see under Alma 17:30.

**Summary:** Maintain in Alma 4:15 the corrected plural reading *afflictions* in “the afflictions of the humble followers of God”.

#### ■ Alma 4:15

*and seeing all their [unequality 1 | inequality ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]*

As discussed under Mosiah 29:32, the critical text will in all cases maintain *unequality*, the consistent reading of the manuscripts for this word.

#### ■ Alma 4:15

*and now it came to pass that  
Alma having seen the afflictions of the humble followers of God  
and the persecutions which was heaped upon them by the remainder of his people  
and seeing all their unequality  
[he >js NULL 1 | he A | BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] began to be very sorrowful*

Here we have one more instance where Joseph Smith, in his editing for the 1837 edition, removed a redundant subject pronoun. Such redundancy is quite common in the original text when the initial

subject is followed by a long present participial clause (in this case, two conjoined ones). For further discussion, see under Mosiah 8:7; also see the list of examples under SUBJECT REPETITION in volume 3. The critical text will restore the redundant subject pronoun *he* in Alma 4:15 (“Alma having seen the afflictions of the humble followers of God . . . **he** began to be very sorrowful”).

**Summary:** Restore the redundant subject pronoun *he* in Alma 4:15 (“Alma . . . **he** began to be very sorrowful”).

#### ■ Alma 4:17

now this man’s name was

[§2 *Nephiah* > §1 *Nephihah* 1 | *Nephihah* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]

Scribe 2 of  $\mathcal{P}$  consistently wrote *Nephihah* as *Nephiah*, not only here in Alma 4:17 but also three other times. Oliver Cowdery, in each of the cases, corrected the spelling by inserting the missing middle *h*; the three other examples are also found in the first part of Alma, where scribe 2 was the scribe in  $\mathcal{P}$ :

Alma 4:18

but he delivered the judgment seat  
unto [§2 *Nephiah* > §1 *Nephihah* 1 | *Nephihah* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]

Alma 4:20

Alma delivered up the judgment seat  
to [§2 *Nephiah* > §1 *Nephihah* 1 | *Nephihah* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]

Alma 8:12

and thou hast delivered up the judgment seat  
unto [§2 *Nephiah* > §1 *Nephihah* 1 | *Nephihah* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]

It is possible that scribe 2’s error was influenced by common biblical names that end in *iah*, such as *Isaiah* and *Jeremiah*. Since either spelling, *Nephihah* or *Nephiah*, is theoretically possible, Oliver Cowdery’s four corrections to *Nephihah* undoubtedly represent the reading in  $\mathcal{C}$ .

Elsewhere in the text (Alma 50–62), there are 20 other occurrences of the name *Nephihah*—and all with that spelling. Oliver Cowdery is the scribe in both manuscripts for these later uses of the name. Of these occurrences, eight of them are extant in the original manuscript and all eight are spelled with the middle *h*. Thus the earliest extant readings for *Nephihah*, in the original manuscript, are all spelled that way.

Morphologically, we have several pairs of Book of Mormon names that support the use of *-hah* as a distinct morpheme at the end of names. In addition to *Nephi/Nephihah*, we have *Cumeni/Cumenihah*, *Mathoni/Mathonihah*, and *Moroni/Moronihah*. Thus evidence from Book of Mormon names suggests that *Nephihah* is derived from *Nephi* by adding *-hah*. Of course, the manuscript evidence itself strongly supports *Nephihah* as the original name.

**Summary:** Retain Oliver Cowdery’s spelling *Nephihah* in Alma 4–8 (namely, his correction in  $\mathcal{P}$  of scribe 2’s consistently misspelled *Nephiah*); *Nephihah* is supported by all the extant spellings of this name in the original manuscript.

## ■ Alma 4:17

*and he sat*

[*upon* > NULL 1 | ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] **in** *the judgment seat*

Here scribe 2 of  $\mathcal{P}$  started to write “and he sat **upon** the judgment seat”, but after writing the preposition *upon*, he immediately crossed it out and wrote inline the correct preposition *in*. In all, there are four passages in the text that refer to “sitting in/upon the judgment seat”, but as David Calabro points out (personal communication), there is a clear difference. When the preposition is *in*, the text refers to a judge functioning in his office:

Alma 4:17

now this man’s name was Nephiah and he was appointed chief judge  
and he sat **in** the judgment seat to judge and govern the people

Helaman 8:27

yea go ye in unto the judgment seat and search  
and behold your judge is murdered and he lieth in his blood  
and he hath been murdered by his brother  
who seeketh to sit **in** the judgment seat

But when the text refers to the judge literally sitting in his judgment seat, the preposition is *upon*:

Helaman 1:9

and behold they sent forth one Kishcumen  
even to the judgment seat of Parhoron  
and murdered Parhoron as he sat **upon** the judgment seat

Helaman 6:15

behold Cezoram was murdered by an unknown hand  
as he sat **upon** the judgment seat

Thus the preposition *in* is undoubtedly correct in Alma 4:17.

**Summary:** Maintain in Alma 4:17 the immediately corrected reading in  $\mathcal{P}$ : “and he sat **in** the judgment seat”.

## ■ Alma 4:18

*now Alma did not grant unto him the office of*

[§2 NULL > §1 *being* 1 | *being* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *high priest over the church*  
*but he retained the office of high priest unto himself*

Here we have two occurrences of “office of X”. Since the use of *being* is not necessary, there seems to be little editorial motivation for Oliver Cowdery to have added this word to the text for one of these cases. The insertion of *being* is probably the result of Oliver’s proofing of the printer’s manuscript against the original manuscript.

The use of the verb *being* is acceptable since “the office” is followed by the prepositional phrase “over the church”, which implies some kind of predication (as if the text could have read

“the office of high priest **presiding** over the church”). The second occurrence of “office of X” does not involve such a predicative context, and thus no verbal element is found there.

*Summary:* Accept in Alma 4:18 the inserted *being*, Oliver Cowdery’s correction in  $\mathcal{P}$  that was undoubtedly based on  $\mathcal{C}$ .

#### ■ Alma 4:20

*and thus in the [ninth > NULL 1 | ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] commencement  
of the ninth year  
of the [S2 NULL > S1 reign of the 1 | reign of the ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] judges  
over the people of Nephi  
Alma delivered up the judgment seat to Nephihah*

Here we see two instances of the tendency to shorten the long expression “in the commencement of the Xth year of the reign of the judges”. The first possibility involves omitting “the commencement of”. Here in Alma 4:20, scribe 2 of  $\mathcal{P}$  started to write “in the ninth year” rather than “in the commencement of the ninth year”. However, he caught his error after writing “in the ninth”, crossing out the *ninth* and then continuing inline with “commencement of the ninth year”. For a fuller discussion of seven other instances of the tendency to omit “the commencement of” (two of which entered the printed editions), see under Alma 30:5.

The second possibility for change in this expression involves omitting the phrase “of the reign” from “the Xth year of the reign of the judges”. Here in Alma 4:20, scribe 2 of  $\mathcal{P}$  omitted the phrase, but Oliver Cowdery supplied it in his proofing of  $\mathcal{P}$  against  $\mathcal{C}$ . There is one more example of this kind of omission in the textual history:

Alma 17:6  
in the first year of [*the reign of* 1ABCDGHKPS | EFIJLMNOQRT] the judges

In this case, the typesetter for the 1849 LDS edition introduced the error, which has been retained in all subsequent LDS editions. For further discussion regarding the possible loss of the phrase “of the reign”, see under Alma 54:1.

A third possibility, not exemplified here in Alma 4:20, is to omit the phrase “of the judges”. This occurred eight times in  $\mathcal{C}$  as the scribe took down Joseph Smith’s dictation. As might be expected for this phrase, the scribe caught the error in each case. For a list of those examples, see the discussion under Alma 28:7.

There is also one case where the text momentarily lost even a larger portion of the expression—namely, “of the reign of the judges” in Helaman 16:12 (see the discussion there).

The critical text will always maintain the reading of the earliest textual sources with respect to the phrase “in (the commencement of) the Xth year of the reign of the judges”. Here in Alma 4:20, the corrected reading in  $\mathcal{P}$  is undoubtedly the original reading.

*Summary:* Maintain in Alma 4:20 the corrected reading in  $\mathcal{P}$ : “in the commencement of the ninth year of the reign of the judges over the people of Nephi”.

# Alma 5

## ■ Alma 5:1

*Now it came to pass that Alma began to  
[declair 1 | deliver ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] the word of God unto the people*

Here the 1830 typesetter accidentally misread *declare* (spelled as *declair*) as *deliver*. His error was probably due to the use of the verb *deliver* in the immediately preceding preface to this chapter:

Alma 5 preface

The words which Alma the high priest according to the holy order of God  
**delivered** to the people in their cities and villages throughout the land

Elsewhere in the text, we have “declare the word (of God)” 28 times, as nearby in Alma 6:8: “and Alma went and began to **declare** the word of God”. There is only one occurrence of “deliver the word (of God)” in the original text:

Mosiah 25:21

and every priest preaching **the word**  
according as it was **delivered** to him by the mouth of Alma

For another passage where *declare* was twice replaced by *deliver* (but only in  $\mathcal{P}$ ), see 3 Nephi 21:2. Neither the LDS or RLDS editions have restored the original reading in Alma 5:1.

**Summary:** Restore “declare the word of God” in Alma 5:1, the reading of the printer’s manuscript; this reading is consistent with other usage in the text.

## ■ Alma 5:1

*Alma began to declare the word of God unto the people first in the land of Zarahemla  
and from thence [s2 throught > s1 throughout 1 | throughout ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]  
all the land*

Here scribe 2 of  $\mathcal{P}$  wrote *throught*, which could be interpreted either as *through* (with the *t* automatically but accidentally added because of the orthographically similar word *thought*) or as a shortened version of *throughout*. Oliver Cowdery corrected *throught* to *throughout*, apparently when he proofed  $\mathcal{P}$  against  $\mathcal{C}$ .

As discussed under Mosiah 29:1, the text can have either *through* or *throughout* in the context of “the land”, although *throughout* is the expected form. In this part of the text, *throughout* is the form consistently used to refer to the extent of Alma’s preaching:

Alma 5 preface

The words which Alma the high priest according to the holy order of God delivered to the people in their cities and villages **throughout** the land

Alma 8:4

and he began to teach the people in the land of Melek according to the holy order of God by which he had been called and he began to teach the people **throughout** all the land of Melek

Alma 16:15

and thus did Alma and Amulek go forth and also many more which had been chosen for the work to preach the word **throughout** all the land

Thus the critical text will accept Oliver's correction of *throght* to *throughout*, the probable reading in  $\mathfrak{C}$ .

**Summary:** Accept in Alma 5:1 *throughout*, Oliver Cowdery's correction in  $\mathfrak{P}$  and the probable reading in  $\mathfrak{C}$ , no longer extant here.

#### ■ Alma 5:2–3

*and these are the words which he spake to the people in the church which was established in the city of Zarahemla according to his own record saying*

*I Alma having been consecrated by [NULL > my 1 | my ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] [§2 own > §1 NULL 1 | ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] father Alma . . .*

Here scribe 2 of  $\mathfrak{P}$  initially wrote “by own father Alma”; then virtually immediately he inserted the *my*, giving “by my own father Alma”. Oliver Cowdery, somewhat later (probably while proofing the printer's manuscript against the original manuscript) deleted the *own*. This change is consistent with other usage in the text since only once is *own* used to modify nouns referring to close family members (such as *father*, *mother*, *brother*, *sister*, *son*, and *daughter*), yet this single occurrence is in a King James biblical quotation:

3 Nephi 24:17 (Malachi 3:17)  
and I will spare them  
as a man spareth **his own son** that serveth him

There is further evidence that the scribes occasionally added *own*:

1 Nephi 4:19 (Oliver Cowdery's initial error in  $\mathfrak{C}$ )  
and after that I had smote off  
his [*own* > NULL 0 | 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST] head  
with his **own** sword . . .

Alma 54:2

for he desired the provisions . . . for the support of his **own** people and he also desired his **own** people for the strengthening of his [ 0ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST | *own* > NULL 1] army



Ether 7:18

and placed him upon [*his throan in* 0 | *his own > his throne in* 1 |  
*his throne in* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] his **own** kingdom

In all of these cases, the scribe was Oliver Cowdery; in each example, there are nearby occurrences of *own* that led Oliver to momentarily insert an extra *own*. Similarly, in Alma 5:3, there is a preceding *own* that seems to have prompted scribe 2 of  $\mathcal{P}$  to accidentally add *own* (thus creating “according to his **own** record saying : I Alma having been consecrated by my **own** father Alma”). Oliver’s decision here in Alma 5:3 to remove the extra *own* was undoubtedly correct and appears to have been the result of comparing  $\mathcal{P}$  against  $\mathcal{O}$ .

*Summary:* Accept in Alma 5:3 Oliver Cowdery’s deletion of *own* in  $\mathcal{P}$  since such usage is not found elsewhere in the Book of Mormon text proper; moreover, there is a nearby preceding *own* that seems to have been the source for the intrusive *own*.

### ■ Alma 5:3

*he began to establish a church in the land  
 which was in the* [Border >+ Borders 1 | borders ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *of Nephi  
 yea the land which was called the land of Mormon*

Scribe 2 of  $\mathcal{P}$  initially wrote the singular *Border*; shortly thereafter he inserted a plural *s* with heavier ink flow. The original manuscript probably read as a plural since scribe 2 is not known for his editing of the text. Moreover, in the Book of Mormon text we find examples of only the plural *borders* but none of the singular *border* (for further discussion and examples, see under 1 Nephi 2:5). The critical text will maintain the plural *borders* here in Alma 5:3.

*Summary:* Retain in Alma 5:3 the plural *borders*, the corrected reading in  $\mathcal{P}$ ; the text otherwise uses *borders*, not *border*.

### ■ Alma 5:3

*he began to establish a church in the land **which** was in the borders of Nephi  
 yea the land* [ 1 | *which* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *was called the land of Mormon  
 yea and he did baptize his brethren in the waters of Mormon*

The 1830 typesetter added the relative pronoun *which* to the first *yea*-clause here in Alma 5:3. This editing makes this passage consistent with other passages in the text where *yea* is followed by either *a land* or *the land*:

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

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

Alma 50:11

the Nephites possessing all the land northward  
yea even all **the land which** was northward of the land Bountiful

The use of *which* in the current text for Alma 5:3 implies that the land of Mormon has already been mentioned. We find extensive reference to the geographic place Mormon earlier in the book of Mosiah, especially chapter 18. The text there specifically notes that this place of Mormon was “in the borders of the land”, which reminds us of the language in Alma 5:3 (“in the land **which** was in the borders of Nephi”):

Mosiah 18:4–8

and it came to pass that as many as did believe him  
did go forth to **a place which was called Mormon**  
having received its name from the king  
**being in the borders of the land**  
having been infested by times or at seasons by wild beasts  
now there was in **Mormon** a fountain of pure water  
and Alma resorted thither . . .  
and it came to pass after many days  
there were a goodly number gathered together to **the place of Mormon**  
to hear the words of Alma . . .  
and it came to pass that he said unto them  
behold here is **the waters of Mormon**  
for thus were they called

And the book of Mosiah continues with various references to “the place of Mormon”, “the waters of Mormon”, “the forest of Mormon”, and just plain “Mormon”:

Mosiah 18:16

and after this manner he did baptize every one  
that went forth to **the place of Mormon** . . .  
yea and they were baptized in **the waters of Mormon**

Mosiah 18:30

and now it came to pass that all this was done in **Mormon**  
yea by **the waters of Mormon**  
in the forest that was near **the waters of Mormon**  
yea **the place of Mormon**  
**the waters of Mormon**  
**the forest of Mormon**

Mosiah 25:18

yea he did baptize them  
after the manner he did his brethren in **the waters of Mormon**

Mosiah 26:15

and blessed are they  
which were baptized in **the waters of Mormon**

Technically, Alma 5:3 is the first actual use of the specific phraseology “the **land** of Mormon”, yet it seems that Alma is repeating the name of the land, not giving it for the first time.

There is some evidence that the scribes occasionally dropped the relative pronoun *which*, as in the following examples; all of these were made by Oliver Cowdery except for one by scribe 2 of  $\mathcal{P}$  (marked below with an asterisk):

2 Nephi 4:1 (initial error by Oliver Cowdery in  $\mathcal{P}$ )  
 and now I Nephi speak concerning the prophecies  
 of [*my fa* >% *which* 1 | *which* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] my father hath spoken  
 concerning Joseph who was carried into Egypt

Mosiah 11:11 (initial loss by Oliver Cowdery in  $\mathcal{P}$ )  
 and the seats [NULL > *which* 1 | *which* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] was sat apart  
 for the high priests  
 which was above all the other seats  
 he did ornament with pure gold

Alma 48:9 (initial loss by Oliver Cowdery in  $\mathcal{P}$ )  
 and thus he did fortify and strengthen the land  
 [*which* 0ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST | NULL >+ *which* 1] was possessed  
 by the Nephites

Alma 63:9 (initial loss by Oliver Cowdery in  $\mathcal{C}$ )  
 and it came to pass that in this year  
 there were many people  
 [NULL >+ *which* 0 | *which* >js *who* 1 | *which* A | *who* BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]  
 went forth into the land northward

Helaman 6:15 (initial loss by Oliver Cowdery in  $\mathcal{P}$ )  
 and it came to pass that in the same year that his son  
 [NULL > *which* >js *who* 1 | *which* A | *who* BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]  
 had been appointed by the people in his stead  
 was also murdered

3 Nephi 1:13 (loss by Oliver Cowdery in  $\mathcal{P}$ ; the 1830 edition was set from  $\mathcal{C}$ )  
 all [*that* 1 | *that which* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] I have caused  
 to be spoken by the mouth of my holy prophets

3 Nephi 1:28 (initial loss by Oliver Cowdery in  $\mathcal{P}$ )  
 because there were many dissenters of the Nephites which did flee unto them  
 which did cause much sorrow unto those Nephites  
 [NULL >+ *which* >js *who* 1 | *which* A | *who* BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] did remain  
 in the land

\* 3 Nephi 27:32 (loss by scribe 2 of  $\mathcal{P}$ , corrected by Oliver Cowdery but in  
 the wrong place)  
 and for that [ 1 | *which* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] moth  
 [§2 NULL > §1 *which* 1 | ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] doth corrupt

Moroni 9:7 (initial loss by Oliver Cowdery in  $\mathcal{P}$ )  
 for according to the knowledge  
 [NULL > *which* 1 | *which* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] I have received from Amoron  
 behold the Lamanites have many prisoners

Thus it is possible here in Alma 5:3 that scribe 2 of  $\mathcal{P}$  accidentally omitted the relative pronoun *which*.

On the other hand, David Calabro points out (personal communication) that in Alma's introductory remarks (verses 3–5) in this discourse, Alma repeats much information that the reader of the Book of Mormon already knows, yet Alma speaks to his audience as if this is all new information to them:

Alma 5:3–5 (earliest text)

I Alma having been consecrated by my father Alma  
 to be a high priest over the church of God  
 he having power and authority from God to do these things  
 behold I say unto you that he began to establish a church  
 in the land which was in the borders of Nephi  
**yea the land was called the land of Mormon**  
**yea and he did baptize his brethren in the waters of Mormon**  
 and behold I say unto you  
 they were delivered out of the hand of the people of king Noah  
 by the mercy and power of God  
 and behold after that they were brought into bondage  
 by the hands of the Lamanites in the wilderness  
**yea I say unto you they were in captivity**  
 and again the Lord did deliver them out of bondage  
 by the power of his word  
 and we were brought into this land  
 and here we began to establish the church of God throughout this land also

Calabro further points out that all three *yea*-clauses in this passage (marked above in bold) are simple basic statements of historical fact. Thus there is nothing actually inappropriate in Alma 5:3 with stating that “yea the land was called the land of Mormon” (the earliest extant reading). The critical text will therefore restore the reading in  $\mathcal{P}$ : “yea the land was called the land of Mormon” (that is, without the *which* that the 1830 typesetter added). Of course, the possibility remains that the original text had the *which* and it was accidentally lost during the early transmission of the text. Even so, the earliest reading without the *which* works well enough.

**Summary:** Restore in Alma 5:3 the earliest reading, “yea the land was called the land of Mormon”, the reading in  $\mathcal{P}$ ; there is no compelling reason for accepting the intrusive *which* that the 1830 typesetter added.

#### ■ Alma 5:4

*they were delivered out of the [hand 1 | hands ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]  
 of the people of king Noah*

Here scribe 2 of  $\mathcal{P}$  wrote the singular *hand*, but otherwise the Book of Mormon text avoids the singular *hand* for expressions of this type. Elsewhere the text has only the plural *hands* in instances of “delivering someone **into the hands** of X” (17 times), “delivering someone **out of the hands** of X” (32 times), and “delivering someone **from the hands** of X” (2 times). There are no other examples of this type that take the singular *hand*.

In addition, there is abundant evidence in the manuscripts that the scribes frequently wrote *hand* instead of the correct *hands*. In the following list, we have ten examples where the scribe initially

wrote *hand* but then corrected it to *hands*; Oliver Cowdery is responsible for seven of the examples, scribe 2 of  $\mathcal{P}$  for the remaining three (each of the latter is marked below with an asterisk):

2 Nephi 15:12 (initial error in  $\mathcal{P}$ )

neither consider the operation  
of his [*hand* >+ *hands* 1 | *hands* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]

\* Mosiah 27:4 (initial error in  $\mathcal{P}$ )

laboring with their own [*hand* > *hands* 1 | *hands* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]  
for their support

Alma 44:7 (initial error in  $\mathcal{P}$ )

ye are in our [*hand* > *hands* 1 | *hands* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]

Alma 52:10 (initial error in  $\mathcal{C}$ )

and strengthen the cities round about which had not fallen  
into the [*hand* > *hands* 0 | *hands* 1 ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] of the Lamanites

Alma 57:12 (initial error in correcting  $\mathcal{P}$ )

therefore they yielded up the city [*into our hands* 0 ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQS |  
NULL >+ *into our hand* > *into our hands* 1 | *unto our hands* RT]

Helaman 4:9 (initial error in  $\mathcal{P}$ )

yea they retained many cities which had fallen  
into the [*hand* > *hands* 1 | *hands* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] of the Lamanites

3 Nephi 4:8 (initial error in  $\mathcal{P}$ )

and deliver them  
out of the [*hand* > *hands* 1 | *hands* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]  
of their enemies

\* Mormon 5:23 (initial error in  $\mathcal{P}$ )

ye are in the [*hand* > *hands* 1 | *hands* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] of God

\* Mormon 6:15 (initial error in  $\mathcal{P}$ )

being left by the [*hand* > *hands* 1 | *hands* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]  
of those who slew them to molder upon the land

Moroni 2:2 (initial error in  $\mathcal{P}$ )

on him whom ye shall lay  
your [*hand* > *hands* 1 | *hands* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]

Thus the chances are quite high that the singular *hand* in  $\mathcal{P}$  for Alma 5:4 is an error for *hands*.

Of course, the singular *hand* is possible in English. In fact, when we consider similar usage in the King James Bible, we find evidence for both singular *hand* and plural *hands*, as in the following sampling from the first part of the King James Old Testament:

Genesis 37:21	and he delivered him out of their <b>hands</b>
Exodus 2:19	an Egyptian delivered us out of the <b>hand</b> of the shepherds
Exodus 3:8	to deliver them out of the <b>hand</b> of the Egyptians
Deuteronomy 1:27	to deliver us into the <b>hand</b> of the Amorites
Joshua 21:44	the LORD delivered all their enemies into their <b>hand</b>
Judges 6:13	and delivered us into the <b>hands</b> of the Midianites

Judges 8:3            God hath delivered into your **hands** the princes of Midian  
                                   Oreb and Zeeb

Judges 8:34            who had delivered them out of the **hands** of all their enemies

In all these examples, the original Hebrew uses the singular for two distinct Hebrew words meaning ‘hand’; thus the variation in number in the King James Bible derives from usage in Early Modern English. Since for this type of expression the singular *hand* is possible in the King James Bible, the critical text will accept the singular *hand* in Alma 5:4, the reading of the earliest extant textual source (the printer’s manuscript), even though the odds are high that this instance of the singular *hand* is a scribal error for *hands*.

*Summary:* Restore in Alma 5:4 the singular *hand* in “they were delivered out of the **hand** of the people of king Noah”; the reading in the singular is based on the earliest extant textual source for this passage (namely, the printer’s manuscript) and is supported by King James usage; however, it is very possible that *hand* is an error for *hands* (the systematic usage for this type of expression elsewhere in the Book of Mormon).

#### ■ Alma 5:5

*and behold after that* [ 1 |, ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]  
*they were brought into bondage by the hands of the Lamanites in the wilderness*  
 —yea I say unto you they were in captivity—  
**and** again the Lord did deliver them out of bondage by the power of his word

Here the original *after* was very probably a conjunction rather than a preposition, which means that the *that* should have been deleted in the editing for the 1837 edition (see the discussion under 1 Nephi 1:17, plus the general discussion under SUBORDINATE CONJUNCTIONS in volume 3). However, the 1830 typesetter placed a comma after the *that*, which means that he interpreted “after that” as a completed prepositional phrase. The original text apparently intended to say that after being in captivity to the Lamanites, the people of Alma were once more delivered out of bondage by the Lord. Note that just previously (in verse 4) the text refers to the first deliverance of the people of Alma: “they were delivered out of the hand of the people of king Noah by the mercy and power of God”.

What we have here in Alma 5:5 is a Hebraistic *and* between the subordinate *after*-clause (which includes a parenthetical *yea*-clause) and the following main clause (“again the Lord did deliver them out of bondage by the power of his word”). For further examples of this kind of usage with *after*-clauses, see under Alma 3:1; also see the general discussion under HEBRAISMS in volume 3. The critical text will therefore remove the comma after the *that* in Alma 5:5. Suitable editing for the standard text, consistent with Joseph Smith’s editing for the 1837 edition, would be to delete the *that* (as well as its comma) and remove the *and* that occurs before the main clause, thus giving “and behold **after** they were brought into bondage by the hands of the Lamanites in the wilderness—yea I say unto you they were in captivity—**again** the Lord did deliver them out of bondage by the power of his word”. For another example where “after that” was interpreted as a completed prepositional phrase, see Ether 4:3. There are, of course, actual examples of prepositional “after that” in the text:

Jacob 6:2	and after that / the end soon cometh
Alma 25:3	and after that / they had many battles with the Nephites
Alma 31:37	and after that / they did separate themselves one from another
3 Nephi 26:13	and after that / he did shew himself unto them oft

**Summary:** Remove in Alma 5:5 the comma that follows the subordinate conjunction *that*, thus restoring an original Hebraism to the text (namely, an instance of *and* between a subordinate *after*-clause and its following main clause).

#### ■ Alma 5:5

*and behold after that **they** were brought into bondage by the hands of the Lamanites in the wilderness—yea I say unto you **they** were in captivity—  
and again the Lord did deliver **them** out of bondage by the power of his word  
and **we** [NULL >jg they >jg NULL 1 | ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] were brought into this land  
and here **we** began to establish the church of God throughout this land also*

Here the text intentionally shifts from the third person plural pronoun *they* to the first person *we*. The speaker is Alma, the son of Alma; the pronoun *they* refers to Alma the father and his people, who were in bondage in the land of Nephi. Alma’s audience here includes the children of his father’s people. Yet Alma the son and many of his listeners were probably born in the land of Nephi prior to the coming of Alma’s people into the land of Zarahemla; thus Alma the son, speaking to this audience, can say that “**we** were brought into this land and here **we** began to establish the church of God throughout this land also”.

Initially, the 1830 typesetter thought that the pronoun *we* was in error, so he supralinearly inserted *they* in  $\mathcal{D}$ ; but before crossing out the *we*, he decided that the *we* was correct, so he deleted his *they*. For a more complicated example where the text switches from first to third person and then back to first person, see the discussion under Alma 56:52–53.

**Summary:** Accept in Alma 5:5 the switch from the third person plural pronoun to the first person plural pronoun; here Alma shifts from referring to his father’s people (*they*) to himself and his audience (*we*).

#### ■ Alma 5:6

*and [NULL > now 1 | now ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] behold  
I say unto you my brethren . . .*

Scribe 2 of  $\mathcal{D}$  initially omitted the narrative adverb *now*; almost immediately he supralinearly inserted the *now*. Elsewhere in the text there are over a hundred instances of “and now behold” and almost three hundred of “and behold”, so either reading is clearly possible. The critical text will therefore accept the corrected reading in  $\mathcal{D}$  as the original reading here. For another example of the accidental loss of the narrative adverb *now*, see under 1 Nephi 19:4.

**Summary:** Maintain in Alma 5:6 the *now* that scribe 2 supralinearly inserted after the conjunction *and*.

## ■ Alma 5:7

yea he [*awaked* 1ABDEFIJLPS | *awakened* CGHKNOQRT | *awaked* > *awakened* M] them  
 out of a deep sleep  
 and they [*awoke* 1 | *awoke* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] unto God

In this passage we have two original instances of the verb *awake*; each one has undergone textual variation. In the first case, the earliest text has the simple past-tense form *awaked*, which was changed to *awakened* in the 1840 edition; that is, the verb *awake* was replaced by *awaken*. This change entered the LDS text in the third printing (in 1907) of the 1905 LDS edition. The verbs *awake* and *awaken* can be found in the original text of the Book of Mormon, including transitive examples for both verbs. Some of the other examples of transitive *awake* have been edited to *awaken* (as here in Alma 5:7), but not all:

2 Nephi 9:47

is it expedient that I should **awake** you to an awful reality of these things

Alma 51:34

he did not **awake** his servants

Alma 51:35

and he **awoke** them

Alma 55:18 (changed to *awaken* in the 1920 LDS edition and in the 1953 RLDS edition)

but had they [*awoke* 01ABCDEFGHIJKLMNPQ | *awaked* O | *awakened* RST]  
 the Lamanites . . .

Alma 62:36 (changed to *awaken* in the 1981 LDS edition)

the king did [*awake* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPS | *awaken* T] his servants

Mormon 9:13 (changed to *awaken* in the 1920 LDS edition and in the 1953 RLDS edition)

from which sleep all men shall be  
 [*awoke* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNPQ | *awaked* O | *awakened* RST] by the power of God

But all the original examples of transitive *awaken* have been left unchanged:

Mosiah 2:38 the demands of divine justice doth **awaken** his immortal soul

Mosiah 4:5 if the knowledge of the goodness of God at this time  
 hath **awakened** you to a sense of your nothingness

Mosiah 9:17 for we were **awakened** to a remembrance of the deliverance  
 of our fathers

Alma 4:3 they were **awakened** to a remembrance of their duty

Alma 7:22 that I might **awaken** you to a sense of your duty to God

In Alma 5:7, the critical text will restore the original form of *awake* (namely, the simple past-tense *awaked*). For discussion of the competition between the past participial forms of *awake* and *awaken*, see under Mosiah 24:23.

The second case of variation in this passage deals with an instance of intransitive *awake*. The printer's manuscript reads *awake* in the clause "and they **awake** unto God", but this present-tense reading seems to be an error since the preceding text is in the past tense: "yea he **awaked** them



out of a deep sleep”. The 1830 typesetter interpreted *awake* as an error for *awoke*. And there is manuscript evidence that scribe 2 of  $\mathcal{P}$  sometimes miswrote *o* as *a*:

	CORRECT SPELLING	SCRIBE 2'S SPELLING IN $\mathcal{P}$
Alma 1:3	labor	labar
Alma 9:17	period	periad
3 Nephi 20:43	extolled	extalled

But another possibility is that the *awake* in  $\mathcal{P}$  for Alma 5:7 is an error for *awaked*. And there is manuscript evidence that scribe 2 of  $\mathcal{P}$  sometimes omitted the past-tense *d*:

Mosiah 27:25  
 yea born of God  
 [*change* > *changed* 1 | *changed* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]  
 from their carnal and fallen state  
 to a state of righteousness

Alma 5:57  
 the names of the wicked shall not be  
 [*mingle* > *mingled* 1 | *mingled* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]  
 with the names of my people

(For another possible instance of the loss of the past-tense *d* by this scribe, see the discussion under 3 Nephi 28:3.) Thus we can find scribal evidence to support in Alma 5:7 either *awoke* or *awaked* as the original reading for *awake*, the reading in  $\mathcal{P}$ .

Internal evidence, however, supports *awoke* as the correct reading in Alma 5:7. Elsewhere in the text, we always get *awoke* as the simple past-tense form for *awake* (five times), not *awaked*:

Mosiah 3:2	and I <b>awoke</b>
Alma 47:14	before they <b>awoke</b> at the dawn of the day
Alma 52:1	when the Lamanites <b>awoke</b> on the first morning of the first month
Alma 55:22	when the Lamanites <b>awoke</b> in the morning
Alma 62:24	when the Lamanites <b>awoke</b>

Thus the internal support is stronger for *awoke* rather than *awaked* as the original reading for “and they **awake** unto God”, the reading in  $\mathcal{P}$ .

**Summary:** Restore in Alma 5:7 the original *awaked* in “yea he **awaked** them out of a deep sleep”; also maintain in Alma 5:7 the 1830 typesetter’s emendation of *awake* as *awoke* since all other instances in the text of the simple past tense for the intransitive verb *awake* read as *awoke* rather than *awaked*.

### ■ Alma 5:7

*behold they were in the **midst** of darkness*

John Tvedtnes has suggested on page 3 of “Reconstructing the Book of Mormon”, *The FARMS Review* 15/1 (2003), that the reading “in the **midst** of darkness” in Alma 5:7 is an error for “in the **mist** of darkness”. This part of the text is not extant in  $\mathcal{G}$ ; in  $\mathcal{P}$ , the unknown scribe 2 initially wrote the *d* of *midst* without much of an ascender, then added a little more to the ascender to

make the letter look more like a regular *d* than an *a*. It would be incorrect to say that this overwriting of the *d* in *midst* means that “the *d* was added as an afterthought.” The printer’s manuscript firmly supports *midst*, not *mist*, as the original reading.

Elsewhere the Book of Mormon has the following passages with the phrase “mist(s) of darkness”:

1 Nephi 8:23

and it came to pass that  
there arose **a mist of darkness**  
yea even **an exceeding great mist of darkness**

1 Nephi 8:24

and they did press forward  
through **the** [*mists* 0 | *mist* > *mists* 1 | *mist* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] **of darkness**

1 Nephi 12:4

and it came to pass that  
I saw **a mist of darkness** on the face of the land of promise

1 Nephi 12:17

and **the mists of darkness** are the temptations of the devil

3 Nephi 8:22

for so great were **the mists of darkness**  
which were upon the face of the land

The plural “the **mists** of darkness” was the original reading in 1 Nephi 8:24. This example and the other ones show that when preceded by *the*, the plural *mists* is expected rather than the singular *mist*; in fact, there are no instances of “the mist” in the original text of the Book of Mormon. This systematic usage could be used to argue that if Alma 5:7 is to be emended, as suggested by Tvedtnes, then perhaps it should read “they were in the **mists** of darkness” rather than “they were in the **mist** of darkness”.

In the King James Bible, there is one example of “the **mist** of darkness” (but none of “the **mists** of darkness”):

2 Peter 2:17

these are wells without water  
clouds that are carried with a tempest  
to whom **the mist of darkness** is reserved forever

However, there are two examples in Deuteronomy that support the Book of Mormon reading “in the midst of darkness”:

Deuteronomy 5:22

these words the LORD spake unto all your assembly in the mount  
out of **the midst** of the fire / of the cloud / and **of the thick darkness**

Deuteronomy 5:23

and it came to pass  
when ye heard the voice out of **the midst of the darkness**  
—for the mountain did burn with fire—  
that ye came near unto me

When we consider all the Book of Mormon passages (other than possibly Alma 5:7) that refer more than once to mists of darkness, we find that the first occurrence in a passage always involves an indefinite reference to the darkness (with either the indefinite article *a/an* or no determiner at all, represented below as NULL); then later in the passage when the darkness is again referred to, the noun phrase is always preceded by the definite article *the*:

1 Nephi 8:23–24 (*a, an; the*)

there arose **a** mist of darkness  
 yea even **an** exceeding great mist of darkness . . .  
 and they did press forward through **the** mists of darkness

1 Nephi 12:4–5 (*a; the*)

and it came to pass that  
 I saw **a** mist of darkness on the face of the land of promise . . .  
 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

3 Nephi 8:19–23 (NULL, NULL; *the, the, the, the*)

and then behold there was **NULL** darkness upon the face of the land  
 and it came to pass that there was **NULL** thick darkness upon the face of all the land  
 insomuch that the inhabitants thereof which had not fallen  
 could feel **the** vapor of darkness . . .  
 and there could be no light because of **the** darkness . . .  
 for so great were **the** mists of darkness which were upon the face of the land . . .  
 yea great were the groanings of the people because of **the** darkness  
 and the great destruction which had come upon them

In addition, the larger context for the Alma 5:7 passage shows that the use of *midst* there is wholly appropriate:

Alma 5:7

behold he changed their hearts  
 yea he awaked them out of a deep sleep and they awoke unto God  
 behold they were in the **midst** of darkness  
 nevertheless their souls were illuminated by the light of the everlasting word  
 yea they were encircled about by the bands of death and the chains of hell  
 and an everlasting destruction did await them

These repentant people were originally surrounded by darkness (“in the midst of darkness”). Notice the following reference to them being “encircled about by the bands of death and the chains of hell”. The use of “in **the** mist(s) of darkness” would seem strange here since there is no previous mention of a mist of darkness or simply darkness. If *mist* (or *mists*) were correct in Alma 5:7, we should expect either “behold they were in a mist of darkness” or perhaps “behold they were in mists of darkness”. Of course, the use of the definite article *the* in front of *midst* is firm in the text. And we definitely expect *the* before *midst*: there are 41 other examples of “the midst” in the text (31 of “in the midst”), but none with any other determiner. Thus the use of *the* before *midst* is highly expected, but *the* before *mist* does not work well in Alma 5:7.

Finally, there is no textual variation between *midst* and *mist(s)*. On one occasion Oliver Cowdery wrote *mids* in place of *midst* (in 2 Nephi 16:5), but still the intended word was *midst*

(in agreement with Isaiah 6:5 in the King James Bible). The only variant for *mist(s)* is the one involving the singular and plural of *mist* in 1 Nephi 8:24 (listed above). Thus there is no strong reason to reject the earliest reading “in the midst of darkness” in Alma 5:7.

*Summary:* Maintain the use of *midst* in Alma 5:7 (“in the midst of darkness”); elsewhere the language of the Book of Mormon supports *midst* in this context rather than *mist(s)*.

#### ■ Alma 5:11

*did not my father Alma*

[*believed* >% *believe* >jg *believe* 1 | *believe* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]

*in the words which was delivered by the mouth of Abinadi*

*and was he not a holy prophet*

*did he not speak the word of God*

[, >jg ? >jg ; 1 |, ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]

*and my father Alma*

[*believed* >jg *believe* 1 | *believe* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *them*

[NULL >jg : >jg ? 1 |? ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]

Here we have two cases where the printer’s manuscript initially read *believed*. The first one is clearly wrong (“**did** not my father Alma **believed** in the words”), and scribe 2 of  $\mathcal{D}$  tried to correct the *believed* that he initially wrote by erasing the final *d*. The abrasion extends into the preceding *e*, and some ink smearing of the *d* can be observed; but overall one might think that the *d* was still there. To make sure, John Gilbert, the 1830 compositor, crossed out the partially erased *d* with pencil and correctly set the 1830 edition to read “did not my father Alma **believe** in the words”. This initial *believed* in  $\mathcal{D}$  may be due to the following *delivered*, which is visually similar to *believed*. Another source for this initial error, perhaps more probable, is the *believed* that is found two manuscript lines below; note the similarity of “did not **my father Alma believe** them” with “and **my father Alma believed** them”.

Later on in the verse, when the 1830 compositor came to “and my father Alma believed them”, he made the same change of *believed* to *believe* (once more in  $\mathcal{D}$  he crossed out the *d* of *believed* with pencil). But scribe 2 of  $\mathcal{D}$  had not tried to delete the *d* from this second occurrence of *believed*, mainly because this is how the text actually read. Thus the compositor’s emendation of the second *believed* to *believe* was a mistake. In the current text, because this second *believed* was changed to *believe*, the question mark is necessary at the end of the final clause in this passage. But by restoring the correct *believed*, we could reinterpret this passage as a sequence of three questions that ends with a declarative statement:

Alma 5:11 (alternative accidentals)

Did not my father Alma believe in the words  
which was delivered by the mouth of Abinadi?  
And was he not a holy prophet?  
Did he not speak the word of God?  
And my father Alma believed them.

This revision in the punctuation supports the interpretation that the *them* at the very end of the passage (“and my father Alma believed them”) actually refers to the earlier “the words which was

delivered by the mouth of Abinadi”), not the nearer “the word of God”; for discussion of this possibility, see the following analysis of the number disagreement between “the word of God” and *them*. Of course, the current punctuation will also work for the original reading: “Did he not speak the word of God, and my father Alma believed them?” (although I would prefer the omission of the comma).

*Summary:* Restore in Alma 5:11 the past-tense form *believed* in the latter part of verse 11 (“did he not speak the word of God and my father Alma **believed** them”); scribe 2’s correction in  $\mathcal{P}$  of *believed* to *believe* earlier in this passage, also followed by the 1830 compositor, is undoubtedly correct (“did not my father Alma **believe** in the words”).

### ■ Alma 5:11

*did not my father Alma believe in the **words**  
which was delivered by the mouth of Abinadi  
and was he not a holy prophet*

*did he not speak the [word >js words 1 | word A | words BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] of God  
and my father Alma believed them*

Here in Alma 5:11, the printer’s manuscript originally read “the word of God”, which the 1830 compositor followed. But Joseph Smith added the plural *s* in his editing for the 1837 edition, undoubtedly because the immediately surrounding text uses plural forms (“the **words** which was delivered by the mouth of Abinadi . . . and my father Alma believed **them**”). Elsewhere the Book of Mormon text has many examples of the precise phrase “the **word** of God” (90 of them); but there are four examples of “the **words** of God”, and all of these are found at the beginning of the book of Alma:

Alma 1:7

but the man withstood him  
admonishing him with the **words** of God

Alma 1:9

now because Gideon withstood him with the **words** of God  
he was wroth with Gideon

Alma 3:18

now the Amlicites knew not that they were fulfilling the **words** of God  
when they began to mark themselves in their foreheads

Alma 8:30

and it came to pass that Alma went forth and also Amulek among the people  
to declare the **words** of God unto them

Thus the suggestion that Alma 5:11 originally had the plural *words* in the expression “the word(s) of God” seems quite reasonable. But it should also be noted that the use of the singular *word* in “the word(s) of God” occurs 18 times in Alma 1–9 (not counting the instance here in Alma 5:11); in fact, there are three other occurrences of the singular “the word of God” in Alma 5. Thus the occurrence of “the **word** of God” is more prevalent than “the **words** of God”, even in this part of

the text. Furthermore, later in this chapter of Alma, verse 13 uses the singular *word* to refer to Abinadi's preaching: "he preached the **word** unto your fathers". So the singular *word* in verse 11 may not necessarily be an error.

Elsewhere in the text, when the verb is *speak* (as in Alma 5:11), we have four examples of the "the word of God" as the direct object, but none with "the words of God":

The Words of Mormon 1:17	and they did speak the <b>word</b> of God
Mosiah 13:4	and again because I have spoken the <b>word</b> of God . . .
Alma 37:24	that the <b>word</b> of God might be fulfilled which he spake
Moroni 9:4	and when I speak the <b>word</b> of God with sharpness . . .

Still, there are examples of the verb *speak* occurring with "the **words** of the Lord" (1 Nephi 4:14, 1 Nephi 7:4, 2 Nephi 5:19, Helaman 13:5, and 3 Nephi 29:2), "the **words** of your Maker" (2 Nephi 9:40), and "the **words** of (Jesus) Christ" (2 Nephi 32:3, 3 Nephi 30:1, and Moroni 2:1), all of which contain the plural *words*. But there are also examples where *speak* occurs with the singular *word*: namely, "the word of the Lord" (2 Nephi 5:20, Jarom 1:9, and Helaman 10:12). Thus usage allows either the singular or the plural when the text refers to "speaking the word(s) of <deity>".

There is abundant manuscript evidence that the scribes frequently mixed up the number for *word(s)*; consider, for instance, the following three cases of textual variance for the phrase "the word(s) of God":

Alma 1:7  
 but the man withstood him admonishing him  
 with the [~~§2 words~~ > §1 words 1 | words ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] of God  
 [While proofing  $\mathcal{P}$  against  $\mathcal{C}$ , Oliver Cowdery initially decided to correct *words* to *word*; but after crossing out *words*, he restored the plural *words*.]

Alma 23:3  
 that the [~~words~~ > word 0 | word 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST] of God  
 might have no obstruction  
 [While taking down Joseph Smith's dictation, Oliver Cowdery initially wrote *words* in  $\mathcal{C}$ ; then almost immediately he corrected *words* to *word* by deleting the plural *s*.]

3 Nephi 28:20  
 but they did smite the earth  
 with the [~~§2 words~~ >+ §1 word 1 | word ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] of God  
 [Oliver Cowdery corrected scribe 2's *words* to *word* in  $\mathcal{P}$ ; the 1830 edition, here set directly from  $\mathcal{C}$ , reads in the singular.]

Another possible emendation for Alma 5:11 is that the pronoun *them* may actually be an error for *him*; that is, in the original text the last clause read "and my father Alma believed **him**". Usually, the verb *believe* takes a direct object that refers to language rather than to persons: in 36 instances (including here in Alma 5:11), the referent is either *word(s)* or *thing(s)*; in 11 instances, we have a more specific reference to scriptures, records, reports, or testimonies. But in a handful of cases, the direct object for *believe* refers to persons:

Mosiah 18:4

and it came to pass that  
as many as did believe **him** did go forth to a place . . .

Mosiah 18:6

and it came to pass that  
as many as believed **him** went thither to hear his words

Ether 4:10

and he that believeth not my words  
believeth not **my disciples**

Ether 4:12 (three times)

he that will not believe my words will not believe **me** that I am  
and he that will not believe **me** will not believe **the Father** which sent me

The examples in Ether 4:10, 12 show both types of direct objects being used in the same passage (“believeth not my words / believeth not my disciples” and “believe my words . . . believe me . . . believe me . . . believe the Father”). As discussed under 1 Nephi 10:18–19, there is some evidence that scribes could mix up *them* and *him* since both are pronounced in casual speech as /əm/.

So here in Alma 5:11 there are three possibilities. First of all, we can restore the earliest extant reading, despite the possible conflict between the singular *word* and the following plural pronoun *them*. Or we have a choice between two possible emendations:

- emend *word* to *words* (Joseph Smith’s emendation for the 1837 edition):  
did he not speak the **words** of God and my father believed **them**
- emend *them* to *him* (an alternative emendation):  
did he not speak the **word** of God and my father believed **him**

The critical text will restore the earliest reading under the following reasoning. First, it is not necessary that the *them* at the end of Alma 5:11 specifically refers to “the **word** of God”; the *them* may actually be referring to the earlier use in verse 11 of “the **words** which was delivered by the mouth of Abinadi”. And even if *them* refers to “the word of God”, there is considerable evidence elsewhere in the text that pronouns may disagree in number with *word(s)* or with other nouns that refer to speech or writing. For a case where a singular pronoun can refer to either *words* or its equivalent *things*, see under 2 Nephi 33:4, which originally read “and the **things** which I have written in weakness will he make strong unto them / for **it** persuadeth them to do good” (the current text has *words* rather than *things*).

**Summary:** Restore in Alma 5:11 the earliest reading (in  $\mathcal{P}$  and the 1830 edition): “did he not speak the **word** of God and my father believed **them**”; there is support for such usage elsewhere in the text.

## ■ Alma 5:14

*and now behold I ask of you my brethren of the church  
have ye spiritually been born of God  
have ye received his image  
in your [own 1 | ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] countenances*

Here the printer's manuscript reads "in your own countenances". At first glance, the occurrence of *own* here seems unnecessary, which may explain why the 1830 typesetter omitted the *own* (even if unintentionally). There is a theoretical possibility that an extra *own* was inserted in this passage during the early transmission of the text. Manuscript evidence shows that scribes sometimes accidentally added an extra *own*:

1 Nephi 4:19 (Oliver Cowdery's initial error in  $\mathcal{O}$ )

and after that I had smote off  
his [*own* > NULL 0 | 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST] head  
with his **own** sword . . .

Alma 5:2–3 (*own* added by scribe 2 of  $\mathcal{P}$ ; corrected by Oliver Cowdery  
when proofing  $\mathcal{P}$  against  $\mathcal{O}$ )

and these are the words . . .  
according to his **own** record saying:  
I Alma having been consecrated  
by my [ $\S$ 2 *own* >  $\S$ 1 NULL 1 | ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST] father Alma . . .

Alma 54:2 (Oliver Cowdery's initial error in  $\mathcal{P}$ )

and he also desired his **own** people for the strengthening  
of his [ 0ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST | *own* > NULL 1] army

Ether 7:18 (Oliver Cowdery started to write "his own throne" in  $\mathcal{P}$ )

and placed him upon [*his throan in* 0 | *his own* > *his throne in* 1 |  
*his throne in* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST] his **own** kingdom

In all four of these examples, there is a nearby *own* that seems to have triggered the insertion of the extra *own*. And there is a fifth possible example, one in which scribe 2 of  $\mathcal{P}$  may have accidentally added an extra *own* under the influence of a following *own*:

Mormon 4:8 (omitted in the 1830 edition)

they did again boast  
of their [*own* 1PST | ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOQR] strength  
and they went forth in their **own** might

For discussion of this example, see under Mormon 4:8.

Here in Alma 5:14, however, there is no nearby *own* that could have served as the source for the *own*. Thus the *own* in  $\mathcal{P}$  could be original to the text. Also note that Oliver Cowdery did not remove this *own* when he proofed  $\mathcal{P}$  against  $\mathcal{O}$ . Moreover, there is a greater tendency in the history of the text to omit *own* (if only momentarily) rather than to add it:

Enos 1:10 (Oliver Cowdery's initial error in  $\mathcal{P}$ )

and their transgressions will I bring down with sorrow  
upon their [NULL > *own* 1 | *own* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST] heads



- Mosiah 10:11 (Oliver Cowdery’s initial error in  $\mathcal{P}$ )  
 therefore they depended  
 upon their [NULL > *own* 1 | *own* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] strength
- Alma 1:3 (omitted in the 1837 edition)  
 and they ought not to labor  
 with their [*own* 1APS | BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] hands
- Alma 38:11 (Oliver Cowdery’s initial error in  $\mathcal{C}$ )  
 yea see that ye do not boast  
 in your [NULL >- *own* 0 | *own* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST] wisdom
- Alma 40:13 (omitted in the 1874 RLDS edition)  
 and this because of their [*own* 01ABCDEFGHIJLMNQRST | HK] iniquity
- Alma 52:1 (Oliver Cowdery’s initial error in  $\mathcal{C}$ )  
 behold they found Amalickiah was dead  
 in his [NULL >- *own* 0 | *own* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST] tent
- Mormon 3:9 (scribe 2’s initial error in  $\mathcal{P}$ )  
 they began to boast  
 in their [NULL > *own* 1 | *own* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] strength

This evidence suggests that the loss of *own* in the 1830 edition for Alma 5:14 is accidental, not an intended emendation to the text.

There are no other examples in the Book of Mormon of “own countenance(s)”. There are four other cases in the text of *countenance(s)* preceded by a possessive determiner (*their*, *your*, and *his*), but *own* does not occur in any of these examples:

- |               |  |
|---------------|--|
| 2 Nephi 13:9  | the shew of <b>their countenance</b> doth witness against them |
| Alma 5:19     | having the image of God engraven upon <b>your countenances</b> |
| 3 Nephi 19:25 | and <b>his countenance</b> did smile upon them                 |
| 3 Nephi 19:25 | and the light of <b>his countenance</b> did shine upon them    |

In particular, note the similarity of the nearby example in Alma 5:19 to Alma 5:14 (both refer to having the image of God in one’s countenance), yet Alma 5:19 has no *own*.

Nonetheless, one can argue for the use of *own* in Alma 5:14. Alma is asking his listeners to compare themselves to their fathers, who would have received Christ’s image in their countenances. Earlier in this passage, Alma refers to the conversion of their fathers:

- Alma 5:13  
 and behold he preached the word unto your fathers  
 and a mighty change was also wrought in their hearts  
 and they humbled themselves and put their trust in the true and living God

In verse 14, Alma is asking his listeners if they too have been spiritually converted. Thus the contrastive use of *own* with *countenances* is perfectly acceptable. The critical text will therefore restore the earliest reading, “have ye received his image in your **own** countenances”, especially since the textual tendency would have been to omit the *own*, not add it, unless there was a nearby *own* (which there is not for Alma 5:14).

*Summary:* Restore in Alma 5:14 the original *own* in “have ye received his image in your **own** countenances”; *own* is used contrastively to compare Alma’s listeners with their fathers, who would have received the image of God in their countenances.

#### ■ Alma 5:17

*or do ye imagine to yourselves*

*that ye can lie unto the Lord [at 1 | in ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] that day*

The 1830 typesetter accidentally replaced the preposition *at* with *in*. Yet both phrases are found elsewhere in the Book of Mormon text: “at that day” occurs 23 times, and “in that day” occurs at least 40 times (see the discussion regarding “in that day” under Helaman 14:20).

The 1830 error here in Alma 5:17 is probably the result of “in that day” occurring in the preceding verse:

Alma 5:16

can you imagine to yourselves  
that ye hear the voice of the Lord saying unto you **in that day**  
come unto me ye blessed  
for behold your works have been the works of righteousness  
upon the face of the earth

In specific support of “at that day”, there are nearby examples of that phrase a few verses later:

Alma 5:19            can ye look up to God **at that day** with a pure heart and clean hands

Alma 5:21            ye will know **at that day** that ye cannot be saved

Thus there is no reason for changing “at that day” to “in that day” in Alma 5:17; the critical text will restore the original preposition, *at*.

*Summary:* Restore “at that day” in Alma 5:17, the reading of the earliest textual source (the printer’s manuscript).

#### ■ Alma 5:21

*for there can no man be saved*

*except his [garment >+ garments 1 | garments ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]*

*[is cleansed from all stain through > NULL 1 | ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] are washed white*

*yea his garments must be purified*

*until [§2 it is > §1 they are 1 | they are ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] cleansed*

*from all stain through the blood of him of whom it hath been spoken by our fathers*

Oliver Cowdery’s correction in the text at the end of this passage (from *it is* to *they are*) is very probably the result of conscious editing. The singular *it is* in the original reading for  $\mathcal{P}$  jarringly conflicts with the preceding plural *his garments*. Earlier in this passage, scribe 2 of  $\mathcal{P}$  initially wrote “except **his garment** is cleansed from all stain through”, undoubtedly because as he copied from  $\mathcal{C}$  into  $\mathcal{P}$ , his eye skipped down one line of the original manuscript to read “**it is** cleansed from all stain through the blood of him”. Scribe 2 caught his copy error, correcting *garment* to *garments*, crossing out “is cleansed from all stain through”, and then writing inline the correct “are washed white”.

The original Book of Mormon text sometimes uses a singular pronoun to refer to a plural noun that acts as a unit, such as *it* to refer to *these records* in Mosiah 28:17: “now after Mosiah had finished translating **these records** / behold **it** gave an account of the people which was destroyed”. Of course, most of the time, the pronoun used to refer to a plural *records* is the plural *they* or *them*. Here in Alma 5:21, the *it* is the only example of a singular pronoun referring to *garments*; elsewhere the text uses the plural *they* or *them*:

1 Nephi 4:19	I took the garments of Laban and put <b>them</b> upon mine own body
2 Nephi 9:44	behold I take off my garments and I shake <b>them</b> before you

The critical text will retain the fully intended but difficult reading in Alma 5:21: “yea his **garments** must be purified until **it is** cleansed from all stain”.

**Summary:** Restore the original singular *it is* in Alma 5:21 since scribe 2’s initial error “**his garment is** cleansed from all stain through” shows that the following line in the original manuscript actually read “**it is** cleansed from all stain through”; the original text sometimes uses the singular pronoun *it* to refer to plural nouns that act as a unit.

#### ■ Alma 5:24–25

*do ye suppose that such an one can have a place to sit down in the kingdom of God . . .  
or also ye cannot suppose that such an one can have [ 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST | a G ] place  
in the kingdom of heaven*

Here the text has *a place* in verse 24 but only *place* in verse 25, when otherwise the passages are quite parallel. It is, of course, possible that in verse 25 the original manuscript had *a place* and the indefinite article *a* was accidentally dropped in the early transmission of the text. The 1858 Wright edition, however, made both passages agree by replacing *place* in verse 25 with *a place*, but this reading was not continued in the RLDS textual tradition.

Elsewhere in the Book of Mormon, when referring to the next life in God’s presence, all passages use *a place* rather than *place*, as in these examples where a choice between *a place* and *place* is possible:

Enos 1:27	there is <b>a place</b> prepared for you in the mansions of my Father
Mosiah 26:23	and it is I that granteth . . . in the end <b>a place</b> at my right hand
Mosiah 26:24	they . . . shall have <b>a place</b> eternally at my right hand
Ether 12:4	yea even <b>a place</b> at the right hand of God
Ether 12:33	to prepare <b>a place</b> for the children of men

But in a revelation given to Joseph Smith in June 1829 (near the end of the translation of the Book of Mormon), there is an example where *place* rather than *a place* is used with *kingdom* (just as in Alma 5:25):

Book of Commandments 15:26 (Doctrine and Covenants 18:25)  
wherefore if they know not the name by which they are called  
they cannot have **place** in the kingdom of my Father

More generally, we have instances of both *place* and *a place* in the expression “to have (a) place”. As already noted, there are two examples of “to have **a place**” (here in Alma 5:24 as well as in Mosiah 26:24); all the other instances are of the form “to have place”:

1 Nephi 4:34	thou shalt have <b>place</b> with us
2 Nephi 4:27	that the evil one have <b>place</b> in my heart
Alma 5:25	that such an one can have <b>place</b> in the kingdom of heaven
Alma 39:6	when it once hath had <b>place</b> in you
Moroni 7:32	that the Holy Ghost may have <b>place</b> in their hearts

Because of the variation between *place* and *a place*, it is probably best to leave *place* unchanged in Alma 5:25 even though the previous verse has *a place*.

*Summary:* Accept in Alma 5:25 *place* (the earliest extant reading) rather than *a place*; there is support elsewhere in the text for using *place* without the indefinite article in the expression “to have (a) place”.

#### ■ Alma 5:24–25

- (1) *behold my brethren do ye **suppose** that  
such an one can have a place to sit down in the kingdom of God  
with Abraham with Isaac and with Jacob and also all the holy prophets  
whose garments are cleansed and are spotless pure and white*
- I say unto you nay*  
[NULL >jg, 1 |, ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQS |; RT]  
*except ye make our Creator a liar from the beginning*
- (2) *or **suppose** that he is a liar from the beginning*  
[NULL >jg; 1 |; A |, BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
- [or also >js NULL 1 | or also A | BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]*  
[NULL >jg, 1 |, A | BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
- (3) *ye cannot **suppose** that such an one can have place in the kingdom of heaven*  
[NULL >jg, 1 |, ABCDEFGHKPS |; IJLMNOQRT]  
*but they shall be cast out  
for they are the children of the kingdom of the devil*

In this long passage, Joseph Smith deleted the awkward *or also*, probably because the third *suppose*-clause (“ye cannot suppose that such an one can have place in the kingdom of heaven”) does not refer to the immediately preceding *suppose*-clause (“or suppose that he is a liar from the beginning”). The *except*-clause (which contains the second *suppose*-clause) refers to the immediately preceding *say*, while the third *suppose*-clause actually refers all the way back to the first *suppose*-clause at the beginning of verse 24; notice that both the first and the third *suppose*-clauses use parallel language: “such an one can have (a) place (to sit down) in the kingdom of God/heaven”. The original 1830 punctuation made this relationship fairly clear:

Alma 5:24–25 (original text, with 1830 punctuation)

behold, my brethren, do ye **suppose that**  
**such an one can have a place to sit down in the kingdom of God,**  
 with Abraham, with Isaac, and with Jacob, and also all the holy prophets,  
 whose garments are cleansed, and are spotless, pure and white?

I say unto you, nay,  
 except ye make our Creator a liar from the beginning,  
 or suppose that he is a liar from the beginning;

or also, ye cannot **suppose that**  
**such an one can have place in the kingdom of heaven,**  
 but they shall be cast out,  
 for they are the children of the kingdom of the devil.

The critical text will therefore restore the original *or also* since it is intentionally used to refer the reader back to the parallel *suppose*-clause in verse 24, the one listed above as (1).

*Summary:* Restore the original *or also* in Alma 5:25 since this conjunctive expression is used to refer the reader back to the initial *suppose*-clause (found in verse 24); the 1830 punctuation correctly represents this connective relationship between the first and third *suppose*-clauses.

#### ■ Alma 5:25

*or also 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 his editing for the 1837 edition, Joseph Smith first tried to change the generic plural pronoun *they* to the singular *he* so that the pronoun would agree in number with the preceding *such an one*. However, the following clause “for **they are the children** of the kingdom of the devil” could not be changed to the singular very easily; the singular “for **he is the child** of the kingdom of the devil” would have sounded quite strange. So instead, Joseph went back to *such an one* and deleted the singular part (*an one*). In  $\mathcal{P}$  itself, he neglected to restore the original *they* to “they shall be cast out”, but the 1837 edition set the intended *they*.

This removal of *an one*, although grammatically correct, reduces the parallelism of the larger passage. In verses 24 through 31 there are five other occurrences of *such an one*, but in these cases we have only singular agreement, so there was no need to edit *such an one* in any of these five cases:

Alma 5:24

do ye suppose that **such an one** can have a place  
 to sit down in the kingdom of God

Alma 5:28

for the kingdom of heaven is soon at hand  
 and **such an one** hath not eternal life

Alma 5:29 (two times)

is there one among you who is not stripped of envy  
 I say unto you that **such an one** is not prepared  
 and I would that he should prepare quickly  
 for the hour is close at hand  
 and he knoweth not when the time shall come  
 for **such an one** is not found guiltless

Alma 5:31

woe unto **such an one**  
 for he is not prepared

Despite the number disagreement between *such an one* and *they*, the critical text will retain the original use of *such an one* in Alma 5:25, thus maintaining the parallel use of *such an one* in the larger passage. Moreover, the original text frequently switched the number for generic pronouns. See, for instance, the discussion under 1 Nephi 10:18–19.

*Summary:* Restore in Alma 5:25 the original use of *such an one*; even though a generic plural *they* is later used in the verse to refer to the singular generic *such an one*, such switches in generic pronoun reference are found elsewhere in the original text.

#### ■ Alma 5:27

*that your garments have been cleansed and made white through the blood of Christ  
 which will come to redeem his people from their [sins 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST | sin HK]*

As noted in the discussion under 1 Nephi 10:10, the Book of Mormon consistently uses the plural *sins* to refer to the atonement of Christ except when the text specifically refers to John the Baptist's declaration of Jesus as the Christ as recorded in John 1:29 (namely, only in 1 Nephi 10:10 and 2 Nephi 31:4). Here in Alma 5:27, the 1874 RLDS edition introduced the singular *sin*, but the 1908 RLDS edition restored the correct plural to the RLDS text.

*Summary:* Maintain the plural *sins* in Alma 5:27, the reading of the earliest textual sources; the Book of Mormon consistently uses the plural *sins* rather than the singular *sin* except when explicitly referring to John the Baptist's language.

#### ■ Alma 5:28

*behold are ye stripped of pride  
 I say unto you  
 if ye are not  
 [§2 NULL >§1 ye are not 1 | ye are not ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] prepared to meet God  
 behold ye must prepare quickly*

In copying from  $\mathcal{C}$  into  $\mathcal{D}$ , scribe 2 of  $\mathcal{D}$  accidentally omitted the identical but necessary phrase “ye are not” in this passage. Oliver Cowdery supplied it when he proofed  $\mathcal{D}$  against  $\mathcal{C}$ . Sometimes scribe 2 skipped over nearly identical phrasal repetitions in the text, as in the following two examples:

title for the book of Alma

[§2 NULL >- §1 *the Book of Alma* ———— *the Son of Alma* 1 |  
 THE BOOK OF ALMA / THE SON OF ALMA ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]  
 The account of Alma who was the son of Alma

3 Nephi 21:8

and when that day shall come  
 [§2 NULL > §1 *it shall come* 1 | *it shall come* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]  
 to pass that kings shall shut their mouths

(See under each of these passages for discussion.) In both of these instances, as in Alma 5:28, Oliver restored the missing text when he proofed  $\mathcal{D}$  against  $\mathcal{C}$ .

**Summary:** Accept Oliver Cowdery’s restoration in  $\mathcal{D}$  of the repeated phrase “ye are not” in Alma 5:28; the text makes little sense without it; moreover, scribe 2 of  $\mathcal{D}$  sometimes made this same kind of error elsewhere in his copywork.

### ■ Alma 5:29

*behold I say* [unto > NULL 1 | ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]  
*is there one among you who is not stripped of envy*

Scribe 2 of  $\mathcal{D}$  started to write “behold I say unto you”. But after writing the *unto*, he realized that  $\mathcal{C}$  actually read “behold I say”—that is, without the expected “unto you”. Scribe 2 therefore crossed out the extra *unto* and continued inline with the question “is there one among you who is not stripped of envy”. Later on, in verse 43, he once more incorrectly wrote the expected “I say unto you” (in this instance, the correct text read “I would that . . .”):

Alma 5:43  
 and now my brethren  
 I [*say unto you* > NULL 1 | ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] would  
 that ye should hear me

Chapter 5 of Alma has numerous examples of “I say unto you” (35 of them), but only one example of “I say” without “unto you” (namely, here at the beginning of Alma 5:29). The high frequency of “I say unto you” led scribe 2 of  $\mathcal{D}$  to twice extend this phraseology in this chapter (but only momentarily). Of course, it is possible that the reading “I say” without “unto you” here in Alma 5:29 was an error in  $\mathcal{C}$ , that the scribe who took down Joseph Smith’s dictation here (probably Oliver Cowdery) accidentally omitted the “unto you”. Although the phrase “I say” otherwise occurs with “unto you” in Alma 5, the shorter phraseology is possible. Consider, for instance, Alma’s words to his son Helaman in Alma 36–37. In five cases, Alma says “I say unto you” to Helaman; but in one case (the last one listed below, in Alma 37:45), he simply says “I say” even though he could have said “I say unto you”:

Alma 36:5	now behold I say <b>unto you</b> : if I had not been born of God . . .
Alma 36:21	yea I say <b>unto you</b> my son that there can be nothing . . .
Alma 36:21	yea and again I say <b>unto you</b> my son that on the other hand . . .



Alma 37:6 but behold I say **unto you** that by small and simple things . . .  
 Alma 37:9 yea I say **unto you**: were it not for these things . . .  
 Alma 37:45 and now I say: is there not a type in this thing

Similarly, in king Benjamin’s discourse in Mosiah 2–5, he usually says “I say unto you” (21 times), but there are also two occurrences of the shorter “I say” (in Mosiah 2:21 and Mosiah 4:7). Thus variation is possible, although overwhelmingly the text uses “unto you” after “I say” in discourses. The critical text will therefore retain the use of “I say” without “unto you” in Alma 5:29, even though this could be a scribal error.

*Summary:* Maintain in Alma 5:29 the unique instance in this chapter of “I say” without “unto you”; such usage is occasionally found elsewhere in the text.

#### ■ Alma 5:29

*behold I say  
 is there one among **you** who is not stripped of envy  
 I say unto **you** that such an one is not prepared  
 and I would that [he 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST | ye ] should prepare quickly  
 for the hour is close at hand  
 and **he** knoweth not when the time shall come*

The 1888 LDS edition accidentally replaced the pronoun *he* with the visually similar *ye*, with possible influence from the preceding two occurrences of *you* in this verse. The *ye* is quite unacceptable given that we have *he* in the following text (“and **he** knoweth not when the time shall come”).

*Summary:* Maintain the original pronoun *he* in Alma 5:29 (“and I would that **he** should prepare quickly”).

#### ■ Alma 5:34

*yea ye shall eat and drink  
 of the [§2 bread > §1 bread 1 | bread ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]  
 and the waters of life freely*

Apparently Oliver Cowdery initially thought “drink of the bread” was a mistake, so he crossed out *bread*. But then he probably noticed the preceding verb *eat*, so he restored the word *bread* by supralinear insertion. Here “eat and drink of the bread and the waters of life” is to be treated as a respective construction—that is, *eat* is associated with *bread* and *drink* with *waters*. As would be expected, the academic word *respective(ly)* does not occur in the Book of Mormon text. The same kind of respective distribution in a conjunct structure occurs twice in another passage later in the text:

3 Nephi 18:29  
 for whoso **eateth and drinketh my flesh and blood** unworthily  
 eateth and drinketh damnation to his soul  
 therefore if ye know that a man is unworthy  
 to **eat and drink of my flesh and blood**  
 ye shall forbid him



In the King James Bible, on the other hand, we have only fully separated conjunctiveness in phrases like “eat bread and drink water” (15 times), “eat flesh and drink blood” (5 times), “eat bread and drink wine” (5 times), and “eat flesh and drink wine” (2 times). The Book of Mormon will retain the clearly intended conjunctive structures that must be treated as respective constructions: “eat and drink of the bread and waters of life” in Alma 5:34 and “eat(eth) and drink(eth) (of) my flesh and blood” twice in 3 Nephi 18:29. Another example of respective usage is found in Moroni 9:8: “and the **husbands** and **fathers** of those **women** and **children** they have slain”.

*Summary:* Maintain the respectively distributed “eat and drink of the bread and waters of life” in Alma 5:34 (and similar instances of respective distribution in 3 Nephi 18:29 and Moroni 9:8); such usage is clearly intended.

### ■ Alma 5:35

*yea come unto me and bring forth works of righteousness  
and ye shall not be [put 1 | hewn ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] down  
and cast into the fire*

Here the 1830 typesetter replaced *put down* with *hewn down*, which is what we expect in the context of “cast into the fire”. Elsewhere in the text there are 14 occurrences of “to hew down” occurring with “to cast into the fire”, and all figuratively refer to God’s judgment:

Jacob 5:42	all the trees of my vineyard are good for nothing save it be to be hewn down and cast into the fire
Jacob 5:46	and they are of no worth but to be hewn down and cast into the fire
Jacob 5:47	that I should hew down all the trees of my vineyard and cast them into the fire
Jacob 5:49	let us go to and hew down the trees of the vineyard and cast them into the fire
Jacob 5:66	until the good shall overcome the bad and the bad be hewn down and cast into the fire
Jacob 6:7	that ye must be hewn down and cast into the fire
Alma 5:52	every tree that bringeth not forth good fruit shall be hewn down and cast into the fire
Alma 5:56	these are they which shall be hewn down and cast into the fire
Helaman 14:18	the same is not hewn down and cast into the fire
Helaman 14:18	but whosoever repenteth not is hewn down and cast into the fire
3 Nephi 14:19	every tree that bringeth not forth good fruit is hewn down and cast into the fire
3 Nephi 27:11	and they are hewn down and cast into the fire
3 Nephi 27:17	the same is he that is also hewn down and cast into the fire
Mormon 8:21	the same is in danger to be hewn down and cast into the fire

Note that two of these also occur in Alma 5 (in verses 52 and 56), thus supporting the 1830 emendation to *hewn down* in verse 35.

Further evidence that *hewn down* may be the correct reading in Alma 5:35 is that for most of the other examples, the passage deals with the acceptability of one's fruit. This association can be seen in Alma 5:35, where the immediately following verse refers to one's fruit:

Alma 5:35–36 (the 1830 text, which reads *hewn* instead of *put*)  
 yea come unto me and bring forth works of righteousness  
 and ye shall not be **hewn down and cast into the fire**  
 for behold the time is at hand  
 that whosoever bringeth forth not good **fruit**  
 or whosoever doeth not the works of righteousness  
 the same hath cause to wail and mourn

This same collocation with *fruit* is found in the New Testament: “every tree which bringeth not forth good fruit is hewn down and cast into the fire” (Matthew 3:10; similarly in Matthew 7:19 and Luke 3:9).

The phrase *hewn down* is also found in the Book of Mormon text when speaking of cutting down men in battle; here, of course, there is no reference to being “cast into the fire” nor, of course, to fruit:

Alma 51:18	as they did lift their weapons of war to fight against the men of Moroni they were hewn down
Alma 51:19	there were four thousand of those dissenters which were hewn down
Mormon 2:15	for I saw thousands of them hewn down
Mormon 6:10	my men were hewn down
Mormon 6:11	and when they had gone through and hewn down all my people . . .
Mormon 6:11	the ten thousand of my people which were hewn down . . .

Elsewhere in the text, there are four occurrences of *put down*. None of these have anything to do with eternal judgment; instead, they refer to reducing or destroying someone's power or position:

2 Nephi 20:13 (quoting Isaiah 10:13)	and I have put down the inhabitants like a valiant man
2 Nephi 26:20	nevertheless they put down the power and the miracles of God
Mosiah 11:5	for he put down all the priests that had been consecrated by his father
Moroni 8:28	and in this part of the land they are also seeking to put down all power and authority which cometh from God

Thus the 1830 typesetter's emendation *hewn down* is consistent with the rest of the text. It is quite possible that the reading in  $\mathcal{D}$ , *put down*, represents an error that entered the text early on in its transmission. One problem, however, is that *put* and *hewn* are neither visually nor aurally similar. One wonders how *hewn* could have been mistakenly replaced by *put* (assuming that *put* is an error in  $\mathcal{D}$ ). This problem leads one to consider the possibility that the original manuscript for Alma 5:35 may have actually read *cut*, not *put*, and that *cut* was miscopied as *put* when scribe 2

of  $\mathcal{P}$  copied from  $\mathcal{C}$  into  $\mathcal{P}$ . Although there are no instances in the Book of Mormon that refer to being “cut down and cast into the fire”, the King James Bible has the following relevant passage:

Jeremiah 22:7  
and they shall **cut down** thy choice cedars  
and cast *them* into the fire

Here the verb is *cut* rather than the expected *hew*. And clearly, the reference is to trees. When the Hebrew for this passage was translated into the Septuagint, the Greek verb chosen was *ekkoptō* ‘to cut down or to cut off’. This is the same Greek verb that is used in the New Testament passages listed above (Matthew 3:10, Matthew 7:19, and Luke 3:9) but is translated there as *hewn down* in the King James Bible. The point is that in English *cut down* is an appropriate substitute for *hewn down*. And the Book of Mormon does have examples of “to cut down” where “to hew down” would be an alternative translation:

2 Nephi 19:10	the sycamores are cut down
2 Nephi 20:34	and he shall cut down the thickets of the forests with iron
2 Nephi 24:12	art thou cut down to the ground
Jacob 5:44	I also cut down that which cumbered this spot of ground
Helaman 1:20	Coriantumr did cut down the watch by the entrance of the city
Helaman 1:24	they did fall upon them and cut them down to the earth

The first three are quotations from Isaiah and, like Jeremiah 22:7, use *cut* rather than *hew*. Just as with “to hew down”, these six examples of “to cut down” deal either with cutting down trees as a symbolic representation of destroying people or with cutting down men in battle. The majority of instances in the Book of Mormon use “to hew down”, but there are also instances of “to cut down”. Thus it is quite possible that Alma 5:35 may have originally read “and ye shall not be **cut** down and cast into the fire” (which parallels more the King James text in Jeremiah 22:7 than in Matthew 3:10).

Such an error of replacing *cut* with *put* would have been facilitated if *cut* had been written in  $\mathcal{C}$  with a capital *C*. In the manuscripts, such capital *C*’s were almost always written with a large upper loop, which means that the *C* could potentially be misread as a capital *P* and then copied as *p*. There are three examples of the specific word *cut* being written as *Cut*, all in the printer’s manuscript: for 1 Nephi 22:20, Oliver Cowdery was the scribe; for Alma 9:14 and 3 Nephi 21:11, scribe 2 of  $\mathcal{P}$  was the scribe. In opposition to this suggested emendation, there are no examples anywhere in the manuscripts (or in the printed editions, for that matter) where a word-initial *c/C* has been mistakenly misread as a *p/P* (or vice versa). But this lack of independent evidence may be the consequence of there being very few words in the Book of Mormon that could have been potentially mixed up in this way. Even so, *put* and *cut*, both verbs, are indeed candidates for being mixed up, especially in the context of *down*.

**Summary:** Emend Alma 5:35 to read *cut down* instead of *put down* (the reading in  $\mathcal{P}$ ) and *hewn down* (the 1830 typesetter’s emended reading); *put* does not work well in this passage, nor does it seem to be an error for the visually and aurally dissimilar *hewn*; on the other hand, *cut* will work in this context and could have been misread as *put* when scribe 2 of  $\mathcal{P}$  copied from  $\mathcal{C}$  into  $\mathcal{P}$ , especially if the *c* of *cut* had been spelled as a capital *C* in  $\mathcal{C}$ .

## ■ Alma 5:36

*for behold the time is at hand  
that whosoever **bringeth** forth not good fruit  
or whosoever [doth > doeth 1 | doeth ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] not the works of righteousness  
the same [hath >js have 1 | hath A | have BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] cause to wail and mourn*

For the 1837 edition, Joseph Smith replaced the singular *hath* with the plural *have* after *the same*, but left the singulars *bringeth* and *doeth* that follow *whosoever*. As discussed under Mosiah 5:10, the generic pronoun *whosoever* can be considered either singular or plural. Here in Alma 5:36, all three verb forms take the third person singular *-(e)th*. (This inflectional ending is frequently used in the plural as well as in the singular in the original Book of Mormon text, so its use three times in this passage does not necessarily indicate that *whosoever* and *the same* are singulars.) In this instance, the critical text will follow the earliest reading: “bringeth . . . doeth . . . hath”. For a general discussion, see under INFLECTIONAL ENDINGS in volume 3. For specific discussion regarding *doeth* rather than *doth*, see under Mosiah 4:18.

**Summary:** Restore the original *hath* in Alma 5:36; in this passage, all three verbs for the generic pronouns *whosoever* and *the same* take the same ending, *-(e)th*.

## ■ Alma 5:37–38

*O ye workers of iniquity  
ye that are puffed up in the vain things of the world  
ye that have professed to have known the ways of righteousness  
—nevertheless [y >+ ye 1 | ye A | BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] have gone astray  
as sheep having no shepherd  
notwithstanding a shepherd hath called after you and art still calling after you  
but ye will not hearken unto his voice—  
behold I say unto you that the good shepherd doth call you*

Here the 1837 edition dropped the pronoun *ye* after *nevertheless*. This change seems to be a simple typo in the 1837 edition that nonetheless created a difficult reading. Inexplicably, this error has never been corrected in any subsequent edition. In the original text, there are 156 cases where the first clause after *nevertheless* contains a finite predicate; and in each of those cases there is an explicit subject. Only here in Alma 5:37 has the original subject after *nevertheless* been ellipted from the text. The resulting reading is somewhat awkward but theoretically possible (thus its retention in all the printed editions after 1837). The critical text will restore the original reading here in Alma 5:37, thus eliminating a unique exception to how *nevertheless*-clauses read in the text.

**Summary:** Restore the subject pronoun *ye* after *nevertheless* in Alma 5:37; its loss in the 1837 edition appears to be accidental.

## ■ Alma 5:37

*notwithstanding a shepherd hath called after you  
and [art 1ABCEFGHIJKLPS | are D | art > is M | is NOQRT] still calling after you*

As discussed under Mosiah 2:21, the original *art* in this verse appears to be fully intended and will therefore be restored in the critical text.

## ■ Alma 5:38

*and in his own name he [doth 1ABCEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST | doeth E] call you*

As discussed under Mosiah 4:18, the appropriate third person singular form for the auxiliary *do* verb is generally *doth*, not *doeth*. Here in Alma 5:38, the introduction in the 1849 LDS edition of *doeth* is a typo. The following 1852 LDS edition restored the correct *doth*.

## ■ Alma 5:43

*for behold I have spoken unto you  
[plain 1ABCEFGHIJKLNPS | plain > plainly M | plainly OQRT]  
that ye cannot err*

As discussed under 2 Nephi 25:20, the verb *speak* frequently takes the bare adverb *plain* rather than the full adverb *plainly*. The critical text will restore the original *plain* here in Alma 5:43. Also see the discussion regarding *harsh(ly)* under 2 Nephi 33:5.

## ■ Alma 5:45

*do ye [NULL >]s not 1 | A | not BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] suppose that  
I know [not >]s NULL 1 | not A | BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] of these things myself*

In English grammar certain verbs like *suppose* and *believe*, referring to thought, can have a negative marker attached to them without affecting the scope of negation. For instance, the *not* in “I believe he’s not coming” can be attached to *believe* itself to give “I don’t believe he’s coming”, with no change in the truth value assigned to the proposition. The same basically holds for Joseph Smith’s editing here in Alma 5:45 for the 1837 edition. Originally, the text read “do ye suppose that I know **not** of these things myself”, which is readily understandable; even so, Joseph decided to attach the *not* to the preceding verb *suppose*, perhaps because it seemed more natural to him (“do ye **not** suppose that I know of these things myself”). Elsewhere the text has examples of *not* in either position for yes-no questions:

Jacob 2:21

do ye **not suppose** that  
such things are abominable unto him who created all flesh

Alma 32:10

do ye **suppose**  
that ye **cannot** worship God save it be in your synagogues only

Alma 32:11

do ye **suppose** that  
ye must **not** worship God only once in a week

Alma 32:14

do ye **not suppose** that  
they are more blessed who truly humble themselves because of the word

In none of these examples has the position of the *not* been changed. The critical text will restore the original placement of the *not* in Alma 5:45: “do ye suppose that I know **not** of these things myself”.

For further discussion of the placement of *not* with respect to verbs like *suppose* and *believe*, see pages 1033–1035 in Randolph Quirk, Sidney Greenbaum, Geoffrey Leech, and Jan Svartvik, *A Comprehensive Grammar of the English Language* (London: Longman, 1985); also see pages 838–842 in Rodney Huddleston and Geoffrey K. Pullum, *The Cambridge Grammar of the English Language* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002).

**Summary:** Restore the original placement of the *not* in Alma 5:45 (namely, in the clause following the verb *suppose*: “do ye suppose that I know **not** of these things myself”).

#### ■ Alma 5:45

*behold I testify unto you that I do know*

[*that* 1ABCDEFGIJLMNOPQRST | HK] *these things whereof I have spoken are true*

The 1874 RLDS edition removed the second *that* in this sentence, probably unintentionally. Nearby, in verse 48, there are two cases where *that* occurs both before and after the verb *know*. And in each case, the repeated *that* has never been removed from the text:

Alma 5:48

I say unto you **that I know** of myself  
**that** whatsoever I shall say unto you concerning that which is to come is true  
and I say unto you **that I know that** Jesus Christ shall come

More generally, when the verb *know* is followed by a finite clause, the *that* is optional; see, for instance, the statistics given under 1 Nephi 1:3. Also see the general discussion under THAT in volume 3.

**Summary:** Maintain the original occurrence of *that* after the verb *know* in Alma 5:45 (and elsewhere in the text whenever it is supported by the earliest textual sources).

#### ■ Alma 5:47

*even so according to the spirit of prophecy which is in me*

*which is also by the [manifestations >% manifestation 1 |*

*manifestation ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] of the Spirit of God*

Here scribe 2 of  $\mathfrak{P}$  initially wrote the plural *manifestations*; then he immediately erased the *s* at the end of the word. The original manuscript, not extant here, undoubtedly read in the singular.

Elsewhere, the earliest textual sources support the plural *manifestations* rather than the singular *manifestation*; all occur in contexts that refer to these manifestations as coming by the Spirit of God:

Mosiah 5:3

and we ourselves also  
through the infinite goodness of God  
and the [*manifestations* 1ABCDEF GHIJKLMNOPQRST | *maniifestations* D]  
of his Spirit  
have great views of that which is to come

Alma 7:17

and the way that I know that ye believe them  
is by the [*manifestation* >+ *manifestations* 1 |  
*manifestation* ABCDEF GHIJKLMNOPQRST] of the Spirit  
which is in me

Mormon 3:16

and I did stand as an idle witness to manifest unto the world  
the things which I saw and heard  
according to the **manifestations** of the Spirit  
which had testified of things to come

Ether 4:11

but he that believeth these things which I have spoken  
him will I visit with the **manifestations** of my Spirit

Moroni 10:8

and they are given by the **manifestations** of the Spirit of God unto men  
to profit them

In Alma 7:17, at two different times, the correct *manifestations* was replaced by the singular *manifestation*: (1) initially in  $\mathcal{P}$ , scribe 2 wrote *manifestation*, but soon thereafter (perhaps after redipping his quill) he added the plural *s* (the *s* is written with somewhat heavier ink flow); and (2) in setting the word, the 1830 compositor reverted to the singular *manifestation*. In Alma 7:17, the singular *is* in the following relative clause (“which is in me”) seems to have been the source for the singular *manifestation*. Of course, the invariant plural usage for the four other occurrences of *manifestation(s)* in the text supports the plural reading in Alma 7:17. Moreover, it is quite possible that the singular *manifestation* here in Alma 5:47 (presumably the reading in  $\mathcal{C}$ ) is an error for *manifestations*.

On the other hand, there is independent evidence for the singular *manifestation* in the scriptures. In the King James Bible, for instance, we have the following example:

1 Corinthians 12:7

but the **manifestation** of the Spirit is given to every man to profit withal

And in two revelations given to Joseph Smith in the first part of 1829 (during the time the Book of Mormon was being translated), we also have the singular for this expression:

Book of Commandments 4:4 (Doctrine and Covenants 5:16) [March 1829]

and behold whosoever believeth in my word  
them will I visit with the **manifestation** of my Spirit

Book of Commandments 7:1 (Doctrine and Covenants 8:1) [April 1829]

believing that you shall receive a knowledge  
concerning the engravings of old records which are ancient  
which contain those parts of my scripture of which have been spoken  
by the **manifestation** of my Spirit

Thus the singular “by the manifestation of the Spirit of God”, the immediately corrected reading in  $\mathcal{D}$  for Alma 5:47, is possible. For each case of *manifestation(s)*, the critical text will rely on the earliest textual sources in determining the number. The two corrected readings in  $\mathcal{D}$  will therefore be accepted: the singular *manifestation* in Alma 5:47 and the plural *manifestations* in Alma 7:17.

**Summary:** Maintain in Alma 5:47 the immediately corrected reading in  $\mathcal{D}$ , “by the **manifestation** of the Spirit of God”; restore in Alma 7:17 the corrected reading in  $\mathcal{D}$ , “by the **manifestations** of the Spirit”.

#### ■ Alma 5:47–48

*and moreover I say unto you that*  
[as 1ABCDEGHKPS | 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*  
[NULL >jg . 1 | ; > , A | , BCDEFGHKPS | . IJLMNOQRT]  
*I say unto you that I know of myself that*  
*whatsoever I shall say unto you concerning that which is to come is true*

The 1852 LDS edition dropped the subordinate conjunction *as* at the beginning of this complex statement. Earlier, the 1830 compositor had first decided that the text of verse 47 should be kept separate from the text of verse 48: in  $\mathcal{D}$  he supplied a period between the two clauses; in the 1830 edition he initially set a semicolon. But during the printing, as an in-press change, he replaced the semicolon with a comma.

The dropping of *as* in the 1852 edition (perhaps accidentally) later led Orson Pratt (in his editing for the 1879 edition) to change the comma at the end of verse 47 to a period. The critical text will restore the original *as* and indicate that there should be only a comma between verses 47 and 48 (or at least that there should be no closure between the two verses). For other examples where a long initial *as*-clause is eventually completed by a main clause, see under Mosiah 23:12.

**Summary:** Restore in Alma 5:47 the subordinate conjunction *as* and the comma at the end of that verse, thus connecting the main clause at the beginning of verse 48 to the subordinate statement in verse 47.

#### ■ Alma 5:48

*and I say unto you that I know that Jesus Christ shall come*  
*yea the Son [of >js NULL 1 | of A | BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]*  
*the Only Begotten of the Father*

Here the earliest text reads “the Son **of** the Only Begotten of the Father”. The extra *of* after *Son* appears to be an early error in the transmission of the text (either when the scribe in  $\mathcal{C}$  took



down Joseph Smith's dictation or when scribe 2 of  $\mathcal{P}$  copied the text from  $\mathcal{C}$ ). The same error appears later on in the book of Alma:

Alma 13:9

thus they become high priests forever  
after the order of the Son [*of* >js NULL 1 | *of* A | BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]  
the Only Begotten of the Father

In both cases, scribe 2 of  $\mathcal{P}$  was the one who copied the text from  $\mathcal{C}$  into  $\mathcal{P}$ . Joseph Smith, in his editing for the 1837 edition, deleted the extra *of* in both these passages. Literally, the earliest text for these two passages says that there is a son of the Son of the Father, which contradicts all other uses in the Book of Mormon of the phrases “Only Begotten Son” and “Only Begotten of the Father”. Otherwise, these phrases always refer to the Son of God, not to a son of the Son of 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

Jacob 4:5

in offering up his son Isaac  
which was a similitude of God and **his Only Begotten Son**

Jacob 4:11

be reconciled unto him through the atonement of Christ  
**his Only Begotten Son**

Alma 9:26

and not many days hence the Son of God shall come in his glory  
and his glory shall be the glory of **the Only Begotten of the Father**

Alma 12:33

then will I have mercy upon you through **mine Only Begotten Son**

Alma 12:34

he shall have claim on mercy through **mine Only Begotten Son**

Alma 13:5

thus this holy calling being prepared from the foundation of the world  
for such as would not harden their hearts  
being in and through the atonement of **the Only Begotten Son . . .**

The error “the Son **of** the Only Begotten of the Father” in Alma 5:48 and Alma 13:9 appears to be a blend of the very frequent “the Son of God” with “the Only Begotten of the Father”. Elsewhere in the original text, the phrase *the son* is modified by an *of*-initial prepositional phrase 131 times, while *the son* alone (without any following *of*-phrase or any other kind of postmodification, such as a noun phrase in apposition) occurs 23 times. Thus there is a rather high expectation that there should be an *of* between *the son* and an immediately following noun phrase. In other words, the

correct appositive usage in “the Son / the Only Begotten of the Father” would have been highly unexpected, thus leading to the accidental intrusion of an extra *of* in both Alma 5:48 and Alma 13:9.

David Calabro (personal communication) suggests another possible emendation for Alma 5:48 and Alma 13:9: namely, the original text may have read “the Son of **God** / the Only Begotten of the Father”, which would mean that for this expression the word *God* was twice omitted during the early transmission of the text. Indeed, there is evidence elsewhere that the scribes occasionally omitted *God*:

1 Nephi 17:30 (Oliver Cowdery in  $\Theta$ )  
 they hardened their hearts and blinded their minds  
 and reviled against Moses and against the true  
 and living [NULL >+ *God* 0 | *God* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST]

Mosiah 4:9 (Oliver Cowdery in  $\mathcal{P}$ )  
 believe in [NULL > *God* 1 | *God* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST]  
 believe that he is

Alma 5:3 (scribe 2 of  $\mathcal{P}$ )  
 he having power and authority  
 from [NULL > *God* 1 | *God* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST] to do these things

But the loss of *God* in all these examples is only momentary. In my mind, it is much more probable that the function word *of* was accidentally inserted twice in the unusual expression “the Son / the Only Begotten of the Father” than the noun *God* was accidentally deleted twice from what sounds perfectly normal, “the Son of God / the Only Begotten of the Father”.

Another possibility, also suggested by David Calabro (personal communication), would be to maintain the *of* in both these passages but to punctuate it so that it could be interpreted appropriately. For instance, one could interpret “the Only Begotten of” as a rephrasing of “the Son of”:

Alma 5:48, Alma 13:9  
 the Son of—the Only Begotten of—the Father

In other words, this complex noun phrase would be equivalent to “the Son of **the Father** / the Only Begotten of the Father”, with ellipsis in the actual text of the first *the Father*. Another possibility, applicable only to the second case (Alma 13:9), would involve the noun *order*:

Alma 13:9  
 the order of the Son—of the Only Begotten of the Father

Here the equivalent reading would be “the order of the Son / **the order** of the Only Begotten of the Father”, with ellipsis in the actual text of the second *the order*. Of course, this second interpretation cannot apply to the first case (Alma 5:48) since the noun *order* is not there. But more significantly, there is no evidence elsewhere in the Book of Mormon text for complex chains of prepositional phrases with these kinds of ellipsis. The easier solution is to simply assume that the extra *of* in “the Son **of** the Only Begotten of the Father” is intrusive.

**Summary:** Accept in Alma 5:48 and Alma 13:9 Joseph Smith’s emendation of “the Son **of** the Only Begotten of the Father” to “the Son / the Only Begotten of the Father”; the extra *of* seems to have been the result of expecting *of* after *the son* when immediately followed by a noun phrase.

## ■ Alma 5:49

*and now I say unto you that this is the order after which I am called  
yea to [§2 speak > §1 preach 1 | preach ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] unto my beloved brethren  
yea and every one that dwelleth in the land  
yea to **preach** unto all / both old and young / both bond and free*

Here in the printer’s manuscript, Oliver Cowdery corrected scribe 2’s *speak* to *preach*. This change is probably a restoration of the reading of the original manuscript rather than the result of editing. Note, in particular, the visual similarity between *speak* and *preach*; scribe 2 of  $\mathcal{P}$  could have easily misread *preach* in  $\mathcal{O}$  as *speak*.

In general, the verb *speak* occurs nearly five times more frequently than *preach* in the Book of Mormon. When speaking or preaching to one’s brethren, the verb *speak* continues to dominate, with nine occurrences of “to **speak** to one’s brethren” and three of “to **preach** to one’s brethren” (including here in Alma 5:49). But in the context of the verb *call* (“called to speak” versus “called to preach”), we have only one instance of “called to speak” (nearby in Alma 5:44: “I am called to speak after this manner”), which may very well have been the source for scribe 2’s incorrect *speak* in verse 49. On the other hand, “called to preach” occurs three other times in the text:

Alma 8:24	I have been called to preach the word of God
Alma 29:13	that same God hath called me by a holy calling to preach the word
Alma 42:31	ye are called of God to preach the word

Moreover, Oliver Cowdery’s correction of *speak* to *preach* is consistent with the language later on in this verse: “yea to **preach** unto all / both old and young / both bond and free” (Alma 5:49). Thus *preach* in “yea to **preach** unto my beloved brethren” is very probably the original reading in Alma 5:49.

**Summary:** Retain in Alma 5:49 the word *preach* (in “yea to preach unto my beloved brethren”); Oliver Cowdery’s correction of *speak* to *preach* in  $\mathcal{P}$  is most probably the reading of the original manuscript (no longer extant here).

## ■ Alma 5:50

*repent all [the >+ Ye 1 | ye ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] ends of the earth*

Scribe 2 initially wrote “repent all **the** ends of the earth”. But he soon corrected the *the* to *ye*; he overwrote the *the* with *Ye* using a heavier ink flow (the capital *Y* was to make sure that the correcting letter *y* covered the *th*). When speaking about “the ends of the earth”, the text consistently maintains the definite article *the* (14 times), but when directly addressing “the ends of the earth”, *ye* always precedes “ends of the earth” (9 times, including here in Alma 5:50). In fact, there are three other occurrences of the specific expression “repent all ye ends of the earth” (in 3 Nephi 27:20, Ether 4:18, and Moroni 7:34), so quite clearly “repent all ye ends of the earth” is the correct reading in Alma 5:50.

**Summary:** Maintain in Alma 5:50 the corrected reading in  $\mathcal{P}$ : “repent all **ye** ends of the earth”.

■ **Alma 5:50**

*yea the Son of God [comes > cometh 1 | cometh ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] in his glory  
in his might majesty power and dominion*

Here scribe 2 of Ø initially wrote the expected modern English verb form *comes* rather than the biblically styled *cometh*. His correction was immediate: he overwrote the *s* with the *t* and then wrote the *h* inline. Although there are a few instances of *comes* in the original text, the text uniformly has *cometh* (not *comes*) when referring to Christ’s coming (17 times), including the following nearby example in Alma 5:48: “and behold it is he that **cometh** to take away the sins of the world”. For further discussion, see under INFLECTIONAL ENDINGS in volume 3.

**Summary:** Maintain in Alma 5:50 the verb form *cometh*, the immediately corrected reading in Ø (“yea the Son of God **cometh** in his glory”).

■ **Alma 5:50**

*behold [ 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMOQRT |, NPS] the glory of the King of all the earth  
[NULL >jg ; 1 |; ABCEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST | : D]  
and also the King of heaven shall very soon shine forth among all the children of men*

Ross Geddes (personal communication, 22 November 2003) proposes that the following two changes in the punctuation for this verse should be implemented:

- (1) place a comma after *behold* (this change was made in the 1906 LDS edition and the 1908 RLDS edition, but the comma did not persist in the LDS text);
- (2) remove the semicolon before the *and*; do not even permit a comma here.

These changes would give the following reading:

Alma 5:50 (revised accidentals)

Behold, the glory of the King of all the earth and also the King of heaven  
shall very soon shine forth among all the children of men.

The Lord is indeed the King of all the earth and also the King of heaven; thus here in Alma 5:50 these two noun phrases are conjoined to each other, which means that this passage is saying that “the glory of the King of earth and heaven shall very soon shine forth among all the children of men”. This interpretation is supported by the preceding part of the verse, which refers to the glory of the coming of the Son of God:

Alma 5:50

yea the Son of God cometh in his glory  
in his might majesty power and dominion

Further, the sentence-initial *behold* in this verse is an example of the narrative connector *behold*, which requires a comma. The text is not telling us to “behold the glory of the King of all the earth”; instead, the *behold* introduces a single statement that the glory of the King of all the earth (and also of heaven) shall very soon shine forth among all the children of men.

*Summary:* Emend the punctuation in Alma 5:50 so that there is a comma after *behold* and no punctuation in the conjoined noun phrase “the King of all the earth and also the King of heaven”.

#### ■ Alma 5:51

*for except ye repent*

*ye can in no wise [inherit 1ABCDEFGHIJLMNOPQRST | enter HK] the kingdom of heaven*

The 1874 RLDS edition replaced *inherit* with *enter*, but the 1908 RLDS edition restored the original *inherit* to the RLDS text. Either reading is possible: in the Book of Mormon, there are 12 examples referring to “the kingdom of God/heaven” that take the verb *inherit* and 4 that take *enter* (two of which are from the Sermon on the Mount as cited in 3 Nephi 12–14). In the New Testament, there are 6 references to “inheriting the kingdom” and 13 to “entering the kingdom”. The typesetter for the 1874 edition seems to have been influenced by the more frequent biblical use of *enter* in this context (in particular, the familiar usage from the Sermon on the Mount).

*Summary:* Maintain the verb *inherit* in Alma 5:51, the reading of the earliest textual sources; either *inherit* or *enter* is possible in the context of “the kingdom of God/heaven”.

#### ■ Alma 5:54

*yea will ye persist*

*in the [persecutions 1ABCDEFGHKPS | persecution FIJLMNOQRT] of your brethren*

As discussed under Mosiah 27:3, there has been some tendency in the printed editions to replace the plural *persecutions* with the singular *persecution*. Here in Alma 5:54, the 1852 LDS edition made such a change, perhaps because the plural *persecutions* sounded particularly strange. Surrounding sentences refer to persisting in something, but in all those instances, there is no possibility of pluralization:

Alma 5:53	will ye still persist in the <b>wearing</b> of costly apparel
Alma 5:54	will ye persist in <b>supposing</b> that ye are better one than another
Alma 5:55	and will you persist in <b>turning</b> your backs upon the poor
Alma 5:56	all ye that will persist in your <b>wickedness</b>

The editor or typesetter for the 1852 edition may have expected something like “will ye persist in the **persecuting** of your brethren” (or “will ye persist in **persecuting** your brethren”) and thus replaced *persecutions* with the singular *persecution*.

There are examples of both singular *persecution* and plural *persecutions* in the original text, although the plural dominates (12 to 4); see the discussion under 2 Nephi 26:8. The critical text will restore the original plural *persecutions* here in Alma 5:54.

*Summary:* Restore in Alma 5:54 the plural *persecutions*, the reading of the earliest textual sources.

## ■ Alma 5:54

*yea will ye persist in the persecutions of your brethren  
who humble themselves and do walk after the holy order of God  
wherewith they have been brought into [this 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST | his > this F] church*

The typesetter for the 1852 LDS edition accidentally misread *this church* as *his church*. For the second printing of that edition, the error was caught and corrected (probably by reference to the 1840 edition). Of course, *his church* would work since the antecedent for the *his* would be the preceding *God* (in “after the holy order of God”).

**Summary:** Maintain in Alma 5:54 the original reading *this church* in “they have been brought into this church”.

## ■ Alma 5:55

*yea and will you persist **in** turning your backs upon the poor and the needy  
and [§2 NULL > §1 in 1 | in ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST] withholding your substance from them*

The original text apparently had a case of prepositional repetition in this verse (“**in** turning your backs upon the poor and the needy and **in** withholding your substance from them”), but scribe 2 of  $\mathcal{P}$  accidentally omitted the repeated *in* when he copied this passage from  $\mathcal{C}$  into  $\mathcal{P}$ . Oliver Cowdery caught the error in his proofing of  $\mathcal{P}$  against  $\mathcal{C}$ . Either reading is possible, as can be seen in the following similar example involving the preposition *in* and a sequence of conjoined gerunds:

Alma 53:7

but he did employ his men **in preparing** for war  
yea **in making** fortifications to guard against the Lamanites  
yea and also **delivering** their women and their children from famine and affliction  
and **providing** food for their armies

In this passage, the preposition *in* is repeated only in the first case (“yea **in** making fortifications”); in the last two cases, there is no repetition (“yea and also delivering . . . and providing”). We therefore follow the earliest textual sources in determining whether the *in* should be repeated. Oliver’s inserted *in* in  $\mathcal{P}$  for Alma 5:55 was most probably the reading of  $\mathcal{C}$ . The critical text will assume as much. For further discussion of the repeated preposition *in*, see under Mosiah 24:1 (as well as more generally under CONJUNCTIVE REPETITION in volume 3).

**Summary:** Maintain the repeated *in* that Oliver Cowdery supplied in Alma 5:55: “and **in** withholding your substance from them”.

## ■ Alma 5:56

*I say unto you that  
these are [they >js those 1 | they ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]  
[which >js who 1 | which A | who BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] shall be hewn down  
and cast into the fire*

Here in the printer’s manuscript, Joseph Smith changed *they* to *those* when he marked up  $\mathcal{P}$  in his editing for the 1837 edition. But this change was never implemented in that edition (or any other one), probably because it was realized that “these are they” is a normal expression in the Book of Mormon. There are 13 instances of “these are they” in the original text, none of which have been edited to “these are those” (except here in  $\mathcal{P}$  for Alma 5:56). On the other hand, there are no occurrences in the original text of “these are those”—and only one in the current text, in Mosiah 15:24, which originally read “**there** are those” (for discussion, see under that passage). For further discussion of the general editing of *they* to *those*, see under PRONOMINAL DETERMINERS in volume 3. Here in Alma 5:56, Joseph also made his typical grammatical change of *which* to *who* (since the relative pronoun refers to people). For a complete discussion of that change, see under WHICH in volume 3.

*Summary:* Retain the original and more expected “these are they” in Alma 5:56.

## ■ Alma 5:57

*and now I say unto you  
all you that are desirous to follow the voice of the good shepherd  
come ye out from the wicked and be ye separate and touch not their unclean things  
and [§2 NULL > §1 behold 1 | behold ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]  
their names shall be blotted out*

Oliver Cowdery added the word *behold* here when he proofed  $\mathcal{P}$  against  $\mathcal{O}$ . Since this passage could read with or without the *behold*, it was undoubtedly in  $\mathcal{O}$ . There would have been no motivation for Oliver to have consciously added the *behold* here except that it was in  $\mathcal{O}$ .

*Summary:* Accept in Alma 5:57 Oliver Cowdery’s corrected reading in  $\mathcal{P}$ : “and **behold** their names shall be blotted out”.

## ■ Alma 5:58

*and [§2 to > §1 unto 1 | unto ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] them  
will I grant an inheritance at my right hand*

Oliver Cowdery’s change of scribe 2’s *to* to *unto* is probably a correction to the reading of the original manuscript since either *to* or *unto* is theoretically possible here. Elsewhere in the Book of Mormon, we have either *unto* or no preposition at all whenever the text refers to giving an inheritance to someone. There are eight other cases where the preposition is *unto*:

Alma 27:22	the land which we will give <b>unto our brethren</b> for an inheritance
Alma 35:9	and did give <b>unto them</b> lands for their inheritance
3 Nephi 15:13	this is the land of your inheritance and the Father hath given it <b>unto you</b>
3 Nephi 16:16	that I should give <b>unto this people</b> this land for their inheritance
3 Nephi 20:14	that I should give <b>unto you</b> this land for your inheritance
3 Nephi 20:29	that I would give <b>unto them</b> again the land of their fathers for their inheritance
3 Nephi 20:33	and give <b>unto them</b> Jerusalem for the land of their inheritance
3 Nephi 21:22	<b>unto whom</b> I have given this land for their inheritance

There are three cases where there is no preposition:

Alma 43:12	they gave <b>them</b> lands for their inheritance
Mormon 5:14	the land of their inheritance which the Lord their God hath given <b>them</b>
Ether 2:15	the land which I shall give <b>you</b> for your inheritance

But there are no examples where *to* is used in this context except initially in  $\mathcal{D}$  for Alma 5:58. The critical text will accept Oliver Cowdery's *unto* in  $\mathcal{D}$  as the original reading.

*Summary:* Maintain in Alma 5:58 Oliver Cowdery's corrected reading in  $\mathcal{D}$  ("and **unto** them will I grant an inheritance at my right hand"), the probable reading of  $\mathcal{C}$ .

#### ■ Alma 5:59

*yea and at [the 1ABCDEFGHIJKLNOPRST | MQ] last  
if he can  
he will destroy him*

The 1905 LDS edition here omitted the definite article *the* from the archaic phrase "at the last" (which means 'in the end'). The 1920 LDS edition restored the *the* to the LDS text. Elsewhere in the Book of Mormon, there are two instances of "at last" without the *the*:

2 Nephi 28:8  
and do all these things for tomorrow we die  
and if it so be that we are guilty  
God will beat us with a few stripes  
and **at last** we shall be saved in the kingdom of God

Alma 7:25  
and may the Lord bless you and keep your garments spotless  
that ye may **at last** be brought to sit down with Abraham Isaac and Jacob  
and the holy prophets

Both of these instances of "at last" mean 'in the end'.

There is one other instance of "at the last" in the text, but it does not mean 'in the end'; instead, "begin at the last" refers to trees and means 'begin with the last trees':



Jacob 5:63  
 graft in the branches  
**begin at the last**  
 that they may be first  
 and that the first may be last

One might propose that in Alma 5:59 the unique instance of “at the last” (with its meaning ‘in the end’) could be the result of some error in the early transmission of the text. Note the high frequency in the text of the longer phrase “at the last day” (49 times), which could have led the scribe to accidentally write “at **the** last” in Alma 5:59 rather than “at last”.

In the King James Bible, there are occurrences of the phrase “at the last” with the meaning ‘in the end’, as in these two examples:

Genesis 49:19  
 Gad / a troop shall overcome him  
 but he shall overcome **at the last**

Matthew 26:59–61  
 now the chief priests and elders and all the council  
 sought false witness against Jesus to put him to death but found none  
 yea though many false witnesses came *yet* found they none  
**at the last** came two false witnesses and said . . .

The Oxford English Dictionary lists “at the last” as a variant of “at last” (see definition 10a under the sixth listed noun *last*), with citations of “at the last” dating from about 1275 to 1821. Thus the unique occurrence of “at the last” in Alma 5:59 is clearly possible. The critical text will accept this now archaic reading “at the last”.

**Summary:** Maintain in Alma 5:59 the archaic phrase “at the last” (which means ‘in the end’); both “at the last” and “at last” are found in the Book of Mormon text.

#### ■ Alma 5:62

*that ye also may be partakers  
 of the [§2 spirit > §1 fruit 1 | fruit ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] of the tree of life*

Scribe 2 of  $\mathcal{P}$  wrote “partakers of the spirit”, an obvious error given that the following words are “of the tree of life”. Oliver Cowdery, when he proofed  $\mathcal{P}$  against  $\mathcal{O}$ , replaced *spirit* with *fruit*, the undoubted reading in  $\mathcal{O}$ . Note that there is some visual similarity between the two words *fruit* and *spirit*. Perhaps scribe 2 expected “partakers of the spirit”, yet elsewhere the Book of Mormon text refers only to “partaking of fruit” (23 times), never to “partaking of the spirit”.

**Summary:** Accept in Alma 5:62 Oliver Cowdery’s correction of *spirit* to *fruit*, which is obviously the appropriate reading for the following “of the tree of life”.

# Alma 6

## ■ Alma 6:2–3

*and it came to pass that*  
[whomsoever >js whosoever 1 | whomsoever A | whosoever BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]  
*did not belong to the church*  
*who repented of* [their >js his >js their 1 | their ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *sins*  
[was >js were 1 | was A | were BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *baptized unto repentance*  
*and* [was >js were 1 | was A | were BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *received into the church*  
*and it also came to pass that*  
[womsoever >js wosoever 1 | whomsoever A | whosoever BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]  
*did belong to the church*  
*that did not repent of their wickedness and humble themselves before God*  
*I mean those which were lifted up in the pride of their hearts*  
*the same were rejected and their names were blotted out*  
*that their names were not numbered among those of the righteous*

Here in Alma 6:2–3, we have two instances where an original *whomsoever* was changed to *whosoever* by Joseph Smith in his editing for the 1837 edition. In both of these instances, the nominal clause acts as the subject in the larger sentence while the *who(m)soever* acts as the subject within the nominal clause. From a grammatical point of view, the second of these conditions involving subject position requires *whosoever*. Even so, the original text of the Book of Mormon sometimes uses *whomsoever* in subject position; see, in particular, the discussion under Alma 3:10.

In this passage, Joseph Smith also worked on making the number for *who(m)soever* consistently plural. At first, he thought to treat the generic pronoun *who(m)soever* as a singular; thus he initially emended *their* in verse 2 to *his*. But then he reversed his emendation, undoubtedly when he noticed that in the following verse 3 there are many instances where plural pronouns are used to refer to the preceding *who(m)soever*: “their wickedness . . . themselves . . . those . . . their hearts . . . their names . . . their names”. Verse 3 also has many examples where the *be* verb is in the plural (namely, four instances of *were*), thus providing motivation for Joseph’s decision to emend two instances of *was* in verse 2 to *were*.

The critical text, of course, will restore the earliest reading for both instances of original *whomsoever* in verses 2 and 3 as well as the two instances of singular *was* in verse 2. Evidence elsewhere argues that the generic pronouns *who(m)soever* and *whoever* can be treated as either singular or plural (see the discussion under 1 Nephi 17:48). In addition, there is frequent disagreement in number between subject and predicate in the original text, as discussed under 1 Nephi 4:4 and, more generally, under SUBJECT-VERB AGREEMENT in volume 3.

*Summary:* Restore the original nonstandard usage in Alma 6:2–3: that is, *whomsoever* rather than *whosoever* in verses 2 and 3, and *was* instead of *were* in verse 2; such usage is intended and found elsewhere in the original text.

#### ■ Alma 6:5

*now I would that ye should understand that the word of God was liberal unto all that [no one was >js none were 1 | no one was A | none were BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] deprived of the privilege of assembling themselves together to hear the word of God*

In this passage, Joseph Smith emended the singular *no one was* to the plural *none were*, probably because of the following plural pronoun *themselves*. Nonetheless, the original text sometimes uses plural forms in reference to the singular generic *one*, as in the following instances:

Mosiah 23:14

and also trusting **no one** to be your **teachers** nor your **ministers** except **he** be **a man** of God

Alma 5:25

or also ye cannot suppose that such **an one** can have place in the kingdom of heaven but **they** shall be cast out for **they are the children** of the kingdom of the devil

Both of these passages were subsequently edited; for discussion, see under each one. Also note that the first of these (the one involving *no one*) actually has a mixture of singular and plural usage (first, the plural nouns *teachers* and *ministers*, then the singular usage in “except **he** be **a man** of God”). The instance of *no one* followed by *themselves* here in Alma 6:5 appears to be intended and most probably represents the original text.

*Summary:* Restore the original singular *no one was* in Alma 6:5; the generic pronoun *one* occasionally takes plural referents.

#### ■ Alma 6:7

*he departed from them yea from the church which was in the city of Zarahemla and went over upon the east [ 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST | side K] of the river Sidon into the valley of Gideon*

□ *there having been a city built* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST  
which was called the city **of Gideon**

□ NULL K

*which was in the valley that was called Gideon*

In this verse, the 1892 RLDS edition made two errors. The first involved the addition of the word *side* after *east* in the phrase “upon the east of the river Sidon”. This addition may have been intentional,

although in no similar construction in the text did the 1892 typesetter add the word *side*. The 1908 RLDS edition restored the original text here in Alma 6:7 by removing the intrusive *side*.

Elsewhere in the text, when describing position with respect to the river Sidon, there are two cases where *side* occurs:

- |           |  |
|-----------|--|
| Alma 2:34 | and contend with the Lamanites and the Amlicites<br>on the west <b>side</b> of the river Sidon |
| Alma 16:7 | the south wilderness which was on the east <b>side</b> of the river Sidon                      |

But normally, the word *side* is not used (nine times, including Alma 6:7):

- |            |   |
|------------|---|
| Alma 2:34  | the bank which was on the west of the river Sidon         |
| Alma 6:7   | and went over upon the east of the river Sidon            |
| Alma 8:3   | the land of Melek on the west of the river Sidon          |
| Alma 16:6  | there shall ye meet them on the east of the river Sidon   |
| Alma 43:27 | the valley . . . which was on the west of the river Sidon |
| Alma 43:32 | the west valley on the west of the river Sidon            |
| Alma 43:53 | the men of Lehi on the east of the river Sidon            |
| Alma 43:53 | the armies of Moroni on the west of the river Sidon       |
| Alma 49:16 | the valley on the east of the river Sidon                 |

In each case we therefore follow the earliest textual sources in determining whether *side* occurs after the directions *east* and *west*.

For this passage, the typesetter for the 1892 RLDS edition also allowed a whole line of text to be accidentally omitted when his eye skipped from the first *of Gideon* to the second one (thus omitting “there having been a city built which was called the city of Gideon”). The copytext for the 1892 edition was the first RLDS edition (1874); there the first *of Gideon* occurred almost exactly above the second one on the printed page, thus facilitating the visual skip. This omission was restored in the following RLDS edition (1908). Without the original line, we get an egregious redundancy: “into the valley of Gideon which was in the valley that was called Gideon”.

**Summary:** In Alma 6:7 the critical text will retain the earliest text, thus ignoring two errors in the 1892 RLDS edition (namely, the intrusive *side* after *east* in the phrase “upon the east of the river Sidon” and the visual skip that omitted the line “there having been a city built which was called the city of Gideon”).

# Alma 7

## ■ Alma 7:1

*seeing that it is the first time that I have spoken unto you by the words of my mouth  
I [having 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST | have > having F] been wholly confined  
to the judgment seat  
having [NULL > had 1 | had ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST] much business  
that I could not come unto you*

This passage has undergone an interesting dittography in the second printing of the 1852 LDS edition. This edition was set from a copy of the 1849 LDS edition and, for this part of the page, line-for-line. The last five lines on page 226 of the 1849 edition read as follows:

Alma 7:1 (1849 edition)

BEHOLD my beloved brethren, seeing that I have been permitted to come unto you, therefore I attempt to address you in my language; yea, by my own mouth, seeing that it is the first time that I have spoken unto you by the words of my mouth, I **having** been wholly confined to the judgment seat,

When this passage was originally set for the 1852 edition, *having* was accidentally replaced by *have*:

Alma 7:1 (1852 edition, first printing)

1. BEHOLD my beloved brethren, seeing that I have been permitted to come unto you, therefore I attempt to address you in my language; yea, by my own mouth, seeing that it is the first time that I have spoken unto you by the words of my mouth, I **have** been wholly confined to the judgment seat,

Thus the 1852 typesetter changed the last clause on the page (a present participial clause) into a finite clause. In preparing for the second printing of the 1852 edition, the editors discovered this error and had the *have* replaced with the correct *having* in the stereotyped plates. But because of the difficulty in repairing a single word in the last line, at the edge of the stereotyped plate, the entire last line was reset (in fact, the word spacing for that whole line was much improved). But in that resetting, the whole next-to-last line was also reset and, along with the entirely reset last line, added to the bottom of the plate. Yet only the last line of type was actually removed from the original stereotyped plate; thus the next-to-last line was accidentally repeated in the corrected plate (shown below with an arrow):

Alma 7:1 (1852 edition, second printing)

1. BEHOLD my beloved brethren, seeing that I have been permitted to come unto you, therefore I attempt to address you in my language; yea, by my own mouth, seeing that it is the first time that I have spoken unto you by the words of my  
→ first time that I have spoken unto you by the words of my mouth, I **having** been wholly confined to the judgment seat,

The dittography is, of course, obvious and was therefore removed from the subsequent LDS edition (1879).

Also in this verse, scribe 2 of  $\mathcal{P}$  initially wrote “having much business”; but then almost immediately he supralinearly inserted the main verb *had* (there is no change in the level of ink flow). The participial clause without the *had* is not impossible, which implies that scribe 2’s correction was not the result of editing. The preceding participial clause also has *having* followed by a past participle, *been*: “I **having been** wholly confined to the judgment seat”.

**Summary:** Maintain in Alma 7:1 the original present participle *having* in “having been wholly confined to the judgment seat” as well as the *had* after *having* in the following present participial clause (“**having had** much business that I could not come unto you”).

#### ■ Alma 7:4

*but blessed be the name of God that  
he hath given [unto 1 | ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] me to know  
yea hath given **unto** me the exceeding great joy of knowing  
that they are established again in the way of his righteousness*

The 1830 typesetter accidentally deleted *unto* before *me* near the beginning of this verse. Yet in the following *yea*-clause he kept the *unto* in the same basic construction (“yea hath given **unto** me the exceeding great joy of knowing that . . .”). In the expression “give (unto) someone to know”, the Book of Mormon text elsewhere always has the *unto*:

Alma 12:9	it is given <b>unto many</b> to know the mysteries of God
Alma 12:10	until it is given <b>unto him</b> to know the mysteries of God
Alma 26:22	<b>unto such</b> it is given to know the mysteries of God
Mormon 3:4	an epistle . . . which gave <b>unto me</b> to know that . . .

The same *unto* is found in the synoptic Gospels in the King James Bible:

Matthew 13:11	it is given <b>unto you</b> to know the mysteries of the kingdom of heaven
Mark 4:11	<b>unto you</b> it is given to know the mystery of the kingdom of God
Luke 8:10	<b>unto you</b> it is given to know the mysteries of the kingdom of God

The critical text will restore the original preposition *unto* in Alma 7:4.

**Summary:** Restore the preposition *unto* before *me* near the beginning of Alma 7:4 (“he hath given **unto** me to know . . .”).

■ Alma 7:4

*but blessed be the name of God that **he hath given** unto me to know  
**yea hath given** unto me the exceeding great joy of knowing  
that they are established again in the way of his righteousness*

One may wonder if there is an accidentally missing pronoun (such as *he*) between *yea* and *hath* in this passage. Evidence elsewhere argues, however, that this usage is intended, although not especially common:

Alma 5:51

and also the Spirit saith unto me  
**yea crieth** unto me with a mighty voice saying . . .

Alma 13:22

yea and the voice of the Lord by the mouth of angels doth declare it  
unto all nations  
**yea doth declare** it that they may have glad tidings of great joy

Alma 29:4

yea I know that he allotteth unto man  
**yea decreeth** unto them decrees which are unalterable according to their wills  
whether it be unto salvation or unto destruction

Alma 60:8

yea even they which have looked up to you for protection  
yea **have placed** you in a situation that ye might have succored them  
yea ye might have sent armies unto them to have strengthened them  
and have saved thousands of them from falling by the sword

Helaman 11:33

yea for they did visit many parts of the land and did do great destruction unto them  
**yea did kill** many and did carry away others captive into the wilderness

3 Nephi 7:1

but in this same year yea the thirtieth year  
they did destroy upon the judgment seat  
**yea did murder** the chief judge of the land

This kind of subject ellipsis is definitely possible in *yea*-clauses in the Book of Mormon. There are also a few examples of this usage in the King James Bible:

Job 21:7

wherefore do the wicked live / become old  
**yea are mighty** in power

Psalms 84:2

my soul longeth  
**yea even fainteth** for the courts of the LORD

John 16:32

behold the hour cometh  
**yea is now come** that ye shall be scattered

The critical text will therefore maintain the reading “yea hath given unto me the exceeding great joy of knowing” in Alma 7:4.

*Summary:* Maintain in Alma 7:4 the subjectless predicate that follows the *yea* in “yea hath given unto me the exceeding great joy of knowing”; such usage is occasionally found in the Book of Mormon and the King James Bible.

#### ■ Alma 7:5

*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 1ABCDEFGHIKPS | affliction FIJLMNOQRT] and sorrow*

In this passage, the 1852 LDS edition omitted the plural *s* at the end of the word *afflictions* in the second occurrence of the phrase “much afflictions and sorrow”. The earlier occurrence of this same phrase in this verse was left unchanged, which argues that the 1852 change from the plural *afflictions* to the singular *affliction* was unintentional. As noted under 1 Nephi 16:35, there are three instances in the original text of *much afflictions*. Also see under Enos 1:21 for evidence that *much* can occur with plural nouns in the original text. The critical text will restore in Alma 7:5 the original instance of *much afflictions* that was changed to *much affliction*.

*Summary:* Restore the original reading for the second occurrence of “much afflictions and sorrow” in Alma 7:5; this reading makes the passage consistent in phraseology and in agreement with the earliest textual sources.

#### ■ Alma 7:6

*but behold I trust that ye are not in a state of so much unbelief as were your brethren  
I trust that ye are not lifted up in the pride of your hearts  
yea I trust that ye have not set your hearts upon riches and the vain things of the world  
yea I trust that [you 1ABCEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST | ye D] do not worship idols  
but that ye do worship the true and the living God  
and that ye look forward for the remission of your sins*

Here in the 1841 British edition, the one instance of subject *you* was replaced with *ye*. As discussed under Mosiah 4:14, *ye* is the normal subject form for the second person plural pronoun, but there are nonetheless many examples of *you* in subject position. Here in Alma 7:6, the change of *you* to *ye* in “I trust that you do not worship idols” was probably due to the influence of five surrounding instances of *that ye*, including three preceding ones of *I trust that ye*. Interestingly, the subsequent LDS edition (1849) restored the original *you*, most probably by reference to an earlier printed edition. One wonders whether this one instance of *that you* in the earliest text for this passage is an early error for *that ye*. But since the original text allows the subject pronoun *you*,



the critical text will follow the earliest textual source here. For further discussion, see under YE in volume 3.

*Summary:* Maintain the one case of subject *you* in Alma 7:6; in this instance, the earliest textual sources support *you* rather than the *ye* found elsewhere in the verse.

#### ■ Alma 7:6

*yea I trust that you do not worship idols  
but that ye do worship the true and the living God  
and that ye look forward for the remission of your sins*  
[ 1 ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQS |, RT ]  
*with an everlasting faith*  
[ 1 ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQS |, RT ]  
*which is to come*

Lyle Fletcher has suggested (personal communication, 29 October 2004) that there may be something missing before “which is to come”, perhaps *in that*: “with an everlasting faith **in that** which is to come”. Another possibility is *of that*, in accord with the following reading:

Mosiah 4:11  
and standing steadfastly in the faith **of that** which is to come

On the other hand, one could maintain the earliest text in Alma 7:6 by interpreting the *which* as meaning ‘who’ — that is, the phrase “which is to come” may refer to the coming of “the true and the living God”, mentioned earlier in the verse. In fact, there is a clear reference to the coming of Christ in the next verse:

Alma 7:7  
for behold I say unto you  
there be many things to come  
and behold there is one thing which is of more importance than they all  
for behold the time is not far distant  
that the Redeemer liveth and cometh among his people

But the statement “there be many things to come” in verse 7 suggests that the reference in verse 6 to something (or someone) coming may not be referring to the coming of the Redeemer per se.

One other way to view Alma 7:6 is that the relative clause “which is to come” refers to the preceding noun phrase “the remission of your sins”. This interpretation would mean that “with an everlasting faith” is a displaced prepositional phrase that refers to “ye look forward”. In other words, the meaning of the passage is equivalent to “ye look forward with an everlasting faith for the remission of your sins which is to come”. As discussed under Mosiah 26:23, there are examples in the text where prepositional phrases syntactically occur in what might appear to be the wrong place. A good example of a displaced prepositional phrase headed by *with* is in Mosiah 26:6: “for it came to pass that they did deceive many **with their flattering words** which were in the church”. (For a more extensive list of examples, see under DISPLACED PREPOSITIONAL PHRASES in

volume 3.) In support of such an interpretation regarding Alma 7:6, there is evidence elsewhere in the text that the remission of sins will come later (as a result of Christ's atonement):

Mosiah 15:11

behold I say unto you  
that whosoever hath heard the words of the prophets  
yea all the holy prophets which have prophesied concerning the coming of the Lord  
I say unto you that all those who hath hearkened unto their words  
and believed that the Lord would redeem his people  
**and have looked forward to that day for a remission of their sins**  
I say unto you that these are his seed  
or they are heirs of the kingdom of God

Thus the most reasonable interpretation of Alma 7:6 is that the relative clause "which is to come" refers to "the remission of sins" while the displaced prepositional phrase "with an everlasting faith" refers to "ye look forward". There is therefore no textual need to emend Alma 7:6. It should also be noted that the 1920 LDS text placed commas around the prepositional phrase "with an everlasting faith", which is consistent with this interpretation.

*Summary:* Maintain in Alma 7:6 the original reading, with the understanding that the prepositional phrase "with an everlasting faith" refers to "ye look forward" while the relative clause "which is to come" refers to "the remission of your sins".

#### ■ Alma 7:8

*now as to this thing I do not know*

*but this much I [§2 NULL > §1 do 1 | do ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] know*

Here scribe 2 of  $\mathcal{P}$  wrote "but this much I know", which is what we might expect in modern English. Oliver Cowdery corrected the text here by inserting the auxiliary verb *do*: "but this much I **do** know". Either reading is possible, which suggests that Oliver's correction was the reading in  $\mathcal{C}$ . It is doubtful that he would have consciously edited the text here since "but this much I know" reads perfectly well. Elsewhere the original text has 99 occurrences of *I know* but also 7 of *I do know*:

Alma 5:45	behold I testify unto you that <b>I do know</b> that . . .
Alma 5:46	and now <b>I do know</b> of myself that they are true
Alma 34:8	behold I say unto you that <b>I do know</b> that Christ shall come
Alma 36:3	for <b>I do know</b> that whomsoever shall put his trust in God . . .
Alma 36:26	they do know of these things of which I have spoken as <b>I do know</b>
Alma 36:30	for ye had ought to know as <b>I do know</b> that . . .
Alma 40:9	and this is the thing of which <b>I do know</b>

Thus the critical text will follow the corrected reading in  $\mathcal{P}$  for Alma 7:8: "but this much I **do** know".

*Summary:* Maintain in Alma 7:8 Oliver Cowdery's corrected reading with the auxiliary verb *do* ("but this much I **do** know").

## ■ Alma 7:9

*cry unto this people saying*

**repent ye** [*repent ye* 1PS | ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOQRT]

*and prepare the way of the Lord*

Here the 1830 typesetter accidentally deleted the repeated phrase “repent ye”. He made the same mistake a little further on in the text:

Alma 9:25

the Lord hath sent his angel to visit many of his people  
 declaring unto them that they must go forth and cry mightily unto this people  
 saying **repent ye** [*repent ye* 1PS | ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOQRT]  
 for the kingdom of heaven is nigh at hand

The 1908 RLDS text restored both these instances of the repeated “repent ye” to the RLDS text. Elsewhere in the Book of Mormon, there are five more instances of this repeated usage:

2 Nephi 31:11	<b>repent ye repent ye</b> and be baptized
Helaman 5:29	<b>repent ye repent ye</b> and seek no more to destroy my servants
Helaman 5:32	<b>repent ye repent ye</b> for the kingdom of heaven is at hand
Helaman 7:17	O <b>repent ye repent ye</b> / why will ye die
Helaman 14:9	therefore <b>repent ye repent ye</b> lest by knowing these things . . .

There are also four instances in the earliest text of nonrepeated “repent ye”:

Jacob 6:11	<b>repent ye</b> and enter ye in at the strait gate
Alma 8:29	<b>repent ye</b> for thus saith the Lord except ye repent . . .
Mormon 3:2	<b>repent ye</b> and come unto me and be ye baptized
Mormon 5:24	therefore <b>repent ye</b> and humble yourselves before him

On the other hand, the King James Bible has no instances of the repeated “repent ye”, only the nonrepeated “repent ye”:

Matthew 3:2	<b>repent ye</b> for the kingdom of heaven is at hand
Mark 1:15	<b>repent ye</b> and believe the gospel
Acts 3:19	<b>repent ye</b> therefore and be converted

But as David Calabro points out (personal communication), there is repetition for similar calls to repentance in the King James Bible, as in Ezekiel 33:11: “**turn ye turn ye** from your evil ways”. Interestingly, this same repetition of “turn ye turn ye” is found in one of the Book of Mormon passages where “repent ye” is also repeated:

Helaman 7:17

O **repent ye repent ye**  
 why will ye die  
**turn ye turn ye** unto the Lord your God  
 why hath he forsaken you

The parallelism in this Book of Mormon couplet clearly supports the repetition of both “repent ye” and “turn ye”. And there is support from the Hebrew biblical text (in Ezekiel 33:11) for repetition

in calls for repentance. The Book of Mormon critical text will in each case follow the earliest reading, thus restoring the two instances of repeated “repent ye” in Alma 7:9 and Alma 9:25.

**Summary:** Restore in Alma 7:9 and Alma 9:25 the repeated usage “repent ye repent ye”; such usage is actually more prevalent in the original text than the nonrepeated “repent ye”.

#### ■ Alma 7:9

*and prepare the way of the Lord  
and walk in his paths which are [strait 1 | straight ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]*

As discussed under 1 Nephi 8:20, the text here should read *straight* since the passage uses the language of Isaiah 40:3 as cited in the synoptic Gospels.

#### ■ Alma 7:10

*and behold he shall be born of Mary at Jerusalem  
which is [ 1ABCDEFGHIJKLNOPRST | in MQ] the land of our forefathers*

Here the 1905 LDS edition added the preposition *in*. This change may have been a conscious emendation since one might think that Jerusalem was not the land of the Nephites’ forefathers but was **in** that land. The 1911 LDS edition maintained the intrusive *in* in this passage, but the 1920 edition removed it from the LDS text. Jesus was born in Bethlehem, which would have been in the land of Jerusalem (as many Book of Mormon commentators have pointed out) but not within the city itself. Thus the 1905 reading is by implication wrong since it would normally be read as meaning that Jesus was born in the city of Jerusalem.

The Book of Mormon frequently refers to Jerusalem as “the land of Jerusalem” (45 times, including here in Alma 7:10). There are 9 references to “the city of Jerusalem” plus 98 references to Jerusalem without any specific use of the word *city* or *land* (and many of these could be interpreted as referring to the land of Jerusalem). The text has 18 other cases of the prepositional phrase “at Jerusalem”, and many of these could refer to the land of Jerusalem.

In accord with the earliest textual sources as well as usage elsewhere in the Book of Mormon, the critical text will retain the more difficult but accurate reading in Alma 7:10 without the preposition *in*.

**Summary:** Maintain the original text in Alma 7:10, which refers to the Son of God as having been born in the land of Jerusalem: “he shall be born of Mary at Jerusalem which is the land of our forefathers”.

#### ■ Alma 7:11

*and he shall go forth  
suffering [pain >+ pains 1 | pains ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]  
and [affliction >+ afflictions 1 | afflictions ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]  
and [temptation >+ temptations 1 | temptations ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]  
of every kind*

In this passage, scribe 2 of  $\mathcal{D}$  initially wrote “pain and affliction and temptation”, then corrected this sequence of singulars to plurals (each *s* is inserted inline and with slightly heavier ink flow,

perhaps the result of scribe 2 redipping his quill). Either the singular or the plural is possible for these nouns. Consider, in particular, other passages that refer to the suffering of Christ; for these passages, there are instances of both singular and plural for *pain(s)* and *temptation(s)*:

2 Nephi 9:21

for behold he suffereth the **pains** of all men  
yea the **pains** of every living creature  
both men women and children which belong to the family of Adam

Mosiah 3:7

and lo he shall suffer **temptations** and **pain** of body

Mosiah 15:5

and thus the flesh becoming subject to the spirit or the Son to the Father  
being one God  
suffereth **temptation** and yieldeth not to the **temptation**

Alma 7:11

and this that the word might be fulfilled which saith  
he will take upon him the **pains** and the sicknesses of his people

Generally, the three nouns *pain(s)*, *affliction(s)*, and *temptation(s)* are not conjoined in the text, neither all together nor in pairs; the only other example besides the one in Alma 7:11 is in Mosiah 3:7, listed above. Overall, the text allows both the singular and plural for these nouns:

SINGULAR		PLURAL	
pain	8 times	pains	19 times
affliction	12 times	afflictions	79 times
temptation	9 times	temptations	10 times

In each case, we will let the earliest textual source determine the number. Here in Alma 7:11, the corrected plural nouns do not appear to be due to conscious editing; instead, they probably represent the reading of the original manuscript. The critical text will accept the plural readings for this passage.

**Summary:** Accept in Alma 7:11 the corrected plural nouns *pains*, *afflictions*, and *temptations*; the original manuscript, not extant here, probably read in the plural since either singular or plural forms are acceptable.

#### ■ Alma 7:11

*and he will take upon him death that he may loose the bands of death  
which [binds >js bind 1 | binds A | bind BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] his people*

The original text here reads “the bands of death which **binds** his people”. The verb *bind* takes the third person singular ending *-s* under the influence of the nearest noun, *death*. Joseph Smith, in his editing for the 1837 edition, removed the *s* so that the associated noun for the verb *bind* would be the head noun *bands*. But the text here may actually mean that it is “death which binds his people” rather than the redundancy of “bands . . . which bind his people”. Other passages, however, refer to bands that bind:

1 Nephi 7:17	that I may burst these bands with which I am bound
Mosiah 23:12	therefore ye were bound with the bands of iniquity
Alma 8:31	until they were bound in bands and cast into prison

Therefore the redundancy in Alma 7:11 is acceptable, and Joseph’s grammatical interpretation is supportable. The critical text will, nonetheless, restore the original *binds* since proximity often determines subject-verb agreement in the original text. See the discussion under 1 Nephi 4:4, in particular the example “the judgments of **God was** upon them” (1 Nephi 18:5). Also see the general discussion under SUBJECT-VERB AGREEMENT in volume 3.

**Summary:** Restore in Alma 7:11 the verb form *binds*; here the inflected form of the verb seems to be determined by the nearest noun, the singular *death* in “the bands of **death** which **binds** his people”.

### ■ Alma 7:12

*that he may know according to the flesh  
how to [suffer 1A | succor BCDEGHJKNOPRST | succour FILMQ] his people  
according to their infirmities*

Here the printer’s manuscript and the 1830 edition read *suffer*. The 1837 edition replaced *suffer* with *succor*, probably intentionally (although this change was not marked in  $\mathcal{P}$  by Joseph Smith in his editing for the 1837 edition). All subsequent editions have retained *succor*. It is quite possible that the original manuscript read *succor* and that scribe 2 of  $\mathcal{P}$  miscopied the word as *suffer*, especially since *succor* and *suffer* are orthographically similar. We should note that in one place in the original manuscript Oliver Cowdery spelled *succor* as *succer* (Alma 57:12). If the original manuscript had the same spelling of *succer* here in Alma 7:12, then the conjectured misreading as *suffer* by scribe 2 in the printer’s manuscript would be all the more plausible. Indeed, a spelling such as *sucker* would be even more susceptible to being misread as *suffer* (but there are no instances of that misspelling in the manuscripts).

Another possibility is that the scribe in  $\mathcal{C}$  misheard Joseph Smith’s *succor* as the phonetically similar *suffer* and thus wrote down *suffer* in  $\mathcal{C}$ . It’s also possible that Joseph himself misread *succor* as *suffer* as he dictated the text. But no matter when *suffer* entered the text here in Alma 7:12, there was probably some influence from the preceding text, which refers to Christ’s suffering:

Alma 7:11–12

and he shall go forth **suffering** pains and afflictions and temptations of every kind  
and this that the word might be fulfilled which saith  
he will take upon him the pains and the sicknesses of his people  
and he will take upon him death  
that he may loose the bands of death which binds his people  
and he will take upon him their infirmities  
that his bowels may be filled with mercy according to the flesh

In fact, the word *suffering*, found near the beginning of verse 11, could have prompted the replacement of *succor* with *suffer* later on in verse 12.

Elsewhere in the text, there are four more occurrences of the verb *succor* (which means ‘to help, relieve’):

## Alma 7

Mosiah 4:16	and also ye yourselves will <b>succor</b> those that stand in need of your succor
Mosiah 7:29	I will not <b>succor</b> my people in the day of their transgression
Alma 4:13	while others were abasing themselves <b>succoring</b> those who stood in need of their succor
Alma 60:8	that ye might have <b>succored</b> them

On the other hand, when the direct object for the verb *suffer* is a human, the typical meaning for *suffer* is ‘to allow’, as in 3 Nephi 16:14: “I will not suffer my people . . . to go through among them”. Nor is there any evidence from the Oxford English Dictionary to suggest that *suffer* originally had a meaning that would work more reasonably here in Alma 7:12. The earliest reading (“how to **suffer** his people according to their infirmities”) does not make much sense, especially in context. The most reasonable emendation is *succor*.

There are two instances of the verb *suffer* elsewhere in the text that one might suppose could be mistakes for *succor*:

Helaman 13:8  
because of the hardness of the hearts of the people of the Nephites  
except they repent I will take away my word from them  
and I will withdraw my Spirit from them  
and I will **suffer** them no longer  
and I will turn the hearts of their brethren against them

Helaman 13:29  
O ye wicked and ye perverse generation  
ye hardened and ye stiff-necked people  
how long will ye suppose that the Lord will **suffer** you

The OED, however, indicates that one meaning for *suffer* (now rare and archaic, according to the OED) is ‘to tolerate, put up with’ (see definition 12 under the verb *suffer*). And this is precisely the meaning for these two occurrences of the verb *suffer* in Helaman 13. On the other hand, the negative meaning ‘to tolerate, put up with’ will not work for the instance of *suffer* in Alma 7:12; it is clear that this passage does not mean that ‘he may know according to the flesh how to **tolerate** his people according to their infirmities’.

**Summary:** Accept in Alma 7:12 the 1837 emendation of *suffer* to *succor* since only *succor* makes sense in context; the aural or visual similarity between the two words, plus the preceding occurrence of *suffering* in verse 11, seems to have caused *succor* to be accidentally replaced by *suffer* early on in the transmission of the text.

### ■ Alma 7:15

*yea come and go forth  
and show unto your God that ye are willing to repent  
of your [sin > sins 1 | sins ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]*

Here scribe 2 of Ø initially wrote “ye are willing to repent of your **sin**” but virtually immediately added the plural *s* to give “ye are willing to repent of your **sins**” (there is no difference in the level

of ink flow). Although the singular is theoretically possible, the Book of Mormon text has only examples of “to repent of one’s **sins**” (34 in all, including here in Alma 7:15); there are no examples of “to repent of one’s **sin**”. The corrected reading here in  $\mathcal{P}$  is undoubtedly the reading of the original manuscript.

*Summary:* Accept in Alma 7:15 the corrected reading in  $\mathcal{P}$ , the plural *sins* in “to repent of your sins”.

#### ■ Alma 7:17

*and now my beloved brethren  
do **you** believe these things  
behold I say unto you  
yea I know that [you 1A | ye BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] believe them  
and the way that I know that **ye** believe them  
is by the manifestations of the Spirit which is in me*

Here we have a case where the modern subject pronoun form *you* was replaced in the 1837 edition by the archaic subject pronoun form *ye*. The apparent source for the change is the otherwise identical language found in the following clause: “I know that **ye** believe them”. Interestingly, earlier in the verse we have a subject *you* that was not changed (“do **you** believe these things”), which suggests that the 1837 change of *you* to *ye* in “yea I know that **you** believe them” was unintended. As discussed under Mosiah 4:14, both *ye* and *you* can occur as the subject pronoun, although *ye* is considerably more common in the Book of Mormon text. For additional discussion, see under YE in volume 3.

*Summary:* Restore in Alma 7:17 the subject pronoun form *you* in the clause “yea I know that **you** believe them”; the 1837 change to *ye* was apparently prompted by the *ye* in the following text: “and the way that **I know that ye believe them** is by the manifestations of the Spirit which is in me”).

#### ■ Alma 7:17

*yea I know that you believe them  
and the way [I > That 1 | that ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] I know  
[that 1ABCEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST | D] ye believe them  
is by the manifestations of the Spirit which is in me*

Here we have two instances where there is some variation with respect to the word *that*. In the printer’s manuscript, scribe 2 initially dropped the relative pronoun *that*: he started to write “and the way I know that ye believe them is . . .”, getting as far as the *I*; then he overwrote the *I* with a capital *T* (capitalized in order to cover the *I*) and continued inline with *hat* (the rest of the word *that*). Thus scribe 2’s correction was immediate. The critical text will, of course, maintain the *that* after *way*.

The second textual change involves the loss in the 1841 British edition of the subordinate conjunction *that* after *know*. The *that* was restored in the subsequent 1849 LDS edition. The critical text will maintain the earliest reading here as well. For some discussion regarding the optionality



of *that* after the verb *know*, see under Enos 1:17; also see the list of examples under THAT in volume 3.

**Summary:** Maintain in Alma 7:17 the two instances of *that* in “and the way **that** I know **that** ye believe them is . . .” (the earliest reading of the text).

#### ■ Alma 7:17

*yea I know that you believe them  
and the way that I know that ye believe them  
is by the [manifestation >+ manifestations 1 | manifestation ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]  
of the [spirit 1ABCDEG | Spirit FHIJKLMNOPQRST]  
which is in me*

As discussed under Alma 5:47, the plural *manifestations* (the corrected reading in  $\mathcal{P}$ ) is most probably the original reading here in Alma 7:17. In addition, we should note that the phrase “the manifestations of the Spirit/spirit which is in me” can be theoretically interpreted in two ways. In one case, the word *Spirit* (capitalized) refers to the Spirit of God. In the other case, the word *spirit* (uncapitalized) figuratively refers to Alma’s own spirit. The 1830 compositor left the word *spirit* uncapitalized (it was uncapitalized in  $\mathcal{P}$ ), but the 1852 LDS edition and the 1874 RLDS edition capitalized the word *Spirit*, thus explicitly claiming that the reference here was to the Spirit of God. Support for the capitalized *Spirit* is found later on in this chapter, when Alma once more refers to the influence of the Spirit in him:

Alma 7:26  
and now my beloved brethren  
I have spoken these words unto you  
according to the [spirit 1ABCDEG | Spirit FHIJKLMNOPQRST]  
which testifieth in me

In this second case, it is virtually impossible for the text to be referring to Alma’s own spirit; rather, Alma is referring to the Spirit of the Lord testifying in him.

**Summary:** Restore in Alma 7:17 the plural *manifestations*; also maintain the capitalized *Spirit* (and, similarly, the capitalized *Spirit* in Alma 7:26).

#### ■ Alma 7:17

*and now because your faith is strong concerning that  
yea concerning the [thing >+ things 1 | things ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] which I have spoken  
great is my joy*

Here scribe 2 of  $\mathcal{P}$  initially wrote *thing*; later, perhaps after redipping his quill, he inserted the plural *s* with somewhat heavier ink flow. Scribe 2 was undoubtedly prompted to write the singular *thing* as a result of the preceding singular pronoun *that*. Earlier in this verse, Alma uses the plural *things* to refer to what he has been teaching the people in the land of Gideon:

Alma 7:17

and now my beloved brethren  
do you believe **these things**  
behold I say unto you  
yea I know that you believe **them**  
and the way that I know that ye believe **them**  
is by the manifestations of the Spirit which is in me

The singular *that* thus refers to the collective “these things” that Alma had spoken. For further discussion of the tendency to mix up the number for *thing(s)*, see under 1 Nephi 15:11.

*Summary:* Accept in Alma 7:17 the plural *things*: “concerning that / yea concerning the things which I have spoken”; although a difficult reading because of the shift from the singular *that* to the plural *things*, this reading appears to be intended.

#### ■ Alma 7:18

*for as I said unto you from the beginning that I had much desire  
that ye [was >js were 1 | was A | were BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] not in the state of dilemma  
like your brethren  
even so I have found that my desires have been gratified*

Here Joseph Smith, in his editing for the 1837 edition, emended the nonstandard “ye was” to “ye were”. This is the only example of “ye was” in the earliest text; in all other instances, the text reads “ye were” (20 times). Obviously, this nonstandard reading may be due to some kind of dialectal overlay (an instance of nonstandard English that entered the text early on in its transmission). A similar example, also fairly rare, is the case of “they was” that occurs as the earliest reading in several passages. As discussed under 1 Nephi 4:4 and Mosiah 10:14, the critical text will allow some instances of “they was” to stand. Further, there is at least one instance in the earliest text where one of the associated verbs for *ye* takes the inflectional ending *-(e)th*: “and yet **ye** put up no petition or **repenteth** not of the thing which thou hast done” (Mosiah 4:22). The critical text will accept these rare instances of nonstandard verb agreement for *ye* since they are dialectally possible and may actually be intended.

*Summary:* Restore the original nonstandard “ye was” in Alma 7:17; another example of nonstandard subject-verb agreement involving *ye* is found in Mosiah 4:22: “and yet **ye** put up no petition or **repenteth** not of the thing which thou hast done”.

#### ■ Alma 7:19

*for I perceive that ye are in the **paths** of righteousness  
I perceive that ye are in the [paths >% path 1 | path ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]  
which **leads** to the kingdom of God  
yea I perceive that ye are making his **paths** straight*

This passage begins with the sentence “for I perceive that ye are in the **paths** of righteousness”, which is then followed by the sentence “I perceive that ye are in the **path** which leads to the kingdom

of God”. The virtual identity of the beginning of these two sentences led scribe 2 of  $\mathcal{P}$  to write the plural *paths* both times, but apparently the original manuscript (no longer extant here) read *path* in the second instance. Note also that the verb in the following relative clause is the third person singular *leads*, thus supporting the singular *path* (“the **path** which **leads** to the kingdom of God”). Scribe 2 of  $\mathcal{P}$  immediately caught his error here and erased the plural *s* at the end of the second instance of *path(s)*. These two cases of *path(s)* are then followed by a third case: “yea I perceive that ye are making his **paths** straight”. Here we return to the plural *paths*.

Interestingly, this passage says there are various paths of righteousness, even God’s paths, but figuratively there is one path that leads to the kingdom of God. This distinction in number is preserved elsewhere in the text:

- God’s **paths** of righteousness:

1 Nephi 16:5	that they would walk in the <b>paths</b> of righteousness
2 Nephi 9:41	remember that his <b>paths</b> are righteousness

- a single **path** leads to eternal life (the kingdom of God):

2 Nephi 31:18	this straight and narrow <b>path</b> which leads to eternal life
2 Nephi 33:9	and walk in the strait <b>path</b> which leads to life and continue in the <b>path</b>

- God’s **paths** are straight:

1 Nephi 10:8	and make his <b>paths</b> straight
Alma 7:9	and walk in his <b>paths</b> which are straight
Alma 37:12	and his <b>paths</b> are straight

Thus in Alma 7:19 the shifting in number for *path(s)* is actually consistent with usage elsewhere in the text.

**Summary:** Follow in Alma 7:19 the immediately corrected reading in  $\mathcal{P}$ : “ye are in the **path** which leads to the kingdom of God”.

#### ■ Alma 7:19–20

*yea I perceive that ye are making his paths [strait 1 | straight ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]  
I perceive that it hath been made known unto you by the testimony of his word  
that he cannot walk in **crooked paths***

As discussed under 1 Nephi 8:20, the text here should read *straight* since the passage uses the language of Isaiah 40:3 as cited in the synoptic Gospels. Also note that the following sentence contrasts the Lord’s straight paths with “crooked paths” that he cannot walk in.

## ■ Alma 7:20–21

neither doth he vary from that which he hath said  
 neither hath he a shadow of turning from the right to the left  
 [or 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQPRT | nor S] from that which is right  
 [or >% to 1 | to ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQPRT] that which is wrong  
 therefore his course is one eternal round  
 [§2 NULL > §1 & 1 | And ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQPRT] he doth not dwell in unholy temples  
 neither can filthiness [or 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQPRT | nor S] any thing which is unclean  
 be received into the kingdom of God

In this passage, the 1953 RLDS edition edited two instances of *or* to *nor*. In both instances, the original *or* seems to be an explanatory *or* (meaning ‘in other words’). The *or*-phrase following “from the right to the left” thus explains that this metaphoric usage means “from that which is right to that which is wrong”. Similarly, the second *or*-phrase explains *filthiness* as “any thing which is unclean”. In these instances, *or* is not equivalent to *nor*: the two 1953 changes to *nor* make the following phrases contrastive rather than explanatory. One clear piece of evidence that the original manuscript itself read *or* rather than *nor* (at least in the first case) is the momentary scribal error that occurred when scribe 2 of  $\mathcal{P}$  initially wrote “**or** that which is wrong”. He would not have written *or* by mistake unless he had just read “**or** from that which is right”. In this instance, scribe 2 immediately caught his error, erased the *or*, and overwrote the erasure with *to*.

Also in this passage, scribe 2 of  $\mathcal{P}$  seems to have omitted an *and* before the clause “he doth not dwell in unholy temples”. Oliver Cowdery, when proofing  $\mathcal{P}$  against  $\mathcal{C}$ , supplied the *and* by supralinearly inserting an ampersand. Since either reading, with or without the *and*, works, Oliver’s correction was probably not the result of editing on his part.

**Summary:** Maintain in Alma 7:20–21 the two original instances of *or*; the conjunction *or* is here used to provide explanation, not contrast; also maintain the connective *and* that Oliver Cowdery supplied when he proofed  $\mathcal{P}$  against  $\mathcal{C}$ .

## ■ Alma 7:24

and then ye will always abound  
 in good [work > works 1 | works ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQPRT]  
 [, 1 |; ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQPQS |. RT]

Scribe 2 of  $\mathcal{P}$  initially wrote the singular *work*; immediately afterwards, he added the plural *s* inline and then a comma after the *s*. (Sometimes scribe 2 of  $\mathcal{P}$  added punctuation as he copied from  $\mathcal{C}$  into  $\mathcal{P}$ , either a period or a comma or something in-between.) The original manuscript undoubtedly read in the plural. Elsewhere, there are 21 references to “good works” but none to “good work”. In fact, later on in his copywork, scribe 2 of  $\mathcal{P}$  continued to make the same initial error of writing *work* in place of *works*:

Alma 12:32  
 the [work > works 1 | works ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQPRT] of justice

3 Nephi 21:5

these [*work* >+ *works* 1 | *works* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]  
 and the [*work* 1PS | *works* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]  
 which shall be wrought among you hereafter

3 Nephi 26:4

to be judged of their [*work* > *works* 1 | *works* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]  
 whether they be good or whether they be evil

3 Nephi 28:33

all the marvelous [*work* > *works* 1 | *works* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] of Christ

Mormon 9:26

the [*work* > *works* 1 | *works* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] of the Lord

The example in 3 Nephi 21:5 involves at least one instance, perhaps two, where scribe 2 of  $\mathcal{P}$  miswrote *works* as *work* (see the discussion under that passage).

**Summary:** Maintain in Alma 7:24 scribe 2 of  $\mathcal{P}$ 's corrected plural “good works”; the text otherwise refers to “good works”, never to “good work”.

#### ■ Alma 7:26

*I have spoken these* [§2 NULL > §1 *words* 1 | *words* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *unto you*

Oliver Cowdery's addition of *words* could have been due to editing since what scribe 2 of  $\mathcal{P}$  wrote (“I have spoken these unto you”) definitely seems strange. Another possibility, if Oliver himself thought up the emendation, would have been to insert the word *things*. Usage in both the Book of Mormon and the King James Bible supports the phraseology “to speak these words” or “to speak these things”, with the following statistics for those cases where *these words* or *these things* serves as the direct object after the verb *speak* (here Alma 7:26 is excluded):

	<i>these words</i>	<i>these things</i>
the Book of Mormon	37	5
the King James Bible	18	6

But there are no instances of “to speak these” in either the Book of Mormon or the King James Bible; this result suggests that “I have spoken these unto you” is missing the head noun for its direct object. When we consider those specific cases where the direct object follows the verb *speak*, we get the following statistics for the small and large plates (once more Alma 7:26 is excluded):

	<i>these words</i>	<i>these things</i>
the small plates of Nephi	10	5
the abridged large plates of Nephi	27	0

Since Alma 7:26 is in the abridged portion of the large plates, *these words* is more probable than *these things* when the verb *speak* precedes. The critical text will therefore accept Oliver Cowdery's correction in Alma 7:26. Even if  $\mathcal{O}$  itself read without *words*, Oliver's correction (as an emendation on his part) would still probably be the original reading.

*Summary:* Accept in Alma 7:26 Oliver Cowdery’s inserted *words*, which was probably the reading of the original text (namely, “I have spoken **these words** unto you”) rather than the initial reading in  $\mathcal{P}$  (“I have spoken **these** unto you”) or the alternative emendation “I have spoken **these things** unto you”.

■ **Alma 7:27**

*and now may the peace of God rest upon you  
and upon your houses and lands  
and upon your flocks and herds and all that you possess  
[ 1 |; ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQS |, RT]  
your women and your children*

One wonders here if there is a missing *and* before “your women and your children”. There is even a possibility that the preposition *upon* is also missing, although it should be noted that for the previous noun phrase there is no preposition either: “and all that you possess”. Moreover, the loss of a single character, an ampersand, would be more plausible than the loss of the longer & *upon*.

It is doubtful that “your women and your children” should be considered as belonging to the general class of “all that you possess”. One could, I suppose, consider the 1920 LDS change in punctuation (from the 1830 semicolon to a comma) as making this interpretation, but it is more likely that the 1920 change in punctuation was simply an attempt to make sure that “your women and your children” would be considered part of the larger list (all the way from “upon you” to “your women and your children”). Elsewhere, the text uses the verb *possess* to refer to actual possessions (physical objects as well as lands and cities) but not to family members.

Sometimes lists in the Book of Mormon lack the expected conjunction between pairs of related conjuncts, as in the following example where no *and* is used to separate three pairs of conjunctive noun phrases:

Alma 43:20  
they had only **their** swords and **their** scimitars  
**their** bows and **their** arrows  
**their** stones and **their** slings

Similarly in Alma 7:27, the list ends with a pair of related conjuncts, “your women and your children”. Notice, in particular, the repetition of the determiner *your* in this conjunctive noun phrase (just like in Alma 43:20, where the determiner *their* is consistently repeated). The critical text will therefore maintain the earliest reading without the normally expected *and* before “your women and your children”, even though there is a possibility that this conjunctive phrase may be missing a preceding *and*.

*Summary:* Maintain in Alma 7:27 the conjunctive noun phrase “your women and your children” without any preceding conjunction *and*; there is some evidence for this kind of asyndetic coordination elsewhere in the text.

## ■ Alma 7:27

*and now may the peace of God rest upon you  
and upon your houses and lands  
and upon your flocks and herds and all that you possess  
your women and your children  
according to your faith and good [works 1ABDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST | words C]*

Here the compositor for the 1840 edition accidentally set the visually similar *words* instead of the correct *works*. Elsewhere in the text, *works*, never *words*, is associated with *faith* (eight times), including two that read *good works*:

Alma 13:3            on account of their exceeding faith and **good works**  
Alma 26:22        he that repenteth and exerciseth faith and bringeth forth **good works**

This obvious 1840 error has never been perpetuated in any subsequent edition. But there are at least ten other cases in the text where the visually similar *works* and *words* have been mixed up. For a list of these cases, see under Alma 12:12–14.

**Summary:** Maintain the original reading “according to your faith and good **works**” in Alma 7:27.

## ■ Alma 7:27

*according to your faith and good works from this time  
[hense > NULL 1 | ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] forth  
[§2 and > §1 & 1 | and ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] forever*

Scribe 2 of  $\mathcal{P}$  initially wrote “from this time henceforth and forever”; then he deleted the *hence* (spelled as *hense* and separated from the following *forth* by a space). There is no other instance in the Book of Mormon text of the expression “from this time forth and forever”, so one may wonder whether scribe 2’s correction here may involve some incompleteness or difficulty in the transmission. We note, for instance, that Oliver Cowdery (when he proofed  $\mathcal{P}$  against  $\mathcal{O}$ ) initially crossed out the *and* of “forth and forever” but ended up restoring the word by supralinearly inserting an ampersand. Obviously, he wasn’t simply correcting the writing of the *and* with the ampersand since he otherwise left scribe 2’s *and*’s in the manuscript.

One possibility is that in Alma 7:27 scribe 2 of  $\mathcal{P}$  crossed out only part of what he should have—that is, he should have crossed out not only *hence* (spelled as *hense*) but also *and forever*. In other words, perhaps the original text read simply as “from this time forth”, which might make better sense when speaking of one’s houses, lands, flocks, herds, and physical possessions (which presumably would not actually last forever):

Alma 7:27 (possible emendation)  
and now may the peace of God rest upon you  
and upon your houses and lands  
and upon your flocks and herds and all that you possess  
your women and your children  
according to your faith and good works  
**from this time forth**

On the other hand, one could argue that an expression like “from this time . . . and forever” does not literally mean ‘for eternity’ but simply for the entire time period that is appropriate to the situation, as in Alma 20:26: “I will grant unto you that my son may retain his kingdom from this time and forever”.

Another possibility for Alma 7:27 is that scribe 2 of  $\mathcal{P}$  crossed out *hense* because he intended to correct this spelling to *hence*, but then he neglected to do so. In other words, the original manuscript read “from this time henceforth and forever” except that *henceforth* was spelled *hense forth*. Scribe 2 of  $\mathcal{P}$  otherwise spells *henceforth* with the *c* and as one word (that is, according to the standard spelling):

Alma 3:14	hinceforth >% henceforth
Alma 3:17	henceforth
3 Nephi 20:36	henceforth

On the other hand, Oliver Cowdery sometimes spelled *henceforth* as either *hense forth* or *henseforth* (in 3 out of 11 passages). For each of the three passages, the spelling with the *s* is in the printer’s manuscript:

Alma 45:17	henseforth
Helaman 12:19	hense forth > hence forth
Ether 2:8	hense forth

Only one of Oliver’s spellings for *henceforth* is extant in  $\mathcal{C}$ , in Alma 45:17, and there the word is spelled as *hence forth*, unlike the *henseforth* in  $\mathcal{P}$ . But given the frequency in  $\mathcal{P}$  with which Oliver misspelled *henceforth* with an *s*, he probably also spelled some instances of *henceforth* in  $\mathcal{C}$  with an *s*. In other words, scribe 2 of  $\mathcal{P}$  could have spelled the word as *hense forth* when he initially wrote it in Alma 7:27 because Oliver’s spelling in the original manuscript was *hense forth*. Of course, this whole argument depends on the claim that scribe 2 avoided spelling *henceforth* as *hense forth* and that he tended to replace Oliver’s nonstandard spellings with his own.

One major problem with these two suggested emendations (each one assuming an incomplete correction on the part of scribe 2 of  $\mathcal{P}$ ) is that Oliver Cowdery, when he proofed  $\mathcal{P}$  against  $\mathcal{C}$ , never further corrected scribe 2’s emendation (although, as noted above, Oliver did end up rewriting the *and* of “from this time forth and forever” with an ampersand).

Moreover, we can find some evidence from the King James Bible in support of scribe 2’s corrected reading in  $\mathcal{P}$ :

Psalm 113:2  
blessed be the name of the LORD  
**from this time forth and forevermore**

Psalm 115:18  
but we will bless the LORD  
**from this time forth and forevermore**

Psalm 121:8  
the LORD shall preserve thy going out and thy coming in  
**from this time forth and even forevermore**



In each of these biblical examples, the phrase “from this time forth” is followed by “and (even) forevermore”, not the same as the Book of Mormon’s “and forever”, but close. In any event, the biblical expression suggests that “from this time forth and forever” (the corrected reading in  $\mathcal{P}$  for Alma 7:27) is possible.

Finally, the strongest evidence against emending the corrected reading in  $\mathcal{P}$  for Alma 7:27 is the sheer variety of expressions in the Book of Mormon text that refer to future time and begin with either “from this time” or “from that time”, some of which occur only once (just like “from this time forth and forever” in Alma 7:27):

□ *from this time*

“from this time henceforth and forever”	4 times
“from this time henceforth”	2 times
“from this time forth”	3 times
“from this time forth and forever”	1 time (Alma 7:27)
“from this time forward”	3 times
“from this time and forever”	1 time (Alma 20:26)
“from this time”	2 times

□ *from that time*

“from that time henceforth and forever”	2 times
“from that time henceforth”	1 time (Alma 45:17)
“from that time forth”	10 times
“from that time forward”	2 times
“from that time”	4 times

Given this immense variety, the critical text will maintain the unique reading “from this time forth and forever” in Alma 7:27, scribe 2’s corrected reading in  $\mathcal{P}$  (and left unchanged by Oliver Cowdery when he proofed  $\mathcal{P}$  against  $\mathcal{C}$ ).

**Summary:** Accept in Alma 7:27 scribe 2’s corrected reading in  $\mathcal{P}$ , “from this time forth and forever”; this unique expression is supported by similar phraseology in the Psalms of the King James Bible as well as by the overall variety in the Book of Mormon for expressions that start out with either “from this time” or “from that time”.

# Alma 8

## ■ Alma 8:1

*And [§2 NULL > §1 now 1 | now ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] it came to pass that Alma returned from the land of Gideon*

Here scribe 2 of  $\mathcal{P}$  accidentally omitted the narrative adverb *now*. Oliver Cowdery, in his proofing of  $\mathcal{P}$  against  $\mathcal{C}$ , supplied the *now*. Since either reading is possible, Oliver’s correction was undoubtedly the reading in  $\mathcal{C}$ . Earlier, in Alma 5:6, scribe 2 of  $\mathcal{P}$  omitted such a *now*; in that instance, scribe 2 caught his error (see that passage for discussion). Here in Alma 8:1, Oliver provided the *now*. There are three other instances in  $\mathcal{P}$  where scribe 2 omitted the adverb *now*, and in each case Oliver supplied it:

Alma 11:25

and [§2 NULL > §1 now 1 | now ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] behold  
for this great evil thou shalt have thy reward

3 Nephi 20:10

behold [§2 NULL > §1 now 1 | now ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]  
I finish the commandment  
which the Father hath commanded me concerning this people

3 Nephi 27:30

and [§2 NULL > §1 now 1 | now ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] behold  
my joy is great even unto fullness

Note that the example in 3 Nephi 20:10 is not an instance of the narrative *now*; instead, in this case the *now* means ‘at this present time’. The two others are examples of the narrative adverb *now*.

**Summary:** Maintain in Alma 8:1 the narrative adverb *now* that scribe 2 of  $\mathcal{P}$  omitted but Oliver Cowdery supplied in his proofing of  $\mathcal{P}$  against  $\mathcal{C}$ .

## ■ Alma 8:4

*and he began to [preach > NULL 1 | ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] teach the people in the land of Melek*

Scribe 2 of  $\mathcal{P}$  initially miswrote the word *teach* as *preach*. He immediately crossed out the incorrect *preach* and wrote the correct *teach* inline. Both words are, of course, semantically related; in fact, in some instances in the text, *preach* and *teach* are conjoined (as in Alma 23:4: “to preach and to

teach the word of God among them”). Thus it is not surprising that there are other instances in the history of the text where *teach* and *preach* have been mixed up:

Alma 23:3 (the 1888 LDS edition replaced *preach* with *teach*)  
 and thus they might go forth  
 and [*preach* 01ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST | *teach* ] the word  
 according to their desires

Alma 38:15 (Oliver Cowdery initially replaced *teach* with *preach* in  $\mathcal{C}$ )  
 now go my son  
 and [*preach* >% *teach* 0 | *teach* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST] the word  
 unto this people

In each instance, we let the earliest textual sources determine whether the word is *teach* or *preach*.

A similar example where scribe 2 of  $\mathcal{P}$  deleted a word that he had expected, but which was wrong, is found later on in Alma 8, namely in verse 10. There he initially wrote “wrestling with God in mighty **power**”; but then he immediately crossed out *power* and wrote inline the correct (and visually similar) *prayer*. It’s possible that scribe 2 was thinking of Jacob wrestling with God (as described in Genesis 32:24–32).

**Summary:** Maintain the verb *teach* in Alma 8:4 and *prayer* in Alma 8:10, immediately corrected readings in  $\mathcal{P}$ .

#### ■ Alma 8:4

*and he began to teach **the** people in the land of Melek  
 according to the holy order of God by which he had been called  
 and he began to teach [§2 NULL > §1 the 1 | the ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST] people  
 throughout all the land of Melek*

In this passage, scribe 2 of  $\mathcal{P}$  did not write the definite article *the* before the second occurrence of *people*; Oliver Cowdery supplied it when he proofed  $\mathcal{P}$  against  $\mathcal{C}$ . There are many examples in the printer’s manuscript where scribe 2 initially omitted the definite article *the* or it was supplied later by Oliver when he proofed  $\mathcal{P}$  (see the list under Alma 2:4), so one could presume here that the *the* was originally in  $\mathcal{C}$  and scribe 2 omitted it. On the other hand, it is possible that Oliver’s addition of *the* was due to conscious editing on his part since there is the preceding sentence in this passage that refers to Alma’s teaching of the people in Melek: “and he began to **teach the people** in the land of Melek”. In other words, one could argue that the virtual identity of that sentence with the following “and he began to **teach people** throughout all the land of Melek” led Oliver to emend that instance of “teach people” to “teach **the** people”; it’s even possible that the change occurred accidentally, with Oliver’s eye straying back two lines in  $\mathcal{C}$  as he proofed  $\mathcal{P}$  against  $\mathcal{C}$ .

In almost all instances, the word *people* in the Book of Mormon text is preceded by a determiner of some kind (like *the*, *a*, *his*, *this*, *all*, and so forth). There are only a few examples where *people* is used in a nondeterminative or partitive sense (none of which refer to teaching people):

1 Nephi 8:21	and I saw numberless concourses <b>of people</b>
1 Nephi 8:27	and it was filled <b>with people</b>
1 Nephi 12:1	and I beheld multitudes <b>of people</b>
1 Nephi 19:22	that they might know concerning the doings of the Lord in other lands <b>among people</b> of old
Alma 24:26	and those which had been slain were <b>righteous people</b>

In addition, there is one passage where Oliver Cowdery himself twice omitted the definite article *the* before *people*, initially when he took down Joseph Smith’s dictation and permanently when he copied the text from  $\mathcal{C}$  into  $\mathcal{P}$ :

Alma 32:2  
they began to have success among the poorer class  
of [NULL >+ *the* 0 | 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST] people

See under Alma 32:2 for additional discussion of this example (which also involves the replacement of *poorer* with *poor* when Oliver copied the text into  $\mathcal{P}$ ). This example shows that there was a minor tendency on Oliver’s part to replace determinative uses of *people* with partitive ones.

In any event, the original reading in  $\mathcal{P}$  for Alma 8:4 (namely, “he began to **teach people** throughout all the land of Melek”) is theoretically possible. Yet elsewhere when the verb is *teach*, the text consistently prefers “teach **the** people” over “teach people” when there is a choice, as in the following list (where I include the first example of “teach the people” in Alma 8:4, for which the text is firm):

Mosiah 6:3	and also had appointed priests to <b>teach the people</b>
Mosiah 18:25	that they should gather themselves together to <b>teach the people</b>
Mosiah 27:32	Alma began from this time forward to <b>teach the people</b>
Alma 8:4	and he began to <b>teach the people</b> in the land of Melek
3 Nephi 26:13	the Lord truly did <b>teach the people</b> for the space of three days

Overall, the evidence indicates that the original text for Alma 8:4 probably read with the definite article *the* in both instances: “and he began to teach **the** people in the land of Melek . . . and he began to teach **the** people throughout all the land of Melek”.

**Summary:** Accept in Alma 8:4 Oliver Cowdery’s inserted *the* as the reading of the original text; the definite article is expected before *people* in this context; in addition, there is considerable evidence that scribe 2 of  $\mathcal{P}$  frequently omitted the definite article.

#### ■ Alma 8:5

*and it came to pass that the people came to him*  
[§2 NULL > §1 *throughout* 1 | *throughout* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST] *all the borders of the land*  
*which was by the wilderness side*

Here in the printer’s manuscript, Oliver Cowdery supplied the preposition *throughout*, probably because the original manuscript had *throughout*. It is possible that  $\mathcal{C}$  itself was missing the preposition and that Oliver himself decided that the missing preposition was *throughout*. Elsewhere there are 50 instances of “throughout . . . the land”, including two more in the larger passage here:

Alma 8:4–5 (the corrected reading in  $\mathcal{D}$ )

- (1) and he began to teach the people **throughout** all the land of Melek  
and it came to pass that the people came to him throughout all the borders  
of the land which was by the wilderness side
- (2) and it came to pass that they were baptized **throughout** all the land

Perhaps Oliver decided on his own to insert *throughout* because of the preceding and following occurrences of that preposition.

In Alma 8:5, the term *borders* refers to bordering regions, not boundaries separating different lands. Such usage is found elsewhere in the text, as in Alma 5:3: “he began to establish a church in the land which was in the **borders** of Nephi / yea the land was called the land of Mormon”. Since *borders* in Alma 8:5 seems to mean ‘bordering regions’, other possible prepositions in lieu of *throughout* include *through*, *in*, *within*, *among*, and *out of* (each of which occurs elsewhere in the text with the noun *borders*). Since there is no clear alternative to *throughout*, the critical text will maintain Oliver’s correction, under the assumption that *throughout* was the reading of the original manuscript.

**Summary:** Accept in Alma 8:5 Oliver Cowdery’s inserted *throughout* as the probable reading of the original text, although other prepositions are possible.

#### ■ Alma 8:6

*and he came to a city which was called*

[ $\mathfrak{S}2$  *Ammonidah* >  $\mathfrak{S}1$  *Ammonihah* 1 | *Ammonihah* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]

The name *Ammonihah* shows some variation in the manuscripts, although ultimately it appears that the correct spelling is *Ammonihah*. But prior to Alma 49, none of the instances of *Ammonihah* are extant in  $\mathcal{C}$ . For the first six times that scribe 2 of  $\mathcal{D}$  copied the name *Ammonihah* from  $\mathcal{C}$  into  $\mathcal{D}$  (from Alma 8:6 through Alma 8:16), he miswrote the name as *Ammonidah*. In each of these six instances, Oliver Cowdery later corrected the *d* to an *h* when he proofed  $\mathcal{D}$  against  $\mathcal{C}$ :

	$\mathcal{C}$	$\mathcal{D}$
1	Alma 8:6	— $\mathfrak{S}2$ <i>Ammonidah</i> > $\mathfrak{S}1$ <i>Ammonihah</i>
2	Alma 8:7	— $\mathfrak{S}2$ <i>Ammonidah</i> > $\mathfrak{S}1$ <i>Ammonihah</i>
3	Alma 8:8	— $\mathfrak{S}2$ <i>Ammonidah</i> > $\mathfrak{S}1$ <i>Ammonihah</i>
4	Alma 8:9	— $\mathfrak{S}2$ <i>Ammonidah</i> > $\mathfrak{S}1$ <i>Ammonihah</i>
5	Alma 8:14	— $\mathfrak{S}2$ <i>Ammonidah</i> > $\mathfrak{S}1$ <i>Ammonihah</i>
6	Alma 8:16	— $\mathfrak{S}2$ <i>Ammonidah</i> > $\mathfrak{S}1$ <i>Ammonihah</i>

Undoubtedly,  $\mathcal{C}$  read *Ammonihah* and scribe 2 misread the *d* as *h*. As he continued with his copywork, scribe 2 of  $\mathcal{D}$  wrote this name five more times, the first two correctly:

	$\mathcal{C}$	$\mathcal{D}$
7	Alma 8:18	— <i>Ammonihah</i>
8	Alma 8:18	— <i>Ammonihah</i>

Alma 8

Scribe 2 of  $\mathcal{P}$  wrote his last three instances of *Ammonihah* as *Amonihah* (with only one *m*), but each instance has the correct *-hah* ending:

		$\mathcal{O}$	$\mathcal{P}$
9	Alma 9 preface	—	Amonihah
10	Alma 9:1	—	Amonihah
11	Alma 10:1	—	Amonihah

Oliver did not correct the misspelling *Amonihah* in  $\mathcal{P}$ , but the 1830 compositor continued to set the name correctly as *Ammonihah*.

When Oliver Cowdery took over for scribe 2 of  $\mathcal{P}$  (at Alma 13:20), he continued to spell the name as *Amonihah*, nine times from Alma 14 through Alma 16:

		$\mathcal{O}$	$\mathcal{P}$
12	Alma 14:23	—	Amonihah
13	Alma 15:1	—	Amonihah
14	Alma 15:15	—	Amonihah
15	Alma 15:16	—	Amonihah
16	Alma 16:2	—	Amonihah
17	Alma 16:3	—	Amonihah
18	Alma 16:9	—	Amonihah
19	Alma 16:9	—	Amonihahites
20	Alma 16:11	—	Amonihah

After some hiatus, in Alma 25:2 Oliver returned to writing the correct spelling in  $\mathcal{P}$ :

		$\mathcal{O}$	$\mathcal{P}$
21	Alma 25:2	—	Ammonihah

The name later appears six times in Alma 49; for five of these six cases, the name is extant in  $\mathcal{O}$  and is spelled correctly by Oliver Cowdery as *Ammonihah*; and in  $\mathcal{P}$  itself, Oliver spells all six instances correctly:

		$\mathcal{O}$	$\mathcal{P}$
22	Alma 49:1	Ammonihah	Ammonihah
23	Alma 49:3	Ammonihah	Ammonihah
24	Alma 49:10	(A            )	Ammonihah
25	Alma 49:11	Ammonihah	Ammonihah
26	Alma 49:14	Ammonihaih > Ammonihah	Ammonihah
27	Alma 49:15	Ammonihah	Ammonihah

Finally, in Helaman 5:10 we have the last occurrence of the name in the text.  $\mathcal{O}$  is not extant there, but Oliver initially wrote the name once more as *Amonihah* in  $\mathcal{P}$ ; but then virtually immediately he corrected it to *Ammonihah* by supralinearly inserting the second *m*:

		$\mathcal{O}$	$\mathcal{P}$
28	Helaman 5:10	—	Amonihah > Ammonihah

This variation suggests the following for how *Ammonihah* was spelled in  $\mathcal{O}$ . First of all, Oliver Cowdery appears to have been the scribe for all 28 instances of *Ammonihah* in  $\mathcal{O}$ . For the first eight occurrences of the name (in Alma 8:6–18), Oliver spelled it correctly as *Ammonihah* (with Joseph Smith probably spelling out the first occurrence of the name for him). But then in the Alma 9 preface, after a brief hiatus in the occurrence of the name, Oliver started to misspell it as *Amonihah* (for a total of 12 times, up through Alma 16:11). But the next gap in the use of the name was considerable (from Alma 16:11 to Alma 25:2); upon reaching Alma 25:2, Oliver seems to have asked Joseph to spell out the name once more. Thus at Alma 25:2 the name was written down correctly in  $\mathcal{O}$ . When Oliver got to Alma 49, he continued with the correct *Ammonihah*, but may have reverted to writing *Amonihah* once more in  $\mathcal{O}$  when he finally got to Helaman 5:10.

When  $\mathcal{O}$  was copied into  $\mathcal{P}$ , scribe 2 of  $\mathcal{P}$  initially misread the first six occurrences of *Ammonihah* as *Ammonidah*, which Oliver Cowdery corrected to *Ammonihah*. The next two instances were correctly spelled by scribe 2 (Oliver had also spelled them correctly in  $\mathcal{O}$ ); but when scribe 2 got to *Amonihah* in the preface to Alma 9, he copied that spelling from  $\mathcal{O}$  into  $\mathcal{P}$ , as did Oliver himself when he started copying the name into  $\mathcal{P}$  at Alma 14:23. When the correct spelling returned to the text in Alma 25:2 and later in Alma 49, Oliver copied them correctly. His last spelling, initially *Amonihah* in  $\mathcal{P}$  (and presumably also in  $\mathcal{O}$ ), was virtually immediately corrected to *Ammonihah* in  $\mathcal{P}$ .

**Summary:** Accept the spelling *Ammonihah* for the name of the city since the earliest (extant) evidence in the manuscripts supports that spelling rather than *Ammonidah* or *Amonihah*.

#### ■ Alma 8:11–12

*and we are not of thy church*

□ *we know that thou hast no power over us* 1\*

□ NULL 1<sup>c</sup>ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST

*and we do not believe in such foolish traditions*

*and now we know that because **we are not of thy church***

*we know that thou hast no power over us*

In his copywork here in  $\mathcal{P}$ , scribe 2's eye skipped down from the first "we are not of thy church" to the second one; thus scribe 2 ended up writing an extra "we know that thou hast no power over us", which Oliver Cowdery later crossed out when he proofed  $\mathcal{P}$  against  $\mathcal{O}$  (the lines used to cross out the text are characteristic of Oliver's crossouts, not scribe 2's). Somehow scribe 2 was able to recover sufficiently from this textual anticipation to include the text that he had initially skipped ("and we do not believe in such foolish traditions and now we know that because we are not of thy church"), but he himself did not cross out the dittography.

Interestingly, this error itself supports the reading of the final sentence where the clause "we know that" is repeated: "and now **we know that** because we are not of thy church / **we know that** thou hast no power over us". Otherwise, we might have supposed that only the subordinate conjunction *that* would have been repeated, as if the text read "and now we know **that** because we

are not of thy church **that** thou hast no power over us”. Here in Alma 8:11–12, the intervening *because*-clause motivates the clausal repetition. As another example of this kind of redundancy, consider the repetitive “that they should commence” in the following passage:

Alma 50:1

And now it came to pass that  
Moroni did not stop making preparations for war  
or to defend themselves against the Lamanites  
for he caused **that his armies should commence**  
in the commencement of the twentieth year of the reign of the judges  
**that they should commence** in digging up heaps of earth  
round about all the cities  
throughout all the land which was possessed by the Nephites

Once more there is some intervening text that leads to the clausal repetition, in this case “in the commencement of the twentieth year of the reign of the judges”.

*Summary:* Accept in Alma 8:11 the corrected reading in  $\mathcal{D}$ , without the extra “we know that thou hast no power over us”; on the other hand, the repetition of “we know that” will be maintained in Alma 8:12 since such clausal redundancy can be found elsewhere in the text.

#### ■ Alma 8:13

*now when the people had said this*  
*and [had 1ABCDGHKPS | EFIJLMNOQRT] 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*

Here the 1849 LDS edition removed the second *had*, probably unintentionally. The subsequent LDS text has continued without this *had*. The following conjoined predicates (“and reviled him and spit upon him and caused that he should be cast out of their city”) also lack the past perfect *had* and have so from the beginning. Elsewhere the text allows for such mixtures of conjoined predicates, some with *had* and some without:

Mosiah 24:21

yea and in the valley of Alma they poured out their thanks to God  
because he **had been** merciful unto them and **eased** their burdens  
and **had delivered** them out of bondage

Helaman 13:33

O that I **had repented** and **had not killed** the prophets  
and **stoned** them and **cast** them out

3 Nephi 8:25

O that we **had repented** before this great and terrible day  
and **had not killed** and **stoned** the prophets and **cast** them out



3 Nephi 26:15

and even **had done** all manner of cures among them  
 and **raised** a man from the dead  
 and **had shewn** forth his power unto them  
 and **had ascended** unto the Father

The two examples in Helaman 13:33 and 3 Nephi 8:25 begin with two predicates headed by *had* and are then followed by at least two more predicates without the *had* (just like originally in Alma 8:13). The two other examples (in Mosiah 24:21 and 3 Nephi 26:15) show that *had* can return after a preceding predicate for which the *had* is lacking. So in any case, we follow the earliest textual sources, thus restoring the omitted *had* in Alma 8:13.

The original *and* before “he departed thence” in Alma 8:13 is a non-English Hebraism that separates the preceding subordinate *when*-clause from its main clause. The 1830 compositor removed this extra *and* when he set the type. As discussed under 1 Nephi 4:8–9, the critical text will restore such instances of *and*. Also see the discussion under HEBRAISMS in volume 3.

**Summary:** Restore the second *had* in Alma 8:13 (“and **had** withstood all his words”), the reading of the earliest textual sources; also restore the Hebraistic use of *and* that originally occurred between the subordinate *when*-clause and its following main clause.

#### ■ Alma 8:13

*now when the people had said this and had withstood all his words  
 and reviled him and spit upon him  
 and [§2 cursed > §1 caused 1 | caused ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]  
 that he should be cast out of their city  
 and he departed thence and took his journey towards the city which was called Aaron*

Scribe 2 of  $\mathcal{P}$  here wrote *cursed* rather than the correct *caused*. The two words are visually similar. In addition, the verb *curse* was probably prompted by the preceding verbs *revile* and *spit*. Oliver Cowdery, in his proofing of  $\mathcal{P}$ , emended the text to the correct *caused*. A similar scribal error is found later on in this chapter; once more Oliver made the correction:

Alma 8:20

therefore go with me into my house  
 and I will impart unto thee  
 of my [§2 favor > §1 food 1 | food ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]

These errors by scribe 2 seem to indicate tiring on his part, especially since in each case the resulting text was quite improbable.

**Summary:** Accept Oliver Cowdery’s corrections in  $\mathcal{P}$  of *cursed* to *caused* in Alma 8:13 and *favor* to *food* in Alma 8:20.

## ■ Alma 8:14

*and it came to pass **that** while he was journeying thither  
being weighed down with sorrow  
wading through much tribulation and anguish of soul  
because of the wickedness of the people which was in the city of Ammonihah  
[and >js NULL 1 | And A | BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] it came to pass  
[that 1ABCDGHKPS | EFIJLMNOQRT] while Alma was thus weighed down with sorrow  
behold an angel of the Lord appeared unto him saying . . .*

As in verse 13, the 1849 LDS edition introduced another simple one-word deletion, this time the subordinate conjunction *that* after the repeated “it came to pass” clause. Since the *that* near the beginning of the verse was retained (“and it came to pass **that** while he was journeying thither”), this 1849 change appears to be unintentional. The subsequent LDS text continues to lack the *that* here. The critical text will, of course, restore the *that*. For general discussion regarding *that* after “it came to pass”, see under THAT in volume 3.

In his editing for the 1837 edition, Joseph Smith removed the *and* that appears before the repeated “it came to pass” clause, thus removing another Hebraistic use of *and* between a subordinate clause (here headed by *while*) and its following main clause. See the discussion for the preceding example in verse 13 involving *when*. For additional examples, see under HEBRAISMS in volume 3.

Note here that the repeated “and it came to pass that” clause is wholly redundant. In his editing for the 1837 edition, Joseph Smith removed some instances of this kind of redundancy, as in 1 Nephi 10:17 and 2 Nephi 4:10 (see the discussion under those passages), but not all. For a complete discussion, see under COME TO PASS in volume 3.

**Summary:** Restore in Alma 8:14 the deleted *that* which originally preceded the second *while*-clause; also restore the Hebraistic use of *and* that follows the first *while*-clause.

## ■ Alma 8:15

*for thou hast been faithful in keeping  
the [commands > commandments 1 | commandments ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] of God  
from the time which thou received thy first message from him*

Here scribe 2 of  $\mathcal{P}$  initially wrote *commandments* as *commands*, but he immediately caught his error, overwrote the *s* with an *m*, and then wrote inline the *ents* to complete the word *commandments*. As discussed under Jacob 2:10, only Jacob uses the phrase “the commands of God”.

**Summary:** Maintain in Alma 8:15 scribe 2’s immediately corrected reading *commandments* in  $\mathcal{P}$ .

## ■ Alma 8:15

*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*

In Early Modern English, the second person singular past-tense verb form typically took the *-(e)st* ending—and almost always *-st* (without the syllabic *e*) when the verb took the regular *-ed*

ending, as discussed on page 165 of Charles Barber, *Early Modern English* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 1997). Here in Alma 8:15, the earliest text has “thou received”, without the expected *-st* ending of Early Modern English. The 1920 LDS edition added the *-st* ending to *received*, but the critical text will restore the original *received*. For past-tense verb forms occurring with the second person singular *thou*, the *-(e)st* ending is sometimes omitted from the earliest Book of Mormon text; see, for instance, the discussion under 2 Nephi 24:12 regarding “thou did” instead of “thou didst”.

**Summary:** Restore in Alma 8:15 the second person singular past-tense form *received* without the expected Early Modern English ending *-st*.

#### ■ Alma 8:15

*behold I am he that delivered it unto [thee 1 | you ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]*

Here the 1830 typesetter accidentally changed *thee* to *you*. But everywhere else in this passage (verses 15–17), the angel uses only the *thou/thee/thy* pronoun forms, never the *ye/you/your* ones:

Alma 8:15–17 (earliest text)

blessed art **thou** Alma  
 therefore lift up **thy** head and rejoice  
 for **thou** hast great cause to rejoice  
 for **thou** hast been faithful in keeping the commandments of God  
 from the time which **thou** received **thy** first message from him  
 behold I am he that delivered it unto **thee**  
 and behold I am sent to command **thee**  
 that **thou** return to the city of Ammonihah . . .  
 for behold they do study at this time  
 that they may destroy the liberty of **thy** people

A similar example of the exclusive use of the *thou/thee/thy* pronoun forms is found in Mosiah 3:3–4 (see the discussion under Mosiah 3:3). Both here and in Mosiah 3:3–4, an angel is speaking (here to Alma, in Mosiah 3:3–4 to king Benjamin). The critical text will maintain the systematic use of the second person singular pronoun forms in both passages.

**Summary:** Restore in Alma 8:15 the *thee* pronoun since in the larger passage (Alma 8:15–17) the angel addresses Alma with only the *thou/thee/thy* pronoun forms.

#### ■ Alma 8:18

*and it came to pass that he entered the city by another way  
 yea by the way which [was 1A | is BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] on the south  
 of the city Ammonihah*

The 1837 edition changed the past-tense *was* to the present-tense *is* here in Alma 8:18. This change in tense appears to be unintentional. It was not marked by Joseph Smith in the printer’s manuscript. Moreover, the Book of Mormon text consistently prefers past-tense verb forms

within past-tense narrative descriptions, including references to geographical location, as in the following example that involves the noun *borders*:

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

As discussed under that passage, every narrative that gives the geographical position with respect to the borders of some place uses the past tense, not the present tense. Here are some additional geographical examples involving words other than *borders* (such as *way*, *land*, and *pass*) that take the past tense:

Mosiah 23:36  
the Lamanites promised unto Alma and his brethren  
that if they would shew them the **way** which **led** to the land of Nephi  
that they would grant unto them their lives and their liberty

Alma 43:5  
and they came into the **land** of Antionum  
which [*was* 01ABCGHKPS | *is* DEFIJLMNOQRT] the land of the Zoramites

Alma 50:34  
and there they did head them by the narrow **pass**  
which **led** by the sea into the land northward

For the example in Alma 43:5, the past-tense *was* was accidentally replaced by the present-tense *is* in the 1841 British edition; this change in tense has been maintained in the LDS text.

**Summary:** Restore the past-tense *was* in the geographical description found in the past-tense narrative of Alma 8:18.

#### ■ Alma 8:18

*yea by the way which was on the south*  
*of the city* [ 1A | *of* BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *Ammonihah*

Here the 1837 typesetter added the preposition *of* between *the city* and *Ammonihah*, probably accidentally. As discussed under 1 Nephi 11:13 (which deals with the phrase “city (of) Jerusalem”), the earliest textual sources determine whether the *of* should occur for any specific instance of “city (of) X”. The same dependence on the earliest sources holds for “land (of) Y” (see the discussion regarding “land (of) Bountiful” under 1 Nephi 17:7).

As far as “city (of) Ammonihah” is concerned, we have examples of both types. There are 11 with the *of* in the earliest text and 3 without the *of* (here I mark each of the latter with an asterisk):

Alma 8:8	to the city <b>of</b> Ammonihah
Alma 8:9	upon the hearts of the people of the city <b>of</b> Ammonihah
Alma 8:14	in the city <b>of</b> Ammonihah
Alma 8:16	to the city <b>of</b> Ammonihah

Alma 8

* Alma 8:18	on the south of the city [ 1A   of BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST ] Ammonihah
Alma 9:1	in the city <b>of</b> Ammonihah
Alma 16:2	into the city <b>of</b> Ammonihah
Alma 16:3	in the city [of 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST   HK] Ammonihah
Alma 49:3	the city <b>of</b> Ammonihah had been rebuilt
Alma 49:10	at the city <b>of</b> Ammonihah
Alma 49:11	at the city <b>of</b> Ammonihah
* Alma 49:14	even to exceed the strength <b>of</b> the city Ammonihah
* Alma 49:15	that they would be frightened at the city [ 01ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST   of s ] Ammonihah
Helaman 5:10	in the city <b>of</b> Ammonihah

As can be seen, there has been some tendency to either remove or add the *of* before *Ammonihah* (besides here in Alma 8:18). Also note that there is no connection between whether *the city* is immediately preceded by *of* and whether *of* occurs after *the city*: we have one example of “**of** the city **of** Ammonihah” (Alma 8:9) and two of “**of** the city Ammonihah” (here in Alma 8:18 and in Alma 49:14). If we consider cases where there is no immediately preceding *of* before *the city*, there are ten with the *of* after *the city* and one without (in Alma 49:15).

**Summary:** In accord with the earliest textual evidence, the critical text will remove the intrusive *of* between *the city* and the name of the city *Ammonihah* in Alma 8:18 (thus restoring “on the south of the city Ammonihah”).

■ Alma 8:18–19

- (1) *now it came to pass that after Alma had received his message from the angel of the Lord he returned speedily to the land of Ammonihah*
- (2) *and [it came to pass that >js NULL 1 | it came to pass that A | BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] he entered the city by another way yea by the way which was on the south of the city Ammonihah*
- (3) *and [It came to pass that 1 | it came to pass that A | BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] as he entered the city he was an hungered and he saith to a man . . .*

As discussed under 1 Nephi 10:17, Joseph Smith removed some instances of the phrase “it came to pass” in his editing for the 1837 edition. Many of these involve a redundant use of the phrase, but here in Alma 8:18–19, the issue was not one of redundancy. Instead, we have a sequence of events for which the frequent use of that phrase in the sequence seemed excessive, so the second and third occurrences of the phrase were removed. The critical text will restore these two instances of “it came to pass” and all others that were in the earliest text. For a complete discussion, see under COME TO PASS in volume 3.

**Summary:** Restore in Alma 8:18–19 the second and third instances of “it came to pass” that occur in close succession after the first instance of the phrase.

## ■ Alma 8:20

*and I know that thou art [a 1ABCDEFGHIJKPRST | an FIJLMNOQ] holy prophet of God*

The Book of Mormon sometimes allows *an* before *h*-initial words, thus treating the *h* in such cases as silent. See, for instance, the discussion under 2 Nephi 13:7 regarding *a/an* before *h*-initial words in the Isaiah quotations found in the Book of Mormon. Here in Alma 8:20, we have *a* before *holy*, what we expect in modern standard English. But the 1852 LDS edition replaced the *a* here with the more biblically styled *an*, and this use of *an holy* was maintained in the LDS text until the 1920 edition.

Elsewhere in the Book of Mormon text, we have at least 15 examples of *a holy*. There is only one possible instance where the original text may have read *an holy*:

Ether 13:5

it should be built up again

[& 1 | a ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] holy city unto the Lord

In this case, the earliest text (the printer's manuscript) reads & *holy*, which implies that Joseph Smith dictated "an holy" but that Oliver Cowdery (the scribe in Ⓞ) misinterpreted it as "and holy". For a complete discussion, see under that passage.

Here in Alma 8:20, the source for the introduction of *an* before *holy* seems to be the biblically styled language in the previous verse, with two instances of *an* before *h*-initial words:

Alma 8:19

and it came to pass that as he entered the city

he was **an hungered** and he saith to a man

will ye give to **an humble** servant of God something to eat

Historically, the archaic expression "to be an hungered" is not a case of the indefinite article *an* (see the discussion under *anhungered* in the Oxford English Dictionary). Interestingly, there are two other instances in the Book of Mormon of the archaic *an hungered* (in Alma 8:26 and Alma 10:7). On the other hand, 2 Nephi 27:3 reads "a hungry man" in a quotation of Isaiah 29:8, which reads "an hungry *man*" in the King James Bible (see the discussion under 2 Nephi 27:3). As far as *humble* is concerned, there are no other examples in the Book of Mormon of the adjective *humble* preceded by the indefinite article.

The King James Bible generally favors *an* before *h*-initial words, but *a* is sometimes found. For example, there are two instances of *a holy* (in Leviticus 27:23 and Isaiah 30:29), in contrast to 41 instances of *an holy*. For *hungered*, *hungry*, and *humble*, the King James Bible has only *an*:

an hungered	9 times (all in the synoptic Gospels)
an hungry	1 time (in Isaiah 29:8)
an humble	1 time (in Proverbs 16:19)

Note that the King James Bible spells *an hungered* as *an hungred*.

In choosing between *a* and *an* before *h*-initial words, the critical text will in each case follow the earliest textual sources. Thus here in Alma 8:20 we have an instance of *a holy*.

**Summary:** Maintain in Alma 8:20 the occurrence of the indefinite article *a* rather than *an* in *a holy*, the reading of the earliest textual sources.

## ■ Alma 8:20

*and I know that thou [will 1ABCGHKPS | wilt DEFIJLMNOQRT] be a blessing unto me and my house*

Here the earliest textual sources read “thou will”, which was changed to the standard biblical “thou wilt” in the 1841 British edition. The LDS text has retained this corrected reading, but the RLDS text has maintained the nonstandard “thou will”. Here we may have an early error in the transmission of the text. In 48 cases the text has an invariant reading for the standard “thou wilt”, but in 5 cases “thou wilt” has been replaced with “thou will” in at least one printed edition:

1 Nephi 1:14 (error first in the 1905 LDS edition)

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

Alma 20:22 (error in the 1849 LDS edition)

behold I will smite thee  
except thou [*wilt* 1ABCDEFGHJKLMNQRST | *will* E] grant unto me that my brethren may be cast out of prison

Alma 20:24 (error in the 1841 British edition)

if thou [*wilt* 1ABCEFGHIJKLMNQRST | *will* D] grant that my brethren may be cast out of prison

Alma 32:17 (error in the 1840 edition)

if thou [*wilt* 01ABCDEFGHJKLMNQRST | *will* C] show unto us a sign from heaven

Helaman 9:20 (error first in the 1837 edition)

if thou [*wilt* 1AHIJKLMNQRST | *will* BCDEFG] tell us

Thus the manuscript occurrence of *will* in Alma 8:20 may very well represent an early error in the transmission of the text.

Nonetheless, there are two instances of “thou will” in Alma 22:16 that are in the original text, it would appear. In that passage, there are three verbs in two *if*-clauses that consistently read in the subjunctive in the earliest extant reading (the printer’s manuscript): “if thou **will** bow down before God / yea if thou **repent** of all thy sins and **will** bow down before God”. See Alma 22:16 for discussion of these instances of “thou will”. More generally, as discussed under Mosiah 12:11, there is evidence that the original text contained a few instances of indicative “thou shall” in addition to the standard “thou shalt”. Thus the critical text will allow instances of “thou will” whenever the earliest textual evidence supports such a nonstandard reading. For a complete discussion of “thou will” and “thou shall”, see under INFLECTIONAL ENDINGS in volume 3.

The online Oxford English Dictionary gives 39 instances of *thou will* and 337 of *thou wilt* (accessed on 28 November 2005); thus we get *will* rather than *wilt* about 10 percent of the time. Wycliffe’s New Testament, dating from 1388, consistently has “thou will” instead of “thou wilt”, as in these examples (accidentals ignored):

Matthew 8:2	if <b>thou will</b> / thou may make me clean
Matthew 15:28	be it done to thee as <b>thou will</b>
Mark 6:22	ask thou of me what <b>thou will</b>

For the citations, see pages 16, 36, and 84 in *The Wycliffe New Testament (1388)*, edited by W. R. Cooper (London: The British Library, 2002). Also compare these results with those of “thou shall” as discussed under Mosiah 12:11.

**Summary:** Restore in Alma 8:20 the nonstandard use of “thou will”, the reading of the earliest textual sources; although “thou will” may be an error for “thou wilt”, there is evidence elsewhere in the text that “thou will” is possible.

#### ■ Alma 8:21

*and it came to pass that the man received him into his house*

*and the man was called Amulek*

*and he brought [§2 NULL > §1 forth 1 | forth ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] bread and meat*

*and [sat 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPS | set RT] before Alma*

Scribe 2 of  $\mathcal{P}$  here wrote “and he brought bread and meat and sat before Alma”, but Oliver Cowdery supralinearly inserted the word *forth* after the verb *brought* when he proofed  $\mathcal{P}$  against  $\mathcal{C}$ . There is some evidence elsewhere that there was some tendency to omit *forth* in the early transmission of the text (see the discussion under 2 Nephi 3:20). It is possible, however, that Oliver decided to add the word *forth* here because of familiarity with the language of the parable of the prodigal son: “**bring forth** the best robe and put *it* on him” (Luke 15:22). More likely, however, the word *forth* was in  $\mathcal{C}$ ; there is no grammatical or strong stylistic motivation to insert the *forth* in this passage.

There are no other examples in the Book of Mormon of bringing forth food and setting it before someone. But there is one example that refers to bringing children forward:

3 Nephi 17:12

so they **brought** their little children

and [sat 1ABCEFGIJKLMNOPQS | set DHKRT] them down upon the ground

round about him

and Jesus stood in the midst

In this instance, the word *forth* is lacking. But there are instances in the King James text where *forth* is found in expressions involving “bringing and setting”:

Genesis 19:16

and while he lingered the men laid hold upon his hand

and upon the hand of his wife and upon the hand of his two daughters

the LORD being merciful unto him

and they **brought** him **forth** and **set** him without the city

Judges 6:18

depart not hence I pray thee until I come unto thee

and **bring forth** my present and **set** *it* before thee

But there are other instances where the *forth* is lacking:

1 Chronicles 16:1

so they **brought** the ark of God and **set** it in the midst of the tent

that David had pitched for it



Acts 5:27

and when they had **brought** them  
they **set** *them* before the council

Thus the *forth* is optional.

Note that in two of these King James examples, the original Hebrew or Greek does not have the expected pronoun after the verb *set*. Thus in the King James text, the pronoun *it* is italicized in Judges 6:18 and the *them* is italicized in Acts 5:27. The language here in Alma 8:21 omits the direct object pronoun (either *them* or *it*) after *sat*: “and he brought forth bread and meat and sat before Alma”.

Note that in both Book of Mormon passages (Alma 8:21 and 3 Nephi 17:12), the original past-tense verb form was the nonstandard *sat*, not the standard *set*. As discussed under Jacob 3:10, there are at least five instances where the earliest text has the nonstandard past-tense *sat* rather than the standard *set*. The critical text will accept the use of *sat* in these instances of “bringing and setting” in Alma 8:21 and 3 Nephi 17:12. Nonetheless, the 1920 LDS grammatical emendation of *sat* to *set* in both instances is correct from a semantic point of view (that is, the verb is transitive).

It is theoretically possible, of course, that the *sat* in the original text for Alma 8:21 could be interpreted as an intransitive—namely, Amulek brought forth the bread and meat and then sat there while Alma ate, much like Abraham when he remained in the presence of his three visitors after serving them:

Genesis 18:7–8

and Abraham ran unto the herd and fetched a calf tender and good  
and gave *it* unto a young man and he hastened to dress it  
and he took butter and milk and the calf which he had dressed  
and **set** *it* before them  
and he stood by them under the tree and they did eat

Of course, Abraham does not sit down with his guests but stands.

As further support for interpreting the verb form *sat* as meaning ‘set’ in Alma 8:21, consider the King James language used to describe the feeding of the five thousand and the four thousand in the synoptic Gospels:

Mark 6:41

and when he had taken the five loaves and the two fishes  
he looked up to heaven and blessed and brake the loaves  
and gave *them* to his disciples to **set** before them

Mark 8:6

and he took the seven loaves and gave thanks and brake  
and gave to his disciples to **set** before *them*  
and they did **set** *them* before the people

Luke 9:16

then he took the five loaves and the two fishes  
and looking up to heaven he blessed them and brake  
and gave to the disciples to **set** before the multitude

These examples show once more that after *set* (or the *sat* of the original Book of Mormon text) we do not need a direct object pronoun, although in two of these cases (in Genesis 18:8 and in the last clause of Mark 8:6) the pronoun, either *it* or *them*, is explicitly provided but is italicized in the King James text because in these cases there is no expressed object in the Hebrew or the Greek.

*Summary:* Maintain in Alma 8:21 the *forth* that Oliver Cowdery added in  $\mathcal{P}$ , apparently when he proofed  $\mathcal{P}$  against  $\mathcal{O}$ ; restore the nonstandard past-tense *sat* in place of the expected *set*; maintain the use of the transitive *sat* without an expressed direct object pronoun such as *it* or *them*.

#### ■ Alma 8:21–22

*and he brought forth bread and meat and sat before Alma  
and it came to pass that*

*Alma ate [ 1 ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST | the N ] bread and he was filled*

The 1906 LDS edition added the definite article *the* before the second occurrence of *bread*, probably because the indefinite *bread* had already been introduced in the previous clause (“he brought forth **bread** and meat”). The occurrence of the definite article *the* before *bread* implies that Alma ate the bread but not the meat (here *meat* seems to mean flesh rather than food in general). In actuality, the phrase “Alma ate bread” as used here in Alma 8:22 simply means that ‘Alma ate (food)’. The only other instance in the Book of Mormon of “eating bread” with the general meaning ‘to eat (food)’ is in 2 Nephi 14:1 (which quotes Isaiah 4:1): “and in that day seven women shall take hold of one man saying : we will eat our own bread and wear our own apparel”. There are quite a few other examples in the King James Bible of this usage, especially in Genesis:

Genesis 31:54

then Jacob offered sacrifice upon the mount  
and called his brethren to **eat bread**  
and they did **eat bread** and tarried all night in the mount

Genesis 43:24–25

and the man brought the men into Joseph’s house and gave *them* water  
and they washed their feet  
and he gave their asses provender  
and they made ready the present against Joseph came at noon  
for they heard that they should **eat bread** there

Genesis 43:31–32

and he washed his face and went out and refrained himself  
and said : set on bread  
and they set on for him by himself  
and for them by themselves  
and for the Egyptians which did eat with him by themselves  
because the Egyptians might not **eat bread** with the Hebrews  
for that *is* an abomination unto the Egyptians

The critical text will therefore maintain the use of *eat bread* in Alma 8:22, with the understanding that it simply means to eat.

*Summary:* In Alma 8:22 there is no need for the definite article *the* before *bread*; the phrase “to eat bread” means ‘to eat (food)’.

■ **Alma 8:22–23**

*and it came to pass that Alma ate bread  
and [§2 NULL > §1 he 1| ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] was filled  
and he blessed Amulek and his house  
and he gave thanks unto God  
and after he had eat **and was filled**  
he saith unto Amulek . . .*

Oliver Cowdery corrected scribe 2’s text here in  $\mathcal{D}$  by inserting the subject pronoun *he* before *was filled* in verse 22. The question is whether Oliver added the *he* in verse 22 to make the text agree with the original manuscript (no longer extant here) or whether Oliver’s *he* was an attempt to edit the text, perhaps because the two immediately following clauses have the pronoun *he*: “and **he** blessed Amulek and his house and **he** gave thanks unto God”. But Oliver did not change the following instance (in verse 23) of “after he had eat and was filled” by adding *he* there, yet in that case the immediately following clause has the pronoun *he* (“he saith unto Amulek”). Ultimately, the 1830 typesetter ignored Oliver’s supralinearly inserted *he* in verse 22, setting simply “and was filled” there (as well as in verse 23).

Elsewhere, after referring to eating, the text has two instances of “and was/were filled”—and in both cases the subject is ellipted before the conjoined predicate:

3 Nephi 18:4–5  
and when they had eat **and were filled**  
he commanded that they should give unto the multitude  
and when the multitude had eaten **and were filled**  
he saith unto the disciples . . .

Further, the King James Bible is full of examples of the form “did eat and were filled”—and without any stated subject before the predicate “were filled”:

Nehemiah 9:25	so they did eat and were filled
Psalms 78:29	so they did eat and were well filled
Matthew 14:20	and they did all eat and were filled
Matthew 15:37	and they did all eat and were filled
Mark 6:42	and they did all eat and were filled
Mark 8:8	so they did eat and were filled
Luke 9:17	and they did eat and were all filled
John 6:26	but because ye did eat of the loaves and were filled

Most probably, the 1830 typesetter was influenced by the familiarity of the language from the synoptic Gospels (especially the stories of the feeding of the five thousand and the four thousand) when he decided to ignore Oliver Cowdery’s extra *he*. Yet in Alma 8:22 the text actually reads “Alma ate bread”, not “Alma did eat”; thus the expected “and was filled” is not as automatic as one might suppose.

Ultimately, there would not have been any strong motivation for Oliver Cowdery to consciously emend “and was filled” in Alma 8:22 to the unexpected “and **he** was filled”. The familiar biblical usage and the language in Alma 8:23 led scribe 2 of  $\mathcal{P}$  and the 1830 typesetter to omit the subject in “and was filled”. The most reasonable solution in Alma 8:22 is that  $\mathcal{C}$  itself read “and **he** was filled”. Thus the critical text will accept Oliver’s correction here as the original reading.

*Summary:* Restore Oliver Cowdery’s inserted *he* in Alma 8:22, the corrected reading in  $\mathcal{P}$  and the probable reading in  $\mathcal{C}$  (no longer extant here).

### ■ Alma 8:23

*and after he had [eat 1ABCDEFGHJKLP | eat > eaten M | eaten NOQRST] and was filled  
he saith unto Amulek . . .*

Sometimes the earliest reading in the text has the nonstandard form *eat* rather than the standard form *eaten* for the past participle of the verb *eat*, as here in Alma 8:23 and in three other places in the text:

3 Nephi 18:4

and when they had [eat 1ABCDEFGHJLNP | eaten HKOQRST | eat > eaten M]  
and were filled

3 Nephi 20:4

and when they had [eat >js eaten 1 | eat A | eaten BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]

3 Nephi 20:9

now when the multitude had all [eat 1A | eaten BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]  
and [drank 1A | drunk BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]

These four instances of *had eat* have been grammatically edited to *had eaten* in the standard text, beginning with the 1837 edition for the last two instances and in later editions for the other two. Elsewhere in the earliest text we get the standard *eaten* (the first three are from Isaiah quotations):

2 Nephi 13:14

for ye **have eaten** up the vineyard

2 Nephi 15:5

and it **shall be eaten** up

2 Nephi 16:13

and they shall return and **shall be eaten** as a teil tree

3 Nephi 6:2

they **had** not **eaten** up all their provisions

3 Nephi 18:5

and when the multitude **had eaten** and were filled

The original text has numerous examples where the past participle takes on the same form as the simple past tense, such as *came* for *come*, *smote* for *smitten*, and *went* for *gone*. (For a complete list of such examples in the original text, see under PAST PARTICIPLE in volume 3.) The last example of “had eat” (in 3 Nephi 20:9) suggests that the past participial *eat*, like the past participial *drank*, is derived from the simple past-tense form of the verb. According to the Oxford English Dictionary, the simple past-tense form *ate* was historically and dialectally often pronounced as /it/ or /ɛt/ (in addition to the standard /eit/). The OED’s list of spellings for the past participle of the verb *eat* show that both *ate* and *eat* served as alternative past participial forms from Early Modern English up into the 1800s. It appears that Joseph Smith dictated instances of *had eat* with either the /it/

or /ɛt/ pronunciation. If Joseph had dictated *had ate* (that is, with the pronunciation /eit/), then the scribe probably would have written down *had ate* rather than *had eat*. The simple past-tense *ate* appears twice in the Book of Mormon text and is spelled both times as *ate* rather than as *eat* or *et*, which suggests the pronunciation /eit/ for those two cases:

Alma 8:22	Alma <b>ate</b> bread and he was filled
Ether 15:26	and it came to pass that they <b>ate</b> and slept

Irrespective of the pronunciation of *eat* in *had eat*, the critical text will restore the four original instances of *had eat* (but leave the five other instances of *had eaten*).

**Summary:** Restore the original past participial form *eat* in Alma 8:23 and in three other places in the text where it shows up in the earliest textual sources: 3 Nephi 18:4, 3 Nephi 20:4, and 3 Nephi 20:9.

### ■ Alma 8:23

*I am Alma and am the high priest  
over the [churches 1 | church ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] of God throughout the land*

The 1830 typesetter replaced the plural *churches* with the singular *church*, undoubtedly because he expected the singular “church of God”. But elsewhere in the text there are ten occurrences of the plural *churches* that refer to different congregations all belonging to the same organization (indeed to the true church, not different sects, as explained in Mosiah 25:22, cited below):

Mosiah 25:19  
and it came to pass that king Mosiah granted unto Alma  
that he might establish **churches** throughout all the land of Zarahemla

Mosiah 25:21  
therefore they did assemble themselves together in different bodies  
being called **churches** / every church having their priests and their teachers

Mosiah 25:22  
and thus notwithstanding there being many **churches**  
they were all one church yea even the church of God

Mosiah 25:22  
for there was nothing preached in all the **churches**  
except it were repentance and faith in God

Mosiah 25:23  
and now there was seven **churches** in the land of Zarahemla

Mosiah 25:23  
and it came to pass that whosoever was desirous  
to take upon them the name of Christ or of God  
they did join the **churches** of God

Mosiah 27:3  
and there was a strict command throughout all the **churches**  
that there should be no persecutions among them

Alma 23:4

Aaron and his brethren went forth  
from city to city and from one house of worship to another  
establishing **churches** and consecrating priests and teachers throughout the land

Alma 45:22

and it came to pass that they did appoint priests and teachers  
throughout all the land over all the **churches**

Alma 45:23

after Helaman and his brethren had appointed priests and teachers  
over the **churches** . . .

Note, in particular, that Mosiah 25:23 has the phrase “the churches of God”, just like originally in Alma 8:23. The use of *church* with the meaning ‘congregation’ is also found in the New Testament, as in Romans 16:16 (“the churches of Christ salute you”) and 1 Corinthians 11:16 (“we have no such custom neither the churches of God”).

**Summary:** Restore the plural “churches of God” in Alma 8:23, the reading of the printer’s manuscript (the earliest extant source); the text frequently refers to the individual congregations as churches.

#### ■ Alma 8:26

*and now Amulek  
because thou hast fed me  
and [took 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPS | taken RT] me in  
thou art blessed*

In most instances the past participle for the verb *take* is the standard *taken*, but in at least six instances the original text read *took*, which is equivalent to the simple past-tense form for the verb. The critical text will in each case follow the evidence from the earliest reading. For a complete listing of the other instances of past participial *took*, see under PAST PARTICIPLES in volume 3. For discussion regarding a complicated example, see under Alma 47:1.

There is some possibility here in Alma 8:26 that the *took* could be interpreted as a simple past-tense form of the verb rather than as an implied instance of *hast took*. For discussion of this possibility, see under 1 Nephi 1:14 (which originally read “when my father had read and **saw** many great and marvelous things”). There are three other examples of conjoined *took* that could be interpreted as either a simple past-tense form or as a past participle:

Alma 24:10

and also that he **hath** forgiven us of these our many sins and murders  
which we have committed  
and [*took* 01ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPS | *taken* RT] away the guilt from our hearts

Helaman 11:24

there were a certain number of the dissenters from the people of Nephi  
which **had** some years before gone over unto the Lamanites  
and [*took* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPS | *taken* RT] upon themselves the name  
of Lamanites

4 Nephi 1:20  
 and there was still peace in the land  
 save it were a small part of the people which **had** revolted from the church  
 and [*took* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPS | *taken* RT] upon them the name of Lamanites

As far as the critical text is concerned, the original *took* will be restored in all these cases.

**Summary:** Restore the nonstandard use of *took* whenever it is supported by the earliest textual sources, as in Alma 8:26: “because thou hast fed me and **took** me in”.

#### ■ Alma 8:29

*go forth* [§2 NULL > §1 & 1 | *and* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *prophesy unto this people saying* . . .

Here scribe 2 of  $\mathcal{P}$  appears to have accidentally missed the *and* after “go forth”. Oliver Cowdery inserted an ampersand, probably based on the reading of the original manuscript. Elsewhere in the text, we always get an *and* after an imperative “go forth” and before a following imperative:

2 Nephi 17:3	go forth now to meet Ahaz . . . <b>and</b> say unto him . . .
Mosiah 11:20	go forth <b>and</b> say unto this people . . .
Alma 5:51	go forth <b>and</b> say unto this people . . .
Alma 7:15	come and go forth <b>and</b> show unto your God that . . .
Alma 17:11	go forth among the Lamanites thy brethren <b>and</b> establish my word
3 Nephi 11:41	go forth unto this people <b>and</b> declare the words which I have spoken

Thus Oliver’s correction is consistent with usage elsewhere in the text.

**Summary:** Maintain in Alma 8:29 the *and* after “go forth”, Oliver Cowdery’s corrected reading in  $\mathcal{P}$ ; this reading is consistent with all other instances of this imperative construction in the text (as “go forth **and** <do something>”).

#### ■ Alma 8:29

*yea* [& 1 | *and* ABCDEFGIJKLMNOPQRST | HK] *I will not turn my fierce anger away*

In this passage the 1874 RLDS edition dropped the *and* after *yea*. As discussed under 2 Nephi 25:5, there have been a number of cases where the text has lost *and* after *yea*. Here in Alma 8:29, the 1908 RLDS edition restored the *and* to the RLDS text.

**Summary:** Maintain the instance of *yea and* in Alma 8:29, the reading of the earliest textual sources.

**Alma 8:31**

*and they had power given unto them  
 insomuch that they could not be confined in dungeons  
 neither [were 1ABCDEFGHIJKLPS | were > was M | was NOQRT] it possible  
 that any man could slay them*

The 1906 LDS large-print edition changed the subjunctive *were* to the indicative *was*. In 1907 this change was adopted into the stereotyped plates for the third printing of the 1905 Chicago edition; subsequent LDS editions have maintained this emendation to *was*. A similar use of the subjunctive *were* is found earlier in the text, and this example of subjunctive *were* has not been edited to the indicative *was*:

Mosiah 1:4

for it **were** not possible that  
 our father Lehi could have remembered all these things  
 to have taught them to his children  
 except it were for the help of these plates

For modern speakers of English, these two examples (in Mosiah 1:4 and Alma 8:31) are not contrary to fact, so *was* is expected.

The critical text will maintain the occurrences of the subjunctive *were* wherever they occurred in the original text. For similar examples involving “it were possible”, see the discussion regarding “if it were possible” under Mosiah 29:13 and “inasmuch as it were possible” under Alma 1:32. Also see the general discussion under MOOD in volume 3.

**Summary:** Restore the original use of the subjunctive *were* in Alma 8:31 (“neither were it possible that . . .”); similar usage is found in Mosiah 1:4 (“for it were not possible that . . .”).



# Alma 9

## ■ Alma 9:1

*And again I Alma having been commanded of God  
that I should take Amulek and go forth and preach again unto this people  
or the people which was in the city of Ammonihah  
[and >js NULL 1 | And A | BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] it came to pass  
as I began to preach unto them  
they began to contend with me*

This is an example of the Hebraistic *and* separating a subordinate present participial clause from its following main clause. Joseph Smith removed this *and* in his editing for the 1837 edition. The critical text will, of course, restore such uses of *and*. See the discussion under Alma 2:30 as well as under HEBRAISMS in volume 3.

**Summary:** Restore in Alma 9:1 the original Hebraistic *and* that followed the present participial clause.

## ■ Alma 9:1

*and it came to pass  
as I [began 1ABDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST | begun c] to preach unto them  
they began to contend with me*

Here the 1840 edition replaced the simple past-tense *began* with *begun*, the past participial form in the standard language. This change seems to have been accidental since the *began* in the following main clause was left unchanged (“they **began** to contend with me”). We have one example of this dialectal intrusion in the manuscripts, but only momentarily:

Alma 26:35  
there never was men that had so great reason to rejoice as we  
since the world [*began* 0ABDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST | *begun* > *began* 1]

In this instance, Oliver Cowdery initially miscopied *began* as *begun* in Ø, but then virtually immediately he corrected the *u* to an *a*. There are no other instances of this particular mix-up in the text. More common is the intentional use in the original text of the simple past-tense form *began* as the past participial form, in place of the standard *begun*. For discussion, see under Jacob 2:12 as well as under PAST PARTICIPLE in volume 3.

**Summary:** Maintain *began* rather than *begun* as the simple past-tense form in Alma 9:1 and elsewhere in the text.

## ■ Alma 9:2

*who [art 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNPRST | are Q] thou*

Here the compositor for the 1911 LDS edition accidentally mis-set the biblical *art* as *are*. The 1920 LDS edition restored the correct *art*. In the Book of Mormon, *are* is much more frequent than *art*, so this kind of typo is not unexpected. There are quite a number of places in the printed editions where *art* has been mis-set as *are*; yet in every case but one (marked below with an asterisk), the error was corrected in the very next edition:

	original use of <i>art</i>	editions with <i>are</i>
2 Nephi 3:23	thou art blessed	1911
2 Nephi 24:12	how art thou fallen from heaven	1888
Alma 5:37	and art still calling after you	1841
Alma 9:2	who art thou	1911
* Alma 18:18	who art thou	1905, 1907, 1911
Alma 19:4	thou art a prophet of a holy God	1905
3 Nephi 12:25	while thou art in the way with him	1911
Ether 3:5	thou art able to shew forth great power	1905
Moroni 9:24	if thou art spared	1905

The compositors for two LDS Chicago editions (the 1905 missionary edition and the 1911 large-print edition) were particularly susceptible to this error. In the original text, *art* is sometimes used with first and third person singular subjects (see, for instance, the discussion under Mosiah 2:21 and Alma 10:7), but there are no examples of “thou are” in the original text.

**Summary:** Maintain all the original instances of “thou art” in the text, including the one in Alma 9:2.

## ■ Alma 9:4

*and they saith also*

[ 1 |, ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQS | : RT ]

*we will not believe thy words if thou shouldst prophesy*

*that this great city should be destroyed in one day*

As discussed under 2 Nephi 3:18, there is some question here whether the *also* should be assigned to the preceding clause (as “and they saith also”) or to the following clause (as “also we will not believe thy words”). Given the preceding text, either interpretation will work:

Alma 9:1–2

and it came to pass as I began to preach unto them  
they began to contend with me saying : who art thou  
suppose ye that we shall believe the testimony of one man  
although he should preach unto us that the earth should pass away

But as noted under 2 Nephi 3:18, *also* does not typically occur right before a subject pronoun unless there is an immediately preceding *and*. The only exception is in a biblical quote, 2 Nephi 16:8 (which cites Isaiah 6:8): “also I heard the voice of the Lord”. Yet even in that instance, the scribe in  $\mathcal{P}$ , Oliver Cowdery, first wrote *and also* (see the discussion under 2 Nephi 16:8). On the other

hand, there is conclusive evidence for cases where *also* must be assigned to the end of *saying*-clauses that introduce a quote:

1 Nephi 17:14	yea and the Lord <b>said also that</b> after ye have arriven . . .
Mosiah 13:35	yea and have they not <b>said also that</b> he should bring to pass . . .
Alma 30:26	and ye <b>say also that</b> he shall be slain for the sins of the world
Alma 30:48	and I <b>say also that</b> ye do not know that there is a God

In each of these instances, the quote is introduced by the subordinate conjunction *that*, thus forcing the reader to interpret the *also* as modifying the preceding verb *say*. Internal evidence therefore argues that here in Alma 9:4 the *also* should be assigned to the verb *say*. The 1830 typesetter’s decision to place a comma after the *also* is therefore likely correct; the change in the 1920 LDS edition to a colon makes explicit that the following quote is a direct one.

**Summary:** Internal textual evidence shows that in Alma 9:4 the *also* most probably belongs to the preceding clause (“and they saith also”), not the following one (as if it read “also we will not believe thy words”); the punctuation for Alma 9:4 in the printed editions has always followed this interpretation.

#### ■ Alma 9:5

*for they were a hard-hearted and [a 1ABCDEFGHIJLMNOQRT | GHKPS] stiff-necked people*

The 1858 Wright edition accidentally omitted the repeated indefinite article *a* in this conjoined structure. The RLDS text has continued with this reading, while the LDS text has maintained the original “**a** hard-hearted and **a** stiff-necked people”, with its repeated *a*. As explained under 1 Nephi 12:18, the repeated *a* is very common in the original text (depending on the type of conjoined structure). In each case, the critical text will follow the earliest textual sources in order to determine whether the indefinite article should be repeated or not. Of course, here in Alma 9:5, the repeated *a* will be maintained. Elsewhere, the text consistently repeats the *a* in expressions that conjoin the word *stiff-necked* with a word containing the morpheme *hard* (such as *hard-hearted* or *hardened*):

Alma 9:31  
 behold the people were wroth with me because I said unto them  
 that they was **a** hard-hearted and **a** stiff-necked people

Alma 15:15  
 but as to the people that were in the land of Ammonihah  
 they yet remained **a** hard-hearted and **a** stiff-necked people

Alma 20:30  
 and as it happened it was their lot to have fallen into the hands  
 of **a** more hardened and **a** more stiff-necked people . . .

In the last example, the 1902 LDS missionary edition accidentally omitted the repeated *a*. For further discussion, see under CONJUNCTIVE REPETITION in volume 3.

**Summary:** Maintain the repeated indefinite article in Alma 9:5: “for they were **a** hard-hearted and **a** stiff-necked people”.

## ■ Alma 9:12

*and except ye repent*

*ye [can not > can 1 | can ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] in no wise*

*inherit the kingdom of God*

Scribe 2 of  $\mathcal{P}$  initially wrote *can not*, then crossed out the *not*. His *can not* is probably a simple scribal error on his part. Evidence elsewhere argues that here in Alma 9:12 scribe 2 was probably not editing out a double negative from the text. First of all, multiple negatives involving “in no wise” do not occur elsewhere in the original text (or in the current text, as we would expect):

2 Nephi 25:29	ye shall in no wise be cast out
Mosiah 27:26	they can in no wise inherit the kingdom of God
Alma 5:51	ye can in no wise inherit the kingdom of heaven
Alma 39:9	ye can in no wise inherit the kingdom of God
3 Nephi 3:15	they would in no wise be delivered out of the hands of those Gaddianton robbers
3 Nephi 11:37	or ye can in no wise receive these things
3 Nephi 11:38	or ye can in no wise inherit the kingdom of God
Mormon 9:29	ye will in no wise be cast out
Moroni 10:21	ye can in no wise be saved in the kingdom of God
Moroni 10:32	ye can in no wise deny the power of God

Spelling evidence also supports interpreting the initial *can not* in Alma 9:12 as a scribal error. Here scribe 2 of  $\mathcal{P}$  wrote *cannot* as two words, *can not*; yet everywhere else he consistently wrote *cannot* as one word (22 times). This regularity suggests that scribe 2 saw only *can* in  $\mathcal{C}$  and added the *not* on his own (thus the exceptional space between the *can* and the *not*, unique for him).

Finally, scribe 2 never corrected any of the actual double negatives in the text when he copied from  $\mathcal{C}$  into  $\mathcal{P}$ . There are four examples, and in each instance the 1830 edition is also a firsthand copy of  $\mathcal{C}$ . In all four cases, both  $\mathcal{P}$  and the 1830 edition have the double negatives, which means that  $\mathcal{C}$  did as well:

4 Nephi 1:16–17 (three original double negatives)
and there were no envyings nor strifes nor tumults
nor whoredoms nor lyings nor murders
<b>nor no</b> manner of lasciviousness . . .
there were no robbers <b>nor no</b> murderers
neither were there Lamanites <b>nor no</b> manner of -ites
Mormon 8:26
and <b>no one</b> need <b>not</b> say
they shall not come

These four instances of multiple negation were removed only later, when the text was edited for the 1837 edition. Thus there would have been no motivation on scribe 2’s part to have edited out a double negative such as “ye **cannot** in **no** wise inherit the kingdom of God”. Double negatives such as these were possibly a part of scribe 2’s own speech, which may explain why he left actual

examples in the text and here in Alma 9:12 initially wrote “ye can **not** in **no** wise inherit the kingdom of God”. The critical text will therefore accept scribe 2’s decision to delete the *not* that he had initially written in Alma 9:12.

The spelling of *cannot* provides other interesting information about the history of the text. Scribe 3 of  $\mathcal{O}$  consistently spelled *cannot* as two words (but there are only two examples), while Oliver Cowdery usually spelled it as one word (there are three places in  $\mathcal{O}$  and five in  $\mathcal{P}$  where he wrote *can not*). As far as the printed editions are concerned, only the later RLDS editions have used the two-word spelling. The spelling is mixed in the 1892 RLDS edition, with the two-word spelling consistently up through 2 Nephi 29:9 but then only the one-word spelling from 2 Nephi 31:1 on. The 1908 RLDS edition used the 1892 edition as copytext and has only the two-word spelling, probably because the 1908 compositor, having already set the first part of the text with *can not*, did not want to use a variant spelling for the rest of the text. Consequently, the current RLDS text has only the archaic two-word spelling, *can not*.

**Summary:** Accept in Alma 9:12 scribe 2’s decision to remove the extra *not* that he initially wrote in  $\mathcal{P}$  after *can*; usage elsewhere in the text as well as his scribal practice supports the correction to “ye **can in no wise** inherit the kingdom of God”.

#### ■ Alma 9:13

*and again it is said that inasmuch as ye will not keep  
my [commandment > commandments 1 | commandments ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]  
ye shall be cut off from the presence of the Lord*

As discussed under 1 Nephi 3:16, the plural “the commandments” is much more frequent in the Book of Mormon text than the singular “the commandment”, but the singular does occur (in 19 out of 146 cases). However, the original text has examples of only the plural “keep **my** commandments” (27 times), including earlier in this verse: “inasmuch as ye shall keep my commandments”. For the second occurrence in this verse, scribe 2 of  $\mathcal{P}$  initially wrote the singular *commandment*, but almost immediately afterwards he inserted the plural *s* (there is no change in the level of ink flow). There is one other example in the text where the scribe (in this case Oliver Cowdery) made the same initial error and virtually immediate correction while copying from  $\mathcal{O}$  into  $\mathcal{P}$ :

3 Nephi 18:14  
therefore blessed are ye if ye shall keep  
my [commandment > commandments 1 |  
commandments ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]  
which the Father hath commanded me that I should give unto you

For this part of the text, the 1830 edition as well as  $\mathcal{P}$  is a firsthand copy of  $\mathcal{O}$ ; thus  $\mathcal{O}$  undoubtedly read in the plural in 3 Nephi 18:14. For Alma 9:13 the critical text will accept scribe 2’s corrected plural reading in  $\mathcal{P}$ : “inasmuch as ye will not keep my **commandments**”.

**Summary:** Accept the plural *commandments* in Alma 9:13; scribe 2’s correction in  $\mathcal{P}$  was very probably based on the reading in  $\mathcal{O}$ .

## ■ Alma 9:16

for it is because of the traditions of their fathers  
 that [§2 causes > §1 causeth >]s cause 1 | causeth A | cause BCDGHKPS | caused EFIJLMNOQRT]  
 them to remain in their state of ignorance

Here scribe 2 of  $\mathcal{P}$  wrote “for it is because of the **traditions** of their fathers that **causes** them to remain in their state of ignorance”. The use of the third person singular present-tense *causes* seems odd, given the preceding plural antecedent *traditions* (or even the nearest noun, *fathers*, also a plural). Oliver Cowdery, when he proofed  $\mathcal{P}$  here, crossed out *causes* and supralinearly inserted *causeth*, the biblically styled alternative to *causes*. In the original Book of Mormon text, the inflectional ending *-(e)th* occurs with both singular and plural subjects, which means that here in Alma 9:16 the usage in “the traditions of their fathers that causeth . . .” is fully acceptable. (See the discussion under the 1 Nephi preface, where the original text read “Nephi’s brethren rebelleth against him”; also see the general discussion under INFLECTIONAL ENDINGS in volume 3.)

There is clear evidence elsewhere in  $\mathcal{P}$  that scribe 2 sometimes accidentally wrote the modern *-(e)s* ending in place of the textually correct *-(e)th* ending. In each of the following, scribe 2 caught his error while he was copying the text (none of these changes show any difference in the level of ink flow):

Alma 5:50

yea the Son of God  
 [comes > cometh 1 | cometh ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] in his glory

3 Nephi 27:18

and for this cause  
 he [fulfils > fulfileth 1 | fulfilleth ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] the words  
 which he hath given

Mormon 8:19

for behold the same  
 that [judges > judgeth 1 | judgeth ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] rashly  
 shall be judged rashly again

For the last two examples, we get the *-(e)th* ending in the 1830 edition, also a firsthand copy of  $\mathcal{O}$  for that part of the text. All of these examples show that here in Alma 9:16 scribe 2’s *causes* could be a copy error that he somehow missed correcting.

There is one other instance in the text where the scribe (in this case Oliver Cowdery) initially wrote *causes* instead of *causeth*. For that case, Oliver’s error is found in the original manuscript; he himself caught his error virtually immediately and corrected it (there is no change in the level of ink flow):

Alma 30:35

and now believest thou that we deceive this people  
 that [causes > causeth 0 | causeth >]s causes 1 | causeth A |  
 causes BCD EFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] such joy in their hearts

In his editing of Alma 30:35 for the 1837 edition, Joseph Smith changed the textually correct but archaic *causeth* to *causes*. But in all other instances where *causeth* is associated with a singular noun, Joseph left *causeth* unchanged:

Jacob 2:6	yea and <b>it</b> grieveth my soul and <b>causeth</b> me to shrink with shame
Mosiah 4:11	and have received a <b>remission</b> of your sins which <b>causeth</b> such exceeding great joy in your souls
Mosiah 29:23	and whosoever doth not obey his laws <b>he causeth</b> to be destroyed
Alma 18:16	behold is it <b>this</b> that <b>causeth</b> thy marvelings
3 Nephi 12:32	whosoever shall put away <b>his</b> wife . . . <b>causeth</b> her to commit adultery

There is one other instance where *causeth* is associated with a plural noun (like in Alma 9:16), and in that case Joseph once more removed the *-th* ending from *causeth* in his editing for the 1837 edition:

2 Nephi 26:21  
and there are many **churches** built up  
which [*causeth* 1A | *cause* BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] envyings  
and strifes and malice

The earliest textual evidence thus shows that there were no other instances in the earliest text of the third person singular *causes*, only *causeth* (seven of them). This evidence argues that Oliver's *causeth* in  $\mathcal{P}$  was the probable reading of the original manuscript for Alma 9:16.

But there is one more possibility to consider regarding “the traditions of their fathers that causes/causeth them to remain in their state of ignorance”: perhaps the third person singular *causes* is correct while the plural *traditions* is an error for the singular *tradition*. In other words, the original text here may have read “the **tradition** of their fathers that **causes** them to remain in their state of ignorance”. In general, the Book of Mormon text has examples of both “the **tradition** of one's fathers” (11 times) and “the **traditions** of one's fathers” (17 times). And there is independent evidence that the scribes sometimes mixed up the number for *tradition(s)*, as in the following two examples for the phrase “the tradition(s) of one's fathers”:

Mosiah 1:5  
because of the [*tradition* >+ *traditions* 1 | *traditions* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]  
of their fathers  
which **are** not correct

Alma 30:16  
and this derangement of your minds comes  
because of the [*traditions* >% *tradition* 0 | *tradition* 1ABDEPS |  
*traditions* CFGHIJKLMNOPQRT] of your fathers  
which [*leads* 0 | *lead* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST] you away  
into a belief of things which are not so

(See under Mosiah 1:5 for discussion of the first example as well as a list of other passages where the number for *tradition(s)* has varied.) The second example (in Alma 30:16) is particularly germane to the discussion here. Oliver Cowdery initially intended to write “because of the **traditions** of your fathers which **leads** you away”, but immediately after writing the plural *traditions*, he erased the *s* at the end of the noun *traditions*, thus eliminating the grammatical disagreement between *traditions* and *leads*. Similarly, one could argue that in Alma 9:16 the same error occurred, perhaps in  $\mathcal{C}$  itself; in other words, the original text itself read “for it is because of the **tradition** of their fathers that **causes** them to remain in their state of ignorance”, but *tradition* was accidentally changed to *traditions* (probably when Joseph Smith's dictation was taken down). So when Oliver

came to proofing  $\mathcal{P}$  against  $\mathcal{O}$ , he decided to emend Alma 9:16, not by removing the *s* from *traditions*, but by changing *causes* to *causeth*.

One problem with this proposal is that if Oliver Cowdery had been consciously editing here in Alma 9:16, he more likely would have removed the *s* ending from *causes*, thus producing “because of the **traditions** of their fathers that **cause** them to remain in their state of ignorance” (which is precisely how Joseph Smith edited the text for the 1837 edition). There is one clear case where Oliver grammatically emended the text because of a plural subject, and in that instance he removed the *-(e)th* ending:

2 Nephi 7:2  
and **they** [*dieth* 0 | *dieth* >+ *die* 1 | *die* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]  
because of thirst

The original manuscript is extant for 2 Nephi 7:2 and reads *they dieth*; in copying from  $\mathcal{O}$  into  $\mathcal{P}$ , Oliver originally wrote *they dieth*, but then later, with heavier ink flow, he emended it to *they die*. So in this case, when he was consciously editing the text, Oliver removed the *-(e)th* ending. In another situation, where the nonstandard grammar was less obvious, Oliver altered what he had originally copied into  $\mathcal{P}$  (which was grammatically correct) in favor of a theoretically ungrammatical use of the *-(e)th* ending:

Jacob 5:18  
behold the **branches** of the wild **tree**  
[*have* > *hath* 1 | *hath* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQS | *have* RT] taken hold  
of the moisture of the root thereof

This virtually immediate correction on Oliver’s part shows him restoring the text to the probable reading in  $\mathcal{O}$ , even if the result is grammatically incorrect.

Thus it appears that the most likely situation in Alma 9:16 is that Oliver Cowdery’s changing of *causes* to *causeth* was the result of his proofing  $\mathcal{P}$  against  $\mathcal{O}$  rather than editing. The critical text will therefore accept his corrected reading in  $\mathcal{P}$ : “for it is because of the **traditions** of their fathers that **causeth** them to remain in their state of ignorance”.

Unfortunately, the 1849 LDS edition further complicated this passage by replacing the edited present-tense *cause* with the past-tense *caused*, apparently a typo since the surrounding context retains its present-tense forms (including some present-tense modals that refer to the future):

Alma 9:15–16 (original reading)  
nevertheless I say unto you  
that it **shall** be more tolerable for them in the day of judgment than for you  
if ye **remain** in your sins  
yea and even more tolerable for them in this life than for you except ye **repent**  
for there **are** many promises which **is** extended to the Lamanites  
for it **is** because of the traditions of their fathers  
that **causeth** them to remain in their state of ignorance  
therefore the Lord **will** be merciful unto them  
and prolong their existence in the land

The subsequent LDS text has maintained the past-tense *caused* in Alma 9:16, but the critical text will restore the present-tense form *causeth*.



*Summary:* Accept in Alma 9:16 Oliver Cowdery’s change in  $\mathcal{P}$  of scribe 2’s *causes* to *causeth*; Oliver’s *causeth* was probably the reading in  $\mathcal{G}$ ; the biblically styled ending *-(e)th* frequently occurs with plural nouns (here *traditions*); the past-tense form *caused* introduced into the LDS text in 1849 contradicts the present-tense verb forms used elsewhere in the passage.

#### ■ Alma 9:18

*but behold I say unto you  
that if ye persist in your wickedness  
that your days shall not be prolonged in the land  
for the Lamanites shall be sent upon you  
and if ye repent not  
they shall come in a time  
[when you 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST | that ye HK] know not  
and ye shall be visited with utter destruction*

Here the 1874 RLDS edition replaced *when you* with *that ye*. Technically, one could interpret the *when* in the original text as meaning, incorrectly, that the Lamanites will come in a time of ignorance (or not knowing). Of course, the obvious meaning here is that if the people of Ammonihah do not repent, the attack of the Lamanites will be a complete surprise to them. The replacement of *when* with *that* removes the rather improbable chance that a reader might misread the text in the other way. The change from *you* to *ye* is also unnecessary since the text sometimes has the modern *you* rather than the archaic *ye* as the subject pronoun. The change to *ye* here in the 1874 RLDS edition may have been influenced by the *ye* in the immediately following clause (“and **ye** shall be visited with utter destruction”). See the discussion under Mosiah 4:14 as well as more generally under YE in volume 3.

*Summary:* Maintain the use of *when you*, the earliest reading, in Alma 9:18: “they shall come in a time when you know not”.

#### ■ Alma 9:19

*for he will not suffer you  
that ye shall live in your iniquities to destroy his people  
I say unto you nay  
he would rather suffer that the Lamanites might destroy  
all [this 1ABCDEFGHIKPS | his FIJLMNOQRT] people  
[which is >js who are 1 | which is A | who are BCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST | who were J] called  
the people of Nephi  
if it were possible that they could fall into sins and transgressions  
after having had so much light and so much knowledge given unto them of the Lord their God*

The 1852 LDS edition changed *this* to *his* in “the Lamanites might destroy all **this** people”, probably unintentionally. The change may be the result of the *his* in the preceding “to destroy **his** people”. The LDS text has retained the reading “all **his** people”, but the critical text will restore the original “all **this** people”.

The initial use of *his people* in this passage is correct since the reference is to the Lord's righteous saints, whom the Lord will not allow the wicked Ammonihahites to destroy. Rather than allow this, the Lord prefers that the Lamanites destroy the entire people of Nephi ("all this people which is called the people of Nephi") if they become sufficiently wicked. Elsewhere in the text, there are five occurrences of "all this people" and eight of "all his people". In each instance, we let the earliest textual sources determine the reading.

There is one other change that needs to be mentioned here. The relative clause that post-modifies "all this people" originally read "which is called the people of Nephi". For the 1837 edition, Joseph Smith edited the *which is* to *who are* (since the antecedent was *all this people*). In the 1888 LDS edition, the present-tense *are* was accidentally replaced by *were*, probably because of the *were* in the following conditional clause ("if it were possible that . . ."). The resulting past-tense *were* in "who were called the people of Nephi" does not make sense, of course, since the people of Nephi have not yet been destroyed. This past-tense reading was never copied into any subsequent LDS edition because the 1888 edition never served as the copytext for any of those editions.

**Summary:** Restore "all this people" in Alma 9:19 since the passage distinguishes between "his people" (the Lord's people) and "all this people" (meaning the Nephites in general, including the people of Ammonihah); maintain the present-tense verb form in the relative clause "which **is** called the people of Nephi" (or "who **are** called the people of Nephi" in the standard edited text).

#### ■ Alma 9:22

*yea and after having been delivered of God out of the land of Jerusalem by the hand of the Lord  
having been saved from famine  
and from [sicknesses 1 | sickness ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]  
and all manner of diseases of every kind . . .*

Here the 1830 typesetter accidentally changed the plural *sicknesses* to the more expected singular *sickness*. There is only one actual occurrence of the singular in the original text, in the phrase "in sickness":

Mosiah 27:5

yea and all their priests and teachers should labor with their own hands  
for their support  
in all cases save it were **in sickness** or in much want

Otherwise the text has only the plural *sicknesses*:

Alma 7:11

he will take upon him the pains and the **sicknesses** of his people

3 Nephi 7:22

and as many as had devils cast out from them  
and were healed of their [sicknesses 1ABCEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST | sickness D]  
and their infirmities  
did truly manifest unto the people  
that they had been wrought upon by the Spirit of God and had been healed

The tendency to replace the plural with the singular is fairly strong; notice that in the last example the 1841 British edition has the singular *sickness*. In both the other examples of *sicknesses*, conjoined nouns are also in the plural: “the **pains** and the **sicknesses** of his people” and “healed of their **sicknesses** and their **infirmities**”. Perhaps the reason *sicknesses* was replaced by *sickness* in Alma 9:22 is that here *sicknesses* is preceded by the singular noun *famine*. But the plural is supported by the use of the following plural *diseases*, which is more closely associated (semantically and syntactically) with *sicknesses* than *sicknesses* is with *famine*. Note that both *sicknesses* and *all manner of diseases* are conjuncts within the same prepositional phrase headed by *from* (“from sicknesses and all manner of diseases of every kind”) while *famine* occurs in its own prepositional phrase, also headed by *from* (“from famine”). The critical text will restore the original plural *sicknesses* here in Alma 9:22.

**Summary:** Restore in Alma 9:22 the plural *sicknesses*, the reading of the printer’s manuscript.

### ■ Alma 9:22

*yea and after having **been** delivered of God out of the land of Jerusalem by the hand of the Lord  
having **been** saved from famine and from sicknesses and all manner of diseases of every kind  
and they having [been 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPS | RT] waxed strong in battle  
that they might not be destroyed  
having **been** brought out of bondage time after time  
and having **been** kept and preserved until now  
and they have been prospered until they are rich in all manner of things*

Here in the earliest text we have a sequence of five present participial clauses, each headed by the perfect *having* and followed by the passive *been*. The expression “having been waxed strong” seems odd since “to wax strong” means ‘to grow strong’ or ‘to become strong’ (see the definition for the verb *wax* in the Oxford English Dictionary). The verb *wax* is a kind of linking verb; thus it seems quite strange here in Alma 9:22 that it should be used transitively and in the passive. The 1920 LDS edition removed the passive auxiliary verb form *been*, thus creating the more expected “they having waxed strong in battle”.

David Calabro has suggested (personal communication) that the *been* in “they having been waxed strong in battle” may be an early error in the text that resulted from the surrounding occurrences of “having been” in the two immediately preceding clauses (“having been delivered” and “having been saved”) and in the two immediately following clauses (“having been brought out of bondage” and “having been kept and preserved”).

Despite the unusualness of the *been* in “they having been waxed strong in battle”, the rest of the passage argues for the *been*. First, all the nearby examples refer to what the Lord had done for these people: he delivered them out of the land of Jerusalem, he saved them from famine and from sicknesses and diseases, he made them strong in battle so they wouldn’t be destroyed, he brought them out of bondage many times, he kept and preserved them up to the present, and he even made them prosper so that they became rich. In other words, it was the Lord who made the people strong in battle, and this is apparently what “they having been waxed strong in battle” means. Note also that the Lord did this so “that they might not be destroyed”. If the *been* is removed, the causative relationship between waxing strong in battle and not being destroyed is weakened.

There are no other examples in the text of “to wax strong” being used transitively (nor is such usage identified in the OED). The Book of Mormon text has 37 examples of the linking verb *wax*, as in “to wax <adjective>” (for which 23 examples take the adjective *strong* or its comparative *stronger*); there is also one example of “to wax in iniquity” (in Jacob 2:23). In this regard, we should note the strange usage in the last sentence of Alma 9:22: “and they have **been** prospered until they are rich in all manner of things”. Normally, we would expect “and they have prospered until they are rich in all manner of things”. But the text says that it was the Lord who made them prosper, thus the use of the transitive expression “to prosper someone”, meaning ‘to make someone prosper’. There are at least 12 other examples in the text of the transitive expression “to prosper someone”, as in this sampling:

Mosiah 2:36	that ye may be blessed prospered and preserved
Mosiah 27:7	and the Lord did visit them and prosper them
Alma 59:3	insomuch that he might with ease maintain that part of the land which he had been so miraculously prospered in retaining
Ether 10:28	and never could be a people more blessed than were they and more prospered by the hand of the Lord

The OED lists this transitive use of the verb *prosper* (see definition 2), with the following citations referring to the Lord prospering someone (here I retain the original spelling):

Jehan Palsgrave (1530)

I besече Jhesu prospere you in all your busynesses.

Thomas Nashe (1593)

God . . . cherrisht and prosperd them with all the blessings hee could.

Thus the larger passage in Alma 9:22 shows that the expression “they having **been** waxed strong in battle” is indeed intended and means ‘they having been made strong in battle’. The critical text will restore the earliest reading, despite its difficulty.

**Summary:** Restore the passive auxiliary verb form *been* in Alma 9:22 (“they having been waxed strong in battle”); the passage as a whole refers to the many things the Lord has done to help his people, which means that the transitive meaning ‘they having been made strong in battle’ for this clause is definitely appropriate, especially given the following resultive clause “that they might not be destroyed”.

### ■ Alma 9:23

*I say unto you that if this be the case*

*that if they should fall*

*into [§2 transgressions > §1 transgression 1 | transgression ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]*

*that it would be far more tolerable for the Lamanites than for them*

As discussed under Mosiah 27:13, scribe 2 of  $\mathfrak{P}$  tended to accidentally write the plural *transgressions* in place of the singular. Sometimes he immediately corrected his error (in Mosiah 27:13 and Alma 3:6 he erased the plural *s*). For this instance in Alma 9:23, Oliver Cowdery crossed out the plural *s* when he proofed  $\mathfrak{P}$  against  $\mathfrak{C}$ .

As already discussed under Jarom 1:10, the original text prefers the singular *transgression* in the expression “to fall into transgression(s)”, 15 times in all. The critical text will therefore accept Oliver Cowdery’s corrected reading here in Alma 9:23.

**Summary:** Maintain the singular *transgression* in Alma 9:23, the corrected reading in  $\mathcal{P}$ ; usage elsewhere consistently supports the singular in the expression “to fall into transgression(s)”.

#### ■ Alma 9:23

*I say unto you **that** if this be the case*

**that** if they should fall into transgression

[*thot* 1 | *that* ABCDEGHKPS | FIJLMNOQRT] *it would be far more tolerable  
for the Lamanites than for them*

Here the 1852 LDS edition removed the second of the two repeated *that*’s from this sentence. This use of the repeated *that* is common in spoken English as well as in the Book of Mormon. Some instances of the repeated *that* have been edited out of the text (see the discussion under 1 Nephi 10:2–3), but many have been left in. Here in Alma 9:23, the critical text will restore the second repeated *that*, the one that was removed in the 1852 edition. For a complete list of passages with the repeated *that*, both edited and unedited, see under THAT in volume 3.

**Summary:** Restore in Alma 9:23 the repeated *that* which was deleted from the LDS text in the 1852 edition.

#### ■ Alma 9:23

*that it would be [far 1ABCDEFGHIJLMNOPQRST | HK] more tolerable for the Lamanites  
than for them*

The 1874 RLDS edition accidentally omitted the adverbial use of *far* here in the phrase “far more tolerable”. The 1908 RLDS edition restored the *far* to the RLDS text. The text has many examples of the standard English comparative form “more <adjective>”, but there is one more example of “far more <adjective>”:

Alma 1:31

and thus they did prosper and become **far more wealthy**  
than those who did not belong to their church

The critical text will maintain, of course, both instances of the comparative construction “far more <adjective>”.

**Summary:** Maintain in Alma 9:23 the use of *far* before *more*, an example of the quite permissible comparative expression “far more <adjective>”.

## ■ Alma 9:25

*declaring unto them that they must go forth and cry mightily unto this people saying  
repent ye [repent ye 1PS | ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]  
for the kingdom of heaven is nigh at hand*

Here is a second example of where the 1830 typesetter accidentally shortened the repeated expression “repent ye repent ye”. The critical text will restore the original repetition. See under Alma 7:9 for discussion.

## ■ Alma 9:25

*for the kingdom of heaven is [at >% nigh 1 | nigh ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] at hand*

Scribe 2 here started to write “the kingdom of heaven is at hand”, but after writing the *a* and part of the *t*, he erased the incomplete *at*, overwrote it with an *n*, and continued writing inline *igh*, the rest of the word *nigh*. Obviously,  $\mathcal{C}$  read “nigh at hand”. The expression “to be at hand” occurs fairly often in the text (12 times), but in almost as many cases *at hand* is modified adverbially (9 times):

“nigh at hand”	Jacob 5:71, Alma 9:25
“soon at hand”	Alma 5:28, Alma 5:50, Alma 10:23
“close at hand”	Alma 5:29
“now at hand”	Alma 60:29
“already at hand”	3 Nephi 1:16, 3 Nephi 1:18

In each case, the critical text will follow the earliest extant reading, thus “nigh at hand” in Alma 9:25.

**Summary:** Maintain the use of *nigh* before *at hand* in Alma 9:25, in accord with scribe 2’s immediate correction in  $\mathcal{D}$ .

## ■ Alma 9:28

*for the time is at hand that  
[every man >js all men 1 | every man A | all men BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] shall reap  
a reward of [their >js his 1 | their ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] works  
according to that which **they** have been :  
if **they** have been righteous **they** shall reap the salvation of **their** souls . . .  
and if **they** have been evil **they** shall reap the damnation of **their** souls*

The earliest text in Alma 9:28 treats *every man* as a plural: “every man shall reap a reward of **their** works”, which is then followed in subsequent clauses by a consistent use of the plural pronouns *they* and *their*. In his editing for the 1837 edition, Joseph Smith initially thought to replace the first *their* (in “a reward of their works”) with *his*, but then he realized that this change would require him to change the seven following instances of the plural *they* and *their* to the singular *he* and *his* (plus some associated verb forms). Consequently, he decided to edit *every man* to the overtly plural *all men* and leave all the instances of *they* and *their*. He did not, however, cross out the *his* he had written in  $\mathcal{D}$ , but the 1837 edition nonetheless ended up with the intended emendation, “**all men** shall reap a reward of **their** works”.

The original text permitted *every man* to take plural pronouns, as in 2 Nephi 29:11: “I will judge the world / **every man** according to **their** works”; in the LDS text, this particular disagreement in number has been maintained, but it was removed from the RLDS text in the 1953 edition by replacing *their* with *his*. For further discussion and other examples of *every man* as a plural, see under 2 Nephi 29:11. The critical text will restore the original *every man* here in Alma 9:28.

**Summary:** Restore in Alma 9:28 the use of *every man* with the plural *their*: “every man shall reap a reward of their works”; such usage is found elsewhere in the original (and current) text.

### ■ Alma 9:28

*if they have been righteous  
they shall reap the salvation of their souls  
according to the power and deliverance of Jesus Christ  
and if they have been evil  
they shall reap the damnation of their souls  
according to the power and **captivation** of the devil*

Ross Geddes (personal communication, 16 November 2005) suggests that the word *captivation* here could be an error for *captivity*, the word that is used elsewhere in the text to refer to being held captive by Satan:

1 Nephi 14:4	according to the captivity of the devil
1 Nephi 14:7	according to the captivity of the devil
2 Nephi 1:18	according to the will and captivity of the devil
2 Nephi 2:27	according to the captivity and power of the devil
Alma 12:6	according to the power of his captivity
Alma 12:17	according to the power and captivity of Satan

The Oxford English Dictionary, under *captivation*, explains that the original meaning for this word was general and referred to “taking or holding captive”. Over time, however, the word has taken on a purely figurative meaning, referring to “the attention, mind, fancy, affections” being held captive. The Book of Mormon’s single use of *captivation* in Alma 9:28 is based on the literal sense of being held captive. The OED provides only one citation (from the early 1600s) with this meaning; there the reference is to the return of the Jews from their Babylonian captivity in the sixth century BCE (original spelling retained):

John Healey (1610)

In the seaventh year after their **captivation** they returned home.

All the other OED citations, from 1656 to 1878, have only the figurative meaning. It may be that the general meaning of *captivation* here in Alma 9:28 is one more example of the archaic vocabulary in the Book of Mormon text. There is no need to suppose that *captivation* is somehow an error in the early transmission of the text. In fact, one would expect the error to go in the other direction: namely, for *captivation* with its literal meaning to be replaced by the very frequent *captivity* (which occurs 61 times in the text). The critical text will maintain the original *captivation* here in Alma 9:28.

*Summary:* Maintain in Alma 9:28 the unique occurrence of the word *captivation* in the text; its meaning here is general and is identical to the meaning of the word *captivity* (which occurs very frequently in the text).

■ **Alma 9:30**

*ye are a lost and [a 1ABCDEFGHIJKLNOPRST | MQ] fallen people*

■ **Alma 9:32**

*and also because I said unto them that they were a lost and [a 1ABDEFIJLMNOPQRST | CGHK] fallen people*

Here we have two passages in which the phrase “a lost and a fallen people” occurs with repetition of the indefinite article *a*. We see in both of these examples the natural tendency to accidentally omit the repeated *a*. In the first case, the 1905 LDS edition dropped the repeated *a*, but it was restored to the LDS text in the 1920 edition; in the second case, the 1840 edition dropped the *a*, and the RLDS textual tradition followed that reading until the *a* was restored to the RLDS text in the 1908 edition.

There is one more instance in the original text of “a lost and a fallen people”, and it too has suffered the loss of the repeated *a*, in this case in the 1852 LDS edition:

Alma 12:22  
all mankind became a lost and [a 01ABCDEGHKPS | FIJLMNOQRT] fallen people

In this instance, the LDS text has not restored the missing *a*. The critical text will maintain, of course, all three instances of the original phraseology, “a lost and a fallen people”. For further discussion, see under CONJUNCTIVE REPETITION in volume 3.

*Summary:* Maintain the three original instances of the phraseology “a lost and a fallen people” in the text (in Alma 9:30, Alma 9:32, and Alma 12:22); the repetition of the indefinite article *a* for conjoined nouns is common in the original text and will be maintained wherever it is supported by the earliest textual sources.

■ **Alma 9:32**

*they was angry with me and sought to lay [NULL > their 1 | their ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] hands upon me*

Scribe 2 of  $\mathcal{P}$  here momentarily omitted the possessive pronoun *their*. Almost immediately, he supralinearly inserted the *their* (there is no change in the level of ink flow). The expression “to lay hands (up)on someone”—rather than “to lay **one’s** hands (up)on someone”—is possible, although it appears that there is only one example of this expression in the original text without the equivalent of the possessive *one’s*. For discussion of that example, see under 1 Nephi 7:19. Here in Alma 9:32, the critical text will maintain the corrected reading in  $\mathcal{P}$ , “and sought to lay **their** hands upon me”.



*Summary:* Accept in Alma 9:32 scribe 2’s supralinearly inserted *their* before *hands* in  $\mathcal{P}$ ; his correction appears to be virtually immediate and very probably represents the reading of  $\mathcal{O}$ , no longer extant here.

■ **Alma 9:32**

*they was angry with me and sought to lay  
their hands upon [S2 NULL > S1 me 1 | me ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]  
that they might cast me into prison*

Here scribe 2 of  $\mathcal{P}$  seems to have accidentally omitted the pronoun for the preposition *upon*: namely, the *me* which Oliver Cowdery supplied when he proofed  $\mathcal{P}$  against  $\mathcal{O}$ . The expression “to lay one’s hands upon” without an object for the preposition *upon* does not seem totally impossible but is definitely unusual, which could have motivated Oliver here to simply supply the *me* on his own. Another case where the earliest reading is missing the pronominal object for a preposition is found earlier in the text:

1 Nephi 7:20  
that I would forgive them of the thing that they had done  
against [S3 NULL >- S1 me 0 | me 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST]

Here scribe 3 of  $\mathcal{O}$  seems to have omitted the pronoun *me* after *against*; in this instance, Oliver supplied on his own the *me*. (Once the dictation was over, there was no proofing of  $\mathcal{O}$  against some other text.) As argued under 1 Nephi 7:20, evidence elsewhere in the text supports the occurrence of *me* after *against* for that passage.

There is considerable evidence in the textual history for the occasional loss of a pronominal object after a preposition. In all cases but one, each particular error has been restricted to a single textual source (the exception is marked below with an arrow):

LOCATION	PREPOSITIONAL PHRASE	SOURCE(S) WITHOUT PRONOUN
1 Nephi 7:20	against me	$\mathcal{O}^*$ (scribe 3)
Mosiah 3:2	before me	1858W
Mosiah 12:26	unto you	1830
Mosiah 15:11	unto you	1830
Mosiah 29:6	upon him	1858W
Alma 2:21	against them	$\mathcal{P}^*$ (scribe 2)
Alma 9:32	upon me	$\mathcal{P}^*$ (scribe 2)
Alma 31:7	with him	$\mathcal{P}^*$ (Oliver Cowdery)
Alma 32:29	unto you	1840
Alma 32:35	unto you	1840
Alma 42:27	unto him	$\mathcal{O}^*$ (Oliver Cowdery)
Alma 44:5	over you	$\mathcal{P}^*$ (Oliver Cowdery)
Alma 47:29	after them	$\mathcal{P}^*$ (Oliver Cowdery)
Alma 54:9	upon you	$\mathcal{O}^*$ (Oliver Cowdery)
Helaman 4:24	from them	$\mathcal{P}^*$ (Oliver Cowdery)

Alma 9

LOCATION	PREPOSITIONAL PHRASE	SOURCE(S) WITHOUT PRONOUN
Helaman 7:27	unto you	1837
Helaman 15:1	unto you	1841
3 Nephi 11:29	unto you	1837
3 Nephi 20:14	unto you	∅* (scribe 2)
3 Nephi 21:1	among them	∅* (scribe 2)
→ 3 Nephi 21:9	among them	1837, 1841
3 Nephi 27:14	before me	∅* (scribe 2)
Ether 3:11	unto him	∅* (Oliver Cowdery)
Ether 8:10	before him	∅* (Oliver Cowdery)
Ether 11:6	among them	∅* (Oliver Cowdery)

In the manuscripts, these missing pronouns were all initial errors (marked as either ∅\* or ∅\*) and were soon supplied by the scribe. In the Book of Mormon, all prepositions require an object; thus expressions like “to do something against NULL” or “to lay one’s hands (up)on NULL” are never found. There is not one example in the text where the object of a preposition appears to be intentionally lacking.

**Summary:** Accept in Alma 9:32 the pronominal object that Oliver Cowdery supplied in ∅; occasionally pronominal objects after prepositions were temporarily omitted in the transmission of the text.

■ **Alma 9:34**

*and now the words of Amulek are not all written  
nevertheless [a 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST | HK] part of his words are written in this book*

The phrase “part(s) of X” or “part(s) thereof” is always preceded by some kind of determiner in the Book of Mormon text (namely, *a/an, one, the, this, that, those, any, no, every, all, many, what,* and *whatsoever*). The phrase “a part of X” is quite frequent, with 25 occurrences in the text (including here in Alma 9:34). But there are no examples like the one here in the early RLDS text (the 1874 and 1892 editions) for which *part* has no determiner (“nevertheless part of his words are written in this book”). Such usage without the determiner is common in English but totally missing from the Book of Mormon text. In accord with the reading in the printer’s manuscript, the 1908 RLDS edition restored the *a* that the 1874 typesetter had skipped.

**Summary:** Maintain in Alma 9:34 the original indefinite article *a* in the expression “a part of X”; there are no examples in the Book of Mormon of “part of X” without some determiner.

# Alma 10

## ■ Alma 10:1

*Now these are the words*

[*which* >]s *That* 1 | *which* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *Amulek preached unto the people*

In his editing for the 1837 edition, Joseph Smith appears to have changed the *which* here to *That*, although he wrote the *That* at the end of the previous chapter—namely, at the end of the previous line in  $\mathcal{P}$  instead of supralinearly:

Alma 9:34–10:1 (lines 30–31 on page 192 of  $\mathcal{P}$ )

written nevertheless a part of his words are written in this Book ===== **That**

Chapter 8th Now these ore the words which Amulek

Joseph also enclosed the *That* in a box and, as noted, capitalized the initial *t* of the word. This change seems quite different from how Joseph usually made changes in the printer’s manuscript. Maybe he had some other intent in writing the *That*, especially since the *which* itself was never crossed out.

In any event, the 1837 edition ignored this change, perhaps because it just wasn’t noticed. And given other examples in the text, it was just as well. Overall, there are 17 occurrences in the original text of “these are the words **which** . . .”, but there are no occurrences of “these are the words **that** . . .”; nor in any of these cases has *which* ever been grammatically emended to *that* except possibly here in Alma 10:1. The original text of the Book of Mormon has many examples of *which* used as a restrictive relative pronoun. So the failure to implement Joseph Smith’s change here is appropriate, given the usage throughout the Book of Mormon. For further discussion, see under **WHICH** in volume 3.

A common prescriptive rule states that *which* should not be used as a restrictive relative pronoun; instead, *that* is preferred. This rule is unsupportable by actual usage and even contradicted by the usage of some well-known grammar gurus who claim the rule. For discussion and examples, see under *that* 1 in Merriam Webster’s Dictionary of English Usage.

**Summary:** Retain the original phraseology “these are the words which . . .” in Alma 10:1; the use of *which* as a restrictive relative pronoun is very common in the original (and current) text of the Book of Mormon.

## ■ Alma 10:2

*I am Amulek*

*I am the son of [Gidanah 1 | Giddonah ABCDEFGHIJLMNOPQRST | Giddonan K]*

*who was the son of Ishmael*

*who was a descendant of Aminadi*

For some reason the 1830 typesetter altered *Gidanah*, the spelling in  $\mathfrak{P}$ , to *Giddonah*. The later misspelling *Giddonan* in the 1892 RLDS edition is, of course, a simple typo and can be ignored. The name *Giddonah* actually occurs elsewhere in the text, in Alma 30:23: “now the high priest’s name was Giddonah”. The name also appears as part of the compound name *Gid+giddonah*, in Mormon 6:13: “the ten thousand of Gidgiddonah had fallen”. (*Gid* alone also exists as a personal name, in Alma 57–58. It is also possible that *Gidgiddonah* derives from *Giddonah* by reduplication of the initial *Gid*.)

It is highly unlikely that Oliver Cowdery remembered the other *Giddonah* spelling and told the 1830 typesetter to change the spelling of *Gidanah* in Alma 10:2 to agree with the later spelling, especially since *Giddonah* occurs only in Alma 30:23 and, secondarily, in the name *Gidgiddonah* in Mormon 6:13—and both at some distance from Alma 10:2. And the 1830 typesetter could never have made the change on his own since at any given time he had access to only 24 (or so) pages of manuscript; moreover, he never set type from  $\mathfrak{C}$  until he reached those portions covering Helaman 13 through Mormon (that part of the text where the 1830 edition was set from  $\mathfrak{C}$ ). And even if he had had access to the entire original manuscript, it is absurd to think that he would have taken the time to find *Giddonah* that far ahead in the manuscript and then to decide on his own that *Gidanah* in Alma 10:2 should be replaced by *Giddonah*.

A more reasonable possibility is that the 1830 typesetter accidentally misspelled *Gidanah* as *Giddonah* (by doubling the *d* and misinterpreting the *an* as *on*). Under this possibility, there would be no reason to reject the reading of the printer’s manuscript here. In particular, there is nothing inherently wrong with the name *Gidanah*. A similar word ending in *-anah* is the Book of Mormon word *rabbannah*, used twice in Alma 18:13 and explained there as meaning “powerful or great king”. The critical text will follow the earliest textual source (here the printer’s manuscript) and restore the spelling *Gidanah* in Alma 10:2.

**Summary:** Restore in Alma 10:2 the spelling *Gidanah* from the printer’s manuscript; the name *Giddonah* found in Alma 30:23 is simply a different name.

## ■ Alma 10:2

*and it was [that 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQPRT | the s] same Aminadi*

*which interpreted the writing which was upon the wall of the temple*

Here the 1953 RLDS edition replaced the determiner *that* with *the*. Elsewhere, the text has one more example of “that same X”, where X is a personal name:

Alma 49:16

and it was **that same Lehi** which fought with the Lamanites  
in the valley on the east of the river Sidon

But there are no examples in the text of “the same X”, where X is a personal name. Note, by the way, that the 1953 RLDS edition did not replace the *that* in Alma 49:16 with *the*, which suggests that the change in Alma 10:2 was a simple typo.

*Summary:* Maintain in Alma 10:2 the determiner *that* in the phrase “that same Aminadi”.

#### ■ Alma 10:4

*yea and behold I have many [kindred 1PS | kindreds ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRT] and friends*

The 1830 typesetter changed the singular *kindred* of the printer’s manuscript to the plural *kindreds*. In current English, *kindred* is singular in form but takes plural verbs (such as “my kindred are . . .”), although in actual speech *kindred* would be considered archaic or dialectal. The preferred term today is the regular count noun *relative* (as in “I have many relatives and friends”).

Elsewhere in the Book of Mormon text, we have instances of the form *kindred* with either the singular meaning ‘relative’ or the plural meaning ‘relatives’:

- singular *kindred* ‘relative’

Alma 10:7            as I was a journeying to see **a very near kindred**

- singular *kindred* ‘relatives’

Mosiah 4:4            my friends and my brethren / **my kindred** and my people

Alma 10:11            yea even **all my kindred** hath he blessed

Alma 15:16            he being rejected by those which were once his friends  
and also by his father and **his kindred**

Alma 28:5            a mourning for **their kindred** which had been slain

Alma 28:11            and many thousands are mourning for the loss of **their kindred**

Alma 28:12            while many thousands of others truly mourn  
for the loss of **their kindred**

3 Nephi 7:2            every man according to his family and **his kindred** and friends

3 Nephi 7:14           every man according to his family **kindred** and friends

There are also instances of the plural *kindreds* with the meaning ‘relatives’:

- plural *kindreds* ‘relatives’

3 Nephi 6:27           those judges had **many** friends and **kindreds**

3 Nephi 6:27           and unite with **the kindreds** of those judges

3 Nephi 7:4            save he had much family and **many kindreds** and friends

3 Nephi 7:6            because of the secret combination of the friends  
and **kindreds** of them which murdered the prophets

Ether 8:17            wherefore Akish administered it unto **his kindreds** and friends

Finally, there are two cases in 3 Nephi where the scribe in  $\mathcal{D}$ , Oliver Cowdery, wrote the plural *kindreds*, but the 1830 edition has the singular *kindred*:

3 Nephi 10:2

they did cease lamenting and howling for the loss  
of their [*kindred* > *kindreds* 1 | *kindred* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]  
which had been slain

3 Nephi 10:8

behold they began to weep and howl again  
because of the loss of their [*kindreds* 1 | *kindred* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]  
and friends

For both of these cases,  $\mathcal{P}$  and the 1830 edition are firsthand copies of  $\mathcal{C}$ . See under each of these passages for discussion of which reading, the singular *kindred* or the plural *kindreds*, represents the original text.

The 1830 change from *many kindred* to *many kindreds* in Alma 10:4 is probably the result of the preceding plural *many*; otherwise, the text has the plural *kindreds* when preceded by *many* (in 3 Nephi 6:27 and 3 Nephi 7:4, listed above). Even so, there are eight occurrences of the singular *kindred* with the plural meaning ‘relatives’ that have never been changed to *kindreds*. These examples show that the singular *kindred* in  $\mathcal{P}$  for Alma 10:4 is perfectly acceptable. The critical text will therefore restore the singular *kindred*, as did the 1908 RLDS edition (based on the reading in  $\mathcal{P}$ ).

Historically and dialectally in English, the singular *kindred* has been used as a plural count noun, much like the word *people* (as in “many people are coming”). Here is an example of *many kindred* (the original language in Alma 10:4) listed in the Oxford English Dictionary under *flowerist*:

William Westmacott (1694)

Saffron . . . hath **many kindred** . . .  
which are propagated in the Gardens of curious Flowerists

In this case, *kindred* refers to related plants rather than related people.

**Summary:** Since either *many kindred* or *many kindreds* will work in Alma 10:4, the critical text will restore the earliest reading, *many kindred* (the reading in  $\mathcal{P}$ ).

#### ■ Alma 10:4

*and I have also [acquired 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST | required E] much riches  
by the hand of my industry*

The 1849 LDS edition accidentally replaced *acquired* with the visually similar *required*. The correct *acquired* was restored in the subsequent LDS edition (1852). Based on the initial words *I have*, perhaps the phraseology “I have required” was expected, as in Proverbs 30:7: “two *things* have I required of thee”.

**Summary:** Maintain in Alma 10:4 the verb form *acquired*, the earliest reading.

## ■ Alma 10:5

*nevertheless after all this I never have known much of the ways of the Lord  
and his mysteries and **marvelous** power  
I said I never had known much of these things  
but behold I mistake  
for I have seen much of his mysteries  
and his [miraculous 1 | marvellous AEFILMNOQ | marvelous BCDGHJKRT | miraculous PS] power*

In the last clause of this verse, the printer's manuscript reads "his mysteries and his **miraculous** power", but the 1830 typesetter changed *miraculous* to *marvelous*, probably because earlier in the verse the text refers to "his mysteries and marvelous power". The 1908 RLDS text restored the word *miraculous*, in accord with the reading in  $\mathcal{P}$  (there *miraculous* was spelled *myraculous* by scribe 2).

Elsewhere in the original text there are two other occurrences of *marvelous power* (Mosiah 1:13 and Alma 57:26) and four of *miraculous power* (Alma 8:32, Alma 49:28, Alma 57:26, and Helaman 4:25). In one case of *miraculous power*, the text has changed from *miraculous power* to *matchless power* (Alma 49:28). Of particular relevance here, we note that in Alma 57:26 both *miraculous power* and *marvelous power* occur in the same passage (just like originally in Alma 10:5):

Alma 57:26

and now their preservation was astonishing to our whole army  
yea that they should be spared  
while there was a thousand of our brethren which were slain  
and we do justly ascribe it to the **miraculous** power of God  
because of their exceeding faith in that which they had been taught to believe  
that there was a just God  
and whosoever did not doubt  
that they should be preserved by his **marvelous** power

**Summary:** Restore in Alma 10:5 the original reading *miraculous power* in place of *marvelous power* ("I have seen much of his mysteries and his **miraculous** power"), even though earlier in the verse the text reads "his mysteries and **marvelous** power".

## ■ Alma 10:6

*even until the fourth day of this seventh month  
which is in the tenth year of the reign of [our 1A | the BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] judges*

The phrase "the reign of the judges", with *the* before *judges*, is the expected phrase in the Book of Mormon, with at least 100 occurrences in the original text. (For an example where "of the reign" was accidentally omitted from the LDS text, see under Alma 17:6. There I also discuss two other cases, Alma 16:9 and Alma 54:1, where "of the reign" may have been lost early in the transmission of the text.)

Given the frequency of "the reign of the judges", it's not surprising that the 1837 edition changed the determiner *our* to *the* here in Alma 10:6. The change may very well have been accidental (a typo by the 1837 typesetter) since there is nothing wrong with "the reign of **our** judges",

despite the fact that there's only this one occurrence of it in the text. Here we have a direct quotation of Amulek's speech rather than Mormon's third-person summary of the chronology, so Amulek's use of *our* in "the reign of our judges" is quite natural. There is only one example where "the reign of the judges" is used in someone's first-person speech (namely, when Alma is speaking to Korihor in Alma 30:32). Mormon, on the other hand, would have avoided using *our* in the phrase since not too long after the birth of Christ, the Nephites started using the number of years after Christ's birth to mark the year, thus eliminating the older system based on the reign of the judges, as Mormon explicitly mentions:

3 Nephi 2:7–8  
 and nine years had passed away from the time  
 which the sign was given which was spoken of by the prophets  
 that Christ should come into the world  
 now the Nephites began to reckon their time from this period  
 which the sign was given or from the coming of Christ  
 therefore nine years had passed away

The critical text will therefore restore the unique occurrence of "the reign of **our** judges" in Alma 10:6.

**Summary:** Restore in Alma 10:6 the phrase "the reign of **our** judges", the reading in the printer's manuscript and very probably the reading of the original text.

#### ■ Alma 10:7

for **thou** shalt feed a prophet of the Lord  
 yea a holy man [*which* >js *who* 1 | *which* A | *who* BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]  
 [*art* >js *is* 1 | *art* A | *is* BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] a chosen man of God

The use of *art* here is nonstandard for Early Modern English. The antecedent for the relative pronoun *which* is the third person singular noun phrase *a holy man*, which means that from a grammatical point of view the verb form should be *is* rather than *art*. Joseph Smith, in his editing for the 1837 edition, replaced the *art* with *is*. (Of course, the archaic use of *which* for a person was changed to *who* for the 1837 edition. For discussion of that change, see under WHICH in volume 3.)

One could view the use of *art* here as simply an error based on the earlier *thou* in the passage ("for **thou** shalt feed a prophet of the Lord"). In several other places in the original text, nonstandard use of *art* is found in a relative clause. In each case, the antecedent for the relative pronoun itself is either a first or third person singular pronoun:

Alma 36:18 (two instances of *art* emended to *am* in the 1906 LDS edition)  
 O Jesus **thou** Son of God  
 have mercy on **me**  
 who [*are* > *art* 0 | *art* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLPS | *art* > *am* M | *am* NOQRT]  
 in the gall of bitterness  
 and [*art* 01ABCDEFGHIJKLPS | *art* > *am* M | *am* NOQRT] encircled about  
 by the everlasting chains of death



Alma 61:2 (Joseph Smith's editing for the 1837 edition)

I Parhoron [*which* >js *who* 1 | *which* A | *who* BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]  
 [*art* >js *am* 1 | *art* A | *am* BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] the chief governor of this land  
 do send these words unto Moroni the chief captain over the army

Helaman 7:16 (Joseph Smith's editing for the 1837 edition)

yea how could ye have given away to the enticing of **him**  
 who [*art* >js *is* 1 | *art* A | *is* BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] seeking  
 to hurl away your souls down to everlasting misery and endless woe

Of these other cases, only in Alma 36:18 is there a preceding second person pronoun that could have prompted the use of the *art* (“O Jesus **thou** Son of God”). Thus the nonstandard use of *art* cannot be explained simply as an error based on the occurrence of a preceding second person singular pronoun form (such as *thou*). The critical text will restore the use of *art* in all these cases since its use is restricted to a specific context (a relative clause) and appears to be fully intended. There are two other instances where such a nonstandard *art* is found in the earliest text—namely, in Mosiah 2:21 and Alma 5:37. In those two instances, *art* begins a predicate that is conjoined by *and* to a preceding predicate that begins with *hath* (for discussion, see under Mosiah 2:21).

**Summary:** Restore the nonstandard use of *art* in Alma 10:7 (and elsewhere in the text in relative clauses where the earliest textual sources support its occurrence).

#### ■ Alma 10:7

*and thou* [*shall* >js *shalt* 1 | *shall* A | *shalt* BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *receive him*  
*into thy house and feed him*  
*and he shall bless thee and thy house*

The critical text will allow instances of *thou shall* rather than *thou shalt*, providing they are supported by the earliest text. Nonetheless, in some cases, *thou shall* may represent an early error in the text. For instance, here in Alma 10:7, perhaps the *shall* was the result of the use of *he shall* in the next clause. Also note that in the following verse, Amulek refers once more to the language of the angel, but in this case we get the grammatically correct *thou shalt*:

Alma 10:8

I found the man which the angel said unto me  
**thou shalt** receive into thy house

So the odds are high that the occurrence of *thou shall* in the earliest textual sources for Alma 10:7 is an error for *thou shalt*. Even so, the critical text will maintain this instance of *thou shall* since elsewhere in the text there are examples where such usage appears to be fully intended (see the discussion under Mosiah 12:11).

**Summary:** Restore in Alma 10:7 the nonstandard use of *thou shall*, the earliest reading in the text (even though this may be an error for the standard *thou shalt*).

## ■ Alma 10:7–8

and thou shall receive him into thy house and feed him  
and he shall bless **thee and thy house**

- |   |                                   |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| □ NULL  | 1*                                |
| □ and the blessing of the Lord shall rest<br>upon <b>thee and thy house</b> | 1 <sup>c</sup> ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST |

and it came to pass that I obeyed the voice of the angel  
and returned towards my house

Here we have a large visual skip by scribe 2 of  $\mathcal{P}$ ; after copying *thee and thy house* into  $\mathcal{P}$ , his eye skipped down to the following *thee and thy house* in  $\mathcal{Q}$ , with the result that he ended up omitting an entire clause. Oliver Cowdery, when he proofed  $\mathcal{P}$  against  $\mathcal{Q}$ , restored the missing clause. Clearly, there would have been no motivation for Oliver to have made up these words since there was nothing inherently wrong with what scribe 2 had written. And as David Calabro points out (personal communication), support for the added phrase can be found later on in this chapter where the text specifically refers once more to the Lord’s blessing resting upon Amulek’s household as well as to Alma blessing Amulek’s household:

Alma 10:11

for behold he hath blessed mine house  
he hath blessed me and my women and my children  
and my father and my kinsfolks  
yea even all my kindred hath he blessed  
and the blessing of the Lord hath rested upon us  
according to the words which he spake

**Summary:** Maintain in Alma 10:7 the corrected text in  $\mathcal{P}$ , with its reference to the blessing of the Lord resting upon Amulek and his house.

## ■ Alma 10:10

for [NULL > *bhold* 1 | *behold* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST] I say unto you that . . .

Since here in  $\mathcal{P}$  either reading, with or without the *behold*, is possible, scribe 2’s supralinearly inserted *behold* (miswritten as *bhold*) undoubtedly represents the reading of the original manuscript. Elsewhere in the text, there are four instances of the precise phraseology “for I say unto you” and five of “for **behold** I say unto you”.

**Summary:** Maintain in Alma 10:10 scribe 2’s corrected reading in  $\mathcal{P}$ : “for **behold** I say unto you”.

## ■ Alma 10:10

*for behold I say unto you that as the Lord liveth  
even so [he hath 1A | he has BCDEGHKPS | has he FIJLMNOQRT] sent his angel  
to make these things manifest unto me*

The 1852 LDS edition changed the word order after *even so* from *he has* to *has he*. (The stylistic change of *hath* to *has* occurred in the 1837 edition and is consistent with Joseph Smith's editing for that edition.) This change in word order was probably a typo in the 1852 edition.

In the Book of Mormon text, either word order after *even so* is possible. Given that we have a pronominal subject and an auxiliary verb, there are nine instances of inverted word order after *even so* in the earliest text (that is, the auxiliary verb precedes the pronominal subject) but six of the noninverted order (including here in Alma 10:10). Here I provide one example of each type where the auxiliary verb is the perfect *have*:

2 Nephi 25:9          even so **have they** been destroyed  
Alma 7:18            even so **I have** found that my desires have been gratified

One of the other cases has also been changed, in this case from the inverted order to the non-inverted order (in the 1830 edition):

Alma 41:6  
even so [*shall he* 01CGHKPS | *he shall* ABDEFIJLMNOQRT] be rewarded  
unto righteousness

In this instance, the original noninverted order was restored in the 1840 edition (but independently rather than by reference to the manuscript reading).

**Summary:** In accord with the earliest reading for Alma 10:10, restore the original noninverted word order in “even so **he hath** sent his angel”; this change also restores the original biblically styled *hath* to the text.

## ■ Alma 10:11

*for behold he hath blessed mine house  
he hath blessed me and my women and my children  
and my father and my [kinsfolks 1ABCDEFHIJKLMNOPQS | kinsfolk~s D | kinsfolk RT]  
yea even all my kindred hath he blessed*

The original text uses the word *kinsfolks*, here in Alma 10:11 and in two other places in the text:

Mormon 8:5  
my father hath been slain in battle  
and all my [*kinsfolks* 1ABCDEFHIJKLMNOPQS | *kinsfolk* RT]  
and I have not friends nor whither to go

Ether 8:13  
and it came to pass that Akish gathered in unto the house of Jared  
all his [*kindsfolks* 1 | *kinsfolks* ABCDEFHIJKLMNOPQS | *kinsfolk* RT]

In all three cases, the 1920 LDS edition replaced the fully archaic *kinsfolks* with the less archaic *kinsfolk* (but not with the American dialectal *kinfolk* or *kinfolks*—that is, *kin* without the *s*). The Oxford English Dictionary states that both *kinsfolks* and *kinsfolk* are now rare in English. Citations from the OED and *Literature Online* <lion.chadwyck.com> show that both *kinsfolks* and *kinsfolk* were frequent in Late Middle English and Early Modern English, but by the 19th century *kinsfolks* had diminished in usage when compared with *kinsfolk* (the latter occurring about 20 times more frequently in the 19th century, according to statistics from *Literature Online*). And in the 20th century, there are no citations of *kinsfolks* in these two electronic sources, but *kinsfolk* still persists. This shifting in frequency explains the 1920 change from *kinsfolks* to *kinsfolk* (although the RLDS text has retained the original *kinsfolks*). The critical text will, of course, restore the original *kinsfolks*, common enough in the 19th century and the intended form in the Book of Mormon.

**Summary:** Restore the original *kinsfolks* in Alma 10:11, Mormon 8:5, and Ether 8:13; the earliest textual sources consistently support this form, one that was common in earlier English.

#### ■ Alma 10:13

*nevertheless there were some among them which thought to question them  
that by their cunning devices they might catch them in their words  
that they might find witness against them  
that they might deliver them to [the 1ABCGHKPS | their DEFIJLMNOQRT] judges*

The 1841 edition introduced *their judges* in place of the original *the judges*, perhaps prompted by the preceding use of *their* in the phrase “by their cunning devices”. The use of the definite article *the* is consistent with other examples involving delivering someone into judicial custody:

Mosiah 26:7

and it came to pass that they were brought before **the** priests  
and delivered up unto **the** priests by the teachers

Alma 14:17

and he smote them again and delivered them to **the** officers  
to be cast into prison

Alma 30:29

but they caused that he should be bound  
and they delivered him up into the hands of **the** officers

**Summary:** Restore in Alma 10:13 the use of the definite article in *the judges* in Alma 10:13; *the* is typically used to refer to judicial officers in the Book of Mormon.

## ■ Alma 10:14

*which were hired or appointed by the people to administer the law  
at their times of [trials >% trial 1 | trials ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]  
or at the **trials** of the crimes of the people before the judges*

Scribe 2 initially wrote the plural *trials* in the phrase “at their times of **trial**”, but then he immediately erased the *s*. The immediacy of the correction indicates that the original manuscript read in the singular. Scribe 2’s mistaken *trials* was probably the result of the plural *trials* in the following explanatory phrase: “or at the **trials** of the crimes of the people before the judges”. This same error tendency seems to have influenced the 1830 typesetter since he too mistakenly replaced *trial* with *trials* (but unlike scribe 2 he did not correct his error). The expression “at their times of trial” is perfectly acceptable, and thus the critical text will restore the singular *trial*.

**Summary:** Restore in Alma 10:14 the singular *trial* in “at their times of **trial**”, which sounds perfectly fine and which was the probable reading of the original manuscript; maintain the plural *trials* in the following text: “or at the **trials** of the crimes of the people before the judges”.

## ■ Alma 10:17

*now they knew not that  
Amulek could know of their [design 1 | designs ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]*

The 1830 edition here changed the singular *design* to the plural *designs*, probably accidentally. Elsewhere the Book of Mormon text has both singular and plural forms for this noun. In nine cases, we have the singular *design* without textual variance; in six cases, we have the plural *designs*, also without any textual variation. One example is similar to the one here in Alma 10:17 in that it too refers to knowing of someone’s intent, and this example has the singular *design*:

3 Nephi 4:24  
and now Gidgiddoni being aware **of their design**  
and knowing of their weakness . . .

Thus the critical text will restore in Alma 10:17 the singular *design*, the reading of the printer’s manuscript (the earliest extant source).

For one of the invariant cases of the singular *design*, there is a possibility that *design* is an error for the plural *designs*. For discussion of that example, see under Alma 43:9.

**Summary:** Restore in Alma 10:17 the reading of the printer’s manuscript (the earliest extant source for this passage), with its singular *design*: “now they knew not that Amulek could know of their **design**”; usage elsewhere in the text allows for either singular *design* or plural *designs*.

## ■ Alma 10:19

*yea well did Mosiah say  
 who was our last king  
 when he was about to deliver up the kingdom  
 having no one to confer it upon  
**causing** that this people should be governed by their own voices  
 yea well did he say  
 that if the time should come  
 that the **voice** of the people should  
 [cause >jg choose 1 | choose ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] iniquity  
 that is / if the time should come that this people should fall into transgression  
 they would be ripe for destruction*

Here scribe 2 of  $\mathcal{P}$  wrote “that the voice of the people should **cause** iniquity”. The 1830 compositor corrected *cause* to *choose* in  $\mathcal{P}$  (his correction is in pencil and looks like it was written as he was punctuating the manuscript prior to setting the type). Although the written *choose* looks somewhat like Oliver Cowdery’s hand, the corrector here was the 1830 compositor, especially since the spelling *choose* is not how Oliver would have spelled the word at that time. As explained under the Words of Mormon 1:4–6, Oliver consistently misspelled *choose* as *chose* except for the last time he wrote the word in  $\mathcal{P}$  (namely, in Ether 6:24), which would have been written near the end of the typesetting (that is, several months later).

The 1830 compositor’s emendation here in Alma 10:19 is undoubtedly correct. The expression “to cause iniquity” occurs nowhere else in the text, but there is one very significant use of “to choose iniquity” that is directly relevant here in Alma 10:19—namely, king Mosiah’s words to the people when he established the reign of the judges:

Mosiah 29:26–27  
 therefore this shall ye observe and make it your law  
 to do your business by the voice of the people  
 and if the time cometh that **the voice of the people doth choose iniquity**  
 then is the time that the judgments of God will come upon you

Moreover, *choose* in Alma 10:19 works better given that the following clause begins with *that is*, which means that the basic idea of the previous clause will be restated. The subsequent statement about the people falling into transgression is semantically closer to a general statement about the people choosing iniquity rather than a specific reference to causing iniquity.

Finally, scribe 2’s error is readily explained. Earlier in Alma 10:19, there is a present participial clause that uses the verb *cause* along with the plural form of the noun *voice*: “**causing** that this people should be governed by their own **voices**”. The preceding occurrence of *causing* thus prompted scribe 2 to misread *choose* as *cause*. As explained under the Words of Mormon 1:4–6, *choose* was probably misspelled as *chose* in  $\mathcal{O}$ , which would have more readily led to the misreading of *chose* as *cause*. Oliver Cowdery was very probably the scribe in Alma 10:19; we have fragments from  $\mathcal{O}$  at the end of this chapter, and they are in Oliver’s hand. And at that time he would have spelled *choose* as *chose*.

*Summary:* Accept in Alma 10:19 the 1830 compositor’s emendation of *cause* to *choose*; the reference is to king Mosiah’s language earlier in Mosiah 29:27: “if the time cometh that the voice of the people doth **choose** iniquity”.

■ **Alma 10:20**

*and now I say unto you that well doth the Lord judge of your iniquities  
well doth he cry unto [this 1ABCDEFGHIJKPRST | his FIJLMNOQ] people  
by the voice of his angels . . .*

The 1852 LDS edition replaced *this* with *his*. Clearly, the people of Ammonihah are not the Lord’s people. The 1920 LDS edition restored the correct *this* to the LDS text. The same error occurred in the previous chapter—namely, the replacement of *this people* with *his people*. For discussion, see under Alma 9:19.

*Summary:* Maintain the determiner *this* in Alma 10:20: “well doth he cry unto **this** people”.

■ **Alma 10:20**

*repent ye repent  
[ye >% for 1 | for ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] the kingdom of heaven is at hand*

Scribe 2 of  $\mathcal{P}$  initially wrote “repent ye repent ye” here in Alma 10:20. As explained under Alma 7:9, this repeated phrase is almost twice as frequent in the original text as the nonrepeated “repent ye”. Apparently, the original manuscript here in Alma 10:20 read “repent ye repent”, so scribe 2 erased the *ye* and overwrote it with the *fo* of *for* and continued inline with the final *r* of the *for*. One wonders here if the *ye* had been accidentally omitted in  $\mathcal{O}$ ; that is, the original text may have read “repent ye repent ye”, but Oliver Cowdery (here the probable scribe in  $\mathcal{O}$ ) accidentally missed the second *ye*. We have examples elsewhere where Oliver momentarily omitted the pronoun *ye*, although all the examples are errors in  $\mathcal{P}$ :

2 Nephi 29:10

neither need [ye >+ NULL >+ ye 1 | ye ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] suppose  
that I have not caused more to be written

Mosiah 7:18

O [NULL > ye 1 | ye ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] my people  
lift up your heads and be comforted

Alma 33:2

if [ye 0ABCDEFGHIJKMNOPQRST | NULL >+ ye 1] suppose  
that ye cannot worship your God  
ye do greatly err

Alma 54:10

but as the Lord liveth our armies shall come upon you except ye withdraw  
and [ye 0ABCDEFGHIJKMNOPQRST | NULL > ye 1] shall soon be visited  
with death

Helaman 13:29

O ye wicked

[& *perverse* > & 1 | *and* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] ye *perverse* generation

There is thus some possibility that the original text in Alma 10:20 read “repent ye repent ye” and that Oliver Cowdery accidentally omitted the second *ye* as he took down Joseph Smith’s dictation.

We should also note that this verse in Alma 10:20 is virtually identical to the previous Alma 9:25, which originally had a double “repent ye” (see the discussion under Alma 7:9):

Alma 9:25 (earliest text)

**repent ye repent ye** for the kingdom of heaven is nigh at hand

Except for the missing *ye* and the exclusion of *nigh*, Alma 10:20 is identical to Alma 9:25. And except for the repeated “repent ye”, Alma 10:20 is identical to the language of the King James Bible:

Matthew 3:1–2

in those days came John the Baptist preaching in the wilderness of Judea  
and saying **repent ye** for the kingdom of heaven is at hand

Thus the earliest extant text for Alma 10:20 is an intermediate reading, similar to both the non-repeated “repent ye” of Matthew 3:2 and the original repeated “repent ye repent ye” of Alma 9:25. One could, I suppose, argue that the original text for Alma 10:20 originally read with only one “repent ye” and that Oliver Cowdery started to write a repeated “repent ye repent ye” in  $\mathcal{O}$ ; but after writing “repent ye repent” in  $\mathcal{O}$ , he neglected to cross out the second *repent*. There’s even a third possibility: perhaps the original text here read simply “repent repent” and the *ye* after the first *repent* was a mistake. In other words, there is a plethora of minimal yet possible emendations for “repent ye repent” here in Alma 10:20.

Despite these arguments for emending the reading “repent ye repent” in  $\mathcal{P}$ , there is also evidence that the text can have examples of imperative *repent* without any following *ye*:

## □ “repent”

Alma 5:33            **repent** and I will receive you  
Alma 5:51            **repent** for except ye repent . . .  
3 Nephi 30:2        and **repent** of your evil doings

## □ “repent repent”

Alma 5:32            **repent repent** for the Lord God hath spoken it

## □ “repent and &lt;do something&gt;”

Helaman 14:9        **repent** and **prepare** the way of the Lord  
Mormon 7:8            therefore **repent** and **be baptized** . . . and **lay hold**  
   upon the gospel of Christ

Contrast the last type, a conjoined imperative, with three instances of “repent ye and <do something>”; in these cases, “repent ye” acts as a conjoined imperative:



Jacob 6:11	<b>repent ye</b> and <b>enter ye</b> in at the strait gate
Mormon 3:2	<b>repent ye</b> and <b>come</b> unto me
Mormon 5:24	therefore <b>repent ye</b> and <b>humble</b> yourselves before him and <b>be ye baptized</b> and <b>build up</b> again my church

While some of the conjoined imperatives in the above list have the *ye*, others do not. In general, the imperative *repent* sometimes occurs without an immediately following *ye*. Thus “repent ye repent” here in Alma 10:20 can be considered just one more type rather than an error for “repent ye”, “repent ye repent ye”, or “repent repent”. The variety of usage argues that “repent ye repent” in Alma 10:20 should be left unchanged.

*Summary:* Accept in Alma 10:20 the immediately corrected reading in  $\mathcal{P}$ , “repent ye repent / for the kingdom of heaven is at hand”, even though there is manuscript evidence that Oliver Cowdery, the probable scribe in  $\mathcal{C}$ , could have omitted a second *ye* in this expression.

#### ■ Alma 10:22–23

*but it would be by famine and by pestilence and the sword . . .  
then ye shall be smitten by famine and by pestilence and by the sword*

We note here that the preposition *by* is not repeated before “the sword” in verse 22, but it is in verse 23. One wonders if perhaps the *by* was accidentally lost in verse 22, especially since in both verses the two preceding conjuncts have the preposition *by* (that is, “**by** famine and **by** pestilence”). And there are cases where the repeated preposition *by* was momentarily omitted by Oliver Cowdery as he copied from  $\mathcal{C}$  into  $\mathcal{P}$  (see the list under Alma 2:38). Perhaps here in Alma 10:22, Oliver omitted the *by* as he took down Joseph Smith’s dictation; or perhaps scribe 2 of  $\mathcal{P}$  omitted the *by* as he copied the text from  $\mathcal{C}$  into  $\mathcal{P}$ .

One other example showing prepositional repetition when the nouns *famine*, *pestilence*, and *sword* are conjoined is found in the book of Helaman; in this case, the repeated preposition is *with* rather than *by*:

Helaman 13:9  
yea I will visit them **with** the sword  
and **with** famine and **with** pestilence

On the other hand, there is more general evidence that the preposition in a multiple conjunctive expression is sometimes not repeated in the original text, as in the following examples involving the preposition *by*:

1 Nephi 19:11  
**by** tempest **by** fire and **by** smoke and vapor of darkness  
and **by** the opening of the earth  
and **by** mountains which shall be carried up

Helaman 5:41  
even until ye shall have faith in Christ  
which was taught unto you **by** Alma and Amulek and **by** Zeezrom

Helaman 15:11

until the time shall come which hath been spoken of **by** our fathers  
and also **by the prophet Zenos and many other prophets**

One could argue that in each of these cases the repeated *by* is lacking when the two conjoined nouns are more closely associated with each other than with the other nouns in the conjunctive expression: *smoke* and *vapor of darkness* are nearly synonymous; Alma and Amulek were missionary companions before Zeezrom was converted; and Zenos was one of the prophets. On the other hand, one might suppose that famine, pestilence, and sword are equally distinct and that therefore there would not be any special association between *pestilence* and *sword*. Yet the text actually does associate them by referring to the pestilence of the sword—and in distinction to *famine*:

Helaman 11:14

let there be a famine  
that **the pestilence of the sword** might cease

Thus we can find some justification for omitting the *by* in Alma 10:22, where *pestilence* and *sword* are conjoined. More generally, we do find conjunctive cases where the preposition just seems to be missing (that is, without any particular justification based on association). The evidence overall suggests that for cases involving repeated prepositions, it is best to follow the earliest textual sources and not try to maximize or minimize the repetition, even if this decision ends up allowing for considerable variety in the text (for a complete discussion, see under CONJUNCTIVE REPETITION in volume 3).

So the question here in Alma 10:22–23 is whether we have an error or variation in the text. The safest solution is to follow the earliest textual sources and allow for the variation, although the possibility does remain that a *by* was omitted before the last conjunct in the conjunctive expression in verse 22.

**Summary:** Accept in Alma 10:22–23 the variation between “by famine and by pestilence and the sword” (verse 22) and “by famine and by pestilence and **by** the sword” (verse 23); the language in Helaman 11:14 suggests that the repeated *by* is not necessary between *pestilence* and *the sword*.

#### ■ Alma 10:25

*why will ye yield yourselves unto him*  
*that he may have power over you to blind your eyes*  
*that ye will not understand* [§2 NULL > §1 *the* 1 | *the* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *words*  
*which are spoken according* [§2 NULL > §1 *to* 1 | *to* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *their truth*

Scribe 2 in this passage apparently skipped a couple of minor words, which Oliver Cowdery corrected when he proofed the printer’s manuscript against the original. Clearly, the *to* needed to be restored. It also appears that the insertion of the *the* was a restoration of the correct text and not due to editing, although there does seem to be a need for some determiner or adjective to precede *words*. Elsewhere in the text, whenever *words* is postmodified by a restrictive relative clause (headed by either *which* or *that*), we always get a preceding determiner for *words*. The most common determiner is overwhelmingly *the*, although there are also a few examples each of *my*, *these*,

*a few, many*, and so forth. The critical text will here accept the supralinearly inserted *the* as the reading of the original text.

**Summary:** Accept in Alma 10:25 Oliver Cowdery's insertion of *the* since it seems necessary and is very probably the reading of the original text.

#### ■ Alma 10:28

*and now it came to pass that  
when Amulek had spoken these words  
the people cried out against him*  
[§2 NULL >p §1 *saying* 1 | *saying* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]  
*now we know that this man is a child of the devil*

Here Oliver Cowdery inserted *saying* in pencil, apparently while in the print shop and without reference to the original manuscript. The written *saying* definitely looks like Oliver's hand, unlike the *choose* that the 1830 compositor wrote in  $\mathcal{P}$  earlier in verse 19 (when he corrected *cause* to *choose*, as discussed above under Alma 10:19). Here in verse 28, the penciled-in punctuation in  $\mathcal{P}$  is heavier than that of the supralinearly inserted *saying*, which implies that the *saying* was added at a different time than the punctuation (for *choose* in verse 19, the level of graphite is the same as that of the immediately surrounding punctuation).

As far as determining whether *saying* should be accepted, it really makes no difference who made the insertion. The fact that the word is in pencil strongly implies that it was inserted in the print shop and without reference to  $\mathcal{C}$ . For similar examples of earlier emendations made in pencil in the print shop and apparently by Oliver Cowdery, see the discussion regarding the following changes: *save* to *serve* in Mosiah 4:14, *chance* to *change* in Mosiah 5:2, and the insertion of *unto* in Mosiah 11:23. Also see the discussion regarding corrections made in pencil to  $\mathcal{C}$  when it was used to proof gathering 22 of the 1830 edition (pages 337–352, covering Alma 41:8 – 46:30): namely, the insertion of *O* in Alma 42:31, the change of *then* to *than* in Alma 43:6, and the change of *hand* to *hands* in Alma 43:44. (This later editing of  $\mathcal{C}$  is also referred to on plate 11 in volume 1 of the critical text.)

Elsewhere in the manuscripts there is evidence that Oliver Cowdery would sometimes add the word *saying*:

1 Nephi 7:1  
it came to pass that the Lord spake unto him again  
[ 0 | *saying* 1 ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST ] that it was not meet for him Lehi  
that he should take his family into the wilderness alone

See the discussion under 1 Nephi 7:1, which shows that the use of *saying* is textually inappropriate when followed by an indirect quote. In addition, sometimes Oliver accidentally omitted the word *saying*:

1 Nephi 2:10 (*saying* lost when copying from  $\mathcal{C}$  into  $\mathcal{P}$ )  
and he also spake unto Lemuel [*saying* 0 | 1 ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]  
O that thou mightest be like unto this valley

2 Nephi 17:10–11 (*saying* initially lost in  $\mathcal{D}$ )  
 moreover the Lord spake again unto Ahaz  
 [NULL >- *saying* 1 | *saying* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]  
 ask thee a sign of the Lord thy God

In any event, it appears that the corrector in Alma 10:28 (probably Oliver Cowdery) felt there was a need for the connective *saying* after “cried out against him” and before the direct quote that followed. As in the discussion regarding *choose* in Alma 10:19, this emendation needs to have independent support before it can be accepted.

Elsewhere in the Book of Mormon text, there are 40 occurrences of *saying* following the verb *cry* and preceding a direct quote. But there are 15 other cases where the verb *cry* introduces a direct quote but without an intervening *saying*, including two earlier in this chapter of Alma:

Alma 10:20  
 well doth he **cry** unto this people by the voice of his angels :  
 repent ye repent / for the kingdom of heaven is at hand

Alma 10:21  
 yea well doth he **cry** by the voice of his angels **that**  
 I will come down among my people with equity and justice in my hands

In the second of these (in verse 21), there is a subordinate conjunction *that* before the direct quote, yet we still have a direct quote (unlike modern English, which requires an indirect quote after the *that*).

But closer to Alma 10:28 are two occurrences of the verb *cry* with *saying* before the direct quote; it was probably these two closer occurrences that served as the motivation for adding the intrusive *saying* in verse 28:

Alma 10:24  
 and they **cried** out **saying** :  
 this man doth revile against our laws which are just

Alma 10:25  
 but Amulek stretched forth his hand  
 and **cried** the mightier unto them **saying** :  
 O ye wicked and perverse generation

In addition, there are two other occurrences in the text of “cry out **against** someone”, and in each instance *saying* occurs before the direct quote:

Helaman 8:1  
 and they **cried** out against him  
**saying** unto the people :  
 why do ye not seize upon this man and bring him forth

Helaman 9:16  
 the judges did expound the matter unto the people  
 and did **cry** out against Nephi **saying** :  
 behold we know that this Nephi must have agreed with some one to slay the judge

But in general, there are enough examples without *saying* to argue that either reading is possible in Alma 10:28. The critical text will therefore restore the original reading in  $\mathcal{P}$  and reject Oliver Cowdery's emendation, the additional *saying*.

**Summary:** Remove from Alma 10:28 the intrusive *saying* that was added in the 1830 print shop, apparently by Oliver Cowdery; there are quite a few additional examples of the verb *cry* being directly followed by a direct quote yet without an intervening *saying*.

#### ■ Alma 10:28

*now we know that this man is a child of the devil  
for he hath lied unto us  
for he hath spoken against our law  
and now he saith that  
he hath not spoken [§2 NULL > §1 against 1 | against ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] it*

Here scribe 2 of  $\mathcal{P}$  wrote “and now he saith that he hath not spoken it”, which is not a difficult reading when considered in isolation. Oliver Cowdery, when he proofed  $\mathcal{P}$  against  $\mathcal{O}$ , supplied the preposition *against*, which makes sense within the larger context. Note that earlier in verse 26 Amulek says “ye say that I have spoken **against** your law but I have not”. Undoubtedly  $\mathcal{O}$  had the preposition *against* also in verse 28.

**Summary:** Accept in Alma 10:28 Oliver Cowdery's corrected reading with the preposition *against* (“he hath not spoken against it”).

#### ■ Alma 10:29

*and again he hath reviled against our lawyers and our judges  
[&c 1 | &c. ABCDEFGHIKLMNOQ | etc. JPS | RT]*

The original use of *etc.* here in Alma 10:29 can be interpreted in two ways. One is that the *etc.* means that Amulek had, in the view of these Ammonihahites, reviled against others (such as the people of the city in general) or against other things (such as their law). Another possibility is that the *etc.* simply means that there were other things that these Ammonihahites said against Amulek. The 1920 LDS edition removed the *etc.* here, but the critical text will restore it. For a general summary regarding the editing of *etc.* in the text, see under ETC. in volume 3.

**Summary:** Restore the occurrence of *etc.* here in Alma 10:29 and elsewhere in the text whenever it is supported by the earliest textual sources.

## ■ Alma 10:30

*and it [come 1 | came ABCFGHIJKLMNOPQRST | became DE] to pass that  
the lawyers put it into their hearts  
that they should remember these things against him*

Here the typesetter for the 1841 British edition accidentally set *became* instead of the correct *came*, thus creating the impossible “it became to pass”. Perhaps what is more amazing is that the typesetter for the 1849 LDS maintained this typo. Finally, the 1852 LDS edition removed the error from the LDS text.

We also note here that scribe 2 of  $\mathfrak{P}$  wrote *came* as *come*. Writing *a* as *o* is a common error for this scribe, as exemplified by the following scribal slips he made in this part of the text:

PASSAGE	MISSPELLING	CORRECT SPELLING
Mosiah 28:19	ore	are
Mosiah 29:42	offairs	affairs
Alma 2:23	thot	that
Alma 2:28	hond	hand
Alma 3:18	foll	fall
Alma 4:15	come	came
Alma 5:23	monner	manner
Alma 5:37	offer	after
Alma 10:26	uderstond	understand
Alma 12:31	gove	gave

**Summary:** Retain the obviously correct “it came to pass” here in Alma 10:30 instead of the impossible “it became to pass” introduced in the 1841 British edition.

## ■ Alma 10:31

*and it came to pass that there was one among them whose name was **Zeezrom***

The issue here is the spelling of the name *Zeezrom*. We do not have the original manuscript reading for the first occurrence of this name (here in Alma 10:31). But this first occurrence is spelled *Zeezrom* in the printer’s manuscript, which suggests that the name was spelled that way in  $\mathfrak{O}$ :

		$\mathfrak{O}$	$\mathfrak{P}$
1	Alma 10:31	—	Zeezrom

Between the first and the second occurrence in the text of the name *Zeezrom*, there is a lengthy explanation of the monetary system of the Nephites (covering Alma 11:3–19), after which we get 16 occurrences of the name in Alma 11–12. In six of those cases, the name is sufficiently extant (and legible) in  $\mathfrak{O}$  that we can tell that the name reads *Zeezrum*, not *Zeezrom*, for this part of the text; in the following list, parentheses surround letters that are only partially extant in  $\mathfrak{O}$ :

		$\mathfrak{O}$	$\mathfrak{P}$
2	Alma 11:21	—	Zeezrom
3	Alma 11:21	Zeezrum	Zeezrom

*Alma 10*

4	Alma 11:22	Zeezru( )	Zeezrom
5	Alma 11:26	—	Zeezrom
6	Alma 11:28	Zeezrum	Zeezrom
7	Alma 11:30	Zee(z um)	Zeezrom
8	Alma 11:32	Zeezrum	Zeezrom
9	Alma 11:34	—	Zeezrom
10	Alma 11:35	(Z)e(ez)rum	Zeezrom
11	Alma 11:38	—	Zeezrom
12	Alma 11:46	(Z )	Zeezrom
13	Alma 12:1	—	Zeezrom
14	Alma 12:2	—	Zeezrom
15	Alma 12:3	—	Zeezrom
16	Alma 12:7	—	Zeezrom
17	Alma 12:8	—	Zeezrom

The name appears six more times in Alma 14–15, but  $\mathcal{O}$  is not extant for any of these occurrences:

		$\mathcal{O}$	$\mathcal{P}$
18	Alma 14:2	—	Zeezrom
19	Alma 14:6	—	Zeezrom
20	Alma 15:3	—	Zeezrom
21	Alma 15:5	—	Zeezrom
22	Alma 15:11	—	Zeezrom
23	Alma 15:12	—	Zeezrom

But in the printer’s manuscript for Alma 10–15, all 23 of these occurrences of the name are systematically spelled *Zeezrom*. This consistency suggests that the very first spelling of *Zeezrom* in Alma 10:31 was indeed *Zeezrom*, not *Zeezrum*.

An important question arises here: Why would Oliver Cowdery have misspelled *Zeezrom* as *Zeezrum* in  $\mathcal{O}$  for Alma 11 when at the end of Alma 10 he had apparently spelled it correctly as *Zeezrom*? There is some hiatus in the occurrence of the name, and one obvious possibility is that Oliver simply forgot the correct spelling and that the resulting spelling *Zeezrum* was just a phonetic misspelling. But another possibility is that the misspelling *Zeezrum* was triggered by the spelling of the monetary unit *ezrum*. In Alma 10:31 we have the first occurrence of *Zeezrom*, but before the second occurrence of this name (in Alma 11:21), we have two occurrences of the monetary unit *ezrum* (in Alma 11:6 and Alma 11:12). Although this word is consistently spelled *ezrom* in the printed editions, the printer’s manuscript spelled it as *ezrum* (the original manuscript is no longer extant for the two occurrences of *ezrum*). Thus it is quite possible that Oliver’s *Zeezrum* was prompted by the intervening *ezrum*. For the spelling of that name, see the discussion under Alma 11:6.

There is independent evidence that intervening names can interfere with the spelling of a name. As discussed under Mosiah 25:2, the original name for the only surviving son of Zedekiah was *Muloch*, but this name was later misspelled in Helaman 6–8 as *Mulek* because the city Mulek is referred to 12 times in Alma 52–53 and then once more in Helaman 5:15, just before the three occurrences of what should have been *Muloch* in Helaman 6–8. As  $\mathcal{O}$  was being dictated, apparently Joseph Smith and Oliver Cowdery did not check on the spelling for *Muloch* in Helaman 6–8;

Oliver must have assumed that it was *Mulek*, what he was used to writing, and did not ask for the name to be spelled. Similarly, here in Alma 10–11, it is very possible that neither Joseph nor Oliver thought to have the spelling of *Zeezrom* checked when it reappeared in Alma 11:21; it had recently occurred at the end of Alma 10. Thus *ezrum* probably led to confusion in the spelling of *Zeezrom*.

Additional support for the spelling *Zeezrom* can be found in later instances of the name in the original manuscript. In Alma 31, *Zeezrom* returns to the narrative as a missionary, along with Alma, to the city of the Zoramites in the land of Antionum. And here in  $\mathcal{O}$  the name is spelled *Zeezrom*—that is, with the *o*:

		$\mathcal{O}$	$\mathcal{P}$
24	Alma 31:6	Zeezrom	Zeezrom
25	Alma 31:32	Zeezrom	Zeezrom

Other spellings of names imply that after a long hiatus, a difficult name that has been previously misspelled is suddenly spelled correctly, probably because the scribe requested Joseph Smith to spell the name once more. See, for instance, the discussion regarding the name *Ammonihah* under Alma 8:6. There in the original manuscript, Oliver Cowdery apparently wrote *Ammonihah* correctly 8 times in Alma 8; yet from Alma 9 through Alma 16, he seems to have systematically misspelled the name 12 times in  $\mathcal{O}$  as *Amonihah*. But then the correct spelling, *Ammonihah*, seems to have returned to  $\mathcal{O}$  in Alma 25:2, which is some distance from the last time Oliver had spelled the word (in Alma 16:11).

After Alma 31, the next reference to the name *Zeezrom* is found much later in the text; here we appear to have a phonetic spelling for the name:

		$\mathcal{O}$	$\mathcal{P}$
26	Alma 56:14	Zeezrum	Zeezrum

In this instance, the reference is to a city called *Zeezrom*, but which is spelled *Zeezrum* in the original manuscript—and in the printer’s manuscript. This is the only time Oliver Cowdery spelled the name as *Zeezrum* in  $\mathcal{P}$  itself. Perhaps he did not realize that this city was probably named after *Zeezrom* and should therefore have been spelled *Zeezrom*. But the 1830 compositor assumed so, it would appear, since he set the spelling of this city as *Zeezrom*. There are many cities in the Book of Mormon named after prominent Nephites. In the following list, the name of the Nephite namesake is well established before the name of the city first appears in the text:

	AS A PERSON	AS A CITY
Lehi-Nephi / Nephi	1 Nephi preface	Mosiah 7:1 / Mosiah 9:15
Helam	Mosiah 18:12	Mosiah 23:20
Gideon	Mosiah 19:4	Alma 6:7
Nephihah	Alma 4:17	Alma 51:14
Zeezrom	Alma 10:31	Alma 56:14
Moroni	Alma 43:16	Alma 50:13
Lehi	Alma 43:35	Alma 51:24
Morionton	Alma 50:28	Alma 51:26
Moronihah	Alma 62:43	3 Nephi 8:10
Kishcumen	Helaman 1:9	3 Nephi 9:10



This naming practice is explained for the city of Ammonihah, although that Nephite is never specifically referred to elsewhere in the text:

Alma 8:6–7

and he came to a city which was called Ammonihah  
 now it was the custom of the people of Nephi to call their lands  
 and their cities and their villages yea even all their small villages  
 after the name of him who first possessed them  
 and thus it was with the land of Ammonihah

The odds are quite high that the city of Zeezrom was named after Zeezrom, the lawyer from Ammonihah. The critical text will presume so.

The last two occurrences of *Zeezrom* in the Book of Mormon are found in Helaman 5 and refer to the person Zeezrom, not the city:

		⊖	Ⓟ
27	Helaman 5:10	—	Zeezrom
28	Helaman 5:41	—	Zeezrom

These two occurrences are no longer extant in the original manuscript; the printer’s manuscript has the correct spelling, *Zeezrom*.

The critical text will therefore accept the spelling *Zeezrom* as the correct one, not only for the name of the individual but also for the name of the city that was apparently named after him.

**Summary:** Retain the current spelling *Zeezrom* throughout the text even though the earliest extant spelling in the original manuscript is *Zeezrum* (in Alma 11:21); the word *ezrum* apparently led Oliver Cowdery to mistakenly replace the correct *Zeezrom* with *Zeezrum* in Alma 11.

#### ■ Alma 10:31–32

now he [being 0A | being >js was 1 | was BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] the foremost  
 to accuse Amulek and Alma  
 [he 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST | K] being one of the most expert among them  
 having much business to do among the people  
 now the object of these lawyers were to get gain

In his editing of this passage for the 1837 edition, Joseph Smith changed the first participial clause to a finite clause by replacing the *being* there with *was*. His editing was motivated by the fact that the original subordinate clause here is never completed. As discussed under Enos 1:3, such participial fragments can be found in the original text. For two other examples, see the discussion under Mosiah 9:1–2 and Alma 4:11–12. The critical text will restore the instance of incompleteness here in Alma 10:31–32.

The 1892 RLDS edition accidentally omitted the subject pronoun *he* after the infinitive clause “to accuse Amulek and Alma”. The *he* is clearly helpful since without it one might misread the immediately following *being* as referring to Alma (“to accuse Amulek and Alma / being one of the most expert among them”).

*Summary:* Restore the incomplete participial clause in Alma 10:31: “now he **being** the foremost to accuse Amulek and Alma”; the original text has a number of such incomplete instances of sentence-initial subordination; also maintain the *he* in “he being one of the most expert among them”.

■ **Alma 10:32**

*and they [gat/got 0 | got 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST] gain according to their employ*

Here the original manuscript is extant, and it appears to read *gat* (although because of the difficulty in reading the fragment, there is a possibility here that *Œ* actually reads *got*). Elsewhere, the earliest textual evidence (all from the printer’s manuscript and the 1830 edition) supports *got* as the simple past-tense form, although in one case in *Ɔ* the *got* could be read as *gat* (this example is marked below with an asterisk):

Mosiah 19:5

he fled and ran and **got** upon the tower which was near the temple

Helaman 13:4

therefore he went and **got** upon the wall thereof

\* 3 Nephi 4:25

and this did they do in the nighttime

and [gat/got 1 | got ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST] on their march  
beyond the robbers

Ether 6:4

they **got** aboard of their vessels or barges

So there is no strong independent support for *gat* as the simple past-tense form for *get*.

But there is indirect support. First of all, when we consider the past participle for *get*, the form *got* is what we generally find in the manuscripts; but in two cases (one of which is firm), the original manuscript can be read as *gat*:

Alma 47:5

and now he had [gat/got 0 | got 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST | gotten Q]  
the command of those parts of the Lamanites which were in favor of the king

Alma 55:2

for I will not grant unto him that he shall have any more power  
than what he hath [gat 0 | got 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST]

In the original text of the Book of Mormon, there is considerable evidence that the past participial form frequently took on the same form as the simple past tense (as in the original text for 1 Nephi 3:30: “and after that the angel **had spake** unto us”); for general discussion, see under PAST PARTICIPLE in volume 3. Thus the occurrence of *hath gat* in Alma 55:2 (and perhaps *had gat* in Alma 47:5) provides evidence that the simple past-tense form for *get* was sometimes *gat* in the original text.

Additional support for the possibility of *gat* comes from the historically related verb *forget*. The earliest text provides evidence that *for~~get~~* can sometimes be used as the simple past-tense form and the past participial form for *forget*:

Alma 37:41 (the simple past-tense *for~~get~~*)

they were slothful  
and [*for~~get~~* > *for~~get~~* 0 | *for~~get~~* >js *for~~got~~* 1 | *for~~got~~* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]  
to exercise their faith and diligence

Alma 60:20 (three occurrences of the past participial *for~~get~~*)

have ye [*for~~get~~* 01 | *for~~got~~* ABCDEFGHIJKLMPS | *for~~gotten~~* NOQRT]  
the commandments of the Lord your God  
yea have ye [*for~~get~~* 1 | *for~~got~~* ABCDEFGHIJKLMPS | *for~~gotten~~* NOQRT]  
the captivity of our fathers  
have ye [*for~~get~~* 1 | *for~~got~~* ABCDEFGHIJKLMOPS | *for~~gotten~~* NQRT]  
the many times we have been delivered out of the hands of our enemies

In all of these cases, the 1830 typesetter replaced the archaic *for~~get~~* with *for~~got~~*. Similarly, the simple past tense and the past participle for the verb *beget* can be *begat*:

1 Nephi 18:7 (the past participial *begat*)

and now my father had **begat** two sons in the wilderness

Ether 6:15 (the simple past-tense *begat*)

and the brother of Jared also **begat** sons and daughters

The simple past-tense *begat* is general in the book of Ether (with 41 occurrences), while the past participial *begat* occurs only in 1 Nephi 18:7 (elsewhere, the past participial verb form for *beget* is *begotten*, with 2 occurrences).

In summary, there is some evidence that the simple past-tense form for *get* could be *gat*. Here in Alma 10:32, the original manuscript appears to support *gat*; thus the critical text will accept *gat* in this instance (and similarly in 3 Nephi 4:25). In accord with the reading of  $\mathcal{C}$ , the critical text will also accept the instances of *had gat* in Alma 47:5 and *hath gat* in Alma 55:2 (for discussion, see under those passages as well as under 2 Nephi 31:19). For a general discussion of the simple past-tense forms for *get* and *forget*, see under PAST in volume 3. Also see the discussion regarding the past participial forms for these two verbs under PAST PARTICIPLE in volume 3.

The simple past-tense form *gat* (for *got*) is archaic, but there are examples of it in the King James Bible (20 times) along with *got* (5 times), as in this contrastive pair of examples:

Genesis 39:12      and he left his garment in her hand and fled and **got** him out  
1 Samuel 26:12      so David took the spear . . . and they **gat** them away

This variation in the King James Bible supports the possibility of variation between *gat* and *got* in the Book of Mormon text.

**Summary:** Accept in Alma 10:32 the apparent reading of the original manuscript—namely, *gat* as the simple past-tense form for the verb *get*.

# Alma 11

## ■ Alma 11:1

*now it was in the law of Mosiah  
that every man which was a judge of the law  
or [which >js those who 1 | which A | those who BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]  
[was 0A | was >js were 1 | were BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] appointed  
to be [Judges 0AFIJLMNOQ | Judges >js a Judge >js Judge 1 | judges BCDEGHKPRST]  
should receive **wages** according to the time  
which [he > they 0 | they 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] labored to judge those  
which were brought before them to be judged*

This passage involves a shift in number, from singular to plural. It starts out in the singular (“every man which was **a judge** of the law”), then shifts to the plural (“or which was appointed to be **judges**”). Such shifts in number can be found elsewhere in the text and will be accepted in the critical text; for some discussion of other cases involving a shift from singular to plural for the phrase “every man”, see under 2 Nephi 29:11. In his editing here in Alma 11:1 for the 1837 edition, Joseph Smith initially changed the plural *judges* to the singular *a judge* (he supralinearly inserted the *a* and crossed out the plural *s*). But then Joseph realized that the following text was in the plural (“according to the time which **they** labored to judge those which were brought before **them** to be judged”). Consequently, he reversed himself and crossed out the inserted *a*; although he did not restore the plural *s* in  $\mathcal{D}$ , the 1837 edition ended up with the intended plural, *judges*. Having maintained the plural *judges*, Joseph made some corrections in the preceding relative clause so that it would read in the plural: he added *those* and changed *which was* to *who were* (thus “or **those who were** appointed to be judges”). The standard LDS and RLDS texts have followed these grammatical emendations, but the critical text will restore the original “or which was appointed to be judges”. The disagreement between the *was* and *judges* is typical of the original text (for discussion, see under 1 Nephi 4:4 as well as under SUBJECT-VERB AGREEMENT in volume 3).

Here in Alma 11:1, one wonders if *wages* shouldn’t be preceded by a possessive pronoun such as *their* or even *his* (as if the original text read “every man which was a judge of the law . . . should receive **his** wages according to the time which . . .”). Elsewhere the Book of Mormon text clearly prefers *his* or *their* before *wages*:

Mosiah 2:33	for he receiveth for <b>his</b> wages an everlasting punishment
Alma 5:42	and whosoever doeth this must receive <b>his</b> wages of him
Alma 5:42	therefore for <b>his</b> wages he receiveth death
Alma 11:3	and the judge receiveth for <b>his</b> wages according to his time

Alma 11:20	they received <b>their</b> wages according to their employ
3 Nephi 24:5	those that oppress the hireling in <b>his</b> wages
Mormon 8:19	for according to his works shall <b>his</b> wages be

The two nearby occurrences in Alma 11:3 and Alma 11:20 strongly suggest that *his* or *their* might have dropped out in the copying process in Alma 11:1, especially since all these verses in Alma 11 refer to the determination of wages. Although this particular portion of Alma 11:1 is not extant in the original manuscript, there is some evidence that *his* was originally there. First of all, in the missing part of the line there is enough room for *his* (or *their*). Secondly, a subsequent scribal error in the next line of  $\mathcal{O}$  suggests that *his* was indeed in the previous line. The facsimile transcript for this part of the original manuscript reads as follows:

Alma 11:1 (lines 11–13 on page 225' of  $\mathcal{O}$ )

( )	f Mos( )ah that every man which ( (	)
LAW O	I	WAS A JUDGE OF THE LAW OR WHICH
( s)	appointed to be Judges should ( (	)
WA		RECEIVE HIS WAGES ACCORDING TO THE
	they	
( )	me which <he>^ laboured to ju(d	)
TI		GE THOSE WHICH WERE BROUGHT BEFORE

Oliver Cowdery initially wrote *he laboured* in  $\mathcal{O}$  because, I would argue, he had just heard (and written) *his wages*, with its singular pronominal *his*, which ultimately refers back to *every man*. The presumption then is that while copying from  $\mathcal{O}$  into  $\mathcal{P}$ , Oliver accidentally dropped out the *his*. Interestingly, the 1830 compositor made the same mistake when he dropped out the *their* in front of *wages* while setting the type for Alma 11:20 (the 1837 edition restored the *their*, probably by reference to  $\mathcal{P}$ ).

If the original text read *his wages* in Alma 11:1, we would have a case of multiple shifting in number for this verse, from singular to plural and then back to the singular before returning to the plural:

Alma 11:1 (with proposed emendation)

- *singular*      **every man** which was **a judge** of the law
- *plural*        or which was appointed to be **judges**
- *singular*      should receive **his** wages according to the time
- *plural*        which **they** labored to judge those
- which were brought before **them** to be judged

Elsewhere, the original text has similar examples of multiple switching in number within the same passage, as in this nearby passage which in the original text also switches the number three times:

Alma 12:34–35

- *singular*      therefore whosoever repenteth and hardeneth not **his** heart
- he** shall have claim on mercy through mine Only Begotten Son
- *plural*        unto a remission of **their** sins
- and **these** shall enter into my rest
- *singular*      and whosoever will harden **his** heart and will do iniquity
- *plural*        behold I swear in my wrath that **they** shall not enter into my rest

In that case, Joseph Smith edited two of the plural pronouns (*their* and *they*, but not *these*) to singulars. For discussion, see under that passage.

In addition to the case of Alma 11:1, there is one other occurrence in the current text of *wages* without any pronominal adjective:

Alma 3:27

for every man **receiveth wages of him** who he listeth to obey

This too may be an error, particularly when we consider another passage in the book of Alma which is semantically related:

Alma 5:41–42

but whosoever bringeth forth evil works  
the same becometh a child of the devil  
for he hearkeneth unto his voice and doth follow him  
and whosoever doeth this must **receive his wages of him**  
therefore for his wages he receiveth death  
as to things pertaining unto righteousness  
being dead unto all good works

The similarity in phraseology is particularly striking: “receiveth wages of him” (Alma 3:27) versus “receive **his** wages of him” (Alma 5:42). However, one example is probably not enough evidence for emending Alma 3:27. On the other hand, in Alma 11:1 the spacing in  $\mathcal{O}$  and the initial *he* in  $\mathcal{O}$  (rather than *they*) in the following clause argue that, despite its difficulty, the original text there read *his wages*. The standard edited text would, of course, read better if the proposed *his* was replaced with *their* (that is, “or those who were appointed to be judges should receive **their** wages according to the time which . . .”).

**Summary:** Emend Alma 11:1 to read “every man which was a judge of the law . . . should receive **his** wages according to the time which . . .”; this emendation is based on indirect evidence from the original manuscript; maintain in this passage the shifting in number from the singular *a judge* to the plural *judges*; also restore the original nonstandard uses of *which* and *was* to this passage.

#### ■ Alma 11:2

*and the judge executed authority and sent forth officers  
that the man should be brought before him  
and [§2 NULL > §1 he 1 | he ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] judgeth the man  
according to the law*

Here scribe 2 of  $\mathcal{P}$  seems to have omitted the subject pronoun *he*, which Oliver Cowdery supplied when he proofed  $\mathcal{P}$  against  $\mathcal{O}$ . Clearly, the text here reads better with the *he*, so Oliver’s correction could have been due to conscious editing on his part. Although  $\mathcal{O}$  is not extant here, there is enough room between nearby surviving fragments for the *he*.

There is considerable evidence that scribe 2 of  $\mathcal{P}$  sometimes omitted the subject pronoun *he*; except for the last example listed below, Oliver Cowdery was the one who supplied the *he* in  $\mathcal{P}$  (as here in Alma 11:2):

Mosiah 27:19

therefore he was taken by those that were with him and carried helpless  
even until [§2 NULL > §1 he 1 | he ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] was laid  
before his father

Alma 5:41

therefore if a man bringeth forth good works  
[§2 NULL > §1 he 1 | he ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] hearkeneth  
unto the voice of the good shepherd  
and he doth follow him

Alma 8:22

and it came to pass that Alma ate bread  
and [§2 NULL > §1 he 1 | ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] was filled  
and he blessed Amulek and his house  
and he gave thanks unto God

3 Nephi 26:15

and it came to pass that  
after [§2 NULL > §1 he 1 | he ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] had ascended  
into heaven  
the second time that he shewed himself unto them . . .

4 Nephi 1:48–49

and it came to pass that  
when three hundred and twenty years had passed away  
Ammaron being constrained by the Holy Ghost  
did hide up the records which were sacred . . .  
even until the three hundred and twentieth year from the coming of Christ  
and [ 1 | he ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] did hide them up unto the Lord

For the last two examples, the 1830 edition was set from  $\mathcal{O}$ , thus arguing that  $\mathcal{O}$  itself had the pronoun and that scribe 2 was responsible for omitting it in  $\mathcal{P}$ .

*Summary:* Accept Oliver Cowdery's inserted *he* in Alma 11:2 as the reading of the original manuscript.

#### ■ Alma 11:2

*and he judgeth the man according to the law*  
*and the [evidences 0ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST | §2 witnesses > §1 evidences 1]*  
*which are brought against him*

Here only the first part of the word *evidences* is extant in  $\mathcal{O}$  (*evi* plus part of the following *d*). The *ev* at the beginning of the word, in Oliver Cowdery's hand, looks somewhat like a *w*, which led scribe 2 of  $\mathcal{P}$  to misread *evidences* as *witnesses* when he copied the text from  $\mathcal{O}$  into  $\mathcal{P}$ . Oliver restored the original *evidences* to  $\mathcal{P}$  when he proofed  $\mathcal{P}$  against  $\mathcal{O}$ . Instances of plural *evidences* can be found elsewhere in the text:



Helaman 5:50

and it came to pass that they did go forth and did minister unto the people  
 declaring throughout all the regions round about  
 all the things which they had heard and seen  
 insomuch that the more part of the Lamanites were convinced of them  
 because of the greatness of the **evidences** which they had received

Helaman 8:24

for ye have rejected all these things  
 notwithstanding so many **evidences** which ye have received

In standard English, we expect the singular *evidence* (acting as a mass noun rather than a count noun). The critical text will accept the plural *evidences* here in Alma 11:2 and elsewhere in the text whenever it is supported by the earliest textual sources.

**Summary:** Maintain *evidences* in Alma 11:2, the apparent reading of the original manuscript and the corrected reading in  $\mathcal{P}$ .

#### ■ Alma 11:2

*and thus the man is compelled to pay that which he oweth  
 or be [striped 1ABDEFPS | stripped CGHIJKLMNOQRT]  
 or be cast out from among the people as a thief and a robber*

The printer's manuscript, in scribe 2's hand, has the spelling *striped*, which is what the 1830 compositor set. But in the 1840 edition, *striped* was changed to *stripped*. The 1879 LDS edition accepted the 1840 *stripped* while the 1908 RLDS edition restored the earlier *striped*.

The 1840 emendation is theoretically possible since the scribes frequently neglected to double consonants when adding the *-ed* inflectional ending. In the following list of cases involving the letter *p*, Oliver Cowdery is responsible for nearly all of the misspellings. All of these examples are found in  $\mathcal{P}$  (there are no examples in the extant portions of  $\mathcal{C}$ ). There is also one clear example of *stripped* misspelled as *striped*, and this is by scribe 2 of  $\mathcal{P}$  (marked below with an asterisk):

□ *stoped* for *stopped*:

Mosiah 4:20      your mouths should be **stoped**

□ *claped* for *clapped*:

Mosiah 18:11      they **claped** their hands for joy

Alma 19:30      she **claped** her hands being filled with joy

Alma 31:36      he **claped** his hands upon all they which were with him

Alma 31:36      as he **claped** his hands upon them

□ *striped* for *stripped*:

\* Alma 5:29      is there one among you who is not **striped** of envy

□ *sliped* for *slipped*:

Helaman 13:35      and they have **sliped** away from us



But in Alma 11:2, it is not immediately clear whether the text should read *striped* (that is, beaten or whipped) or *stripped* (that is, stripped of possessions or clothing).

The Mosaic law definitely made provision for punishment by whipping, as described in the book of Deuteronomy:

Deuteronomy 25:1–3 (King James Bible)  
 if there be a controversy between men  
 and they come unto judgment that *the judges* may judge them  
 then they shall justify the righteous and condemn the wicked  
 and it shall be if the wicked man *be* worthy to be beaten  
 that the judge shall cause him to lie down  
 and to be beaten before his face  
 according to his fault by a certain number  
 forty **stripes** he may give him *and* not exceed  
 lest *if* he should exceed and beat him above these with many **stripes**  
 then thy brother should seem vile unto thee

The King James Bible has 19 examples of the noun *stripe* but none of the verb *stripe*.

On the other hand, the verb *strip* is used in the scriptures, but never as a punishment (except possibly here in Alma 11:2). In the Bible, one's clothes or other objects from the body may be stripped off. Or, figuratively speaking, one may be stripped of glory. Similarly, the Book of Mormon refers to being stripped of pride, envy, and uncleanness.

One particular question then is the possible use of *stripe* in Alma 11:2 as a verb. Although rare, the verb *stripe* 'to beat or whip' dates from at least Late Middle English and can be found up into the late 1800s. We have these citations (with original spellings) from the Oxford English Dictionary (see under the verb *stripe*):

*Promptorium parvulorum sive clericorum, lexicon Anglo-Latinum princeps* (about 1460)

**Strypynge**, or scorgynge with abaleys: *vibex*.

Jehan Palsgrave (1530)

I **strype**, I beate, *je bats*.

Thomas More (1533)

I caused a seruaunt of myne to **strype** him lyke a chyld.  
 . . . They **stryped** hym with roddys.

Jeremy Bentham (1823)

[Paul's] eight **stripings** and beatings.

Thomas Carlyle (1843)

We shall all be **striped** and scourged till we do learn it.

George Meredith (1870)

Still the Gods love her . . . this good France,  
 the bleeding thing they **stripe**.

Interestingly, in the 1557 edition of More's original 1533 *The apologye made by hym*, the words for *stripe(d)* were spelled *stryppe* and *stripped* (that is, with two *p*'s, just like the 1840 edition's *stripped* in Alma 11:2).

Thus *stripe* as a verb is quite possible for the Book of Mormon text. Moreover, since the Mosaic law provides for whipping, we should expect that these Israelite descendants in the Book of Mormon had provisions for striping as a punishment, especially since they explicitly claimed to follow the Mosaic law, as described by Nephi in 2 Nephi 5:10: “and we did observe to keep the judgments and the statutes and the commandments of the Lord in all things according to the law of Moses”.

Note further that the law of Mosiah, as stated in Alma 11:2, goes from the least to the worst punishment: first, the attempt is to get the guilty person to pay; if that fails, then the person is beaten; and ultimately, if that fails, the person is banished from the society. Stripping a person of his goods would actually be a type of forced payment and could fall under the first statement (“compelled to pay that which he oweth”).

The possibility that *stripped* in the LDS text is an error for *striped* is mentioned by John W. Welch on pages 24–27 of “Theft and Robbery in the Book of Mormon and in Ancient Near Eastern Law” (1992), a FARMS paper.

**Summary:** Restore the original spelling *striped* in Alma 11:2 since the reference is most probably to whipping, in accord with the Mosaic law.

#### ■ Alma 11:2–3

*now if a man [oweth 1A | owed BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] another  
and he would not pay that which he did owe  
he was complained of to the judge  
and the judge executed authority  
and [send > sent 1 | sent ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] forth officers  
that the man should be brought before him  
and he [Judgeth >js Judged 1 | judgeth A | judged BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] the man  
according to the law and the evidences  
which [are >js were 1 | are A | were BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] brought against him  
and thus the man [is 01 | was ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] compelled to pay  
that which he [oweth >js owed 1 | oweth A | owed BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]  
or be striped or be cast out from among the people as a thief and a robber  
and the judge [receiveth 01 | recieveth A | received BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]  
for his wages according to his time*

Originally, in describing king Mosiah’s judicial system, the first three verses of Alma 11 show a mixture of present-tense and past-tense verb forms. Verse 1 has only past-tense forms:

Alma 11:1

now it **was** in the law of Mosiah  
that every man which **was** a judge of the law  
or which **was** appointed to be judges  
**should** receive his wages according to the time  
which they **labored** to judge those  
which **were** brought before them to be judged

But verse 2 starts out with a present-tense *oweth* (“now if a man **oweth** another . . .”). This present-tense *oweth* is then followed by some more past-tense forms: “and he **would** not pay that which

he **did** owe / he **was** complained of to the judge and the judge **executed** authority and **sent** forth officers that the man **should** be brought before him”. But then the present-tense forms return to the text: “and he **judgeth** the man according to the law and the evidences which **are** brought against him and thus the man **is** compelled to pay that which he **oweth** . . . and the judge **receiveth** for his wages according to his time”.

In the editing for the 1837 edition, the present-tense forms in Alma 11:2–3 were consistently edited to the past tense; some of these changes were marked by Joseph Smith in  $\mathcal{P}$ . Such mixtures in tense can be found elsewhere in the original Book of Mormon text, as in the following example which also involves a description of the judicial system and reads *murdereth was* in the original text:

Alma 1:18

and they **durst** not steal for fear of the law  
for such **were** punished  
neither **durst** they rob nor murder  
for he that **murdereth was** punished unto death

As explained under that passage, the critical text will restore such instances of mixture in tense.

**Summary:** Restore in Alma 11:2–3 the original present-tense forms that were edited to past-tense forms in the 1837 edition; this kind of mixture in tense is occasionally found in the original text.

### ■ Alma 11:3

*and the judge receiveth for his wages according to his time*

*a [§2 *senire* > §1 *senine* 1 | *senine* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] of gold for a day  
or a senum of silver which is equal to a **senine** of gold*

Scribe 2 of  $\mathcal{P}$  originally wrote *senine* as *senire*, undoubtedly because Oliver Cowdery, here the scribe in  $\mathcal{O}$ , sometimes wrote *n*'s that look like *r*'s. See, for instance, the discussion under Mosiah 2:15–16 regarding *clean/clear* and *even/ever*. As far as *senine* goes, elsewhere the word is consistently spelled *senine*, not *senire* (including a second time in Alma 11:3):

LOCATION	$\mathcal{O}$	$\mathcal{P}$
Alma 11:3	—	senine
Alma 11:5	—	senine
Alma 11:7	—	senine
Alma 11:8	—	senine
Alma 30:33	Senine	Senine
3 Nephi 12:26	—	senine
3 Nephi 12:26	—	senine

The four other instances in Alma 11 are in scribe 2's hand (none are extant in  $\mathcal{O}$ ). The Alma 30 instance is extant in  $\mathcal{O}$  and reads *Senine* (and the same in  $\mathcal{P}$ ). The instances in Alma 30 and 3 Nephi 12 are in Oliver Cowdery's hand. For the two 3 Nephi 12 instances, the 1830 edition reads *senine*; for that portion of the text, the 1830 edition was set from  $\mathcal{O}$ , which means that there  $\mathcal{O}$  most probably read as *senine*. Thus all the other extant spellings support the traditional spelling

*senine*, despite the fact that scribe 2 of  $\mathcal{P}$  wrote the first occurrence as *senire*. The critical text will maintain the spelling *senine*.

**Summary:** Maintain the spelling *senine* throughout the Book of Mormon text.

#### ■ Alma 11:5

*a* [*sean* 1 | *seon* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *of gold*

Here scribe 2 of  $\mathcal{P}$  wrote the first occurrence of *seon* as *sean*. As discussed under Alma 5:7, scribe 2 sometimes wrote *a*'s instead of *o*'s (in Alma 5:7, he wrote *awake* rather than the correct *awoke*). Moreover, Oliver Cowdery's *a*'s and *o*'s are oftentimes very similar, so it could have been very easy for scribe 2 to have misinterpreted *seon* as *sean*.

The word *seon* appears twice more in the text, and in both instances, scribe 2 again wrote *sean*:

LOCATION	$\mathcal{O}$	$\mathcal{P}$
Alma 11:8	—	§2 sean
Alma 11:9	—	§2 sean > §1 seon

Oliver Cowdery was the scribe in  $\mathcal{O}$  for this portion of Alma 11, but unfortunately none of the three instances of *seon* are extant in  $\mathcal{O}$ . For the last instance, when Oliver proofed  $\mathcal{P}$  against  $\mathcal{O}$ , he corrected the *a* to *o* in  $\mathcal{P}$ , thus showing that he read this word, written in his own hand in  $\mathcal{O}$ , as *seon*. For all three instances of *seon*, the 1830 typesetter followed the third (corrected) spelling of the name in  $\mathcal{P}$ .

Scribe 2 of  $\mathcal{P}$  also wrote *onti* as *anti*. One of the instances of *onti* is extant in  $\mathcal{O}$ , and it definitely reads with an *o*. For discussion, see nearby under Alma 11:6.

**Summary:** Maintain in Alma 11:5, 8, 9 the spelling *seon* rather than the original spelling in  $\mathcal{P}$  (namely, scribe 2's *sean*); the spelling *seon* is based on Oliver Cowdery's correction (in verse 9) of scribe 2's *sean* to *seon*, which probably reflects the reading of  $\mathcal{O}$  (no longer extant for any of the three occurrences of this word in the text).

#### ■ Alma 11:6

*an* [*ezrum* 1 | *ezrom* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *of silver*

Here the earliest text (the printer's manuscript) reads *ezrum*; the original manuscript is not extant for this word. There is one other occurrence of *ezrum* in the text:

Alma 11:12  
and an [*ezrum* 1 | *ezrom* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] of silver  
was as great as four senums

$\mathcal{O}$  is not extant for this instance either.

As explained in the discussion under Alma 10:31, the name *Zeezrom* is misspelled in  $\mathcal{O}$  as *Zeezrum* for every extant occurrence of the name in Alma 11 (six times, from verses 21 through 35).

All of these instances of *Zeezrum* occur after Alma 11:12 (that is, after both occurrences of *ezrum*), which suggests that in  $\mathcal{O}$  the misspelling *Zeezrum* was influenced by the spelling *ezrum*. On the other hand, the 1830 compositor twice set *ezrum* as *ezrom*, apparently under the influence of the first occurrence of the name *Zeezrom* (in Alma 10:31), the only instance of *Zeezrom* that preceded the word *ezrum*. The critical text will restore the spelling *ezrum*, the reading of the earliest extant source, the printer's manuscript.

**Summary:** In accord with the reading of the printer's manuscript (and the probable reading of the original manuscript), restore *ezrum* as the name of the monetary unit.

### ■ Alma 11:6

*and an [§2 onhi > §1 onti 1 | onti ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] of silver*

Scribe 2 of  $\mathcal{P}$  had difficulties with the monetary unit *onti*. Here in verse 6, he miswrote it as *onhi*. Oliver Cowdery corrected *onhi* to *onti* when he proofed  $\mathcal{P}$  against  $\mathcal{O}$ . Later on in this chapter, scribe 2 miswrote an *onti* as *anti*:

Alma 11:13

and [§2 anti > §1 an onti 1 | an onti ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]  
was as great as them all

Again Oliver corrected this error, replacing *anti* with *an onti* (by crossing out the *ti* of *anti* and then supralinearly inserting *onti*). Undoubtedly, the original text read *an onti* in verses 6 and 13. Throughout the description of the monetary system here in Alma 11, the indefinite article is consistently used when listing each monetary unit and specifying its value:

Alma 11

verse 3	a senine of gold, a senum of silver, a senine of gold
verse 5	a senine of gold, a seon of gold, a shum of gold, a limnah of gold
verse 6	a senum of silver, an amnor of silver, an ezrum of silver, an onti of silver
verse 7	a senum of silver, a senine of gold
verse 8	a seon of gold, a senine
verse 9	a shum of gold, a seon
verse 10	a limnah of gold
verse 11	an amnor of silver
verse 12	an ezrum of silver
verse 13	an onti
verse 15	a shiblon, a senum, a shiblon
verse 16	a shilum, a shiblon
verse 17	a Leah, a shilum
verse 19	an antion of gold

Later on in the chapter, when Zeezrom tries to tempt Amulek, scribe 2 of  $\mathcal{P}$  twice wrote the plural *onties* as *anties*:

Alma 11:22

behold here is six [*onties* 0ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST | §2 *anties* > §1 *onties* 1]  
of silver

Alma 11:25

behold these six [*anties* > *onties* 1 | *onties* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST]  
which are of great worth  
I will give unto thee

In the first instance, Oliver Cowdery made the correction in  $\mathcal{P}$  to *onties*; in the second instance, scribe 2 himself made the correction, virtually immediately. The instance in verse 22 is particularly important since  $\mathcal{C}$  is extant there and clearly reads *onties*. Thus the manuscript evidence argues that *onti* is the correct name for this monetary unit. We notice here that scribe 2 once more misread an *o* as an *a*, just as he did with the word *seon* (see the discussion under Alma 11:5).

**Summary:** Maintain the name *onti* for the monetary unit; the misspellings *onhi* and *anti* are errors that scribe 2 introduced into  $\mathcal{P}$  but which were all corrected, either by himself or by Oliver Cowdery when he proofed  $\mathcal{P}$  against  $\mathcal{C}$ .

#### ■ Alma 11:11

and an [§2 *omnor* > *amnor* > §1 *omnor* > *amnor* 1 | *amnor* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST]  
of silver  
was as great as two *senums*

Once more we have a problem with *a* versus *o* in the name for a monetary unit. Here scribe 2 of  $\mathcal{P}$  first wrote *omnor*; then he himself corrected it to *amnor*. Later, while proofing against  $\mathcal{C}$ , Oliver Cowdery crossed out scribe 2's corrected *amnor* and supralinearly wrote the *a* as an *o*; but then Oliver himself changed his mind and corrected his own *omnor* to *amnor* (by supralinearly writing out the whole word). Obviously, both scribe 2 and Oliver Cowdery had difficulty interpreting how Oliver had written *amnor* in the original manuscript (which is not extant here). But since both scribes ended up deciding that *amnor* was correct, the critical text will follow their final interpretation. In addition, the word appears earlier in verse 6, and there scribe 2 wrote *amnor* without correction as “an amnor of silver”. Perhaps in verse 11,  $\mathcal{C}$  actually read *omnor* and the corrections in  $\mathcal{P}$  to *amnor* were the result of scribe 2 and Oliver Cowdery independently referring back to the first occurrence of *amnor* in verse 6, spelled correctly there in  $\mathcal{C}$ .

**Summary:** Retain *amnor*, the uncorrected spelling in Alma 11:6 and the twice-corrected spelling in Alma 11:11 (originally by scribe 2 of  $\mathcal{P}$  and later by Oliver Cowdery).

#### ■ Alma 11:13

and an *onti* was as great  
as [*them all* > *js all of them* 1 | *them all* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST]

In his editing of  $\mathcal{P}$  for the 1837 edition, Joseph Smith here revised “as great as **them all**” to read “as great as **all of them**”. This change was never implemented in the 1837 edition. A similar occurrence

of this expression, found earlier in this chapter, was left unchanged in  $\mathcal{D}$ : “and a limnah of gold was the value of **them all**” (Alma 11:10).

Elsewhere in the text, the phrase *them all* is fairly common, with at least 11 occurrences (depending on how *them all* is parsed). On the other hand, there is no occurrence in the original text of *all of them* that is equivalent to *them all*. The only instances of *all of them* are subject forms, not object forms (thus disallowing substitution of *them all*):

2 Nephi 17:19	and they shall come and shall rest <b>all of them</b> in the desolate valleys
2 Nephi 24:18	all the kings of the nations yea <b>all of them</b> lie in glory
Alma 56:46	for they were <b>all of them</b> very young
Alma 58:31	<b>all of them</b> are at this period of time in our possession
3 Nephi 7:17	and <b>all of them</b> cannot be written
3 Nephi 17:25	for they <b>all of them</b> did see and hear

The first two of these are quotations from Isaiah and follow the language of the King James Bible.

Beginning with the 1920 edition, the LDS text has had one instance of *all of them* acting as an object form, but in the original text this read as *every one of them*:

Alma 28:5  
 and thus the cry of mourning was heard  
 among [*every one* 01ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPS | *all* RT] of them

Based on the overwhelming use of *them all* in object position elsewhere in the Book of Mormon text, a more consistent emendation for Alma 28:5 would have been to change *every one of them* to *them all* (“and thus the cry of mourning was heard among **them all**”). For discussion of the grammatical motivation for the 1920 change to *all of them*, see under Alma 28:5.

**Summary:** Retain in Alma 11:13 the original use of *them all* in “an onti was as great as **them all**”.

#### ■ Alma 11:15

*therefore a shiblon*

*for* [§2 NULL >+ §1 a 1 | ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST] *half a measure of barley*

Here scribe 2 of  $\mathcal{D}$  wrote “therefore a shiblon for **half** a measure of barley”. Later, when Oliver Cowdery proofed  $\mathcal{D}$  against  $\mathcal{C}$ , he inserted inline the indefinite article *a* between *for* and *half* (the level of ink flow is slightly heavier).  $\mathcal{C}$  is not extant for the phrase *a half*, but there would have been little motivation for Oliver to have inserted the *a* on his own since either reading, with or without the *a*, is possible in English. Earlier in this verse, in the first clause, we have an instance of *half* without the *a*: “a shiblon is **half** of a senum” (Alma 11:15), although  $\mathcal{C}$  is not extant here to tell us for sure whether an *a* preceded *half*. It seems that this first occurrence of *half* without the *a* led scribe 2 of  $\mathcal{D}$  to write the following occurrence of *half* without the *a* (as “therefore a shiblon for **half** a measure of barley”). The 1830 compositor may have also been influenced by the preceding occurrence of *half* without the *a* since he ended up ignoring the inserted *a* in  $\mathcal{D}$  when he set the text for the second clause in this verse.



In the next verse, we get one more example of *half*, and in this instance the *a* is there in  $\mathcal{D}$  (but  $\mathcal{G}$  is not extant): “and a shilum is **a half** of a shiblon” (Alma 11:16). So in two out of three cases in Alma 11:15–16, we have *a half* in the earliest text. One may wonder if the first occurrence of *half* might not be an error for *a half*. The critical text will, however, allow variation here; there is nothing inappropriate about “a shiblon is **half** of a senum”. Two occurrences of *a half* are not enough evidence to emend one occurrence of *half* to *a half*.

Further evidence for variation with respect to the determiner for *half* is found in verse 17:

Alma 11:17

and a leah is **the half** of [*a* 0ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST | *the* >% *a* 1] shilum

Here we have *the half* in the earliest textual source, namely in  $\mathcal{D}$ . Although  $\mathcal{G}$  is not extant for *the half*, the definite article *the* (instead of *a* or no determiner at all) before *half* appears to be firm. Note that scribe 2 of  $\mathcal{D}$  initially wrote the following phrase “of **a** shilum” as “of **the** shilum” (but then he immediately erased the *the* and overwrote it with an *a*).  $\mathcal{G}$  is extant for “of a shilum”; thus the *a* is firm there. The initial *the* undoubtedly came from the preceding phrase, *the half*. Ultimately, what this means is that here in Alma 11:15–17 the word *half* can be preceded by either *the*, *a*, or no determiner at all. Thus the critical text will in each case follow the earliest reading, with *half* and *a half* in verse 15, *a half* in verse 16, and *the half* in verse 17.

**Summary:** Restore the occurrence of *a half* in the second sentence of Alma 11:15 (“therefore a shiblon for **a half** a measure of barley”); maintain the occurrence of *half* without any determiner in the first clause of Alma 11:15 (“a shiblon is **half** of a senum”); for this part of Alma 11, the text shows considerable variation, with an instance of *a half* in verse 16 (“and a shilum is **a half** of a shiblon”) and an instance of *the half* in verse 17 (“and a leah is **the half** of a shilum”).

#### ■ Alma 11:16–17

and a [*shiblum* > *shillum* > *shilum* 0 | *shilum* 1 | *shiblum* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST]  
 is a half of a shiblon  
 and a leah is the half of a [*shilum* 01 | *shiblum* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST]

For both occurrences of the monetary unit *shilum*, the original manuscript is extant. For the first occurrence of *shilum*, Oliver Cowdery (the scribe here in  $\mathcal{G}$ ) initially wrote *shiblum*, which he first corrected to *shillum* and then finally to *shilum*. Here Joseph Smith probably spelled out the word since Oliver could not have known whether *shilum* had one or two *l*'s. (For this first occurrence of the word, Oliver first overwrote his initial *b* with an *l*; then he crossed out that correcting *l*, leaving only one *l* in *shilum*.) When Oliver wrote the name the second time in  $\mathcal{G}$ , he wrote *shilum* without any error. And when scribe 2 of  $\mathcal{D}$  copied *shilum* into  $\mathcal{D}$ , he too correctly wrote it down as *shilum*. But when the 1830 compositor set this word, he mistakenly set *shilum* as *shiblum*, the same error that Oliver himself initially wrote for the first occurrence of that word in  $\mathcal{G}$ .

This error of *shiblum* for *shilum* was caused by the phonetically similar monetary unit *shiblon*, which is mentioned twice in the immediately preceding verse as well as once between the two occurrences of *shilum* in verses 16 and 17:



Alma 11:15–17 (original text)

a **shiblon** is half of a **senum**  
 therefore a **shiblon** for a half a measure of barley  
 and a **shilum** is a half of a **shiblon**  
 and a leah is the half of a **shilum**

**Summary:** Restore in Alma 11:16–17 the correct name for the monetary unit *shilum* (in place of the *shiblum* of all the printed editions).

#### ■ Alma 11:17–19

*and a leah is the half of a shilum*

- |  |                    |
|--|--------------------|
| (1) <i>now an antion of gold is equal to three shiblons</i>      | 01PS               |
| (2) <i>now this is their number according to their reckoning</i> |                    |
| (2) <i>now this is their number according to their reckoning</i> | ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOQRT |
| (1) <i>now an antion of gold is equal to three shiblons</i>      |                    |

Somehow the 1830 typesetter switched the order of these two sentences, placing the specific statement regarding the antion of gold after the summarizing statement “now this is their number according to their reckoning”. The fact that both sentences begin with *now* probably played a role in causing this confusion. Both the original and printer’s manuscripts support the original order. Obviously, the statement regarding the antion of gold belongs with the preceding statements that specify the values for all the other monetary units (found in verses 7 through 17). In accord with the reading in  $\mathcal{P}$ , the 1908 RLDS edition restored the original order of the sentences to the RLDS text. Restoring the correct order to the LDS text will require switching the verse numbers: verse 18 will become verse 19 and vice versa (the corresponding verse numbers for the current RLDS text are 62 and 63 and are, of course, in the right order).

In this passage the 1830 typesetter also misspelled *shiblons* as *shublons*. This error was first corrected in the 1840 edition and later in the 1920 LDS edition. (See the following discussion under Alma 11:19.) In general, it was very difficult for the scribes and the 1830 typesetter to correctly transmit the unfamiliar names for the monetary units. We have textual variation for *shilum*, *shiblon*, *senine*, *seon*, *amnor*, *ezrum*, and *onti*; and for two of these, *ezrum* and *shilum*, all the printed editions have read incorrectly, as *ezrom* and *shiblum*:

- *ezrum*, not *ezrom* (*ezrom* is due to confusion with *Zeezrom*)
- *shilum*, not *shiblum* (the extra *b* is due to confusion with *shiblon*)

We should also note the consistency in the endings for these names:

- four names end in *-um*: *shilum*, *senum*, *shum*, and *ezrum*
- three names end in *-on*: *shiblon*, *antion*, and *seon*

This consistency gives further support for the original spellings *ezrum* and *seon*.

Verses 7–17, 19 define a set of exchange rates between the various units. Besides using precious metals of gold and silver for exchange, the Nephites set rates for grains (although barley is the only grain specifically mentioned):

Alma 11

EXCHANGE RATE	GOLD	SILVER	BARLEY
1/8		leah	
1/4		shilum	
1/2		shiblon	1/2 measure
1	senine	senum	1 measure
3/2	antion		
2	seon	amnor	
4	shum	ezrum	
7 = 1 + 2 + 4	limnah	onti	

In the text proper, the gold and silver units are referred to as *pieces*, not *coins*: “now these are the names of the different **pieces** of their gold and of their silver according to their value” (Alma 11:4). Here in Alma 11, there is no specific evidence for a coin system (that is, minted pieces of precious metal, with images or writing, perhaps the stipulated weight, on the pieces). The non-canonical chapter summary for Alma 11 has traditionally referred to these monetary units as coins or coinage:

1920 summary	“Nephite coins and measures”
1981 summary	“Nephite coinage set forth”

The use of the word *coin* was also used in the primitive tables of contents (referred to as “reference(s)” or “index”) that were added to copies of some of the early Book of Mormon editions (which had no versification system and thus needed some kind of help in finding passages):

1830 edition	“Names of money”
1837 and 1840 editions	“Names of Nephite coin”
1840 edition	“Coins named”
1841 edition	“Coins named”

The word *coin*, of course, claims more than what the text actually says. Interestingly, the 1981 chapter summary has been changed in the recently published Doubleday edition of the Book of Mormon (2004) to read “The Nephite **monetary system** set forth” (the text for this edition was provided by the LDS Church).

**Summary:** Switch the order of the text for verses 18 and 19 in Alma 11 (according to the reading of the two manuscripts), thus restoring the placement of all the monetary units in one section.

■ Alma 11:19

*now an antion of gold is equal to three [shiblons 1CGHKPRST | shublons ABDEFIJLMNOQ]*

Here in verse 19, the 1830 compositor misread *shiblons* and set it incorrectly as *shublons*. Earlier in Alma 11, he set the word correctly as *shiblon* (twice in verse 15 and once in verse 16):

Alma 11:15–16

a **shiblon** is half of a senum  
 therefore a **shiblon** for a half a measure of barley  
 and a shilum is a half of a **shiblon**

The 1840 edition restored the original *shiblons* here in verse 19, a correction that the RLDS textual tradition has consistently followed. The LDS textual tradition maintained the incorrect *shublons* until the 1920 edition.

*Summary:* Maintain the spelling *shiblon* throughout Alma 11, including verse 19.

#### ■ Alma 11:20

*because they received [their 01BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST | A] wages according to their employ*

The 1830 typesetter accidentally omitted the determiner *their* before *wages*, but it was restored in the 1837 edition, apparently by reference to  $\mathcal{P}$ . As discussed earlier under Alma 11:1, the text normally has either *his* or *their* as the determiner for *wages*. The critical text will, of course, maintain the *their* here in Alma 11:20.

*Summary:* Maintain the determiner *their* for *wages* in Alma 11:20 (“because they received **their** wages according to their employ”).

#### ■ Alma 11:21

*and this Zeezrom began to question Amulek saying . . .*

One wonders here if *this* might be a mistake for *thus*, especially since the preceding verse describes the intent of these lawyers like Zeezrom:

Alma 11:20–21 (original text with proposed emendation)

now it was for the sole purpose for to get gain  
 because they received their wages according to their employ  
 therefore they did stir up the people to riotings  
 and all manner of disturbances and wickedness  
 that they might have more employ  
 that they might get money according to the suits which was brought before them  
 therefore they did stir up the people against Alma and Amulek  
 and **thus** Zeezrom began to question Amulek saying . . .

Here at the beginning of verse 21, the original manuscript is not extant for the end of the line, but the word *thus*, if that was the reading in  $\mathcal{O}$ , would have occurred at the end of the line in  $\mathcal{O}$ . Words at the end of the line in  $\mathcal{O}$  were sometimes misread when they were copied from  $\mathcal{O}$  into  $\mathcal{P}$ ; the rapid shift of the scribe’s eye from the end of the line in  $\mathcal{O}$  to the beginning of the next line allowed errors to enter the text during the copying process. See, for instance, the discussion regarding the following copying errors for words at the end of the line in  $\mathcal{O}$ :

1 Nephi 8:27	up > at
1 Nephi 15:16	numbered > remembered
2 Nephi 24:25	break > bring
Alma 33:21	behold > be healed
Alma 40:6	& > NULL

Alma 41:3	also > NULL
Alma 41:5	to > NULL
Alma 53:4	encircled > enclosed
Alma 54:10	retain > retake
Alma 55:19	that > NULL

In some of these cases, the change involved the deletion or replacement of a small word; in other cases, the error resulted from the word being hyphenated at the end of the line. In general, the scribes were prone to make mistakes when copying the ends of lines. Thus it is possible here in Alma 11:21 that scribe 2 of  $\mathcal{P}$  misread a *thus* at the end of the line in  $\mathcal{G}$  as *this*.

There are quite a number of instances where the scribes wrote *this* instead of *thus*, if only momentarily:

- 1 Nephi 2:12 (Oliver Cowdery's initial error in  $\mathcal{P}$ )  
 and [*thus* 0ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST | *this* > *thus* 1] Laman and Lemuel  
 being the eldest  
 did murmur against their father
- 1 Nephi 9:6 (scribe 3's initial error in  $\mathcal{G}$ )  
 and [*this* > *thus* 0 | *thus* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST] it is
- Mosiah 3:24 (Oliver Cowdery's initial error in  $\mathcal{P}$ )  
 and [*this* > *thus* 1 | *thus* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST] saith the Lord . . .
- Mosiah 29:47 (scribe 2's initial error in  $\mathcal{P}$ )  
 and [*this* > *thus* 1 | *thus* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST] ended the days of Alma
- Alma 1:28 (scribe 2's initial error in  $\mathcal{P}$ )  
 and [*this* > *thus* 1 | *thus* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST] they did establish  
 the affairs of the church
- Alma 1:33 (scribe 2's initial error in  $\mathcal{P}$ )  
 and it came to pass that  
 by [*this* > *thus* 1 | *thus* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST] exercising the law upon them  
 every man suffering according to that which he had done . . .
- Alma 6:8 (scribe 2's initial error in  $\mathcal{P}$ )  
 and [*this* > *thus* 1 | *thus* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST] it is written
- Alma 35:12 (Oliver Cowdery's initial error in  $\mathcal{P}$ )  
 and [*thus* 0ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST | *this* > *thus* 1] ended  
 the seventeenth year of the reign of the judges over the people of Nephi
- Alma 47:35 (Oliver Cowdery's initial error in  $\mathcal{P}$ )  
 and [*thus* 0ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST | *this* > *thus* 1] by his fraud  
 and by the assistance of his cunning servants  
 he obtained the kingdom
- Alma 49:29 (Oliver Cowdery's initial error in  $\mathcal{G}$ )  
 and [*this* > *thus* 0 | *thus* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST] ended  
 the nineteenth year of the reign of the judges over the people of Nephi

- Alma 51:37 (Oliver Cowdery's initial error in  $\mathcal{O}$ )  
 and [*this* > *thus* > NULL 0 | 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST]  
**thus** ended the days of Amalickiah
- Alma 52:26 (Oliver Cowdery's initial error in  $\mathcal{O}$ )  
 and [*this* >% *thus* 0 | *thus* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST] Moroni had obtained  
 a possession of the city Mulek
- Alma 56:19 (Oliver Cowdery's initial error in  $\mathcal{P}$ )  
 and [*thus* 0ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST | *this* > *thus* 1] were we favored of the Lord
- Alma 58:17 (Oliver Cowdery's initial error in  $\mathcal{P}$ )  
 and when they had [*thus* 0ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST | *this* > *thus* 1]  
 secreted themselves . . .
- Helaman 2:11 (Oliver Cowdery's initial error in  $\mathcal{O}$ )  
 and [*this* > *thus* 0 | *thus* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST]  
 when Helaman sent forth to take them . . .
- 3 Nephi 2:1 (Oliver Cowdery's initial error in  $\mathcal{P}$ )  
 [*this* > *thus* 1 | *thus* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST] passed away  
 the ninety and fifth year also
- Ether 2:3 (Oliver Cowdery's initial error in  $\mathcal{P}$ )  
 and [*this* > *thus* 1 | *thus* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST] they did carry with them  
 swarms of bees

Scribe 2 of  $\mathcal{P}$  is responsible for four of the above examples of initially miswriting *thus* as *this*. But we should also note that in most of these cases Oliver Cowdery himself mistakenly wrote *this* for *thus*, which suggests that in Alma 11:21 he could have replaced an original *thus* with *this* as he took down Joseph Smith's dictation; in other words, Oliver rather than scribe 2 of  $\mathcal{P}$  could have been responsible for the change. It should also be noted here that there is considerable evidence that *this* was sometimes miswritten—usually only momentarily—as *thus*. For a list of examples and discussion of the error in this opposite direction, see under Ether 1:43. Finally, there are a few other cases where there is some real issue over whether the text should read *this* or *thus*; see the discussion under Alma 24:17–18, Alma 52:24–25, and 4 Nephi 1:49.

The occurrence of *thus* immediately followed by a personal name is fairly common in the narrative; in fact, for two of the following (each marked below with an asterisk), the scribe initially wrote *this* instead of the correct *thus* (see the preceding list for the specific variation):

- |                |   |
|----------------|---|
| * 1 Nephi 2:12 | and <b>thus Laman and Lemuel</b> being the eldest did murmur              |
| Alma 17:21     | and <b>thus Ammon</b> was carried before the king                         |
| Alma 46:36     | and <b>thus Moroni</b> planted the standard of liberty among the Nephites |
| Alma 47:30     | and <b>thus Amalickiah</b> by his fraud gained the hearts of the people   |
| Alma 50:6      | <b>thus Moroni</b> did prepare strong holds                               |
| Alma 50:12     | <b>thus Moroni</b> with his armies which did increase daily . . .         |
| Alma 51:21     | and <b>thus Moroni</b> put an end to those kingmen                        |
| * Alma 52:26   | and <b>thus Moroni</b> had obtained a possession of the city Mulek        |

In these cases, the *thus* is typically preceded by *and* in the narrative; in other words, the text has examples of “and thus <personal name>”. On the other hand, there are no examples elsewhere in the narrative of “and this <personal name>”. There are cases of “this <personal name>” in the narrative, but none with *and* preceding (excluding the questionable one here in Alma 11:21):

Alma 2:2	now <b>this Amlici</b> had by his cunning drawn away much people after him
Alma 13:17	now <b>this Melchizedek</b> was a king over the land of Salem
Alma 53:2	now behold <b>this Lehi</b> was a man who had been with Moroni . . .
Helaman 2:12	and more of <b>this Gaddianton</b> shall be spoken hereafter
Helaman 2:13	ye shall see that <b>this Gaddianton</b> did prove the overthrow yea almost the entire destruction of the people of Nephi
3 Nephi 3:12	and now behold <b>this Lachoneus</b> the governor was a just man
3 Nephi 3:19	therefore <b>this Gidgiddoni</b> was a great prophet among them

Another possible emendation for Alma 11:21 would be to insert the word *now*, giving “and **now** this Zeezrom began to question Amulek”. There is considerable evidence that the scribes (in particular, scribe 2 of  $\mathcal{P}$  and Oliver Cowdery) sometimes omitted *now* after the conjunction *and*:

1 Nephi 8:29 (Oliver Cowdery’s initial error in $\mathcal{P}$ )	and [ <i>now</i> 0ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST   NULL >+ <i>now</i> 1] I Nephi do not speak all the words of my father
1 Nephi 19:4 (Oliver Cowdery omitted the <i>now</i> in $\mathcal{P}$ )	and [ <i>now</i> 0   1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST] this have I done
Alma 5:6 (scribe 2’s initial error in $\mathcal{P}$ )	and [NULL > <i>now</i> 1   <i>now</i> ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST] behold I say unto you my brethren . . .
Alma 8:1 (scribe 2’s error in $\mathcal{P}$ , corrected by Oliver Cowdery)	And [§2 NULL > §1 <i>now</i> 1   <i>now</i> ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST] it came to pass that Alma returned from the land of Gideon
Alma 11:25 (scribe 2’s error in $\mathcal{P}$ , corrected by Oliver Cowdery)	and [§2 NULL > §1 <i>now</i> 1   <i>now</i> ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST] behold for this great evil thou shalt have thy reward
Alma 32:5 (Oliver Cowdery omitted the <i>now</i> in $\mathcal{P}$ )	and [ <i>now</i> 0   1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST] behold what shall we do
Alma 42:29 (Oliver Cowdery’s initial error in $\mathcal{G}$ )	and [NULL > <i>now</i> 0   <i>now</i> 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST] my son I desire that ye should let these things trouble you no more
3 Nephi 15:1 (Oliver Cowdery’s initial error in $\mathcal{P}$ )	And [ <i>it</i> > <i>now</i> 1   <i>now</i> ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST] it came to pass that when Jesus had ended these sayings he cast his eyes round about on the multitude

3 Nephi 27:30 (scribe 2's error in  $\mathcal{D}$ , corrected by Oliver Cowdery)  
 and [§2 NULL > §1 *now* 1 | *now* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] behold  
 my joy is great

Another possible emendation for Alma 11:21, but less plausible, is that an original *now* was accidentally replaced by *and*. There is only one example in the manuscripts of *now* and *and* being mixed up:

Helaman 8:7  
 [*now* >+ & 1 | *And* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] it came to pass that  
 thus they did stir up the people to anger against Nephi

Here Oliver Cowdery initially wrote *now* in place of *and*, but there are no examples of the opposite error—namely, of scribes accidentally writing *and* in place of *now*.

There is also the possibility that the original text might have read “and **thus this** Zeezrom began to question Amulek”, which means that the word *thus* was lost early in the transmission of the text. If such an error occurred, it probably would have occurred as Joseph Smith dictated the text to Oliver Cowdery rather than when scribe 2 of  $\mathcal{D}$  copied from  $\mathcal{C}$  into  $\mathcal{D}$ . This is because there is no room in the lacuna between surviving fragments of  $\mathcal{C}$  for *thus this* except by supralinear insertion (which, of course, is a possibility). There is one instance of *thus this* in the text, in Alma 13:5: “**thus this** holy calling being prepared from the foundation of the world”; clearly, *thus this* is not impossible. There is also some minor evidence for the loss of *thus* during the manuscript transmission of the text. In the following case, Oliver Cowdery momentarily omitted a *thus* as he copied from  $\mathcal{C}$  into  $\mathcal{D}$ :

Alma 58:4  
 and it came to pass that  
 I [*thus* 0ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST | NULL > *thus* 1] did send  
 an embassy to the great governor of our land

For another case where Oliver may have omitted a *thus*, see the discussion under 3 Nephi 8:17.

So there are several possible emendations for the strange “**and this** Zeezrom” that begins Alma 11:21. The two most plausible ones, when we take the frequency of manuscript errors into account, are (1) “**and thus** Zeezrom began to question Amulek” and (2) “**and now this** Zeezrom began to question Amulek”. One advantage of the first emendation is that it directly connects the text to the immediately preceding verse 20 (as noted at the beginning of this discussion). Another advantage is that the proposed change of *thus* to *this* could readily have occurred while copying from  $\mathcal{C}$  into  $\mathcal{D}$  if the word *thus* was the reading at the end of a line in  $\mathcal{C}$ , a place where the scribes frequently made errors in copying. On the other hand, if *now* was lost from the text, it probably occurred when Oliver Cowdery took down Joseph Smith's dictation (there is no room for the *now* between extant fragments of  $\mathcal{C}$  except by supralinear insertion). Of course, either error (*thus* to *this* or the loss of *now*) could have occurred during the original dictation of the text. The critical text will accept the first emendation as being the more probable; even so, the second is also quite possible.

**Summary:** Emend Alma 11:21 to read “and **thus** Zeezrom began to question Amulek”; there is considerable evidence that the scribes tended to write *this* for *thus*; on the other hand, if *this* is correct,



the original text most probably read “and **now** this Zeezrom” since there is also considerable evidence that the scribes tended to omit *now* after *and*; in either case, the earliest reading of the text, “and this Zeezrom”, seems abrupt and inappropriate, apparently the result of some early error in the transmission of the text.

■ **Alma 11:21–22**

*therefore he saith unto Amulek  
will ye answer the questions which I shall put unto you  
and Amulek saith unto him  
yea [I will 1PS| ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRT]  
if it be according to the Spirit of the Lord which is in me*

Here in Alma 11:22, the 1830 typesetter accidentally omitted the clause *I will*, the reading of the printer’s manuscript. Although these words are not extant in the original manuscript, spacing between extant fragments strongly supports their original occurrence in  $\mathcal{O}$ . In accord with the reading in  $\mathcal{P}$ , the 1908 RLDS edition restored the *I will* to the RLDS text.

There are other examples of *yea if* in the Book of Mormon text, but none with the same construction as the secondary, shortened reading in Alma 11:22. Elsewhere in the text, clauses headed by *yea if* either (1) refer to an immediately preceding conditional *if*-clause or (2) are completed by a resultive main clause—or both:

Mosiah 12:33

- (1) I know **if** ye keep the commandments of God / ye shall be saved  
**yea if** ye keep the commandments which the Lord delivered unto Moses  
in the mount of Sinai

Mosiah 29:13

- (1) therefore **if** it were possible that ye could have just men to be your kings  
which would establish the laws of God and judge this people  
according to his commandments  
**yea if** ye could have men for your kings  
which would do even as my father Benjamin did for this people  
I say unto you: if this could always be the case
- (2) then it would be expedient that ye should always have kings to rule over you

Alma 12:13

- (1) then **if** our hearts have been hardened  
**yea if** we have hardened our hearts against the word  
insomuch that it hath not been found in us
- (2) then will our state be awful

Alma 22:16

- (1) **if** thou will bow down before God  
**yea if** thou repent of all thy sins and will bow down before God  
and call on his name in faith believing that ye shall receive
- (2) then shalt thou receive the hope which thou desirest



Alma 27:8

- yea if** the Lord saith unto us : go  
 (2) we will go down unto our brethren

Alma 60:16

- yea if** we had gone forth against them in the strength of the Lord  
 (2) we should have dispersed our enemies

Alma 60:27

- (1) and **if** there be any among you that hath a desire for freedom  
**yea if** there be even a spark of freedom remaining  
 (2) behold I will stir up insurrections among you

Helaman 7:8

- yea if** my days could have been in them days  
 (2) then would my soul have had joy in the righteousness of my brethren

Helaman 12:14

- yea if** he say unto the earth : thou shalt go back  
 that it lengthen out the day for many hours  
 (2) and it is done

But in no other place do we have a stranded *yea if* clause—that is, without any preceding *if*-clause or any following main clause. The critical text will therefore restore the original reading in Alma 11:22: “**yea I will** if it be according to the Spirit of the Lord which is in me”.

*Summary:* Restore the *I will* in Alma 11:22 that the 1830 typesetter accidentally omitted.

#### ■ Alma 11:22

*yea I will if it* [be 0ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST | be >js they 1] *according to the Spirit of the Lord which is in me*

Here in his editing of  $\mathcal{P}$  for the 1837 edition, Joseph Smith changed the subject pronoun *it* to *they* (although he actually crossed out the following *be* rather than the *it*). Apparently, Joseph’s intent was to reinterpret the original *it* as a plural so that it would specifically refer to Zeezrom’s request in the previous verse:

Alma 11:21

will ye answer **the questions** which I shall put unto you

In other words, Joseph’s *they* refers to the plural *the questions*. This suggestion was, however, ignored in the 1837 edition, probably because the subject *it* is not actually a regular pronoun that expects an antecedent but instead is an expletive *it* that fills the subject position.

*Summary:* Maintain the original singular pronoun *it* in Alma 11:22; Joseph Smith considered replacing *it* with *they* so that the subject pronoun would refer to the preceding *the questions*.

## ■ Alma 11:22

*behold here is six onties of silver  
and all these will I give [unto 1 | ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] thee  
if thou wilt deny the existence of a Supreme Being*

The printer's manuscript has *unto thee*. Apparently the original manuscript also did, based on the spacing between extant fragments (the actual phrase is not extant in  $\mathfrak{C}$ ). The 1830 typesetter accidentally dropped the preposition *unto*, and no subsequent edition has ever restored it.

Of course, either reading is theoretically possible. Typically, the preposition is not expressed in the biblical passages cited in the Book of Mormon (in each instance the *unto* is also lacking in the King James text):

- 1 Nephi 17:55 (based on Exodus 20:12)  
that thy days may be long in the land which the Lord thy God shall **give thee**
- 2 Nephi 24:3 (Isaiah 14:3)  
the Lord shall **give thee** rest from thy sorrow and from thy fear
- Mosiah 13:20 (Exodus 20:12)  
that thy days may be long upon the land which the Lord thy God **giveth thee**

In only one nonbiblical passage does the Book of Mormon text lack the preposition *unto* in the expression “give (unto) thee”:

- Jacob 2:11  
get thou up into the temple on the morrow  
and declare the word which I shall **give thee** unto this people

Elsewhere, the Book of Mormon text uses the preposition *unto* in this context:

- 1 Nephi 11:7            this thing shall be given **unto** thee for a sign
- 2 Nephi 27:20        thou shalt read the words which I shall give **unto** thee
- Alma 11:25            these six onties which are of great worth I will give **unto** thee
- Alma 18:21            whatsoever thou desirest I will give **unto** thee
- Alma 26:27            and I will give **unto** thee success
- Alma 30:49            this will I give **unto** thee for a sign
- Helaman 10:4        the word which I have given **unto** thee
- Ether 3:23            these two stones will I give **unto** thee

Of particular importance for the reading here in Alma 11:22 is the similar phraseology nearby in Alma 11:25, where Amulek specifically refers to Zeezrom's offer of six onties:

- Alma 11:25  
for thou saidest unto me  
behold these six onties which are of great worth I will **give unto thee**

Interestingly, the language in the Jacob 2:11 passage (which lacks the *unto*) parallels the language in Helaman 10:4 (which has the *unto*):

Jacob 2:11 declare the word which I shall **give** **thee** unto this people  
 Helaman 10:4 declared the word which I have **given unto thee** unto this people

Although there is some possibility that an *unto* was lost in Jacob 2:11, the critical text will follow the earliest textual sources in that case—and in all other cases. Here in Alma 11:22, the original *unto* will be restored, but in Jacob 2:11 no *unto* will be supplied.

*Summary:* Restore in Alma 11:22 the preposition *unto* in “all these will I give **unto** thee”, the reading of the printer’s manuscript.

#### ■ Alma 11:23

[§2 *knoweth* > §1 *knowest* 1 | *Kowest* A | *Knowest* BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *thou*  
*that the righteous yieldeth to no such temptations*

As discussed under 1 Nephi 11:2, the critical text will accept Oliver Cowdery’s correction in  $\mathcal{P}$  of *knoweth thou* to *knowest thou*. The *-eth* ending that scribe 2 of  $\mathcal{P}$  wrote down here in Alma 11:23 may be an early error in the transmission due to the initial *th* of the following subject pronoun *thou*.

#### ■ Alma 11:25

*and now thou hast lied before God unto me*  
 [for 1 | ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *thou saidest unto me . . .*

The 1830 typesetter accidentally omitted the connecting *for* before *thou saidest*. The *for* provides the typical connection characteristic of the Book of Mormon narrative style. Either reading, with or without the *for*, is theoretically possible; thus the critical text will restore the earliest reading, with the *for*. None of the printed editions have ever restored the *for* here in Alma 11:25, despite its occurrence in  $\mathcal{P}$ . A similar example of narrative *for* is found later on in the text:

Helaman 11:14  
 and I know that thou wilt even at this time hearken unto my words  
**for thou saidst** that if this people repent I will spare them

*Summary:* Restore the connective *for* in Alma 11:25: “**for** thou saidest unto me”.

#### ■ Alma 11:25

*for thou* [*saidest* > *g* *saidst* 1 | *saidst* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *unto me*  
*behold these six onties which are of great worth I will give unto thee*  
*when thou* [*had* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPS | *hadst* QRT] *it in thy heart to retain them from me*

As discussed under Alma 8:15, the second person singular ending for past-tense verb forms in Early Modern English was *-(e)st*, especially *-st* when the verb ended in the regular past-tense *-ed*. The Book of Mormon text, however, has a number of examples where the *-(e)st* ending is lacking (for a list, see under 2 Nephi 24:12). Thus the critical text will accept the use of *thou had* here in Alma 11:25 rather than the *thou hadst* that the 1911 LDS edition introduced into the LDS text. The RLDS text has continued with the original *thou had*.

We also see here in Alma 11:25 that the earliest extant text (the printer’s manuscript) read *thou saidest*, which John Gilbert, the 1830 typesetter, emended to *thou saidst* (he used a pencil to cross out the *e* in  $\mathcal{P}$ ). Either ending, *-est* or *-st*, was possible in Early Modern English. Although the current King James Bible has examples of only *saidst* (22 of them), in the original 1611 printing five of these were set as *saidest*, as in John 4:18 (given here in its 1611 accidentals): “In that saidest thou truely.” One, in Job 35:2, was set as *saydest* in the 1611 King James Bible. Similarly, Coverdale’s 1535 Bible reads *saydest* for Psalm 89:19 (rather than the *saidst* of the 1611 King James Bible); see the citations in the Oxford English Dictionary under the variant spellings for *said(e)st* listed under the verb *say*. The OED also cites the following example from the middle of the 1800s:

Elizabeth Barrett Browning (1850)  
No need of flowers—albeit ‘bring flowers’, thou **saidest**.

The occasional 19th-century use of *saidest* argues that the original occurrence of *saidest* in  $\mathcal{P}$  for Alma 11:25 could be an instance of dialectal overlay. But since *saidest* was possible in Early Modern English, the critical text will accept such usage. There is only one other instance of *said(e)st* in the Book of Mormon text, and that one reads *saidst* in the earliest text (but *said* in the early editions from 1837 through 1858):

Helaman 11:14  
for thou [*saidst* 1AIIJLMNOPQRST | *said* BCDEFG | *hast said* HK] that . . .

The past-tense modal verbs *should* and *would* provide additional examples of textual variation for the second person singular ending *-(e)st*. For discussion, see under 1 Nephi 20:5. There the argument is that we should in each case follow the earliest textual sources in determining whether the ending should be *-est* or *-st*. We will follow the same here in Alma 11:25 with respect to the form *saidest*.

**Summary:** Restore the form *saidest* in Alma 11:25, the earliest reading in  $\mathcal{P}$ , rather than the expected King James *saidst* (the 1830 typesetter’s emendation towards the biblical style).

### ■ Alma 11:25

*and it was only thy [desire > desires 1 | desire ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]  
that I should deny the true and living God  
that thou mightest have cause to destroy me*

As discussed under Mosiah 18:10 and 18:11, the original text had examples of plural *desires* acting as subject predicate following a singular subject and an associated singular form of the *be* verb (such as “it was”). Here in Alma 11:25, scribe 2 of  $\mathcal{P}$  initially wrote “it was only thy desire”, which is what one expects in modern English. But then virtually immediately scribe 2 corrected the singular *desire* to the plural *desires* (his *s*, inserted inline, shows no change in the level of ink flow). The 1830 typesetter, on the other hand, reverted to the expected singular *desire*. The critical text will restore the plural *desires* since there are other examples in the text of this particular usage.

**Summary:** Restore in Alma 11:25 the plural *desires*, the corrected reading in  $\mathcal{P}$ : “and it was only thy **desires** that I should deny the true and living God”.

## ■ Alma 11:25

*and [§2 NULL > §1 now 1 | now ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] behold  
for this great evil thou shalt have thy reward*

The occurrence of *now* here in Alma 11:25 is theoretically optional. There would have been no motivation for Oliver Cowdery to have supplied the *now* in his proofing of  $\mathcal{P}$  against  $\mathcal{O}$  except that it was in  $\mathcal{O}$ . The critical text will accept the corrected reading in  $\mathcal{P}$  for this passage. For another example of where scribe 2 of  $\mathcal{P}$  initially omitted the narrative *now* in the phrase “and now behold”, see Alma 5:6.

*Summary:* Accept the occurrence of *now* in Alma 11:25, the corrected reading in  $\mathcal{P}$ : “and now behold”.

## ■ Alma 11:26–27

*and Zeezrom saith unto him  
thou sayest there is a true and [a 01A | BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] living God  
and Amulek saith  
yea there is a true and [a 1ABCGHKPS | DEFIJLMNOQRT] living God*

The original text had two occurrences of “a true and a living God” in this passage. But since this construction with its repeated *a* is not normal English, the tendency has been to remove the repeated indefinite article *a*. For the first example, the 1837 edition accidentally deleted the second *a*, an omission that all subsequent editions have followed; for the second example, it was the 1841 British edition that deleted the repeated *a*, and all LDS editions have followed that reading.

A parallel construction, “the true and (the) living God”, involves the definite article *the*. For this construction, there are two instances in the text of the repeated *the* (Alma 7:6 and Alma 43:10); but there are four instances where the *the* is not repeated (1 Nephi 17:30, Alma 5:13, Alma 11:25, and Mormon 9:28). Note that one of the nonrepeating instances occurs here in Alma 11:

Alma 11:25  
and it was only thy desires  
that I should deny **the true and living God**  
that thou mightest have cause to destroy me

The lack of the repeated *the* in verse 25 may have contributed to the omission of the repeated *a* in the two instances of “a true and a living God” found in the immediately following verses 26 and 27. The critical text will maintain the original variation: in each case we follow the earliest textual sources in determining whether the article (either the indefinite *a/an* or the definite *the*) should be repeated in conjunctive constructions. For further discussion, see under CONJUNCTIVE REPETITION in volume 3.

*Summary:* In accord with the reading of the earliest textual sources, restore in Alma 11:26–27 the repeated indefinite article *a* for both occurrences of “a true and a living God”.

## ■ Alma 11:30–31

*now Zeezrom saith unto him again  
how knowest thou these things  
and he saith  
an angel [hath 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST | had HK] made them known unto me*

The 1874 RLDS edition replaced the present-tense perfect auxiliary *hath* with the past-tense *had*, probably unintentionally. The 1908 RLDS edition restored the correct *hath* to the RLDS text. In this particular exchange between Zeezrom and Amulek, we have a consistent use of the present tense: “how **knowest** thou these things . . . an angel **hath** made them known unto me”. The critical text will maintain the present-tense *hath* here in Alma 11:31.

**Summary:** Retain in Alma 11:31 the present-tense *hath*, which is consistent with the preceding present-tense *knowest* in verse 30.

## ■ Alma 11:34–35

*and Zeezrom saith again  
shall he save his people in their sins  
and Amulek answered and said unto him  
I say unto you: he shall not  
[now > for 0 | for 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST] it is impossible for him to deny his word  
now Zeezrom saith unto the people . . .*

Here in the original manuscript, Oliver Cowdery corrected *now* with *for*; he crossed out the *now* that he had initially written and supralinearly inserted the *for* (and without any change in the level of ink flow). The *for* works much better than *now* in this context since its associated clause is explanatory. We would expect *now* to introduce a new topic. Oliver’s initial error here in verse 34 was probably the result of the subsequent use of *now* that begins the following verse: “now Zeezrom saith unto the people” (Alma 11:35). The critical text will, of course, accept Oliver’s corrected reading in  $\mathcal{C}$ .

**Summary:** Maintain the use of *for* in Alma 11:34; in this case, the *for* explains why the Lord will not save his people “in their sins”.

## ■ Alma 11:35

*for he [saith 0A | saith >js said 1 | said BCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST] there is but one God  
yet he [saith >js said 1 | saith ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST] that the Son of God shall come  
but he shall not save his people*

In this particular verse, we have two instances where Zeezrom refers to what Amulek just said (although Zeezrom misrepresents what Amulek actually said). In the original text, the present-tense “he saith” is used here twice. In his editing for the 1837 edition, Joseph Smith changed both of these to “he said” (each time he marked the change in  $\mathcal{P}$ ). This editing was probably the result of

Joseph’s attempt in the larger passage to change instances of the historical present tense to the past tense, although these two instances here are technically not cases of the historical present. (For the original use of the historical present tense in Alma 11:21–39, see the following discussion under Alma 11:36.)

When verse 35 was set for the 1837 edition, the first of Joseph Smith’s changes was implemented, but the second was not. The 1837 edition (and all subsequent editions) have thus ended up with a mixed text, with one occurrence of “he said” and another of “he saith”. Several times in their confrontation, Zeezrom and Amulek cite each other. In these citations, the verbs *say* and *speak* can be in either the present or past tense:

Alma 11:25 (Amulek cites Zeezrom)

for thou [*saidest* >jg *saidst* 1 | *saidst* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] unto me  
behold these six onties which are of great worth I will give unto thee

Alma 11:26 (Zeezrom cites Amulek)

thou **sayest** there is a true and a living God

Alma 11:35 (Zeezrom cites Amulek twice)

for he [*saith* 0A | *saith* >js *said* 1 | *said* BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]  
there is but one God  
yet he [*saith* >js *said* 1 | *saith* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] that  
the Son of God shall come but he shall not save his people

Alma 11:36 (Amulek cites Zeezrom and himself)

for thou **sayest** that  
I [*speak* 0 | §2 *spake* > §1 *speak* 1 | *spake* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]  
as though I had authority to command God  
because I **said** he shall not save his people in their sins

Thus there is a mixture of the present and past tenses when Zeezrom and Amulek quote each other. The critical text will, in each case, follow the reading of the earliest textual sources.

*Summary:* Restore the consistent use of the present-tense “he saith” in Alma 11:35.

### ■ Alma 11:36

*now Amulek [*saith* >% *said* 0 | *said* 1 | *saith* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] again unto him  
behold thou hast lied*

In the original manuscript, Oliver Cowdery initially wrote *saith*, but then he erased the *th* and overwrote it with a *d*. Scribe 2 of  $\mathcal{P}$  copied the *said* correctly, but the 1830 compositor set the present-tense *saith*. What is particularly interesting here is that this use of the historical present tense has been maintained in every printed edition, even though the tendency in the history of the text has been to remove instances of the historical present tense (for discussion, see under 1 Nephi 2:1 as well as under HISTORICAL PRESENT in volume 3).

The larger passage here in Alma 11:21–39 shows some variation with respect to the use of the historical present tense. In Mormon’s abridgment of the confrontation between Zeezrom and

Amulek, the original text uses both the historical present tense and the past tense to identify who is speaking, Zeezrom or Amulek. The clear tendency in the editing of the text has been to replace the historical present tense with the past tense, although not every instance of the historical present has been removed. Most of the changes to the past tense were made in the editing for the 1837 edition. Each example of the historical present that varies from the normal 1837 editing is marked below with an asterisk; each case that was originally in the past tense is indicated by an arrow:

VERSE	SPEAKER	TEXTUAL VARIATION
21	Zeezrom	[ <i>saith</i> 0A   <i>saith</i> >js <i>said</i> 1   <i>said</i> BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
22	Amulek	[ <i>saith</i> >js <i>said</i> 1   <i>saith</i> A   <i>said</i> BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
22	Zeezrom	[ <i>saith</i> >js <i>said</i> 1   <i>saith</i> A   <i>said</i> BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
23	Amulek	[ <i>saith</i> >js <i>said</i> 1   <i>saith</i> A   <i>said</i> BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
26	Zeezrom	[ <i>saith</i> >js <i>said</i> 1   <i>saith</i> A   <i>said</i> BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
27	Amulek	[ <i>saith</i> >js <i>said</i> 1   <i>saith</i> A   <i>said</i> BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
28	Zeezrom	[ <i>saith</i> >js <i>said</i> 1   <i>saith</i> A   <i>said</i> BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
* 29	Amulek	[ <i>answereth</i> 01ABCDEGHKPS   <i>answered</i> FIJLMNOQRT]
30	Zeezrom	[ <i>saith</i> 0A   <i>saith</i> >js <i>said</i> 1   <i>said</i> BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
31	Amulek	[ <i>saith</i> >js <i>said</i> 1   <i>saith</i> A   <i>said</i> BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
32	Zeezrom	[ <i>saith</i> 0A   <i>saith</i> >js <i>said</i> 1   <i>said</i> BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
* 33	Amulek	[ <i>saith</i> 0   <i>said</i> 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
34	Zeezrom	[ <i>saith</i> >js <i>said</i> 1   <i>saith</i> A   <i>said</i> BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
→ 34	Amulek	[ <i>answered</i> . . . <i>said</i> 01ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
35	Zeezrom	[ <i>saith</i> 0A   <i>saith</i> >js <i>said</i> 1   <i>said</i> BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
→ * 36	Amulek	[ <i>saith</i> >% <i>said</i> 0   <i>said</i> 1   <i>saith</i> ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
* 38	Zeezrom	[ <i>saith</i> 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
39	Amulek	[ <i>saith</i> >js <i>said</i> 1   <i>saith</i> A   <i>said</i> BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]

So in only two cases (out of a total of 18) is the original reading in the past tense (*answered* and *said* in verse 34 and *said* in verse 36), although the original *said* in verse 36 was changed to *saith* by the 1830 typesetter and, surprisingly, has been maintained in the present tense in all subsequent printed editions. Similarly, verse 38 has maintained its original present-tense *saith*. The 15 other original cases of the historical present tense have been edited to the past tense. Joseph Smith is responsible for 13 of these changes; the 1852 LDS edition is responsible for the change in verse 29, scribe 2 of  $\mathcal{P}$  for the one in verse 33. The critical text will restore all 16 cases of the original historical present tense here in Alma 11:21–39.

**Summary:** In accord with the earliest textual sources, restore every instance of the historical present tense in Alma 11:21–39; also restore in Alma 11:36 the original past-tense *said*, which is supported by the past-tense usage in verse 34 (“answered and said”).



## ■ Alma 11:36

now Amulek saith again unto him  
 behold thou hast lied for thou sayest that  
 I [*speak* 0 | §2 *spake* > §1 *speak* 1 | *spake* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]  
 as though I had authority to command God  
 because I said he shall not save his people in their sins

Scribe 2 of  $\mathcal{P}$  changed the reading of the original manuscript (which is extant here in Alma 11:36) from the present-tense *speak* to the past-tense *spake*. While proofing the printer’s manuscript, Oliver Cowdery restored the present-tense *speak*. But the 1830 typesetter reverted to the past-tense *spake* that scribe 2 originally wrote in  $\mathcal{P}$ . As discussed above under Alma 11:35, either the present tense or the past tense is possible when Zeezrom and Amulek quote each other. We therefore follow the earliest textual sources here in Alma 11:36—namely, the present-tense *speak*.

**Summary:** Restore the present-tense *speak* in Alma 11:36, the reading of the original manuscript.

## ■ Alma 11:38–39

now Zeezrom saith again unto him  
 is [§2 *it* > §1 NULL 1 | ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *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

In the printer’s manuscript, scribe 2 wrote “is **it** the Son of God the very Eternal Father”; the word *it* in this question of Zeezrom’s seems inappropriate. Later, when proofing  $\mathcal{P}$  against  $\mathcal{C}$ , Oliver Cowdery, it would appear, crossed out the *it* (the crossout looks like his typical crossout). The original manuscript is not extant for this word, although the spacing between extant fragments works best if *it* was not there.

Amulek’s answer in the following verse, “yea he is the very Eternal Father” (Alma 11:39), definitely suggests that the question Zeezrom asked was simply “is the Son of God the very Eternal Father”. The critical text will maintain the corrected reading in  $\mathcal{P}$ . Scribe 2’s extra *it* was probably influenced by one of Zeezrom’s questions a few verses earlier in this chapter: “who is he that shall come / is **it** the Son of God” (Alma 11:32).

**Summary:** Accept in Alma 11:38 Oliver Cowdery’s correction in  $\mathcal{P}$ ; the *it* that scribe 2 wrote down was probably a simple scribal error on his part and was apparently based on the language earlier in verse 32 (“is **it** the Son of God”).

## ■ Alma 11:39

*yea he is the very Eternal Father  
of heaven and [ 1 | of ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] earth  
and all things which in them is*

The 1830 typesetter added the repeated *of* here, thus producing a more repetitive conjoined structure for the phrase referring to “the Father of heaven and earth”. Such a structure, with the repeated *of*, occurs in five other places in the original text:

2 Nephi 25:12

yea even the Father **of** heaven and **of** earth  
shall manifest himself unto them in the flesh

Mosiah 3:8

and he shall be called Jesus Christ the Son of God  
the Father **of** heaven and [*of* 1 | ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] earth  
the Creator of all things from the beginning

Mosiah 15:4

and they are one God  
yea the very Eternal Father **of** heaven and **of** earth

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  
as it hath been spoken—  
why will he not shew himself unto us

For the example in Mosiah 3:8, the second *of* was accidentally deleted by the 1830 typesetter, thus producing for that example the reading without the repeated *of* in all the printed editions: “the Father of heaven and earth” (see the discussion under Mosiah 3:8). One could argue from the error in Mosiah 3:8 that in Alma 11:39 a similar repeated *of* was accidentally omitted in the early transmission of the text but was then restored by the 1830 typesetter (probably unintentionally). We should also note that here in Alma 11:39 the reference to the Father reads “the very Eternal Father”, not simply “the Father”; Mosiah 15:4 also refers to “the very Eternal Father”, and it has the *of* before *earth*.

The Book of Mormon does have a conjunctive expression involving *heaven* and *earth* without any repeated *of*: namely, “by the help of the all-powerful Creator **of** heaven and earth” (Jacob 2:5). Similar usage is found in the King James Bible:

Genesis 14:19	the most high God / the possessor <b>of</b> heaven and earth
Genesis 14:22	the LORD / the most high God / the possessor <b>of</b> heaven and earth
Ezra 5:11	the God <b>of</b> heaven and earth

Matthew 11:25     O Father / Lord **of** heaven and earth  
 Luke 10:21        O Father / Lord **of** heaven and earth  
 Acts 17:24        Lord **of** heaven and earth

More generally in the King James Bible, the preposition *of* is sometimes repeated in conjuncts of *heaven(s)* and *earth*, as in Genesis 2:4: “these *are* the generations **of** the heavens and **of** the earth when they were created”. A similar example is found in the Book of Mormon:

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

Such variation in usage, in both the King James Bible and the Book of Mormon, argues that the earliest reading for Alma 11:39 (namely, without the repeated *of*) is possible. The critical text will therefore restore that reading.

*Summary:* Remove the intrusive *of* in the conjoined structure in Alma 11:39, thus restoring an appropriate conjunctive relationship for the Book of Mormon text: “the very Eternal Father of heaven and earth and all things which in them is”.

#### ■ Alma 11:41

*for behold the day cometh  
 that all shall rise from the dead  
 [NULL > & 1 | and ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] stand before God  
 and be judged according to his works*

Here scribe 2 of  $\mathcal{P}$  initially wrote three conjoined predicates such that the conjunction *and* occurred only before the last predicate: “all shall rise from the dead / stand before God / **and** be judged”. Almost immediately scribe 2 added the *and* before the middle predicate (his supralinearly inserted ampersand was written without any change in the level of ink flow). Theoretically, either reading is possible in English, but the use of *and* between each predicate is the expected Book of Mormon style, as in the following example that expresses the same idea as in Alma 11:41:

Alma 40:21  
 until the time which is appointed of God  
 that the dead shall come forth  
**and** be reunited both soul and body  
**and** be brought to stand before God  
**and** be judged according to their works

The critical text will maintain the *and* before the middle predicate in Alma 11:41 (“and stand before God”).

*Summary:* Maintain in Alma 11:41 the corrected reading with the *and* before the second conjoined predicate: “all shall rise from the dead **and** stand before God and be judged according to his works”.

## ■ Alma 11:41

for behold the day cometh that **all** shall rise from the dead and stand before God  
and be judged according to [§2 his > §1 their 1 | their ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] works

Scribe 2 of  $\mathcal{P}$  wrote “**all** shall rise . . . and be judged according to **his** works”; in this instance, Oliver Cowdery changed the *his* to *their*. Clearly, scribe 2’s text is the harder reading, and it is quite possible that Oliver’s change here represents editing on his part. Of course,  $\mathcal{C}$  itself may have read *their* and scribe 2 accidentally wrote *his*. Yet there is no explicit evidence elsewhere that scribe 2 ever mixed up *their* and *his*. In fact, there is only one example where this scribe mixed up the number for pronouns, and in that one instance he caught his error:

3 Nephi 21:10  
yet I will heal **him**  
for I will shew unto [*him* > NULL 1 | ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] **them**  
that my wisdom is greater than the cunning of the devil

In this case, it was probably the preceding *him* (“I will heal him”) that led scribe 2 to write *him* a second time; but in this later example he immediately caught his error, crossing out the *him* and then writing the correct *them* inline. Thus for Alma 11:41, one could argue that the *his* was the result of the preceding singular noun *God* (“and stand before **God** and be judged according to **his** works”). There is one example in the manuscripts of this kind of error, although the error was made in  $\mathcal{C}$  by Oliver Cowdery and not by scribe 2 of  $\mathcal{P}$ :

Alma 44:23  
and the armies of the Nephites or of **Moroni** returned  
and came to [*his* > % *their* 0 | *their* 1 ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] houses  
and **their** lands

In this case, Oliver immediately caught his error in  $\mathcal{C}$ , erased the *his*, and overwrote it with the correct *their*. But there are no instances of scribe 2 of  $\mathcal{P}$  ever making this particular kind of error.

Elsewhere the text definitely prefers the plural *their* when referring to people being judged according to their works (16 times). In several cases, the language is similar to that of Alma 11:41, including instances where there is a preceding occurrence of *all*:

2 Nephi 9:44  
wherefore ye shall know at the last day  
when **all** men shall be judged of **their** works  
that the God of Israel did witness that I shook your iniquities from my soul

2 Nephi 28:23  
and **all** that have been seized therewith must stand before the throne of God  
and be judged according to **their** works

Alma 12:8  
that **all** shall rise from the dead / both the just and the unjust  
and are brought to stand before God to be judged according to **their** works

3 Nephi 26:4  
 and even unto the great and last day  
 when **all** people and **all** kindreds and **all** nations and tongues  
 shall stand before God to be judged of **their** works

3 Nephi 27:15  
 therefore according to the power of the Father I will draw **all** men unto me  
 that they may be judged according to **their** works

In referring to the judgment of people, the only other time the text has *his works* is when there is a preceding instance of the grammatically singular *every man*; yet only the second of the following actually has *his* in the earliest text:

2 Nephi 29:11  
 for out of the books which shall be written  
 I will judge the world  
**every man** according to [*their* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQPRT | *his* s] works

Mosiah 3:24  
 whereof they shall be judged  
**every man** according to **his** works

The language in 2 Nephi 29:11 is supported by the following biblical passage:

Revelation 20:12–13 (King James Bible)  
 and the dead were judged out of those things  
 which were written in the books  
 according to **their** works . . .  
 and death and hell delivered up the dead which were in them  
 and **they** were judged **every man** according to **their** works

The example from Mosiah 3:24 suggests another possible emendation for Alma 11:41: namely, the original text in Alma 11:41 may have read “all shall rise from the dead and stand before God and be judged / **every man** according to **his** works”. In other words, it is possible that  $\mathcal{O}$  itself was missing *every man*; thus Oliver’s decision to emend *his* to *their* in  $\mathcal{D}$  may have been his own attempt to deal with a difficult reading in  $\mathcal{O}$ . On the other hand, it seems unusual that such a specific noun phrase as *every man* would have been omitted from  $\mathcal{O}$ .

There are instances in the original text where the plural *all* can take singular pronouns. The examples involve the noun phrase *all things* and the singular pronoun *it* (including a nearby example in Alma 11:44):

1 Nephi 17:50  
 if God had commanded me to do **all things**  
 I could do [*it* 0A | *it* >js *them* 1 | *them* BCDEFGHIJKLMNQPRT]

Alma 11:44  
 but [*all things* 0ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQPQS | *all thing* > *all things* 1 | *every thing* RT]  
 shall be restored to **its** perfect frame as **it** is now or in the body

Alma 40:23

but **all things** shall be restored  
 to [*its* 0A | *its* >js *their* 1 | *their* BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] proper and perfect frame

Mormon 9:29

but see that ye do **all things** in worthiness  
 and do **it** in the name of Jesus Christ

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  
 therefore the Lord could not withhold anything from him

There appears to be another instance of this usage in the original text:

Alma 41:4

and if [*his* >+ *their* 0 | *their* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST] works are evil  
 they shall be restored unto [*him* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPS | *them* RT] for evil  
 therefore **all things** shall be restored  
 to [*its* >+ *their* 0 | *their* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST] proper order  
 every thing to **its** natural frame

In this last passage we have two later corrections that Oliver Cowdery made in  $\mathcal{C}$ ; the ink flow for the two supralinear *their*'s is uneven and distinctly different from the inline text. In other words, Oliver seems to have later edited the two singular determiners *his* and *its* to the plural *their*, which would thus support the hypothesis that Oliver's change of *his* to *their* here in Alma 11:41 was due to editing on his part. (See under Alma 41:4 for a complete discussion of that more complicated case.)

Thus the examples of "all things . . . it/its" in the original text argue that in Alma 11:41 scribe 2's "**all** shall . . . be judged according to **his** works" was actually the original reading, which would then imply that Oliver Cowdery on his own emended the *his* to *their* in Alma 11:41. The original reading in  $\mathcal{P}$ , although difficult, seems to be intended. The critical text will therefore restore the original reading in  $\mathcal{P}$ : "**all** shall rise from the dead and stand before God and be judged according to **his** works". Perhaps Oliver felt that the phrase *his works* could be misinterpreted as referring to God's works.

**Summary:** Restore in Alma 11:41 the original reading in  $\mathcal{P}$ : "**all** shall rise from the dead and stand before God and be judged according to **his** works"; Oliver Cowdery's correction of *his* to *their* appears to be the result of editing on his part.

#### ■ Alma 11:42

*now there is a death which is called*  
 [ 1 | a ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *temporal death*

Here in Alma 11:42, the printer's manuscript did not have the indefinite article *a* before "temporal death". The 1830 typesetter added the *a*. Elsewhere in the text there are examples of "a temporal death" and "a spiritual death". In fact, all other references to either temporal or spiritual death have a determiner of some kind:

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

Alma 11:42

and the death of Christ shall loose the bands of **this** temporal death  
that all shall be raised from **this** temporal death

Alma 12:16

then cometh a death even a second death which is **a** spiritual death  
then is a time that whosoever dieth in his sins  
as to [*the* 1A | *a* BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] temporal death  
shall also die **a** spiritual death

Alma 12:24

and we see that death comes upon mankind  
yea the death which has been spoken of by Amulek which is **the** temporal death

Alma 42:8–9

now behold it was not expedient  
that man should be reclaimed from **this** temporal death . . .  
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 it was expedient  
that mankind should be reclaimed from **this** spiritual death

Helaman 14:16

yea behold this death bringeth to pass the resurrection  
and redeemeth all mankind from the first death / **that** spiritual death

Helaman 14:18

and there cometh upon them again **a** spiritual death  
yea a second death

Mormon 9:13

and all shall stand before his bar  
being redeemed and loosed from this eternal band of death  
which death is **a** temporal death

In one of these cases (in Alma 12:16), the 1837 edition changed the determiner from *the* to *a*; see the discussion under that passage.

Thus the original occurrence in Alma 11:42 of “temporal death” without any determiner is quite unique. Yet it turns out that when the text uses the passive verb form *called* to identify something, the determiner is often unexpressed:

Mosiah 8:13	and the things are called <b>interpreters</b>
Mosiah 8:13	and whosoever is commanded to look in them the same is called <b>seer</b>

Mosiah 28:16      and whosoever has the things is called **seer**  
 Alma 16:11        and it was called **Desolation of Nehors**

Thus the original language in Alma 11:42, “now there is a death which is called temporal death”, is quite possible and will therefore be restored in the critical text.

**Summary:** Remove in Alma 11:42 the intrusive *a* that the 1830 typesetter added before “temporal death”, thus restoring the reading in  $\mathcal{P}$ : “now there is a death which is called **temporal death**”; the original text often omits the determiner before noun phrases when referring to what something or someone is called.

#### ■ Alma 11:44

*but [all things 0ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPS | all thing > all things 1 | every thing RT]  
 shall be restored to its perfect frame as it is now or in the body*

The original text allows for *all things* to be referred to by means of the singular pronoun *it*. Here in Alma 11:44, *all things* is followed by two instances of *it* (“**its** perfect frame as **it** is now or in the body”). The 1920 LDS edition emended *all things* to *every thing*, thus making sure that the following *its* and *it* would agree with the antecedent subject. In a similar instance of this usage later on in the text, Joseph Smith emended the singular pronominal determiner to the plural in order to obtain number agreement:

Alma 40:23  
 but **all things** shall be restored  
 to [*its* 0A | *its* >js *their* 1 | *their* BCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST] proper and perfect frame

For related discussion involving this particular problem in number agreement, see under Alma 11:41 and Alma 41:4 (also see the discussion under 1 Nephi 17:50). The critical text will, of course, restore the original use of *all things* here in Alma 11:44: “**all things** shall be restored to **its** perfect frame as **it** is now or in the body”.

**Summary:** Restore in Alma 11:44 the original plural *all things* even though the following predicate uses the singular *it* to refer to *all things*; such disagreement in number is found elsewhere in the original text.

#### ■ Alma 11:44

*but all things shall be restored to its perfect frame  
 as it is now [& > or 0 | §2 on and > §1 or 1 | or ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST] in the body  
 and all shall be brought and be rained  
 before the bar of Christ the Son of God the Father and the Holy Spirit  
 which [is 0ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST | NULL >jg is 1] one eternal God*

Here in the original manuscript, Oliver Cowdery initially thought that “as it is now” ended without any following explanatory prepositional phrase; that is, he didn’t expect the following “or in the



body” (which explains the phrase “as it is now”), and so he initially wrote *and* (as an ampersand). Oliver then crossed out the ampersand and supralinearly wrote the correct *or* in  $\mathcal{O}$ . When scribe 2 of  $\mathcal{P}$  copied the text here, he miswrote *or* as *on* and then added an *and*, thus ending up with the inexplicable “as it is now on and in the body”. (Oliver’s *n*’s and *r*’s often look alike, thus the tendency for the scribe in  $\mathcal{P}$  or the 1830 typesetter to misread the *r* or *n* in some words; see the discussion under Mosiah 2:15–16.) Here in Alma 11:44, when he proofed  $\mathcal{P}$  against  $\mathcal{O}$ , Oliver crossed out scribe 2’s error, *on and*, and once more supralinearly inserted the correct *or*.

Nearby, John Gilbert also inserted the word *is* that was missing in his copytext ( $\mathcal{P}$  incorrectly read “the Son of God the Father and the Holy Spirit which one eternal God”). Gilbert’s emendation was the right one since  $\mathcal{O}$  is extant here and reads “which is one eternal God”.

**Summary:** Accept in Alma 11:44 Oliver Cowdery’s correcting *or* (he made this correction in both  $\mathcal{O}$  and  $\mathcal{P}$ ); the compositor’s insertion in  $\mathcal{P}$  of *is* in the relative clause “which **is** one eternal God” was also correct.

#### ■ Alma 11:44

*but all things shall be restored to its perfect frame  
as it is now or in the body  
and shall be brought and be raigned before the bar of Christ the Son  
and God the Father and the Holy Spirit which is one eternal God  
to be judged according to their works  
whether they be good or whether they be evil*

Ross Geddes (personal communication, 6 April 2006) suggests that this passage may contain an error. The extant text (based on the reading in  $\mathcal{P}$ ) reads “and shall be brought and be (ar)raigned before the bar of Christ”, which sounds a little odd since one wouldn’t think that “and [all things] shall be brought and be (ar)raigned before the bar of Christ”. (For the form *raigned* rather than *arraigned*, see the following discussion.) Geddes suggests that the original text read “and **all** shall be brought and be (ar)raigned before the bar of Christ”.  $\mathcal{O}$  is not extant for this particular portion of the text. The transcript of  $\mathcal{O}$ , in volume 1 of the critical text, assumes that  $\mathcal{O}$  read as in  $\mathcal{P}$ , without any *all* at the end of line 15:

Alma 11:44 (lines 14–17 on page 228’ of  $\mathcal{O}$ )

```
(
SO MUCH AS A HAIR OF THEIR HEADS
                                     b)e lost but all things s(hal )
                                     L
(
BE RESTORED TO ITS PERFECT FRAM
                                     e) as it is now ^<&> in the boddy (&)
                                     or
(
SHALL BE BROUGHT & BE REIGNE
                                     d) before the bar of Christ th( )
                                     E
(
SON & GOD THE FATHER & THE
                                     H)oly spirit which is [ ] ete(r )
                                     ONE          NAL
```

But the spacing between extant fragments suggests that line 16 could have ended “in the boddy & **all**”, although the fit would have been tight:

Alma 11:44 (possible revision for line 15 on page 228' of  $\mathcal{O}$ )

(  
BE RESTORED TO ITS PERFECT FRAM  
e) as it is now <sup>or</sup> in the boddy (& )  
ALL

Now if *all* was originally there at the end of the line, it could have easily been skipped when copying from  $\mathcal{O}$  into  $\mathcal{P}$ , especially since the following line of  $\mathcal{P}$  would have begun with *shall*, which ends in *all*. In addition, we know that Oliver tended to omit short words at the end of the line in  $\mathcal{O}$  as he copied from  $\mathcal{O}$  into  $\mathcal{P}$  (for a list of established examples, see under Alma 11:21).

Evidence elsewhere in the text strongly supports the use of *all* when referring to the resurrection and the day of judgment; in fact, the passages that agree most closely with the language in Alma 11:44 read *all shall*, just as in the proposed emendation here:

Alma 11:41

for behold the day cometh  
that **all shall** rise from the dead and shall stand before God  
and be judged according to his works

Alma 11:42

and the death of Christ shall loose the bands of this temporal death  
that **all shall** be raised from this temporal death

Alma 12:8

what does this mean which Amulek hath spoken  
concerning the resurrection of the dead  
that **all shall** rise from the dead  
both the just and the unjust  
and are brought to stand before God  
to be judged according to their works

Alma 40:4

behold there is a time appointed  
that **all shall** come forth from the dead

Alma 40:5

and it sufficeth me to know that this is the case  
that there is a time appointed  
when **all shall** rise from the dead

Alma 40:10

and when the time cometh when **all shall** rise  
then shall they know that God knoweth  
all the times which are appointed unto man

Mormon 9:13

and **all shall** stand before his bar  
being redeemed and loosed from this eternal band of death  
which death is a temporal death

Thus internal evidence supports emending the text here in Alma 11:44 to read “and **all** shall be brought and be (ar)rained before the bar of Christ”.

*Summary:* Emend Alma 11:44 by inserting *all* before *shall*, giving “**and all shall** be brought and be (ar)raigned before the bar of Christ”; it is possible that *all* was in  $\mathcal{O}$  at the end of a line and was accidentally omitted by Oliver Cowdery when he copied from  $\mathcal{O}$  into  $\mathcal{P}$ .

■ **Alma 11:44**

*but all things shall be restored to its perfect frame  
as it is now or in the body  
and all shall be brought  
and be [reigned >jg arraigned 1 | arraigned ABCDEFHIJKLMNOPQRST | arranged G]  
before the bar of Christ the Son and God the Father and the Holy Spirit  
which is one eternal God  
to be judged according to their works  
whether they be good or whether they be evil*

Here the earliest reading for the verb *arraigned* is written as *reigned* by scribe 2 of  $\mathcal{P}$ . Only part of the *d* at the end of the word is extant in  $\mathcal{O}$  (for this part of the text,  $\mathcal{O}$  is in Oliver Cowdery’s hand), but spacing between extant fragments of  $\mathcal{O}$  suggests that  $\mathcal{O}$  too had the shorter form *reigned* (or some variant spelling of it). Given the spelling in  $\mathcal{P}$ , one way to interpret *reigned* is that it represents a misunderstanding on either Joseph Smith’s or the scribes’ part—that is, *arraign* was an unfamiliar word and was therefore replaced by the familiar verb *reign*, meaning ‘to rule as monarch’. Another possibility, suggested by Don Brugger, is that the scribe simply did not hear the unstressed initial vowel in *arraigned* and wrote *reigned* without considering the context. Of course, given the meaning of the verb *reign*, “to be **reigned** before the bar of Christ” is quite unacceptable. The 1830 compositor, John Gilbert, corrected *reigned* to *arraigned* in  $\mathcal{P}$  (his correction is in pencil), and that is what he set in the 1830 edition. (The compositor for the 1858 Wright edition set the word as *arranged*, but that was a simple typo resulting from him misreading his copytext, the 1840 edition.)

But there is another possibility here: the original text may have actually read *raigned*, which Joseph Smith read off correctly and which was then spelled as *reigned* by the scribes (perhaps in  $\mathcal{O}$ , definitely in  $\mathcal{P}$ ). According to the Oxford English Dictionary, *raign* is a shortened form of the verb *arraign* that occurred in Early Modern English. The OED lists the following spellings for this form in the 15th and 16th centuries: *reyne*, *reygne*, *rayne*, *raygne*, *reign*, and *rain* (listed under the verbs *arraign* and *raign*). Citations of this usage range from 1444 to 1581, with the following examples that deal with religious subjects (original spellings retained):

*The Pilgrimage of Perfection* (1526)

**reigned** before Pylate & iudged

Henry Brinklow (1544)

the day whan ye shal be **reygned** at the iudgement seate of God

The last example is striking in that it specifically refers to the day of judgment, just like Alma 11:44. One could argue that in Early Modern English *arraign* developed the shorten form *raign* under the influence of the independent verb *reign*, especially since both verbs deal with governing.

Thus scribe 2's use of *reigned* in  $\mathcal{P}$  may represent this older, shortened form of the verb *arraign* rather than an error in the transmission of the text. As discussed under Mosiah 19:24 for the word *ceremony* (also see the general discussion on archaic vocabulary in volume 3), there is considerable evidence that the original vocabulary of the Book of Mormon dates from the 1500s and 1600s, a finding that supports the possibility that *raigned* could be the reading of the original text here in Alma 11:44. There are no other instances of the verb *arraign* (or *raign*) in the text, so we have no other specific evidence in the Book of Mormon to help us decide on how to treat this verb. Nor are there any verbs or nouns in the text for which an initial unstressed schwa vowel has been omitted or added in the manuscripts. There are, however, a few other words (adverbs and prepositions) that show the tendency to lose or add an initial unstressed *a*; in the following list, I give the passage here in volume 4 under which I discuss the variation:

again > gain	2 Nephi 5:11
against > gainst	2 Nephi 5:11
round > around	1 Nephi 8:13

Ultimately it is difficult to tell whether *reigned* in Alma 11:44 is a mistake for *arraigned* or whether it represents the older historical form *raigned*. The solution depends in large part on the degree to which we accept the argument that the vocabulary of the Book of Mormon text derives from Early Modern English. Since the evidence is convincing to me, I will follow the earliest textual sources here (namely, the printer's manuscript) and assume that the original text used the shortened form *raigned* in Alma 11:44 rather than the expected *arraigned*. The possibility remains, of course, that *reigned* represents an error in the early transmission of the Book of Mormon text.

**Summary:** Accept in Alma 11:44 the historical form *raigned* for *arraigned*, thus restoring to the Book of Mormon one more instance of the archaic vocabulary of Early Modern English; another possibility is that *reigned*, the reading of the printer's manuscript (the earliest extant textual source here), is simply an error for *arraigned* that entered the text during its early transmission, perhaps under the influence of the verb *reign*.

#### ■ Alma 11:45

*now behold I have spoken [to > unto to 1 | unto ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] you  
concerning the death of the mortal body*

The original manuscript is not extant for the word *unto*, although spacing between surviving fragments has room for the entire *unto* rather than the shorter *to* that scribe 2 of  $\mathcal{P}$  originally wrote when he copied the text from  $\mathcal{O}$  into  $\mathcal{P}$ . In correcting  $\mathcal{P}$ , scribe 2 supralinearly inserted the correct *unto* but neglected to cross out the *to*. Since either *unto* or *to* will work here, scribe 2's *unto* undoubtedly reflects the reading in  $\mathcal{O}$ . The critical text will maintain the preposition *unto*.

**Summary:** Accept in Alma 11:45 the correcting *unto* in  $\mathcal{P}$  as the reading of  $\mathcal{O}$ ; there would have been no motivation for scribe 2 to have corrected *to* to *unto* except that  $\mathcal{O}$  read that way.

# Alma 12

## ■ Alma 12:1

*for he beheld that Amulek had caught him  
in his [lieings >% lieing 1 | lying ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]  
and [deceivings >% deceiving 1 | deceiving ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] to destroy him*

## ■ Alma 12:3

*now Zeezrom  
seeing that thou hast been taken  
in thy [lieings 1 | lying ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] and craftiness...*

In Alma 12:1–3, scribe 2 of  $\mathcal{P}$  initially wrote plural forms, *lyings* (twice) and *deceivings* (once). In the first case (“his lyings and deceivings” in verse 1), scribe 2 immediately corrected these two plurals to singulars by erasing the final *s*’s. These two corrections seem to indicate that scribe 2 was correcting the text to agree with the reading of the original manuscript, although one could view these two corrections as instances of editing on scribe 2’s part. In the second case (“thy lyings” in verse 3), the plural was not corrected by scribe 2, but the 1830 typesetter removed the plural *s*. One could argue that in Alma 12:3 scribe 2 made the same mistake as he did in verse 1 but in this case did not catch his error. On the other hand, the 1830 typesetter may have decided to make these two verses read consistently (namely, with the singular *lying*). In addition, the nearby singular *craftiness* in verse 3 might have motivated him to adopt the singular *lying* in that verse.

Usage elsewhere in the text shows that there is variation in number for the nouns *lying(s)* and *deceiving(s)*. As far as the conjoined usage of these two nouns is concerned, we get plural forms in all cases except one (marked below with an arrow):

Alma 16:18 (*lyings* changed to *lying* in the 1874 RLDS edition)  
now those priests which did go forth among the people  
did preach against all [*lieings* 1 | *lyings* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST | *lying* HK]  
and **deceivings** and envyings and strifes and malice and revilings

3 Nephi 1:22  
but notwithstanding these **lyings** and **deceivings**  
the more part of the people did believe and were converted unto the Lord

3 Nephi 21:19  
and it shall come to pass that all **lyings** and **deceivings** and envyings  
and [*strife* >+ *strifes* 1 | *strifes* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]  
and [*priestcraft* 1 | *priestcrafts* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]  
and whoredoms shall be done away

3 Nephi 30:2

turn all ye Gentiles from your wicked ways  
and repent of your evil doings :  
of your **lyings** and **deceivings**  
and of your whoredoms  
and of your secret abominations and your idolatries  
and of your murders and your priestcrafts and your envyings  
and your [*strife* >+ *strifes* 1 | *strifes* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]  
and from all your wickedness and abominations

Mormon 8:31

yea it shall come in a day when there shall be great pollutions  
upon the face of the earth :  
→ there shall be murders and robbing and **lying** and **deceivings**  
and whoredoms and all manner of abominations

The last example is the only one where we get the singular *lying* when combined with *deceiving(s)*, but this example of *lying* appears to be a gerundive noun, like the preceding *robbing*. One could argue that the original text here read *lyings* but that under the influence of the preceding *robbing*, *lyings* was mistakenly written as *lying* in  $\mathcal{C}$ . For this part of the text, both  $\mathcal{D}$  and the 1830 edition are firsthand copies of  $\mathcal{C}$ ; thus the odds are quite high that for Mormon 8:31 the original manuscript read *lying*.

In the Book of Mormon text the noun *deceiving(s)* is always conjoined with *lying(s)*, as in Alma 12:1. But there are instances where the noun *lying(s)* occurs without *deceivings*, as in Alma 12:3. For these cases, the plural is normal; but there is at least one instance with the singular *lying* in the earliest text (marked below with an arrow):

Alma 20:13

that they may by their cunning and their **lyings** deceive us

Alma 30:47

than that thou shouldst be the means of bringing many souls down to destruction  
→ by thy **lying** and by thy flattering words

3 Nephi 1:22

there began to be **lyings** sent forth among the people

3 Nephi 1:29 (*lyings* changed to *lying* in the 1858 Wright edition)

and were led away by some which were Zoramites  
by their [*lieings* 1 | *lyings* ABCDEFIJLMNOPQRST | *lying* GHK]  
and their flattering words  
to join those Gaddianton robbers

3 Nephi 16:10

and shall be filled with all manner of **lyings** and of deceits and of mischiefs  
and all manner of hypocrisy and murders and priestcrafts and whoredoms  
and of secret abominations

## 4 Nephi 1:16

and there were no envyings nor strifes nor tumults nor whoredoms  
 nor [*lyeings* >% *lyeing* 1 | *lyings* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] nor murders  
 nor no manner of lasciviousness

Of course, the singular *lying* in Alma 30:47 should, as in Mormon 8:31, be interpreted as a gerundive noun.

The last case listed above (in 4 Nephi 1:16) is complicated since in 4 Nephi both  $\mathcal{P}$  and the 1830 edition are firsthand copies of  $\mathcal{C}$ . Scribe 2 of  $\mathcal{P}$  initially wrote the plural *lyings* (spelled as *lyeings*); then he immediately corrected the number to the singular by erasing the plural *s*. It appears that he may have accidentally written the plural *lyings* because of the surrounding plural nouns (“no envyings nor strifes nor tumults nor whoredoms . . . nor murders”). There would have been no motivation for him to correct *lyings* to the singular unless  $\mathcal{C}$  read in the singular. Of course, this means that the 1830 typesetter also made the change to the plural *lyings* under the influence of the surrounding plural nouns. This example from 4 Nephi also argues that the changes in  $\mathcal{P}$  of *lyings* and *deceivings* to singulars in Alma 12:1 represent one other attempt by scribe 2 to get the number written down correctly in  $\mathcal{P}$ . On the other hand, the 1830 change to the singular *lying* in Alma 12:3 could have been made, as already noted, under the influence of the conjoined singular form *craftiness* or the preceding singular *lying* in verse 1. Here at the beginning of Alma 12, the critical text will follow the earliest textual sources, accepting the singular forms *lying* and *deceiving* in verse 1 but the plural *lyings* in verse 3. For further discussion regarding the number for *lying(s)* in 4 Nephi 1:16, see under that passage.

**Summary:** Accept in Alma 12:1 the singular “lying and deceiving”, the immediately corrected reading in  $\mathcal{P}$ ; restore in Alma 12:3 the plural *lyings* in “thy lyings and craftiness”, the reading in  $\mathcal{P}$ .

## ■ Alma 12:3

for thou [*hast* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST | *has* E] not lied unto men only  
 but thou **hast** lied unto God

The 1849 LDS edition replaced the biblical *hast* with *has*; this change was undoubtedly a typo and was not copied into the subsequent LDS edition (1852). Note that the *hast* in the following clause was left unchanged in the 1849 edition (“but **thou hast** lied unto God”).

**Summary:** Maintain the two occurrences of “thou hast” in Alma 12:3.

## ■ Alma 12:3

for behold he knows all [*the* > *thy* 1 | *thy* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST] thoughts  
 and thou seest that **thy** thoughts are made known unto us by his Spirit

Here we have an initial copying error in  $\mathcal{P}$  that scribe 2 soon corrected. He first wrote “the thoughts”, but then virtually immediately he overwrote the *e* of *the* with a *y* (there is no difference in the level of ink flow). Perhaps scribe 2 was expecting something like “all the thoughts of X”. There are



a few instances in the manuscripts where *thy* and *the* have been mixed up; for examples, see under 2 Nephi 20:30. Also see the discussion under Alma 12:5 below regarding *thine* in the phrase “*thine adversary*”.

*Summary:* Accept in Alma 12:3 the corrected reading in  $\mathcal{P}$ : “he knows all **thy** thoughts”.

#### ■ Alma 12:4

*and thou seest that we know that thy plan was a very subtle plan  
as to the subtlety of the devil for to lie and to deceive this people  
that thou mightest set them against us to revile us  
and [to 1ABDEFIJLMNOPQRST | CGHK] cast us out*

In the 1840 edition the infinitival *to* was deleted before the verb *cast* near the end of this passage. This deletion was undoubtedly accidental since otherwise in the text there are numerous examples of conjoined infinitival clauses; in fact, earlier in this passage, we have one, namely “for **to** lie and **to** deceive this people”.

This passage also has a case of the archaic or dialectal *for to*, a usage that Joseph Smith generally removed from the text in his editing for the 1837 edition but not here in Alma 12:4. There is one other place in the text where *for to* remains, in Mosiah 13:25. For discussion, see under that passage as well as under Mosiah 20:1; also see the complete analysis under FOR TO in volume 3.

*Summary:* Retain in Alma 12:4 the repeated infinitival *to* in the conjoined infinitival clauses (“**to** revile us and **to** cast us out”); also maintain the use of *for to* in this passage (and elsewhere in the text, whenever it is supported by the earliest textual sources).

#### ■ Alma 12:5

*now this was a plan of thine adversary*

It seems quite possible that the expression “**thine adversary**” here in Alma 12:5 is an error for “**the adversary**”. Elsewhere in the Book of Mormon, the noun *adversary* refers either to a human adversary or to Satan. Most instances of the word refer to human adversaries and are found in biblical quotes:

2 Nephi 7:8 (Isaiah 50:8)

who is **mine adversary**

2 Nephi 19:11 (Isaiah 9:11)

therefore the Lord shall set up **the adversaries of Rezin** against him

2 Nephi 21:13 (Isaiah 11:13)

and **the adversaries of Judah** shall be cut off

3 Nephi 12:25 (Matthew 5:25)

agree with **thine adversary** quickly



3 Nephi 20:17 (Micah 5:9)  
thy hand shall be lifted up upon **thine adversaries**

3 Nephi 21:13 (based on Micah 5:9)  
their hand shall be lifted up upon **their adversaries**

There is one nonbiblical instance of *adversary* in the Book of Mormon that refers to people, and this is in the plural:

Alma 1:22  
nevertheless there were many among them who began to be proud  
and began to contend warmly with **their adversaries** even unto blows

Otherwise in the Book of Mormon, *adversary* is used to refer to Satan (three times). Here in Alma 12:5 we have “thine adversary” in all the extant textual sources, but the two other instances read “the adversary”:

1 Nephi 15:24  
neither could the temptations and the fiery darts of **the adversary**  
overpower them unto blindness

Alma 12:6  
and behold I say unto you all that this was a snare of **the adversary**  
which he hath laid to catch this people

In fact, the last example is found in the very next verse after Alma 12:5, which suggests that “thine adversary” in verse 5 may be an error for “the adversary”. The familiarity of the language from the Sermon on the Mount, Matthew 5:25 (“agree with **thine** adversary quickly”, quoted in 3 Nephi 12:25), could have led the scribe to write *thine* rather than *the* in Alma 12:5. An even more powerful influence leading to “thine adversary” would have been the many instances of the second person singular in the immediately preceding text here in Alma 12:

Alma 12:3–5 (possible textual change marked with an arrow)  
now Zeezrom seeing that **thou hast** been taken in **thy** lyings and craftiness  
for **thou hast** not lied unto men only but **thou hast** lied unto God  
for behold he knows all **thy** thoughts  
and **thou seest** that **thy** thoughts are made known unto us by his Spirit  
and **thou seest** that we know that **thy** plan was a very subtle plan  
as to the subtlety of the devil for to lie and to deceive this people  
that **thou mightest** set them against us to revile us and to cast us out  
→ now this was a plan of **the** > **thine** adversary  
and he hath exercised his power in **thee**

Unfortunately, ☉ is no longer extant in Alma 12:5, so the emended reading “the adversary” can only be conjectured. Of course, such an error as *thine* for *the* could have entered the text as Oliver Cowdery took down Joseph Smith’s dictation for this passage. Elsewhere in the history of the text, there is one manuscript example where *the* was replaced with *thy*. In that instance, Oliver miscopied *the* as *thy* under the influence of the second person singular forms in the immediately preceding text:

1 Nephi 20:8 (Isaiah 48:8)

yea and **thou heardest** not  
 yea **thou knewest** not  
 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* 0ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST | *thy* >js *the* 1] womb

(See under 1 Nephi 20:8 for further discussion of this particular error.) So in Alma 12:5, if *the* was mistaken as *thy*, the *thy* would have been converted to *thine*, given that the following word *adversary* began with a vowel. It turns out, however, that there are no explicit instances in the transmission of the text of *the* being replaced by *thine*.

In the King James Bible, the noun *adversary* almost always refers to human adversaries, but there is one clear instance where *adversary* refers to Satan, and in this case the determiner is the second person plural *your*:

1 Peter 5:8

be sober be vigilant  
 because **your adversary the devil** as a roaring lion walketh about  
 seeking whom he may devour

Thus the use of “thine adversary” is possible in Alma 12:5. Consequently, the critical text will maintain the reading “thine adversary”, although there is a good chance that this reading is an error for “the adversary”.

**Summary:** Accept in Alma 12:5 the reading “thine adversary”, the reading of all the (extant) textual sources; even so, this reading may be an error for “the adversary”, as in the following verse: “this was a snare of the adversary” (Alma 12:6).

#### ■ Alma 12:6

*that he might bring you into subjection* [*unto* 1ABCEFGHIJKLMNQRST | *under* D] *him*

Here the compositor for the 1841 British edition set *under* rather than the *unto* of the original text. He must have expected the phraseology “to be in subjection **under** someone”. Elsewhere in the Book of Mormon text, when referring to being subject to someone, the preposition is either *unto* or *to*, but never *under*:

2 Nephi 9:5	that he suffereth himself to become subject <b>unto</b> man
2 Nephi 9:5	that all men might become subject <b>unto</b> him
2 Nephi 9:8	our spirits must become subject <b>to</b> that angel
Mosiah 7:18	when we shall no longer be in subjection <b>to</b> our enemies
Mosiah 15:5	and thus the flesh becoming subject <b>to</b> the Spirit or the Son <b>to</b> the Father
Mosiah 16:3	knowing evil from good / subjecting themselves <b>to</b> the devil
Mosiah 24:9	for he was subject <b>to</b> king Laman
Alma 2:10	that he might subject them <b>to</b> him

Alma 5:20	when you have yielded yourselves to become subjects <b>to</b> the devil
Alma 61:13	that we shall subject ourselves <b>to</b> our enemies
3 Nephi 6:30	that the land should no more be at liberty but should be subject <b>unto</b> kings
Moroni 7:17	neither doth they which subject themselves <b>unto</b> him
Moroni 7:30	for behold they are subject <b>unto</b> him
Moroni 9:26	until all things shall become subject <b>unto</b> him

The critical text will therefore continue with *unto* here in Alma 12:6.

**Summary:** Maintain in Alma 12:6 the preposition *unto* in “that he might bring you into subjection **unto** him”.

#### ■ Alma 12:7

*for he was convinced that they knew the thoughts and intents  
of his [§2 hearts >+ §1 heart 1 | heart ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]*

In this passage scribe 2 of  $\mathcal{P}$  accidentally copied the original singular *heart* as the impossible *hearts*, undoubtedly because of the preceding plural nouns *thoughts* and *intents*. Oliver Cowdery corrected the text to the singular *heart* when he proofed  $\mathcal{P}$  against  $\mathcal{C}$  (which is not extant here).

**Summary:** Maintain in Alma 12:7 the corrected reading in  $\mathcal{P}$ , the singular *heart* in “they knew the thoughts and intents of his heart”.

#### ■ Alma 12:8

*[§2 NULL > §1 & 1 | And ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] Zeezrom began  
to inquire of them diligently*

Scribe 2 of  $\mathcal{P}$  frequently omitted the conjunction *and* when he copied from  $\mathcal{C}$  into  $\mathcal{P}$ . Sometimes he caught his error; other times it was supplied by Oliver Cowdery when Oliver proofed  $\mathcal{P}$  against  $\mathcal{C}$ :

Mosiah 26:39 (corrected by scribe 2)  
being commanded of God to pray without ceasing  
[NULL > & 1 | and ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] to give thanks in all things

Alma 7:21 (corrected by Oliver Cowdery)  
[§2 NULL > §1 & 1 | And ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] he doth not dwell  
in unholy temples

Alma 8:29 (corrected by Oliver Cowdery)  
go forth [§2 NULL > §1 & 1 | and ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] prophesy  
unto this people

Alma 11:41 (corrected by scribe 2)  
for behold the day cometh that all shall rise from the dead  
[NULL > & 1 | and ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] stand before God

Alma 12:8 (corrected by Oliver Cowdery)

[§2 NULL > §1 & 1 | *And* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] Zeezrom began  
to inquire of them diligently

Alma 12:10 (corrected by Oliver Cowdery)

[§2 NULL >+ §1 & 1 | *and* ABCDEFGHK | *And* IJKLMNOPQRST] therefore  
he that will harden his heart  
the same receiveth the lesser portion of the word

Alma 13:3 (corrected by Oliver Cowdery)

therefore they having chosen good  
[§2 NULL > §1 & 1 | *and* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] exercising  
exceeding great faith  
are called with a holy calling

3 Nephi 20:27 (corrected by scribe 2)

[NULL > & 1 | *And* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] after that ye were blessed  
then fulfileth the Father the covenant which he made with Abraham

3 Nephi 23:8 (corrected by Oliver Cowdery; omitted by the 1830 typesetter)

and when Nephi had brought forth the records and laid them before him  
[§2 NULL > §1 & 1 | ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] he cast his eyes upon them

3 Nephi 24:18 (corrected by Oliver Cowdery)

then shall ye return  
[§2 NULL >+ §1 & 1 | *and* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] discern  
between the righteous and the wicked

Mormon 5:5 (corrected by Oliver Cowdery)

but it came to pass that whatsoever lands we had passed by  
[§2 NULL >+ §1 & 1 | *and* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] the inhabitants thereof  
were not gathered in  
were destroyed by the Lamanites

The last four examples are found in that portion of the text where the 1830 edition was set from  $\mathcal{O}$  rather than  $\mathcal{P}$ ; in three out of the four cases, the 1830 reading supports the decision to supply the *and* in  $\mathcal{P}$ . There are also a couple of cases in this part of the text when both scribe 2 and Oliver failed to supply the *and* in  $\mathcal{P}$  but the 1830 compositor maintained it as he set the type for the 1830 edition:

3 Nephi 24:11 (not corrected by Oliver Cowdery)

and I will rebuke the devourer for your sakes  
[ 1 | *and* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] he shall not destroy the fruits of your ground

Mormon 2:2 (not corrected by Oliver Cowdery)

therefore three hundred and twenty  
[ 1 | *and* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] six years had passed away

The example in 3 Nephi 24:11 quotes the King James version of Malachi 3:11, which has the *and*. The *and* is not required in all of the above instances, although the use of *and* generally sounds more

appropriate for the Book of Mormon style of language (as here in Alma 12:8). In each case, the critical text will accept the reading with the *and*.

*Summary:* Maintain in Alma 12:8 the *and* that Oliver Cowdery supplied when he proofed Ⓐ against Ⓒ (“**and** Zeezrom began to inquire of them diligently”).

#### ■ Alma 12:9

*it is given unto many to know the mysteries of God  
nevertheless they are laid under a strict command  
that they shall **not** impart **only** according to the portion of his word  
which he doth grant unto the children of men  
according to the heed and diligence which they give unto him*

In this passage the word *only* means ‘except’. The scope of negation for the preceding *not* in “they shall **not** impart” ends with that clause, but speakers of modern English tend to misinterpret the *only* as coming within the scope of negation for the *not*. In other words, the passage here is misinterpreted as meaning that those who know the mysteries of God should impart not only according to God’s word but in some other (unspecified) way as well. One way to help the reader correctly interpret the use of *only* in such passages would be to place a comma (or perhaps a dash) before the word *only*, thus showing that the scope of negation has ended.

There are other places in the Book of Mormon text where *only* has the meaning ‘except’ and thus the scope of negation ends before the *only*. For nearly all these cases, the 1830 typesetter placed a comma before *only*, thus helping to convey the correct interpretation:

Mosiah 3:17

and moreover I say unto you that  
there shall be **no** other name given **nor no** other way **nor** means  
whereby salvation can come unto the children of men  
[ 1 |, ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] **only** in and through the name of Christ  
the Lord Omnipotent

Mosiah 3:21

and behold when that time cometh  
**none** shall be found blameless before God except it be little children  
[ 1 |, ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] **only** through repentance  
and faith on the name of the Lord God Omnipotent

Mosiah 3:22

and even at this time  
when thou shalt have taught thy people the things  
which the Lord thy God hath commanded thee  
even then are they found **no** more blameless in the sight of God  
[ 1 |, ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] **only** according to the words  
which I have spoken unto thee

Alma 38:9

and now my son I have told you this  
that ye might learn wisdom  
that ye may learn of me  
that there is **no** other way **nor** means whereby man can be saved  
[ 1 |, ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] **only** in and through Christ

Alma 42:13

therefore according to justice  
the plan of redemption could **not** be brought about  
[ 01 |, ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] **only** on conditions of repentance of men  
in this probationary state

Helaman 5:9

yea remember that there is **no** other way **nor** means whereby man can be saved  
[ 1 |, ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] **only** through the atoning blood of Jesus Christ  
which shall come

Moroni 10:19

and that all these gifts of which I have spoken which are spiritual  
**never** will be done away  
even as long as the world shall stand  
[ 1 |, ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] **only** according to the unbelief  
of the children of men

In two other places in the text, as in Alma 12:9, the 1830 typesetter neglected to provide a comma before *only*; nor have any of the subsequent editions added an interpretative comma:

Alma 22:34

therefore the Lamanites could have **no** more possessions  
**only** in the land of Nephi and the wilderness round about

Alma 32:24

now I do **not** desire that ye should suppose that I mean to judge you  
**only** according to that which is true

Adding a comma (or a dash) before *only* in these two passages would be particularly helpful in interpreting *only* as meaning ‘except’ and thus blocking the scope of negation. For additional discussion of the use of punctuation in the LDS scriptures to help readers properly interpret *only* when it has the meaning ‘except’, see the discussion on pages 7–8 of Royal Skousen, “Through a Glass Darkly: Trying to Understand the Scriptures”, *Brigham Young University Studies* 26/4 (1986): 3–20.

**Summary:** Place a comma (or a dash) before conjunctive uses of *only* whenever such punctuation would help to bring out the meaning ‘except’ and thus block the scope of negation (including instances in Alma 12:9, Alma 22:34, and Alma 32:24).

## ■ Alma 12:9

*nevertheless they **are** laid under a strict command that they **shall** not impart  
only according to the portion of his word  
which he **doth** grant unto the children of men  
according to the heed and diligence  
which they [give 1ABCEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST | gave D] unto him*

The 1841 British edition accidentally set the present-tense *give* as the past-tense *gave*. The subsequent LDS edition (1849) restored the original *give*. The rest of the passage is in the present tense.

**Summary:** Maintain in Alma 12:9 the present-tense *give*.

## ■ Alma 12:10

[§2 NULL >+ §1 & 1 | *and* ABCDEFGHK | *And* IJKLMNOPQRST]  
*therefore he that will harden his heart  
the same receiveth the lesser portion of the word*

As discussed under Alma 12:8, scribe 2 of  $\mathcal{P}$  frequently omitted the conjunction *and*. Here in Alma 12:10, Oliver Cowdery supplied the *and* when he proofed  $\mathcal{P}$  against  $\mathcal{C}$ . Clearly, either reading (with or without the *and*) is possible in this context; thus there would have been no reason for Oliver to add the *and* on his own. The critical text will follow the corrected reading in  $\mathcal{P}$ .

**Summary:** Accept Oliver Cowdery's addition in  $\mathcal{P}$  of *and* at the beginning of Alma 12:10 (the probable reading of  $\mathcal{C}$ , no longer extant here).

## ■ Alma 12:10

*and therefore he that will harden his heart  
the same receiveth the lesser portion of the word  
and he that will not harden his heart  
to him is given the greater portion of the word  
until it is given unto him to know the mysteries of God  
until they [knew 1 | know ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] them in full*

Here in the printer's manuscript, scribe 2 wrote "until they **knew** them in full", yet the rest of the larger passage is in the present tense, in particular in the parallel construction in the following verse:

Alma 12:11

and he that will harden his heart  
to him is given the lesser portion of the word  
until they **know** nothing concerning his mysteries

Thus the 1830 typesetter replaced *knew* with the present-tense *know* in the preceding verse.

There are other examples of difficulties between *know* and *knew* in the transmission of the text, including this instance in  $\mathcal{P}$  where Oliver Cowdery himself miswrote *know* as *knew* but caught his error and corrected it:

Alma 55:3

behold I [*know* 0ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST | *knew* > *know* 1] the place  
where the Lamanites doth guard my people which they have taken prisoners

For other examples of textually significant mix-ups between *know* and *knew*, see under Alma 38:4 and Helaman 9:36. The critical text will accept the 1830 emendation of *knew* to *know* in Alma 12:10; the original text here most probably read “until they **know** them in full”.

**Summary:** Accept in Alma 12:10 the 1830 emendation of *knew* to *know* (“until they **know** them in full”); the context argues for the present-tense form of the verb.

### ■ Alma 12:10–11

and therefore **he** that will harden **his** heart / the same receiveth the lesser portion of the word  
and **he** that will not harden **his** heart / to **him** is given the greater portion of the word  
until it is given unto **him** to know the mysteries of God  
until [*they* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLPS | *they* > *he* M | *he* NOQRT] **know** them in full  
and [*he* >js *they* 1 | *he* A | *they* BCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST]  
that will harden [*his* heart >js *their* hearts 1 | *his* heart A | *their* hearts BCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST]  
to [*him* >js *thim* 1 | *him* A | *them* BCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST] is given the lesser portion of the word  
until **they** know nothing concerning his mysteries

In the original text, this passage begins with a singular pronoun *he* but makes an unexpected transition to the plural *they*, then reverts to *he* in verse 11, and finally returns to *they* a second time. Joseph Smith systematized the pronouns here so that verse 10 is consistently singular and verse 11 is consistently plural. The original text, however, shows a parallel pattern of generic singular (parts A and B) followed by generic plural (part C):

- |     |          |   |
|-----|----------|---|
| □ A | verse 10 | and therefore <b>he</b> that will harden <b>his</b> heart<br>the same receiveth the lesser portion of the word<br>and <b>he</b> that will not harden <b>his</b> heart |
|     | verse 11 | and <b>he</b> that will harden <b>his</b> heart   |
| □ B | verse 10 | to <b>him</b> is given the greater portion of the word<br>until it is given unto <b>him</b> to know the mysteries of God  |
|     | verse 11 | to <b>him</b> is given the lesser portion of the word   |
| □ C | verse 10 | until <b>they</b> know them in full   |
|     | verse 11 | until <b>they</b> know nothing concerning his mysteries   |

Switching the number for generic pronouns within the same passage is fairly common in the original text; see the other examples listed under 1 Nephi 10:18–19. The critical text will restore the original, repeated pattern of generic singular *he/his/him* followed by generic plural *they* here in Alma 12:10–11.

In verse 10, Joseph Smith’s editing of “until **they** know” to “until **he** know” shows him creating a distinctive subjunctive use of *he know* rather than the indicative *he knoweth* or *he knows*. In



most contexts where we can distinguish between subjunctive and indicative verb forms in *until*-clauses, the Book of Mormon text prefers the indicative, as in “until the time **cometh**” (in 2 Nephi 9:2 and Ether 3:21), 18 times in all. But the original text also has a few distinctive cases of the subjunctive in *until*-clauses (the first one quotes Isaiah 6:11):

2 Nephi 16:11	until the cities <b>be</b> wasted . . . and the land <b>be</b> utterly desolate
Ether 2:11	until the fullness <b>be</b> come
Ether 13:8	until the end <b>come</b>

Thus Joseph’s minimal editing of “until they know” to “until he know” can be supported by usage elsewhere in the text. (The example in Ether 2:11 was edited in the 1837 edition to a different subjunctive form, “until the fullness **come**”; see the discussion under that passage.)

*Summary:* Restore the original pronominal variation in Alma 12:10–11; switches in pronominal number are found elsewhere in the original text.

#### ■ Alma 12:12–14

*and Amulek hath spoken plainly concerning death  
and being raised from this mortality to a state of immortality  
and being brought before the bar of God to be judged according to our **works**  
then if our hearts have been hardened  
yea if we have hardened our hearts against the **word**  
insomuch that it hath not been found in us  
then will our state be awful  
for then we shall be condemned  
for our [works >% words 1 | words ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] will condemn us  
yea all our [work 1A | works BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] will condemn us  
we shall not be found spotless  
and our thoughts will also condemn us*

Scribe 2 of  $\mathcal{P}$  obviously had some difficulty with *works* and *words* in Alma 12:14. He first wrote *works* at the beginning of the verse (“for our **works** will condemn us”); then he erased the *k* and overwrote the *ks* with *ds* (which implies that  $\mathcal{C}$  here read *words*). Scribe 2 also wrote the singular *work* in the next clause (“yea all our **work** will condemn us”), but this singular form seems quite out of place. We expect the plural *works*, which shows up in the 1837 edition. There is clear evidence that the Book of Mormon scribes frequently wrote *works* as *work* (for a list of examples, see under 2 Nephi 30:17). Moreover, the original text prefers the plural *works* when referring to people being judged (see the discussion under 1 Nephi 15:33). More than likely, the original text here in Alma 12:14 read “yea all our **works** will condemn us”.

The real question in Alma 12:14 centers around whether the first clause of that verse originally read *works* (the initial reading in  $\mathcal{P}$ ) or *words* (the immediately corrected reading in  $\mathcal{P}$ ). As noted above, the original manuscript (no longer extant here) probably read *words*; even so, that could have been an error for *works*. Numerous examples show that the scribes, both scribe 2 of  $\mathcal{P}$  and Oliver Cowdery, mixed up *word(s)* and *work(s)* in the manuscripts (I include here the case in Alma 12:14):

- Alma 9:17 (scribe 2's initial error in  $\mathcal{P}$ , virtually immediately corrected)  
and at some period of time they will be brought to believe  
in his [*work* > *word* 1 | *word* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
- Alma 10:16 (scribe 2's initial error in  $\mathcal{P}$ , virtually immediately corrected)  
that thereby they might make him cross his words  
or contradict the [*works* > *words* 1 | *words* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]  
which he should speak
- Alma 12:14 (scribe 2's initial error in  $\mathcal{P}$ , immediately corrected)  
for our [*works* >% *words* 1 | *words* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] will condemn us
- Alma 37:12 (Oliver Cowdery's initial error in  $\mathcal{G}$ , immediately corrected)  
for he doth counsel in wisdom  
over all his [*words* >% *works* 0 | *works* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
- Helaman 16:16 (Oliver Cowdery's initial error in  $\mathcal{P}$ , virtually immediately corrected)  
but behold we know that all these great and marvelous  
[*words* > *works* 1 | *works* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] cannot come to pass
- 3 Nephi 26:8 (scribe 2's initial error in  $\mathcal{P}$ , virtually immediately corrected)  
according to the [*works* > *words* 1 | *words* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]  
which Jesus hath spoken
- 3 Nephi 27:24 (scribe 2's error in  $\mathcal{P}$ , corrected by Oliver Cowdery)  
write the [§2 *words* >+ §1 *works* 1 | *works* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST | *words* j]  
of this people
- Mormon 9:17 (scribe 2's initial error in  $\mathcal{P}$ , virtually immediately corrected)  
and by the power of his [*work* > *word* 1 | *word* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]  
man was created of the dust of the earth

In five out of six cases, scribe 2 of  $\mathcal{P}$  initially wrote *work(s)* in place of *word(s)*. Oliver Cowdery, on the other hand, twice wrote *words* in place of *works*. Thus here in Alma 12:14, Oliver might have mistakenly written *words* in  $\mathcal{G}$ ; but if so, he did not catch his error. Then scribe 2 initially miswrote *words* as *works* (which was actually correct, I would propose), but then he immediately corrected it to the reading in  $\mathcal{G}$ . Oliver's possible error in  $\mathcal{G}$  could be the result of the use of *word* in the immediately preceding verse (Alma 12:13: "yea if we have hardened our hearts against the **word**"), despite the earlier statement in verse 12 that we will "be judged according to our **works**".

There are also places where the editions have mixed up *word(s)* and *work(s)*, but none of these mix-ups have ever been transmitted into subsequent editions:

- 1 Nephi 19:10 (initially in the 1892 RLDS edition, corrected in press)  
according to the [*words* 01ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST | *works* > *words* κ] of Zenoch
- Alma 7:27 (1840 edition)  
according to your faith  
and good [*works* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST | *words* c]
- Alma 42:22 (1841 British edition)  
the [*works* 01ABCEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST | *words* d] of justice would be destroyed

Alma 53:10 (1953 RLDS edition)

or rather by the power and [word 01ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQPRT | work s] of God

3 Nephi 27:24 (1888 LDS edition)

write the [§2 words >+ §1 works 1 | works ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQPRT | words j]  
of this people

There are also semantic problems with the current text in Alma 12:14. First of all, verse 12 refers to us being “judged according to our **works**”. Then at the transition from verse 13 to verse 14, the text explains (I would propose) that if we have rejected the word so that it is not found in us, then “we shall be condemned—for our works will condemn us”. In other words, the text is repeating the fact that judgment will be based on our works—and here, the text specifically refers to those who have rejected the word of God.

The use of *yea* in the text means that the *yea*-clause should be an amplification or explanation of the preceding clause. In the current text, there are 27 other occurrences of *yea all*, and all of them either repeat (perhaps in part) the phraseology of the preceding clause or they summarize or expand upon preceding information, as in these examples:

1 Nephi 21:1 (total repetition of phraseology)

and again hearken O ye house of Israel  
**all ye that are broken off** and are driven out  
because of the wickedness of the pastors of my people  
**yea all ye that are broken off**  
that are scattered abroad which are of my people O house of Israel

Mosiah 21:3–4 (summarizing a preceding list)

but they would **smite** them on their cheeks  
and **exercise authority** over them  
and began to **put heavy burdens** upon their backs  
and **drive them** as they would a dumb ass  
**yea all this** was done that the word of the Lord might be fulfilled

Alma 14:22 (partial repetition of phraseology, with emphasis on “all manner of”)

and **many such things—yea all manner of such things—**  
did they say unto them

There are also examples of “*yea . . . all*” with intervening words, such as *even*, as well as examples where the *all* occurs in a prepositional phrase; yet in every case, the same general class of items is referred to in the *yea*-clause, as in the following examples:

Alma 8:7

now it was the custom of the people of Nephi to call their lands and their cities  
and **their villages—yea even all their small villages—**  
after the name of him who first possessed them

Alma 28:1

and the armies of the Nephites were set round about **the land of Jershon**  
**yea in all the borders** round about the land of Zarahemla

Helaman 14:17

but behold the resurrection of Christ redeemeth **mankind**  
**yea even all mankind**  
 and bringeth them back into the presence of the Lord

Ether 3:15

seest thou that **ye** are created after mine own image  
**yea even all men** were created in the beginning after mine own image

In the current text for Alma 12:14, the use of *yea all* implies that words belong to the larger class of works. Our words are, of course, a part of all our works, but words are never referred to as works elsewhere in the Book of Mormon. One would think that if *words* were correct in this first clause of verse 14, then we should expect a different kind of transition than *for*. We might also expect the word *also*. In other words, something like “**and** our words will **also** condemn us”, as later on in the verse when the text reads “**and** our thoughts will **also** condemn us”. The transitional *for* at the beginning of verse 14 clearly suggests that no new class of criteria is being introduced.

If the correct reading for Alma 12:14 has *works* in both clauses, then the *yea*-clause is placing emphasis on the *all*—that is, we will be judged by **all** our works, not just part of them. We won’t be able to select which works we will be judged on. Here are some other examples of *yea all* where the emphasis is clearly on the *all*:

2 Nephi 30:16

wherefore **the things** of all nations shall be made known  
**yea all things** shall be made known unto the children of men

Mosiah 15:11

whosoever hath heard the words of **the prophets**  
**yea all the holy prophets** which have prophesied  
 concerning the coming of the Lord . . .

Alma 18:38

and he also rehearsed unto them  
 concerning **the rebellions** of Laman and Lemuel and the sons of Ishmael  
**yea all their rebellions** did he relate unto them

Alma 23:13

and these are they that laid down **the weapons** of their rebellion  
**yea all their weapons** of war

There is one biblical passage that explicitly states we will be judged by our words, yet even here there is no specific reference to works:

Matthew 12:36–37 (King James Bible)

but I say unto you that every idle **word** that men shall speak  
 they shall give account thereof in the day of judgment  
 for by thy **words** thou shalt be justified  
 and by thy **words** thou shalt be condemned

Except for the current text in Alma 12:14, the Book of Mormon has only examples stating that the word(s) of the Lord will judge or condemn us, not that our own words will:

2 Nephi 25:18

wherefore he shall bring forth his words unto them  
which words shall judge them at the last day

2 Nephi 25:22

wherefore these things shall go from generation to generation . . .  
and the nations which shall possess them shall be judged of them  
according to the words which are written

2 Nephi 29:11

for I command all men . . . that they shall write the words which I speak unto them  
for out of the books which shall be written I will judge the world  
every man according to their works according to that which is written

2 Nephi 33:14

behold I bid you an everlasting farewell  
for these words shall condemn you at the last day

The Words of Mormon 1:11

for there are great things written upon them  
out of which my people and their brethren shall be judged at the great and last day  
according to the word of God which is written

Thus there is no internal textual support for the current reading in Alma 12:14, “for our **words** will condemn us”. The use of *words* creates several problematic aspects to the reading, while *works* presents no difficulties at all. In addition, scribal errors provide strong support for the possibility that *works* was accidentally replaced by *words* in Alma 12:14.

*Summary:* Emend Alma 12:14 to read “for our **works** will condemn us / yea all our **works** will condemn us”; in other words, accept scribe 2’s initial *works* in  $\mathfrak{P}$  (rather than his corrected *words*) as well as the 1837 emendation that produced the plural *works* in the following *yea*-clause (instead of the singular *work*); the original manuscript apparently read *words* in Alma 12:14, but this reading was probably an error due to the preceding “yea if we have hardened our hearts against the **word**” (in verse 13).

#### ■ Alma 12:14

*and in this awful state*

*we shall not [dearst >]s dare 1 | durst A | dare BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]*

*[ 1ABCDEFGHIKPS | to FIJLMNOQRT] look up to our God*

As discussed under Alma 1:33, the modal verb *durst* is historically a past-tense form and is usually used this way in the Book of Mormon. But some instances of *durst* in the Book of Mormon have a semantically present-tense meaning. And here in Alma 12:14, we have a unique instance of *durst* participating in a double modal, *shall durst*: “we **shall** not **durst** look up to our God”. In his editing for the 1837 edition, Joseph Smith replaced the modal *durst* with *dare*, the corresponding present-tense modal form: “we **shall** not **dare** look up to our God”. In the 1852 LDS edition, the infinitival *to* was added after the modal verb *dare*, thus making *dare* into a main verb.

The online Oxford English Dictionary gives 13 examples of *shall dare*. Eight of these are followed by the infinitival *to* and a subsequent infinitive verb form, but five have just the bare infinitive verb form without the *to*:

*The Roxburghe Ballads* (1682)

What Pimping Whig **shall dare controule, or check** the Lawful Heir?

Henry Fielding (1733)

I will make thee a dreadful example to all future knights  
who **shall dare dispute** the incomparableness of that divine lady.

William Collins (1742)

No wailing ghost **shall dare appear**  
To vex with shrieks this quiet grove.

Walter Scott (1814)

The cause that I shall assert I **shall dare support** in every danger.

Percy Bysshe Shelley (1817)

What we have done None **shall dare vouch**, though it be truly known.

On the other hand, the OED lists no examples of *shall durst* (nor are there any cited on *Literature Online* <lion.chadwyck.com>).

In the original text of the Book of Mormon, the modal verb *dare* never occurs at all; there is only *durst*, and that occurs in both present and past time. The main verb *dare* occurs once in the text:

Mormon 5:9

therefore I write a small abridgment  
**daring** not **to give** a full account of the things which I have seen

This example has the infinitive marker *to* after *daring* (“daring not to give”), which lends support to the 1852 addition of *to* here in Alma 12:14. However, Joseph Smith did not add the *to* in Alma 12:14; he intended *dare* to be a modal verb, as in “I dare not tell him”. The critical text will restore the original double modal *shall durst* in Alma 12:14: “we shall not durst look up to our God”.

**Summary:** Restore the original double modal *shall durst* in Alma 12:14 (“we **shall** not **durst** look up to our God”); Joseph Smith’s *shall dare* (“we **shall** not **dare** look up to our God”), introduced into the 1837 edition, is also a double modal; beginning with the 1852 LDS edition, the LDS text has had the infinitival *to* after the *dare* (“we **shall** not **dare to** look up to our God”), thus making *dare* into a main verb.

#### ■ Alma 12:14

*and in this awful state we shall not durst look up to our God*

[§2 and >+ §1 we and 1 | and we ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQR | And we PS] *would fain be glad  
if we could command the rocks and the mountains to fall upon us*

Here scribe 2 of  $\mathcal{P}$  seems to have accidentally omitted the repeated subject pronoun *we* when he copied from  $\mathcal{C}$  into  $\mathcal{P}$ ; Oliver Cowdery supplied it when he proofed  $\mathcal{P}$  against  $\mathcal{C}$  (although Oliver supralinearly inserted the *we* before the conjunction *and*). It is very probable that  $\mathcal{C}$  had the *we* since in this conjoined structure the repeated subject is optional.

*Summary:* Accept in Alma 12:14 the *we* that Oliver Cowdery supralinearly inserted in  $\mathcal{P}$ ; Oliver undoubtedly intended the *we* to follow the *and*.

#### ■ Alma 12:14

*and we would fain be glad if we could command the rocks*

*and [the 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST | NULL > the F] mountains to fall upon us*

In the first printing of the 1852 LDS edition, the repeated determiner *the* was accidentally omitted from “the rocks and **the** mountains”. For the second printing, the *the* was restored, probably by reference to the 1840 edition. There are no other examples in the text where *rocks* is conjoined with any other noun; but in other conjuncts of noun phrases involving *mountains*, the determiner *the* is always repeated:

Jacob 4:6	and <b>the</b> very trees obey us or <b>the</b> mountains or <b>the</b> waves of the sea
Helaman 11:31	those robbers which infested <b>the</b> mountains and <b>the</b> wilderness
Helaman 12:9	at his voice doth <b>the</b> hills and <b>the</b> mountains tremble and quake
3 Nephi 4:1	and out of <b>the</b> mountains and <b>the</b> wilderness

The use of the repeated *the* here in Alma 12:14 appears to be fully intended. For further discussion of such repetition, see under CONJUNCTIVE REPETITION in volume 3.

*Summary:* Maintain in Alma 12:14 the repeated determiner *the*: “if we could command the rocks and **the** mountains to fall upon us”.

#### ■ Alma 12:15–16

*we must come forth and stand before him in his glory and in his power*

*and in his might and majesty and dominion*

*and acknowledge to [their >js our 1 | their A | our BCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST] everlasting shame*

*that all his judgments are just*

*that he is just in all his works*

*and that he is merciful unto the children of men*

*and that he hath all power to save every man*

*that believeth on his name and bringeth forth fruit meet for repentance*

In the middle of this passage—in fact, within the same sentence—the earliest text switches from the first person plural to the third person plural. The first-person usage begins in verse 12 (“to be judged according to **our** works”) and continues into verse 15 (“**we** must come forth”). The rest of verse 15 is in the third person plural, beginning with the conjoined predicate “and acknowledge to **their** everlasting shame”. In his editing for the 1837 edition, Joseph Smith emended the third person *their* to the first person *our*, thus making the following pronominal form agree with the sentence-initial subject pronoun *we* (“**we** must come forth . . . and acknowledge to **our** everlasting shame”). Later in the sentence, the text refers to the salvation of mankind in the third person, not the first person: “and that he is merciful unto **the children of men** and that he hath all power to save **every man** that believeth on his name”.



As noted under Alma 11:41, there is no evidence that scribe 2 of  $\mathcal{P}$  ever mixed up the number for pronouns. Nor is there any specific evidence that he ever mixed up the person (such as switching the first and third person plural pronouns). On the other hand, there is evidence that Oliver Cowdery occasionally switched the person for these plural pronouns, but only under the influence of the grammatical person for words in the preceding text:

1 Nephi 16:10 (influence of the preceding third person plural *two spindles*)  
 and within the ball was **two spindles**  
 and the one pointed the way  
 whither [*they* > *we* 0 | *we* 1 ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] should go  
 into the wilderness

Mosiah 9:11 (influence of the preceding first person plural *we*)  
 therefore it came to pass that  
 after **we** had dwelt in the land for the space of twelve years  
 that king Laman began to grow uneasy  
 lest by any means my people should wax strong in the land  
 and that they could not overpower [*us* > *them* 1 | *them* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]  
 and bring them into bondage

Alma 60:16 (influence of the preceding first person plural *our* and *us*)  
 had they been true to the cause of **our** freedom and united with **us**  
 and gone forth against **our** enemies instead of taking up  
 [*our* > *their* 1 | *their* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] swords against us . . .

It is therefore possible that in Alma 12:15 Oliver Cowdery mistakenly wrote *their* instead of *our* in  $\mathcal{C}$ . However, in each of the three examples listed above, there was a nearby preceding form of the opposing person that seems to have prompted the error. No such preceding form can, however, be found here in Alma 12:15; that is, there is no third person plural pronoun in verse 15 that could have caused an original *our* to be replaced by *their* during the early transmission of the text. Perhaps one could argue that the immediately preceding sequence of third person singular pronominal forms, *him* and *his*, led *our* to be replaced by the third person *their* (“and stand before **him** in **his** glory and in **his** power and in **his** might and majesty and dominion”).

There are other instances in the text of such sudden shifts from first to third person, including one noted example in Alma 56:52–53 involving an apparent shift from a direct quote to an indirect one, with concomitant shifting from first person to third person (see the discussion there as well as under Alma 5:5). The critical text will accept here in Alma 12:15 the earliest reading, “to **their** everlasting shame”, despite its difficulty. There seems to be little reason for the *their* except that the original text read that way, although David Calabro (personal communication) points out that the *their* might be Alma’s own attempt to distance himself from having “everlasting shame”. Even so, the preceding verses (13–14) use the inclusive first person plural to refer to what will happen at the day of judgment “if we have hardened our hearts against the word”. Calabro suggests that the shift to the third person occurred in verse 15 because of its considerable distance from that first person *if*-clause at the beginning of verse 13.

**Summary:** Restore in Alma 12:15 the occurrence of *their* in the earliest reading (“and acknowledge to **their** everlasting shame that . . .”); this difficult third person usage seems to have been the reading of the original text.



## ■ Alma 12:16–17

and now behold I say unto you  
 then cometh a death even a second death  
 which is a spiritual death  
**then is a time** that whosoever dieth in his sins  
 as to [*the* 1A | *a* BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *temporal death*  
 shall also die a spiritual death  
 yea he shall die as to things pertaining unto righteousness  
**then is the time** when their torments shall be as a lake of fire and brimstone  
 whose flames ascendeth up forever and ever  
 and **then is the time** that they shall be chained down to an everlasting destruction  
 according to the power and captivity of Satan  
 having subjected them according to his will

Here the 1837 edition changed the definite article *the* to the indefinite article *a* in the phrase “as to **the** temporal death”, probably because of the surrounding occurrences of “a (spiritual) death” in this passage: “**a** death even **a** second death which is **a** spiritual death . . . shall also die **a** spiritual death”. Everyone suffers temporal death; thus the definite article *the* works perfectly well with *temporal death*. On the other hand, not everyone will suffer spiritual death; thus *a* works well with *spiritual death*. The critical text will restore the original definite article *the* before *temporal death*.

Lyle Fletcher (personal communication, 14 January 2004) suggests that the single occurrence of “then is **a** time” in verse 16 may be a mistake for “then is **the** time”, the phraseology that occurs twice in the following verse. The previous occurrence in verse 16 of three instances of the indefinite article *a* could have led to the replacement of an original *the* before *time* with *a*—just like “the temporal death” was changed to “a temporal death” in the 1837 edition. Nonetheless, one could consider the initial occurrence of *time* as the first reference to the time of spiritual death (thus the use of the indefinite article in “then is **a** time”), while the following two examples of “then is **the** time” refer to this same time of spiritual death (thus the use of the definite article). Here is another example involving the word *time* that shows the shift from the indefinite article *a* to the definite determiners *this* and *the*:

Alma 40:4

behold there is **a time** appointed that all shall come forth from the dead  
 now when **this time** cometh no one knows  
 but God knoweth **the time** which is appointed

Thus the occurrence of “then is **a** time” is quite appropriate when spiritual death is initially mentioned in Alma 12:16–17.

**Summary:** Restore the original *the* that occurred before *temporal death* in Alma 12:16; also maintain in that verse the indefinite article *a* before *time* (“then is **a** time”) since this is the first reference to the time of spiritual death in this passage; subsequent references in verse 17 to this time use the definite article *the* (two occurrences of “then is **the** time”).

## ■ Alma 12:17

*then is the time*

*when their [torments >js torment 1 | torments ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] shall be  
as a lake of fire and brimstone*

*whose [flames 1ABCDEFGHIKPS | flame FIJLMNOQRT] ascendeth up forever and ever*

In this passage we have two plural nouns, *torments* and *flames*, that have taken on singular forms at some time during the transmission of the text. In the first case, the printer's manuscript originally read "when their **torments** shall be as a lake of fire and brimstone". All the printed editions read in the plural, but Joseph Smith, in his editing for the 1837 edition, deleted the plural *s* here in *torments*. Ultimately, the 1837 edition maintained the plural *torments*. There is nothing grammatically wrong with the plural *torments* here, but Joseph's emendation in  $\mathcal{P}$  may have been based on the consistent use of the singular noun *torment* elsewhere in the text (including six other instances involving the phrase "the lake of fire and brimstone", each marked below with an asterisk):

1 Nephi 15:31	doth this thing mean the <b>torment</b> of the body in the days of probation
* 2 Nephi 9:16	and their <b>torment</b> is a lake of fire and brimstone
* 2 Nephi 9:19	and that lake of fire and brimstone which is endless <b>torment</b>
* 2 Nephi 9:26	and the lake of fire and brimstone which is endless <b>torment</b>
* 2 Nephi 28:23	even a lake of fire and brimstone which is endless <b>torment</b>
* Jacob 6:10	which lake of fire and brimstone is endless <b>torment</b>
Mosiah 2:39	his final doom is to endure a never-ending <b>torment</b>
Mosiah 3:25	into a state of misery and endless <b>torment</b>
* Mosiah 3:27	and their <b>torment</b> is as a lake of fire and brimstone
Mosiah 5:5	that we may not bring upon ourselves a never-ending <b>torment</b>
Mosiah 27:29	my soul was racked with eternal <b>torment</b>
Mosiah 28:3	the very thoughts that any soul should endure endless <b>torment</b>
Alma 36:12	but I was racked with eternal <b>torment</b>
Alma 36:17	as I was thus racked with <b>torment</b>
Moroni 8:21	for they are in danger of death hell and an endless <b>torment</b>

Thus the occurrence of the plural *torments* in the earliest text for Alma 12:17 is unique. But since there is nothing really wrong with the plural usage, the critical text will retain it, especially since it is the original reading in  $\mathcal{P}$  as well as the reading of all the printed editions.

In the case of *flames*, the 1852 LDS edition replaced "flames ascendeth" with "flame ascendeth", thus creating a singular subject *flame* for the historically third person singular verb ending *-(e)th*. But the original text allowed the *-(e)th* inflectional ending to take plural subjects. In fact, the original text prefers "flames ascendeth", as explained under 2 Nephi 9:16. Thus the critical text will restore here in Alma 12:17 the original "whose **flames ascendeth** up forever and ever".

**Summary:** Maintain in Alma 12:17 the original plural form *torments*; despite the uniqueness of the plural for this word in Alma 12:17, there is nothing inappropriate about it; also restore the plural *flames*, the original reading in  $\mathcal{P}$ , especially since the expression "flames ascendeth" occurs elsewhere in the original text.

## ■ Alma 12:17

*then is the time when their torments shall be as a lake of fire and brimstone  
whose flames ascendeth up forever and* [§2 forever > §1 ever 1 | ever ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]

In the printer’s manuscript, Oliver Cowdery changed scribe 2’s “forever and forever” to “forever and ever”. This change was probably a correction based on the reading of the original manuscript since the Book of Mormon text consistently uses the phraseology “forever and ever” (at least eight other times) but never “forever and forever”, except here originally in the printer’s manuscript. (For another possible instance of original “forever and ever”, see the discussion under Alma 26:16.) Five of these other instances of “forever and ever” have the same language as here in Alma 12:17 (namely, “ascendeth up forever and ever”):

1 Nephi 15:30

and the brightness thereof was like unto the brightness of a flaming fire  
which ascendeth up unto God **forever and ever** and hath no end

2 Nephi 9:16

and their torment is a lake of fire and brimstone  
whose flames ascendeth up **forever and ever**

Jacob 6:10

that ye must go away into that lake of fire and brimstone  
whose flames are unquenchable  
and whose smoke ascendeth up **forever and ever**

Mosiah 2:38

which is like an unquenchable fire  
whose flames ascendeth up **forever and ever**

Mosiah 3:27

and their torment is as a lake of fire and brimstone  
whose flames are unquenchable  
and whose smoke ascendeth up **forever and ever**

Of course, one could argue that in Alma 12:17 Oliver emended the text since “forever and forever” would have seemed strange to him. More likely, scribe 2 of  $\mathcal{P}$  accidentally repeated the *forever* instead of writing the correct *ever*, especially since this scribe was prone to writing dittographies—although none are quite like this one (for discussion and examples, see the discussion under Alma 12:27). The King James Bible has 46 examples of “forever and ever” but none of “forever and forever”. Clearly, “forever and ever” is the expected phraseology.

**Summary:** Accept in Alma 12:17 Oliver Cowdery’s correction in  $\mathcal{P}$  of *forever* to *ever*, which was probably the reading of  $\mathcal{O}$ ; the expected phraseology is definitely “forever and ever”.

## ■ Alma 12:17

*and then is the time that **they** shall be chained down to an everlasting destruction according to the power and captivity of Satan*

[NULL >jg *he* 1 | *he* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *having subjected them according to his will*

In preparing the printer's manuscript for typesetting, the 1830 compositor, John Gilbert, supra-linearly inserted in pencil the subject pronoun *he* before the dependent *having*-clause, probably because he did not want the reader to misinterpret the preceding pronoun *they* as the subject for *having*; obviously, the intended meaning is that Satan was the one subjecting those who had spiritually died. We have evidence that scribe 2 of  $\mathcal{P}$  occasionally omitted the subject pronoun *he*; for a list, see under Alma 11:2. So it is quite possible that Gilbert's emendation represents the original text.

Although the *he* is helpful in Alma 12:17, the question is whether the *he* is necessary (if so, there must have been an early loss of the subject pronoun). There are examples elsewhere in the text of present-participial clauses that refer to nearby nonsubject words rather than to more distant subject noun phrases, as in the following examples:

Mosiah 18:4 (no *it* before *having*)

as many as did believe him  
did go forth to **a place** which was called Mormon  
**having** received its name from the king

Mosiah 25:21 (no *they* before *being*)

therefore they did assemble themselves together in **different bodies**  
**being** called churches

Alma 15:5 (no *he* before *being*)

and they found **him** upon **his** bed sick  
**being** very low with a burning fever

Alma 40:13 (no *they* before *being*)

there shall be weeping and wailing and gnashing of teeth  
and this because of **their** own iniquity  
**being** led captive by the will of the devil

The earliest text in Alma 12:17 is therefore possible. Consequently, the critical text will restore the earliest reading: "according to the power and captivity of Satan / having subjected them according to his will".

*Summary:* Restore in Alma 12:17 the earliest reading, "according to the power and captivity of Satan / having subjected them according to his will"; the 1830 typesetter supplied the subject pronoun *he*, but this emendation was unnecessary since elsewhere the text allows such usage.

## ■ Alma 12:20

*but there was one Antionah who was a chief ruler among them*  
 [came 01EFIJLMNOPQRST | come ABCDGHK] forth and **said** unto him . . .

Here the original manuscript is extant and reads “there was one Antionah . . . **came** forth”; the past-tense *came* agrees with the following conjoined past-tense *said*. The 1830 compositor replaced *came* with *come*, which was followed in the earliest editions. The 1849 LDS edition restored the original *came* (but without reference to either  $\mathcal{C}$  or  $\mathcal{P}$ ). The 1908 RLDS edition restored *came* by reference to  $\mathcal{P}$ .

As discussed under Enos 1:23, the Book of Mormon text allows the past-tense verb form in the existential construction “there was (not) something <past-tense verb form>”, as in Helaman 13:2: “there was one Samuel a Lamanite **came** into the land of Zarahemla and **began** to preach unto the people”. The critical text will therefore maintain the earliest reading here in Alma 12:20 (“there was one Antionah . . . **came** forth and **said** unto him”).

**Summary:** Maintain the past-tense forms in Alma 12:20: “there was one Antionah . . . **came** forth and **said** unto him”.

## ■ Alma 12:21

*what does [this 1ABDE | the CGHIJKLMNOPQRST | this > the F] scripture mean*  
*which saith that God placed cherubims and a flaming sword on the east of the Garden of Eden*

The 1840 edition replaced the determiner *this* with the definite article *the* before the noun *scripture*. This change may be due to Joseph Smith’s editing for that edition, or it may simply represent a typo on the part of the 1840 typesetter. Either reading is possible, which suggests that the 1840 change is simply a typo. Elsewhere, it is true that the text has only *the scripture*, never *this scripture*:

Alma 30:8	for thus saith <b>the</b> scripture . . .
Alma 45:19	but behold <b>the</b> scripture saith . . .
Mormon 8:20	behold what <b>the</b> scripture saith . . .
Ether 13:12	and when these things come bringeth to pass <b>the</b> scripture which saith . . .

David Calabro also points out (personal communication) that here in Alma 12:21 an original *the* could have been misheard as *this* as Joseph Smith dictated the text to Oliver Cowdery (the scribe for this part of  $\mathcal{C}$ ), especially since *scripture*, the following word, begins with the letter *s*. For another example involving *this* versus *the*, see the discussion under 1 Nephi 15:21; there the original text apparently read “what meaneth **the things** which our father saw in a dream” (rather than the current reading, “what meaneth **this thing** which our father saw in a dream”).

Despite this internal evidence for *the scripture* in Alma 12:21, there are other examples involving the verb *mean* that occur with either *this* or *these* and are followed by a relative clause headed by *which*:

1 Nephi 22:1  
 what mean **these** things which ye have read

Alma 12:8

what does **this** mean which Amulek hath spoken  
concerning the resurrection of the dead

Thus the use of *this* in Alma 12:21 is perfectly acceptable and will be restored in the critical text.

*Summary:* Restore in Alma 12:21 the demonstrative *this*, the reading of the earliest textual sources; the reading “what does **this** scripture mean” is supported by the nearby usage in Alma 12:8: “what does **this** mean which Amulek hath spoken”; the replacement of *this* by *the* in the 1840 edition is probably a typo rather than the result of conscious editing.

#### ■ Alma 12:21

*what does this scripture mean which saith that  
God placed [Cherabs > Cherabims >]s Cherabim 1 | Cherubims A |  
cherubims BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQS | cherubim RT] and a flaming sword  
on the east of the Garden of Eden*

Here in Alma 12:21, the biblical scripture that Antionah is citing follows the language of the King James Bible:

Genesis 3:24

and he placed at the east of the Garden of Eden  
**cherubims** and a flaming sword

*Cherubims*, the plural for *cherub*, is a double plural consisting of the Hebrew *-im* followed by the English *-s* (with 65 occurrences in the King James Bible but none of the purely Hebrew plural *cherubim*). And originally, the Book of Mormon text had the same double plural form, *cherubims*. Interestingly, scribe 2 of  $\mathcal{P}$  initially wrote the word as *Cherabs* (that is, as the purely English plural form for the noun *cherub*, spelled as *Cherab* by scribe 2); in other words, only the English *-s* was added to the singular noun. But then scribe 2 immediately corrected *Cherabs* to *Cherabims*, his spelling of the King James double plural *cherubims*.  $\mathcal{O}$  is not extant for this word in Alma 12:21, but  $\mathcal{O}$  most probably read as *Cherubims*, which scribe 2 misread as *Cherabims* (Oliver Cowdery, the scribe here in  $\mathcal{O}$ , frequently wrote his *u*'s so that they looked like *a*'s). The 1830 compositor set *Cherubims*. In his editing of  $\mathcal{P}$  for the 1837 edition, Joseph Smith crossed out the plural *s* of *Cherabims*, but this change was never implemented in this passage in the 1837 edition. The change to *cherubim* was finally made in the 1920 LDS edition, but the RLDS text has retained the original King James double plural, *cherubims*.

The plural *cherubims* occurs two more times in the Book of Mormon text, and the editing of  $\mathcal{P}$  for the 1837 edition is similar except that in these two cases Joseph Smith's change to the purely Hebrew plural *cherubim* was implemented in the 1837 edition:

Alma 42:2

yea he drove out the man  
and he placed at the east end of the Garden of Eden  
[*Cherubims* 0A | *Cherubims* >]s *Cherubim* 1 |  
*Cherubim* BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQ | *cherubim* OPRST]  
and a flaming sword

Alma 42:3  
 the Lord God placed  
 [Cherubims >js Cherubim 1 | Cherubims A |  
 Cherubim BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQ | cherubim OPRST]  
 and the flaming sword  
 that he should not partake of the fruit

The critical text will, of course, restore the original double plural *cherubims*, the consistent reading of the King James Bible and the earliest reading in all three cases in the Book of Mormon.

**Summary:** Restore the double plural *cherubims* in Alma 12:21 and in Alma 42:2–3; this plural for the Hebrew noun *cherub* is the form that the King James translators consistently used.

#### ■ Alma 12:22

now we see that Adam did fall  
 by [ 01A | the BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST ] partaking of the forbidden fruit

The 1837 edition added *the* before *partaking*, yet standard English actually prefers no article before the gerund when the gerund is followed by a modifying prepositional phrase. In the original text of the Book of Mormon, such cases of gerunds preceded by *the* did occur, but some have been eliminated from the current text. For discussion, see under 1 Nephi 17:32; also see the complete discussion under GERUNDIVES in volume 3.

Here in Alma 12:22, we have a case where *the* was added, probably by accident (Joseph Smith did not mark the insertion of the *the* in the printer’s manuscript). So in accord with standard English as well as the earliest textual sources, the critical text will, in this case, remove the intrusive *the*.

**Summary:** Remove the intrusive *the* before *partaking* in Alma 12:22, thus restoring the original reading “Adam did fall by partaking of the forbidden fruit”.

#### ■ Alma 12:22

and thus we see **that** by his fall  
 [that all >js NULL 1 | that all A | all BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST ] mankind  
 became a lost and a fallen people

For the 1837 edition, Joseph Smith deleted the repeated *that* from “**that** by his fall **that** all mankind became a lost and a fallen people”. Joseph also accidentally crossed out the *all* which followed the second *that*. But in the 1837 edition itself, Joseph’s deletion of the *all* ended up being ignored; at some stage in producing the 1837 edition, it was recognized that the deletion of the *all* was simply an accident. There is nothing wrong with the phrase “all mankind”, which occurs 19 other times in the text; there are also instances of *mankind* without any preceding *all* (5 times), including one nearby in Alma 12:24: “and we see that death comes upon mankind”. Clearly, either reading is possible, as in the following contrastive occurrence of *mankind* and *all mankind* in Helaman 14:17: “but behold the resurrection of Christ redeemeth **mankind** / yea even **all mankind**”. The critical text will therefore follow the earliest textual sources for each instance of “(all) mankind”.

There are quite a few cases in the history of the text where the repeated *that* has been removed, including one in the verse immediately following Alma 12:22:

Alma 12:23  
 and now behold I say unto you  
**that** if it had been possible for Adam  
 for to have partaken of the fruit of the tree of life at that time  
 [*that* 1A | BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] there would have been no death

As in verse 22, the repeated *that* was removed in the 1837 edition. For further discussion of this editing, see under 1 Nephi 10:2–3; also see under THAT in volume 3 for other instances in the original text of the repeated *that*. The critical text will maintain all instances of the repeated *that*, providing they are supported by the earliest text.

**Summary:** Restore the two repeated *that*'s in Alma 12:22–23 that were removed in editing for the 1837 edition; maintain in verse 22 the *all* before *mankind* that Joseph Smith accidentally deleted in his editing of Ø for the 1837 edition.

#### ■ Alma 12:22

*all mankind became a lost and [a 01ABCDEFGHIKPS | FIJLMNOQRT] fallen people*

Here the 1852 LDS edition accidentally omitted the repeated indefinite article *a* before *fallen*. For two other instances where the text has accidentally lost the repeated *a* in the phrase “a lost and a fallen people”, see the discussion under Alma 9:30, 32. Also see the general discussion under CONJUNCTIVE REPETITION in volume 3.

**Summary:** Restore in Alma 12:22 the repeated *a* in “a lost and a fallen people”.

#### ■ Alma 12:23

*and the [word 1ABCEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST | world D] would have been void making God a liar*

The compositor for the 1841 British edition accidentally set *word* as *world*, perhaps under the influence of the following *would*. This obvious typo was removed from the following 1849 LDS edition (even though it used the 1841 edition as copytext). In two other places the text refers to the word being void (the first is only a few verses later):

Alma 12:26      and the word of God would have been void  
 Alma 42:5      yea and also the word of God would have been void

**Summary:** Maintain in Alma 12:23 the reference to the word, not the world, as being void.



## ■ Alma 12:23

for he said

if thou eat [§2 thereof > §1 NULL 1 | ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]

thou [shalt 1AFIJLMNOQRT | shall BCDEGHKPS] surely die

In this verse, there is some variation, especially when compared with the corresponding language in the book of Genesis:

Genesis 2:17 (King James Bible)

but of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil

thou shalt not eat of it

for in the day that thou **eatest thereof**

thou **shalt** surely die

The first question to consider is whether the original text for Alma 12:23 read “if thou eatest” (the King James text has “that thou eatest”) rather than “if thou eat” (the Book of Mormon reading). Here in Alma 12:23, the verb *eat* takes the subjunctive form without the inflectional ending *-est*. The original text has examples of subjunctive verb forms in subordinate clauses, as in the following examples:

Mosiah 12:12      all this shall come upon thee except **thou repent**

Alma 8:16      I am sent to command thee that **thou return**  
to the city of Ammonihah

Alma 22:16      yea if **thou repent** of all thy sins

Thus the occurrence of “if thou eat” as the earliest reading for Alma 12:23 is quite possible. Although the original manuscript is not extant for *thou eat*, spacing between surviving fragments indicates that *eat* fits better than *eatest*. The critical text will therefore maintain the earliest reading, “if thou eat”, in Alma 12:23.

The second case of variation here in Alma 12:23 has to do with the *thereof* that scribe 2 of  $\mathcal{P}$  originally wrote. Oliver Cowdery, when proofing  $\mathcal{P}$ , crossed out this *thereof*. Based on spacing between extant fragments, there is no room in  $\mathcal{C}$  for a *thereof* except by supralinear insertion. Scribe 2’s *thereof* was probably the result of his familiarity with the biblical account of Adam and Eve in the Garden of Eden. Interestingly, there are 24 occurrences of “eat thereof” in the King James Bible, but none in the Book of Mormon text; so Oliver Cowdery’s crossing out of the *thereof* is entirely consistent with the language of the Book of Mormon. The critical text will therefore accept the reading without the *thereof*.

Finally, the 1837 edition replaced the *shalt* with *shall* in the phrase “thou shalt surely die”. This change appears to be accidental. For discussion of the phraseology *thou shall* (which is occasionally found in the earliest text of the Book of Mormon), see under Mosiah 12:11. In this instance, however, the earliest text reads *thou shalt*, in agreement with the corresponding King James passage. The 1852 LDS edition restored the original *shalt* to the LDS text, but the RLDS text has retained the 1837 *thou shall*.

**Summary:** Maintain in Alma 12:23 the corrected reading in  $\mathcal{P}$ , “if thou eat / thou shalt surely die”; spacing between extant fragments of  $\mathcal{C}$  argue for this shorter reading rather than a longer reading based on the King James text (“if thou **eatest thereof** / thou shalt surely die”).

## ■ Alma 12:26

*if it were possible  
that our first parents could have [went 1ABCDEFGHIJKLP | went > gone M | gone NOQRST] forth  
and **partaken** of the tree of life  
they would have been forever miserable*

Here we have an instance of the simple past-tense *went* acting as the past participial form for the verb *go*. The 1906 LDS large-print edition introduced the standard *gone* into the LDS text; the RLDS text retained the nonstandard *went* until the 1953 RLDS edition. Elsewhere, the text has only the standard *gone* (73 times). As discussed under PAST PARTICIPLE in volume 3, the use of the simple past-tense form for the past participle was common in the original text of the Book of Mormon (such as “the angel **had spake** unto us” in 1 Nephi 3:30 and “we **had came** down” in 1 Nephi 5:1). The critical text will restore this usage whenever it is supported in the earliest text. Here in Alma 12:26, the original nonstandard use of “could have went” will be restored, even though it is conjoined with *partaken* (the standard past participial form for the verb *partake*) rather than with *partook* (the simple past-tense form). For discussion of past participial *partook*, see under 1 Nephi 8:25.

**Summary:** Restore in Alma 12:26 the unique occurrence of *went* as the past participial form for the verb *go*.

## ■ Alma 12:27

*but behold [behold >jg NULL 1 | ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] it was not so*

Here scribe 2 of  $\mathcal{P}$  wrote *behold* twice. The 1830 compositor, John Gilbert, crossed out the extra *behold* in  $\mathcal{P}$  and set a single *behold* for the 1830 edition. There are no other examples of *behold behold* in the Book of Mormon text. The King James Bible has only one example: “the first *shall say* to Zion: behold / behold them” (Isaiah 41:27). And here in the case of Alma 12:27, there is no room for an extra *behold* between extant fragments of  $\mathcal{G}$  except by supralinear insertion. So it appears that here in Alma 12:27 we have a case of scribal dittography. Scribe 2 of  $\mathcal{P}$  frequently wrote dittographies as he copied from  $\mathcal{G}$  into  $\mathcal{P}$  (there are 27 clear cases). About half of his dittographies occurred at the ends of lines (13 times). Sometimes scribe 2 caught his dittography (12 times); sometimes it was corrected by Oliver Cowdery when he proofed  $\mathcal{P}$  against  $\mathcal{G}$  (10 times). And in few cases the dittography was missed by both scribe 2 and Oliver but ended up being correctly set by the 1830 compositor (5 times).

In almost every case, scribe 2’s dittographies in  $\mathcal{P}$  were the simple repetition of one or two words; in the following list, each case where the dittography occurred at the end of a line in  $\mathcal{P}$  is marked with an asterisk:

PASSAGE	REPEATED WORD(S)	CORRECTOR
* Mosiah 29:43	that	scribe 2 of $\mathcal{P}$
* Mosiah 29:46	that	scribe 2 of $\mathcal{P}$
* Alma 1:6	of	1830 compositor
* Alma 1:25	in the	scribe 2 of $\mathcal{P}$

* Alma 3:1	number	Oliver Cowdery
Alma 3:20	Lamanites	scribe 2 of Ø
* Alma 4:3	of	scribe 2 of Ø
Alma 7:11	this	scribe 2 of Ø
Alma 7:14	and	scribe 2 of Ø
Alma 10:28	hath	scribe 2 of Ø
Alma 12:27	behold	1830 compositor
* 3 Nephi 21:4	of	scribe 2 of Ø
3 Nephi 27:14	or	Oliver Cowdery
* 3 Nephi 28:15	out	Oliver Cowdery
3 Nephi 28:18	them	Oliver Cowdery
* 3 Nephi 30:2	of your	Oliver Cowdery
4 Nephi 1:1	year	1830 compositor (copied from Ø)
* 4 Nephi 1:13	the	1830 compositor (copied from Ø)
* Mormon 2:16	the	scribe 2 of Ø
Mormon 3:4	of the	1830 compositor (copied from Ø)
Mormon 7:10	of	Oliver Cowdery
* Mormon 8:24	could	Oliver Cowdery
Mormon 9:16	of	scribe 2 of Ø
Mormon 9:26	stand	Oliver Cowdery
* Mormon 9:28	with	Oliver Cowdery

From this list, I exclude two cases (a *you* in Alma 5:6 and a *by* in Mormon 3:14) where scribe 2 of Ø initially miswrote the word, crossed it out, and then correctly wrote the word inline. Such instances are not really dittographies.

In two cases, scribe 2's dittography was longer than two words, and in each of these cases the dittography resulted from him trying to deal with some other repetition in the original text:

Alma 5:62

I speak by way of command unto you that **belong to the church**  
 and unto those which do not **belong to the church**  
 [§2 & unto those who do not belong to the Church > §1 NULL 1]  
 I speak by way of invitation saying . . .

Mormon 9:14 (equivalent correction)

he that is happy **shall be happy still**  
 and he that is unhappy **shall be unhappy still**  
 [*shall be unhappy shall be unhappy shall be unhappy still* > NULL 1]

Oliver Cowdery corrected the first of these two longer dittographies; scribe 2 corrected the second one (although he actually crossed out the preceding *still* rather than the following one). Amazingly, in the second one, “shall be unhappy” was repeated three extra times inline.

Finally, there is one odd case of dittography in Alma 12:17 where “forever and ever” was miscopied as “forever and forever”, an instance of partial dittography. In this case, Oliver Cowdery corrected the repeated *forever* to the correct *ever*. For discussion of this example, see under that passage.

*Summary:* Accept the 1830 compositor’s emendation of *behold behold* to a single *behold*; spacing considerations between extant fragments of  $\mathcal{O}$  as well as usage elsewhere in the text supports the compositor’s decision to consider the repeated *behold* as a dittography.

■ **Alma 12:27**

*but it was appointed unto [man 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPS | men RT] that they must die*

The 1920 LDS edition emended *man* here to *men* in order to make the number agree with the following plural pronoun *they*. The original text, however, has other examples of singular *man*, meaning ‘mankind’, taking the plural pronoun, as in the following instance that was also emended to *men* (in this instance, by Oliver Cowdery when he copied from  $\mathcal{O}$  into  $\mathcal{P}$ ):

Alma 29:4

yea I know that

he allotteth unto [*man* 0D | *man* > *men* 1 | *men* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST]

yea decreeth unto **them** decrees which are unalterable

For similar examples, see the discussion regarding *every man* under 2 Nephi 29:11; the original text had quite a few cases where the plural pronoun *they* was used to refer to generic *man*.

*Summary:* Restore in Alma 12:27 the singular *man*, the original reading, despite the following plural pronoun *they*.

■ **Alma 12:29**

*therefore he sent angels to converse with them*

[*which* 0A | *which* >js *who* 1 | *who* BCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST] *caused men to behold of his glory*

Here the relative pronoun *which* has two possible antecedents, either the noun *angels* or the whole clause itself. In his editing for the 1837 edition, Joseph Smith interpreted the *which* as referring to the angels; thus he grammatically emended the *which* to *who*. (The original text generally used *which* to refer to people as well as things; see the discussion under WHICH in volume 3.) But one could also interpret the *which* here as referring to the act itself of sending angels to converse with men, an act that causes men to behold God’s glory, as is implied, for instance, in Luke 2:9: “and lo the angel of the Lord came upon them and the glory of the Lord shone round about them”. Technically, the critical text does not need to decide which meaning of *which* is intended here in Alma 12:29 since the original *which* will be restored. For additional discussion, see under WHICH in volume 3.

*Summary:* Restore the original *which* in Alma 12:29, the earliest reading; the *which* here may refer to the entire preceding clause rather than to the noun *angels*.

## ■ Alma 12:29

*therefore he sent angels to converse with them  
which caused men to behold*

[§2 of >% NULL > §1 of 1 | of ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST | HK] *his glory*

Here in the printer's manuscript, scribe 2 initially wrote "to behold **of** his glory", but then he erased the *of*. Oliver Cowdery, when he proofed  $\mathcal{P}$  against  $\mathcal{C}$ , restored the *of*. The 1874 RLDS edition also removed the *of* here, but it was restored to the RLDS text in the 1908 RLDS edition.

The *of* is unusual here, thus the tendency to remove it. Elsewhere in the text, we only have examples of "to behold something" (excluding, of course, the gerundive use of the verb in Moroni 10:14, which requires the *of*: "and again to another / **the beholding of** angels and ministering spirits". Nor are there any examples of "to behold **of** something" in the King James Bible (excluding once more a gerundive use which requires the *of*, in Ecclesiastes 5:11: "and what good *is there* to the owners thereof / saving **the beholding of them** with their eyes"). Here in Alma 12:29, the critical text will maintain the unexpected original reading, "to behold **of** his glory". Oliver Cowdery would not have supplied the *of* in  $\mathcal{P}$  unless  $\mathcal{C}$  read that way.

**Summary:** Retain the preposition *of* in Alma 12:29, the original reading (undoubtedly intended, despite its unusualness for modern English readers).

## ■ Alma 12:30

*and they began from that time forth to call on his name*

*therefore God conversed with [men 01ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST | man > men F]*

*and made known unto **them** the plan of redemption*

Here in the 1852 LDS edition, *men* was originally mis-set as *man*. But in the second printing of this edition, the correct *men* was restored, either by reference to the 1840 edition or by noticing that the surrounding text uses the plural pronouns *they* and *them*. The critical text will, of course, maintain the reading of the original manuscript: "therefore God conversed with **men**".

**Summary:** Maintain the plural *men* in Alma 12:30, the reading of the earliest textual sources (including, in this instance, the original manuscript).

## ■ Alma 12:31

*they having first transgressed the first commandments as to things which were temporal  
and becoming as [Gods 01AIIJLMNOQRT | gods BCDEFGHKPS] knowing good from evil*

The word *Gods* here should probably be capitalized; the current LDS text reads *Gods*, while the RLDS text reads *gods*. In the corresponding passage in the current King James Bible, this word is not capitalized, but in the original 1611 printing it was:

Genesis 3:5

□ 1979 *LDS Bible (with modern accidentals)*:

For God doth know that in the day ye eat thereof,  
then your eyes shall be opened,  
and ye shall be as **gods**, knowing good and evil.

□ 1611 *text (with original accidentals)*:

For God doeth know, that in the day ye eate thereof,  
then your eyes shalbee opened:  
and yee shall bee as **Gods**, knowing good and euill.

The meaning here in Alma 12:31 is that Adam and Eve would become like God by knowing good from evil, which is explained later in Genesis 3:

Genesis 3:22 (King James Bible)

and the LORD God said  
behold the man is become as one of us  
to know good and evil

There is no reference here in Genesis 3 to Adam and Eve becoming lesser gods or pagan gods, which would require the lowercase usage. For further discussion regarding the capitalization of the singular *god/God*, see under 2 Nephi 9:30. For discussion regarding the capitalization of *Messiah*, *Savior*, and *Christ*, see under 1 Nephi 1:19.

*Summary*: Maintain the capitalized *Gods* in Alma 12:31; here the text intends to say that Adam and Eve would become as Gods, equal to God in knowing good and evil.

#### ■ Alma 12:31

*placing themselves in a state to act or being placed in a state to act*  
*according to their [will > wills >% will > wills 1 | wills ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]*  
*and [pleasure > pleasures 1 | pleasures ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]*

As discussed under Alma 4:8, the critical text will maintain the original plural usage here in Alma 12:31: “according to their **wills** and **pleasures**”.

#### ■ Alma 12:32

*for the [work > works 1 | works ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] of justice could not be destroyed*

The original manuscript is not extant here but probably read *works*. Scribe 2 of  $\mathcal{P}$  initially copied the word as *work*, but then almost immediately afterwards inserted inline the plural *s* (there is no change in the level of ink flow). As noted under Alma 7:24, scribe 2 frequently miswrote *works* as *work*.

Usage elsewhere in the text shows that either *work* or *works* can occur with the prepositional phrase “of justice”:

Alma 42:13	except it should destroy the <b>work</b> of justice
Alma 42:13	now the <b>work</b> of justice could not be destroyed
Alma 42:22	the <b>works</b> of justice would be destroyed

Overall, the text is evenly divided between “the work of justice” and “the works of justice”; in each case, the critical text will follow the earliest reading.

*Summary:* Accept in Alma 12:32 the plural *works*, the virtually immediate correction in  $\mathcal{P}$ ; usage in Alma 42:22 supports the plural usage “the works of justice”.

### ■ Alma 12:33

*but God did call on [men 1ABDEFIJLMNOPQRST | man CGHK] in the name of his Son*

Once more we have a question regarding the number for *man/men* (see the nearby discussion under verses 27 and 30). In this instance, the 1840 edition replaced the plural *men* with the singular *man*. Either reading is theoretically possible. There is one similar passage where the verb is *call*, and this reads in the plural: “and the office of their ministry is to call **men** unto repentance” (Moroni 7:31). Here in Alma 12:33, the critical text will follow the earliest reading, “God did call on **men** in the name of his Son”.

*Summary:* Maintain in Alma 12:33 the earliest text with its plural *men*: “God did call on men”.

### ■ Alma 12:34–35

*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 BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] sins  
and these shall enter into my rest  
and whosoever will harden his heart and will do iniquity  
behold I swear in my wrath  
that [they >js he 1 | they A | he BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] shall not enter into my rest*

Here we have two instances where singular pronouns are first used to refer to *whosoever*, but then the text switches to plural pronouns. In his editing for the 1837 edition, Joseph Smith changed the plural pronouns to singulars: *their* to *his* in verse 34 and *they* to *he* in verse 35. But, it should be noted, Joseph left the plural *these* at the end of verse 34 in “and **these** shall enter into my rest”. (Admittedly, replacing *these* with *he* or *this* in this clause would have been awkward.)

As discussed under 1 Nephi 17:48, *whoso* and *who(m)soever* can take either the singular *he* or plural *they*. As noted in that discussion, there are other passages where the number switches. Thus the critical text will restore the original mixture in pronominal number here in Alma 12:34–35.

*Summary:* The original text allows *whosoever* to take both singular and plural pronouns, even within the same sentence; restore in Alma 12 the original use of *their* in verse 34 and *they* in verse 35.

## ■ Alma 12:35

*behold I [swear 1ABCEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST | sware D] in my wrath  
that they shall not enter into my rest*

The 1841 British edition accidentally spelled *swear* as *sware*, the homophonous past-tense spelling for the verb *swear*. The larger context here requires the present-tense *swear*, which the subsequent LDS edition (1849) restored to the text.

*Summary:* Maintain the present-tense *swear* in Alma 12:35.

## ■ Alma 12:36

*therefore your iniquity provoketh him  
that he sendeth down his wrath upon you  
as in the first provocation  
yea according to his word in the last provocation  
as well as [in 1A | BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] the first  
to the everlasting destruction of your souls  
therefore according to his word  
[unto 0ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST | §2 until > §1 unto 1]  
[NULL > the last 0 | the last 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST] death  
as well as the first*

Here we have two instances involving conjunctive repetition of prepositions. The earliest text read “according to his word **in** the last provocation as well as **in** the first”. In setting the 1837 edition, the compositor seems to have accidentally omitted the repeated *in* here. Perhaps he was influenced by the phraseology later in the verse: “according to his word **unto** the last death as well as the first” (where the preposition *unto* is not repeated before *the first*). It should be noted here that scribe 2 of  $\mathcal{P}$  miswrote the preposition *unto* as *until* but Oliver Cowdery corrected it to *unto* when he proofed  $\mathcal{P}$  against  $\mathcal{O}$ ; in this instance,  $\mathcal{O}$  is extant and reads *unto*. (Here enough of  $\mathcal{O}$  is extant to also determine that Oliver initially wrote simply *unto death* in  $\mathcal{O}$  but then almost immediately corrected the reading there by supralinearly inserting *the last*.)

Elsewhere in the Book of Mormon text, when *as well as* is used to conjoin prepositional phrases, the preposition is repeated in almost every case:

1 Nephi 13:41

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

Alma 24:14

that the plan of salvation might be made known **unto** us  
as well as **unto** future generations

Alma 39:18

that the plan of redemption should be made known **unto** this people  
as well as **unto** their children

Alma 56:16

yea and they were depressed **in** body as well as **in** spirit



Helaman 11:6

and the whole earth was smitten even **among** the Lamanites  
as well as **among** the Nephites

Helaman 16:18

why will he not shew himself **unto** us  
as well as **unto** they which shall be at Jerusalem

Helaman 16:19

yea why will he not shew himself **in** this land  
as well as **in** the land of Jerusalem

In one complex case, the preposition *of* is, quite naturally, not repeated before *the words*:

Moroni 8:29

they must perish soon unto the fulfilling  
**of** the prophecies which was spoken by the prophets  
as well as the words of our Savior himself

The only other instance of *as well as* where the preposition is not repeated is here in Alma 12:36—that is, for the second occurrence of *as well as* in this verse: “therefore according to his word **unto** the last death as well as the first”. One wonders here in Alma 12:36 if the original text also repeated the *unto* (in other words, perhaps the original text read “according to his word **unto** the last death as well as **unto** the first”). The critical text will, however, not make this emendation since the repetition of the preposition is not required in English. On the other hand, earlier in the verse, the original repeated preposition *in* will be restored: “according to his word **in** the last provocation as well as **in** the first”. In each case, we will follow the earliest textual sources. The original manuscript is not extant for either case of the possibly repeated preposition here in Alma 12:36; the spacing between extant fragments is fairly large, with the result that in both cases there is not enough evidence to argue either for or against the occurrence of the repeated preposition in  $\mathcal{C}$ . Hence we have to rely on the reading in  $\mathcal{D}$  for this passage.

**Summary:** Restore the original repeated preposition *in* for the first occurrence of *as well as* in Alma 12:36 (“according to his word **in** the last provocation as well as **in** the first”); maintain the second instance of *as well as* without the repeated preposition *unto* (“according to his word **unto** the last death as well as the first”).

### ■ Alma 12:37

*let us repent*

and [§2 *not harden* >% *harden not* >- §1 *harden not* 1 | *harden not* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]

*our hearts*

*that we provoke not the Lord our God to pull down his wrath upon us*

Scribe 2 of  $\mathcal{D}$  initially wrote this passage as “let us repent and not harden our hearts”, the word order that we would expect in modern English. But scribe 2 immediately corrected the word order by erasing *not harden* and overwriting it with *harden not*. Oliver Cowdery, when he proofed  $\mathcal{D}$

against  $\mathcal{O}$ , rewrote the correct *harden not*, first crossing out scribe 2's *harden not* and then supra-linearly inserting it. It is quite clear from both corrections that  $\mathcal{O}$  read "let us repent and harden not our hearts". Moreover, the original text has nine other instances of "harden not", five of which are conjoined to a preceding predicate:

Alma 12:33	if ye will repent <b>and harden not</b> your hearts
Alma 12:34	whosoever repenteth <b>and hardeneth not</b> his heart
Alma 34:31	that ye would come forth <b>and harden not</b> your hearts any longer
Alma 34:31	if ye will repent <b>and harden not</b> your hearts
3 Nephi 21:22	if they will repent . . . <b>and harden not</b> their hearts

Notice that the first two examples listed above also occur in Alma 12, only a few verses earlier. The critical text will maintain the corrected word order here in Alma 12:37.

David Calabro (personal communication) reminds me that Alma 12–13 also contains many phrases that parallel the King James language in the epistle to the Hebrews, including two uses of the phrase "harden not your hearts" in conjunction with a reference to provoking the Lord:

Hebrews 3:8, 15  
**harden not your hearts** as in the provocation  
 in the day of temptation in the wilderness . . .  
 today if ye will hear his voice  
**harden not your hearts** as in the provocation

Thus the reading "harden not our hearts that we provoke not the Lord our God" in Alma 12:37 is undoubtedly correct.

**Summary:** Maintain in Alma 12:37 the corrected word order in  $\mathcal{P}$ : "let us repent and **harden not** our hearts".

# Alma 13

## ■ Alma 13:1

*I would **cite** your minds **forward** to the time  
which the Lord God gave these commandments unto his children*

The expression “to cite one’s mind forward” is definitely unusual, and one wonders if there might not be some error here. One possibility, for instance, is that the verb *cite* is an error for *cast* (which is visually similar to *cite*). There are, in fact, two scriptural passages which use *cast* with *mind*:

Luke 1:29 (King James Bible)

and when she saw *him* she was troubled at his saying  
and **cast in her mind** what manner of salutation this should be

Book of Commandments 5:11 (Doctrine and Covenants 6:22)

verily verily I say unto you  
if you desire a further witness  
**cast your mind** upon the night that you cried unto me in your heart  
that you might know concerning the truth of these things

The second example is from a revelation given through Joseph Smith to Oliver Cowdery that dates from the same time period as the Book of the Mormon translation (April 1829). However, in both these instances of “cast (in) one’s mind”, the expression is not used causatively, as it would be if the text here in Alma 13:1 originally read “I would **cast** your minds forward to the time . . .” (as if Alma were causing each person in his audience to cast their own mind on that time”).

Another difficulty with the expression “to cite one’s mind forward” is the use of the adverb *forward*. Douglas Stringer (personal communication, 2 November 2003) notes that *forward* seems unusual here since Alma is referring to an event in the past. Perhaps the text should read “I would cite your minds **back** to the time which the Lord God gave these commandments unto his children”.

Although I have not been able to find any evidence in English for the precise expression “to cite one’s mind forward”, there is some indirect evidence from earlier English that the verb *cite* will work here. According to the Oxford English Dictionary, this verb can mean ‘to arouse’ (see definition 2 under the verb *cite*); it derives from the Latin *citare* ‘to set in rapid motion, rouse, stimulate’ (see the OED definition under the verb *incite*). Although this meaning for *cite* is now archaic in English, that seems to be the intended meaning here in Alma 13:1. Given the earlier meaning of the words *cite* and *incite* in English, the use of the word *forward* may be related to the idea of “inciting” (or “citing”) one’s mind to go forward in confronting a new thought. In any event, the expression “I would cite your minds forward” appears to be an idiomatic expression

that means ‘I would urge you to consider’. Its unique use in Alma 13:1 appears to be intended, and the critical text will therefore retain the expression, despite the difficulty in interpreting it.

**Summary:** Retain in Alma 13:1 the expression “I would cite your minds forward”, which involves an archaic use of the verb *cite* and apparently means ‘I would urge you to consider’.

#### ■ 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*

The original Book of Mormon text has examples where the relative pronoun modifying *time* is either *which* or *that* rather than the expected *when*. Here in Alma 13:1, the 1840 edition introduced the *when* (probably as a result of Joseph Smith’s editing). The *when* was introduced into the LDS text in the second printing of the 1852 LDS edition (as a result of consulting the 1840 edition). The 1908 RLDS edition restored the original *which* (the reading in  $\mathcal{P}$ ) to the RLDS text. The critical text will also restore the original use of *which* here in Alma 13:1. See the discussion under 1 Nephi 19:2 for other examples of this usage as well as the evidence for its textual acceptability.

**Summary:** Restore the original use of *which* in Alma 13:1 (“I would cite your minds forward to the time **which** the Lord God gave these commandments”); such usage can be found elsewhere in the original text of the Book of Mormon.

#### ■ Alma 13:3

*and this is the manner after which they were ordained*

*being called and prepared from the foundation of the world*

*according to the foreknowledge of God*

*on account of their exceeding faith and good works*

[ 01 | ; ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST ]

*in the first place*

*being left to choose good or evil*

Here the 1830 typesetter placed a semicolon before the phrase “in the first place”, thus assigning this phrase to the following present participial clause (“in the first place being left to choose good or evil”) rather than the preceding text (“being called and prepared from the foundation of the world . . . on account of their exceeding faith and good works in the first place”). Mahlon Edwards (personal communication, 20 November 2003) has proposed that the phrase “in the first place” works better with the preceding text; he suggests the following punctuation:

Alma 13:3 (proposed change in punctuation)

on account of their exceeding faith and good works in the first place,  
being left to choose good and evil

Elsewhere there are three examples for which “in the first place” clearly begins a finite clause:

2 Nephi 32:9

ye must not perform any thing unto the Lord  
save **in the first place** ye shall pray unto the Father in the name of Christ

Mosiah 2:23

and now **in the first place** he hath created you  
and granted unto you your lives

Alma 13:5

or in fine

[ 1 | : ABCGHKPS | ; DEFILMNOQ | , RT ]

**in the first place** they were on the same standing with their brethren

[The 1841 British edition accidentally set the colon after *in fine* as a semicolon; the 1920 LDS edition replaced this typo with a comma, the expected punctuation here.]

The last of these is found shortly after Alma 13:3. For one other instance of “in the first place”, the reading is ambiguous:

Alma 32:22

therefore he desireth

[ 0 | NULL > jg , 1 | , ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST ]

in the first place

[ 0 | NULL > jg , 1 | , ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST ]

that ye should believe / yea even on his word

In this instance, the phrase “in the first place” could refer to what the Lord desires first of all or above all else. Or this phrase could mean that the Lord desires that we should first believe in his word (even though the subordinate *that* follows the phrase “in the first place”). The difference in meaning here is minor, as it is in Alma 13:3. Given the way the phrase is unambiguously used in Alma 13:5, it is probably best to maintain the current punctuation in Alma 13:3.

**Summary:** Maintain the current punctuation in Alma 13:3, with the semicolon preceding the phrase “in the first place”; attaching this phrase to the following participial clause is supported by the nearby usage in Alma 13:5 (“or in fine / in the first place they were on the same standing with their brethren”).

### ■ Alma 13:3

*therefore they having chosen good*

[ §2 NULL > §1 & 1 | *and* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST ] *exercising exceeding great faith  
are called with a holy calling*

As discussed under Alma 12:8, scribe 2 of  $\mathcal{P}$  frequently omitted the conjunction *and*. In this instance, Oliver Cowdery provided the *and* when he proofed  $\mathcal{P}$  against  $\mathcal{C}$ . Here the *and* is expected between the two participial clauses. The critical text will maintain Oliver’s corrected reading in  $\mathcal{P}$ .

**Summary:** Accept the *and* that Oliver Cowdery inserted in Alma 13:3; the *and* was probably the reading of the original manuscript, no longer extant here.

## ■ Alma 13:3–4

therefore they **having** chosen good and exercising exceeding great faith  
 are called with a holy calling / yea with that holy calling  
 which was prepared with and according to a preparatory redemption for such  
 and thus they [having >js havi 1 | having A | have BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] been called  
 to this holy calling on account of their faith  
 while others would reject the Spirit of God  
 on account of the hardness of their hearts and blindness of their minds . . .

Here in Alma 13:4 Joseph Smith emended a present participial clause that in the earliest text is never completed by a main clause—namely, by changing the present participial *having* to the finite verb form *have*. It is possible here that the earliest reading, *they having*, is an error that entered the text because of the preceding *they having* at the beginning of verse 3 (“therefore they having chosen good”). On the other hand, as discussed under Enos 1:3, the original text has cases of stranded present participial clauses. For that reason, the critical text will restore this instance of *they having* here in Alma 13:4.

David Calabro also points out (personal communication) that present participial clauses are also found throughout subsequent verses in the larger passage, with only an occasional main clause; and in a couple more instances (marked below with arrows), the present participial clause is introduced by *thus* (just as in verse 4, “and thus they having been called”):

Alma 13:5–8

- thus this holy calling **being** prepared from the foundation of the world . . .  
**being** in and through the atonement of the Only Begotten Son . . .
- and thus **being** called by this holy calling . . .  
 this high priesthood **being** after the order of his Son . . .  
 or in other words **being** without beginning of days or end of years  
**being** prepared from eternity to all eternity . . .  
**being** called with a holy calling . . .  
 and **taking** upon them the high priesthood of the holy order . . .

Thus the original text in Alma 13:4 is consistent with usage elsewhere in the larger passage.

**Summary:** Restore the original stranded present participial clause at the beginning of Alma 13:4 (“and thus they **having** been called to this holy calling”); such disconnected usage is found elsewhere in the earliest text.

## ■ Alma 13:4

while if it had not been for this  
 they might [ 1ABCDEFHGHIJKLOP | NULL > have M | have NQRST]  
 [§2 had > §1 had 1 | had ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] as great privilege as their brethren

Here in the printer’s manuscript, scribe 2 wrote “they **might had** as great privilege as their brethren”. Oliver Cowdery, when he proofed  $\mathfrak{P}$  against  $\mathfrak{O}$ , crossed out the *had* and then supralinearly wrote *had*—that is, he made no change at all. Perhaps Oliver intended to write *have had* but accidentally

ended up writing only the *had*. Another possibility is that Oliver expected *have had*, but when he started to correct  $\mathcal{P}$  (by crossing out the *had*), he noticed that  $\mathcal{O}$  itself had only the *had*, and he therefore decided to follow the reading in  $\mathcal{O}$ .

The earliest reading without the *have* seems quite odd here, although it is true that all the various editions printed “they might had” until the 1906 LDS edition (for the LDS text) and the 1953 RLDS edition (for the RLDS text). For modern readers, the expression appears to be an error, thus the textual emendation in the 20th century.

Elsewhere the text has examples of “<modal verb> have had” but none of “<modal verb> had”:

2 Nephi 2:22–23

and they must have remained forever and had no end  
and they **would have had** no children

Helaman 7:7

O that I **could have had** my days in the days  
when my father Nephi first came out of the land of Jerusalem

Helaman 7:8

yea if my days could have been in them days  
then **would** my soul **have had** joy in the righteousness of my brethren

Mormon 4:4

for were it not for that  
the Lamanites **could have had** no power over them

Mormon 9:33

and if we could have written in the Hebrew  
behold ye **would have had** none imperfection in our record

Except for the earliest text here in Alma 13:4, there are no examples of “<modal verb> had” in the Book of Mormon text.

Yet we can find considerable evidence for the expression “might had” in earlier English, as in the following examples from *Literature Online* <lion.chadwyck.com>; here the accidentals have been regularized:

Edmund Elviden (about 1570)

that if by sufferance he **might had** the full of his desire

Robert Baker (1589)

if they truly on us **might had** their will

Thomas Ravenscroft (1609)

where you **might had** your will of me

Francis Quarles (1646)

I thought my rules **might had** the grace to stand

Richard Brome (1659)

his wife by whom he **might had** comfort in progeny

Thomas Porter (1664)

in my old mistress' time I **might had** a knight of *Calatrava*

Charles Hopkins (1695)

you **might had** the same for the same action

Mary Pix (1697)

the devil **might had** her sweetness for me

Richard Henry Stoddard (1877)

you **might had** your pick had you waited

Most of the examples date from the late 1500s through the 1600s; there is one in the last part of the 19th century but none in the 20th century. This example from the 19th century could explain why the expression “they might had” in Alma 13:4 was left unchanged in the printed editions until the 20th century. In modern English, of course, we expect “might have had” in all the above citations. The critical text will restore the original but unique use of “might had” in Alma 13:4.

*Summary:* Restore in Alma 13:4 the earliest reading, “they **might had** as great privilege as their brethren”; despite its difficulty, the expression “might had” can be found from Early Modern English up through the 19th century.

#### ■ Alma 13:5

*thus this holy calling being prepared from the foundation of the world*

*for such as would not harden their hearts*

*being in and through the atonement of the Only Begotten Son*

[*which >js who 1 | which A | who BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST*] *was prepared*

In his editing for the 1837 edition, Joseph Smith interpreted the relative pronoun *which* here in Alma 13:5 as referring to *the Only Begotten Son* rather than to the preceding *the atonement*. There is one similar instance where Joseph interpreted the relative pronoun *which* as referring to Christ rather than to the plan of redemption:

Mosiah 18:13

and may the Spirit of the Lord be poured out upon you

and may he grant unto you eternal life through the redemption of Christ

[*which >js whom 1 | which A | whom BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST*] he hath prepared  
from the foundation of the world

Yet quite a few passages elsewhere in the text refer to the atonement or the plan of redemption as being prepared from the beginning:

Mosiah 4:6

if ye have come to a knowledge of the goodness of God

and his matchless power and his wisdom and his patience

and his long-suffering towards the children of men

and also **the atonement** which hath been prepared

from the foundation of the world . . .



Mosiah 4:7

this is the man that receiveth salvation through **the atonement**  
which was prepared from the foundation of the world

Mosiah 15:19

for were it not for **the redemption** which he hath made for his people  
which was prepared from the foundation of the world

Alma 12:30

therefore God conversed with men  
and made known unto them **the plan of redemption**  
which had been prepared from the foundation of the world

Alma 18:39

for he expounded unto them **the plan of redemption**  
which was prepared from the foundation of the world

Alma 22:13

and Aaron did expound unto him the scriptures from the creation of Adam  
laying the fall of man before him and their carnal state  
and also **the plan of redemption**  
which was prepared from the foundation of the world through Christ

There is one passage, however, where Christ clearly refers to himself as being prepared to redeem the world:

Ether 3:14

behold I am he  
[*which* >]s *who* 1 | *which* A | *who* BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] was prepared  
from the foundation of the world  
to redeem my people

Thus either interpretation is possible in Mosiah 18:13 and Alma 13:5. My own inclination, however, is that the original *which* in both Mosiah 18:13 and Alma 13:5 refers to the plan itself. Of course, the critical text will restore the original *which* in both passages, thus allowing us to avoid deciding in these two cases the antecedent for the *which*. For further discussion, see under WHICH in volume 3.

**Summary:** Restore the relative pronoun *which* in Alma 13:5 as well as in Mosiah 18:13; although the *which* may refer to Christ, there is also the possibility that it refers to the atonement itself.

#### ■ Alma 13:6

*and thus being called by [this 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQPRT | his s] holy calling  
and ordained unto the high priesthood of the holy order of God  
to teach his commandments unto the children of men  
that they also might enter into his rest*

Here the 1953 RLDS edition replaced *this* with *his* in “this holy calling”; this change is probably a typo, perhaps facilitated by the use of *his* elsewhere in this passage. The use of *this* here is undoubtedly correct; note its use in the two preceding present participial clauses:

Alma 13:4 and thus they having been called to **this holy calling** . . .  
 Alma 13:5 thus **this holy calling** being prepared from the foundation  
 of the world . . .

The critical text will therefore follow the earliest reading, “this holy calling”, in Alma 13:6.

*Summary:* Maintain in Alma 13:6 the use of *this* in “this holy calling” (the earliest extant reading) which is consistent with nearby usage in verses 4 and 5.

#### ■ Alma 13:8

*now they were ordained after this manner  
 being called with a holy calling and ordained with a holy ordinance  
 and taking upon [themselves > them 1 | them ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]  
 the high priesthood of the holy order*

Scribe 2 of  $\mathcal{P}$  initially wrote “taking upon **themselves**”, then virtually immediately corrected the *themselves* to *them* by crossing out *selves*. As discussed under Mosiah 25:23, the expression “take upon them(selves)” occurs in the Book of Mormon text with both *them* and *themselves*. In each case, we follow the earliest textual sources. Here in Alma 13:8, the critical text will accept the corrected reading in  $\mathcal{P}$ , “taking upon **them** the high priesthood of the holy order”.

*Summary:* Accept in Alma 13:8 the corrected *them* in place of the *themselves* that scribe 2 initially wrote in  $\mathcal{P}$ .

#### ■ Alma 13:8

*which calling and ordinance and high priesthood  
 is without beginning [or 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST | and HK] end*

The 1874 RLDS edition accidentally replaced *or* with *and*. The 1908 RLDS edition restored the original *or* to the RLDS text. There are other instances of “without X **or** Y” in the text, and two of them are found in nearby verses:

Alma 13:7 being without beginning of days **or** end of years  
 Alma 13:9 which is without beginning of days **or** end of years  
 Alma 32:16 without being brought to know the word **or** even compelled to know  
 Mormon 5:18 without sail **or** anchor

There is one example in the text of “without X **and** Y”, namely in Mormon 5:16: “and they are without Christ **and** God in the world”. Of course, in this instance, the scope of negation includes both Christ and God; thus the *and* is appropriate in that passage. As we might expect, the Book of Mormon uses *and* to connect *beginning* and *end* when the conjunctive relationship is positive rather than negative:

Alma 11:39            he is the beginning **and** the end  
 3 Nephi 9:18        I am Alpha and Omega / the beginning **and** the end

But there are no examples of “without beginning **and** end”. Given the negative preposition *without*, the conjunction *or* is undoubtedly the correct reading for Alma 13:8.

*Summary:* Maintain the coordinating conjunction *or* in Alma 13:8 (“without beginning or end”).

### ■ Alma 13:9

*thus they become high priests forever*  
*after the order of the Son / the Only Begotten of the Father*

One wonders here if the present-tense form *become* is an error for the past-tense *became*. Both the beginning and the ending of the passage are in the past tense:

Alma 13:8–10 (possible emendation marked with an arrow)  
 now they **were ordained** after this manner :  
 being called with a holy calling and ordained with a holy ordinance  
 and taking upon them the high priesthood of the holy order  
 which calling and ordinance and high priesthood is without beginning or end  
 → thus they **became** high priests forever  
 after the order of the Son / the Only Begotten of the Father  
 which is without beginning of days or end of years  
 which is full of grace equity and truth  
 and thus it is / Amen  
 Now as I said concerning the holy order or this high priesthood  
 there were many which **were ordained** and **became** high priests of God

Notice in verse 10 (at the end) that after the doxology to the Son (beginning with “after the order of the Son” and ending with “and thus it is / Amen”), Alma repeats what he said earlier. He explicitly introduces his reprise with “Now as I said concerning the holy order or this high priesthood” and then follows that with a repetition of the past-tense *were ordained* and a repetition, if the emendation is accepted, of the past-tense *became*.

There is one example in the manuscripts that indirectly shows a tendency for the scribes to mix up *become* and *became*. (Here I exclude the use of *became* as the past participle in the original text; for discussion of that usage, see under 1 Nephi 17:43.) This single example is found in that portion of the text where both  $\mathfrak{P}$  and the 1830 edition were set from  $\mathfrak{C}$ :

4 Nephi 1:43  
 and also the people which were called the people of Nephi  
 began to be proud in their hearts because of their exceeding riches  
 and [*became* 1KPS | *become* ABCDEFGHIJLMNOQRT] vain  
 like unto their brethren the Lamanites

As discussed under that passage, usage elsewhere in the text argues that *became*, the reading in  $\mathfrak{P}$ , is the original reading, which means that here we have a possible instance of *became* being replaced

by *become*. It is possible that the 1830 compositor set *become* in 4 Nephi 1:43 because the reading in  $\mathcal{O}$  looked somewhat like *become* rather than *became*. There are also a few other examples of mix-ups between *become* and *became* in the printed editions:

Alma 1:32 (1840 change from *became* to *become*)

by thus exercising the law upon them  
every man suffering according to that which he had done  
they [*became* 1ABDEFIJLMNOQRT | *become* CGHKPS] more still  
and durst not commit any wickedness

3 Nephi 7:12 (1906 LDS change from *become* to *became*)

for he flattered them that there would be many dissenters  
and they [*become* 1ABCDEFGHJKLMOPQRST | *became* N] sufficiently strong  
to contend with the tribes of the people

Moroni 7:26 (1906 LDS change from *become* to *became*)

and after that he came / men also were saved by faith in his name  
and by faith they [*become* 1ABCDEFGHJKLMOPQRST | *became* N]  
the sons of God

Although there is only minor indirect evidence for mixing up *become* and *became* in the manuscripts, there is considerable evidence that the scribes had difficulty with the historically related verb *come*, especially in their tendency to write the base form *come* in place of the correct past-tense form *came*:

1 Nephi 11:27 (scribe 3 of  $\mathcal{O}$ 's *came* looks somewhat like *come*)

I **beheld** the heavens open  
and the Holy Ghost [*came/come* 0 | *come* 1ABCDEFGHJKLMNPQRST | *came* 0]  
down out of heaven  
and **abode** upon him in the form of a dove

2 Nephi 7:2 (Oliver Cowdery miscopied the *came* in  $\mathcal{O}$  as *come* in  $\mathcal{P}$ )

wherefore when I [*came* 0BCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST | *come* >js *came* 1 | *come* A]  
there **was** no man  
when I **called**  
yea there **was** none to answer

Mosiah 11:17 (Oliver Cowdery probably miscopied *came* as *come* in  $\mathcal{P}$ )

and the Lamanites [*come* 1 | *came* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST] upon them  
and **killed** them and **drove** many of their flocks out of the land

Mosiah 19:13 (Oliver Cowdery initially miswrote *came* as *come* in  $\mathcal{P}$ )

and it [*come* > *came* 1 | *came* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST] to pass that . . .

Alma 4:15 (scribe 2 of  $\mathcal{P}$  miswrote *came* as *come*)

and now it [*come* 1 | *came* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST] to pass that . . .

Alma 10:30 (scribe 2 of  $\mathcal{P}$  miswrote *came* as *come*)

and it [*come* 1 | *came* ABCFGHIJKLMNQRST | *became* DE] to pass that . . .

- Alma 35:8 (Oliver Cowdery initially miswrote *came* as *come* in  $\mathcal{G}$ )  
 and the chief ruler of the Zoramites  
 being a very wicked man  
**sent** over unto the people of Ammon  
 desiring them that they should cast out of their land  
 all those which [*come* > *came* 0 | *came* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST] over  
 from them into their land
- Alma 43:5 (Oliver Cowdery initially miswrote *came* in  $\mathcal{G}$  as *come* in  $\mathcal{P}$ )  
 and it **came** to pass that  
 the Lamanites [*came* 0ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST | *come* > *came* 1]  
 with their thousands  
 and they **came** into the land of Antionum
- Helaman 11:34 (Oliver Cowdery miswrote *came* as *come* in  $\mathcal{P}$ )  
 now this great evil which [*come* 1 | *came* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST]  
 unto the people because of their iniquity  
**did stir** them up again in remembrance of the Lord their God
- 3 Nephi 4:22 (Oliver Cowdery apparently miswrote *came* as *come* in  $\mathcal{G}$ ;  
 copied as *come* into both  $\mathcal{P}$  and the 1830 edition)  
 and thus it **became** the desire of the people of Zemnarihah  
 to withdraw from their design because of the great destruction  
 which [*come* 1ABC | *came* DEFGHIJKLMNQRST] upon them  
 by night and by day
- 3 Nephi 6:23 (Oliver Cowdery wrote *came* as *come* in  $\mathcal{P}$ )  
 now there **were** many of those  
 which **testified** of the things pertaining to Christ / which **testified** boldly  
 which **were** taken and put to death secretly by the judges  
 that the knowledge of their death  
 [*come* 1 | *came* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST] not unto the governor of the land  
 until after their death
- 3 Nephi 6:25 (Oliver Cowdery initially wrote *came* as *come* in  $\mathcal{P}$ )  
 therefore a complaint [*come* > *came* 1 | *came* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST] up  
 unto the land of Zarahemla to the governor of the land against these judges  
 which **had condemned** the prophets of the Lord unto death
- Mormon 2:16 (scribe 2 of  $\mathcal{P}$  initially wrote *came* as *come* in  $\mathcal{P}$ )  
 and they **were** pursued  
 until they [*come* > *came* 1 | *came* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST]  
 even to the land of Jashon
- Mormon 4:2 (scribe 2 of  $\mathcal{P}$  wrote *came* as *come* in  $\mathcal{P}$ )  
 and it [*come* 1 | *came* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST] to pass that . . .
- Moroni 7:26 (Oliver Cowdery wrote *came* as *come* in  $\mathcal{P}$ )  
 and after that he [*come* 1 | *came* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST]  
 men also **were saved** by faith in his name

These many examples of *came* miswritten as *come* argue that scribe 2 of  $\mathcal{D}$  could have miswritten *became* as *become* in Alma 13:9—or that Oliver Cowdery could have made that mistake in  $\mathcal{O}$  when he copied down Joseph Smith’s dictation.

It is possible that the present-tense form *become* entered the text in Alma 13:9 as a result of the present-tense *is* in the immediately following doxology:

Alma 13:9 (earliest extant text)

thus they **become** high priests forever  
 after the order of the Son / the Only Begotten of the Father  
 which **is** without beginning of days or end of years  
 which **is** full of grace equity and truth  
 and thus it **is** / Amen

But another way to look at the occurrence of the present-tense *become* is to consider it part of the doxology. As David Calabro points out (personal communication), we get a similar use of the present tense earlier in this chapter:

Alma 13:3

and this is the manner after which they **were ordained** :  
 being called and prepared from the foundation of the world  
 according to the foreknowledge of God  
 on account of their exceeding faith and good works  
 in the first place being left to choose good or evil  
 therefore they having chosen good and exercising exceeding great faith  
**are called** with a holy calling  
 yea with that holy calling which **was prepared** with  
 and according to a preparatory redemption for such

Just as in verses 8–10, verse 3 has a present-tense verb form (“are called”) referring to accepting the calling of high priest, yet the larger passage begins and ends in the past tense (“were ordained . . . was prepared”). Thus the earliest text in Alma 13:9 will work; even though *become* in verse 9 may be an error for *became*, the critical text will accept the earliest reading, *become*.

**Summary:** Accept the present-tense *become* in Alma 13:9, the reading in all the extant sources; this present-tense form is supported by similar usage in Alma 13:3.

### ■ Alma 13:9

*thus they become high priests forever after the order of the Son*  
 [of >]s NULL 1 | of A | BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *the Only Begotten of the Father*

Here in Alma 13:9, an intrusive *of* was apparently inserted between “the Son” and “the Only Begotten of the Father” during the early transmission of the text. This same error seems to have also occurred in Alma 5:48. See the discussion under that passage for why this extra *of* entered the text. The critical text will read “the Son / the Only Begotten of the Father” in both Alma 5:48 and Alma 13:9.

### ■ Alma 13:10

*Now as I said concerning the holy order*

[*or* 1T | of ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRS] *this high priesthood*

The earliest extant text reads “the holy order **or** this high priesthood” (in the printer’s manuscript). But the 1830 compositor set “the holy order **of** this high priesthood”. He was probably influenced by the use of *of* in similar expressions found earlier in this passage:

Alma 13:6           and ordained unto the high priesthood **of** the holy order of God

Alma 13:8           and taking upon them the high priesthood **of** the holy order

These two instances imply that if *of* were in Alma 13:10, the expression should have read with the opposite word order (as “this high priesthood of the holy order”, which would be just like Alma 13:8 except for the determiner *this*). In accord with the reading in  $\mathcal{P}$ , the 1981 LDS edition restored the earlier *or* in place of the innovative *of*. The RLDS text, on the other hand, has maintained the 1830 reading.

One aspect complicating this analysis is that there is not enough room between extant fragments of  $\mathcal{C}$  for the entire reading “the holy order *or/of* this high priesthood”. In my transcript for this portion of the text, I proposed that the words “the holy order *or*” were initially skipped by Oliver Cowdery, the scribe for  $\mathcal{C}$ , and that he subsequently inserted “the holy order *or*” supralinearly:

Alma 13:10 (line 10 on page 234' of  $\mathcal{C}$ )

(	THE HOLY ORDER OR	)
(	NOW AS I SAID CONCERNING ^ THIS HIGH PRIESTHOO	d) ther( w)ere many E

The *d* at the end of the word *priesthood* is partially extant in  $\mathcal{C}$ , so we can be confident that the original manuscript did not read with the opposite word order (that is, with “this high priesthood” preceding “the holy order”). If that had been the word order, then one could argue that perhaps the original text read “this high priesthood **of** the holy order”. Instead, what we seem to have in the original text is a corrective or explanatory *or*. After the doxology at the end of verse 9, Alma first referred to “the holy order”, which would have been somewhat vague, so he added “or this high priesthood”. The critical text will therefore accept the reading in  $\mathcal{P}$  as the original reading since it does work and the 1830 change to the *of* is easily explained.

**Summary:** Maintain in Alma 13:10 the reading of the printer’s manuscript, “Now as I said concerning the holy order **or** this high priesthood”;  $\mathcal{C}$  is only partially extant here, but spacing between extant fragments indicates some supralinear insertion there, probably “the holy order *or*”;  $\mathcal{C}$  also supports the word order in  $\mathcal{P}$  (that is, *priesthood* occurs last).

### ■ Alma 13:10

*and it was on account of*

[*their* 0BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST | *the* 1A] *exceeding faith and repentance*

*and their righteousness before God*

Here it appears that Oliver Cowdery, when copying from the original manuscript to the printer’s manuscript, accidentally replaced *their* with *the*. In the original manuscript, the line ends with *the*,

but there is clearly room at the beginning of the next line for the rest of the word (namely, *-ir*). Oliver frequently made errors trying to copy words at the end of the line (see the list of examples under Alma 11:21).

Here in Alma 13:10, the *the* was corrected to *their* in the 1837 edition, but this change was undoubtedly based on the obvious difficulty of the reading “on account of **the** exceeding faith and repentance” (there is no specific evidence that the original manuscript was ever consulted in the editing for the 1837 edition). Elsewhere in the text, whenever the text reads “the exceeding <noun>” or “the exceeding <adjective> <noun>”, the noun is always postmodified by a relative clause or by a prepositional phrase headed by *of*:

Mosiah 4:3	the exceeding faith <b>which</b> they had in Jesus Christ
Alma 7:4	the exceeding great joy <b>of</b> knowing that . . .
Alma 7:26	the exceeding diligence and heed <b>which</b> ye have given unto my word
Alma 36:24	the exceeding joy <b>of which</b> I did taste
Alma 53:11	the exceeding love <b>which</b> Ammon and his brethren had had for them
Alma 59:1	the exceeding success <b>which</b> Helaman had had in obtaining those lands
Alma 60:11	the exceeding goodness <b>of</b> God
Alma 62:41	the exceeding great length <b>of</b> the war between the Nephites and the Lamanites
Alma 62:41	the exceeding great length <b>of</b> the war
Helaman 3:36	the exceeding great pride <b>which</b> had got into the hearts of the people
Helaman 7:14	the exceeding sorrow <b>of</b> my heart
Helaman 11:31	the exceeding greatness <b>of</b> the numbers of those robbers
3 Nephi 8:12	the exceeding great quaking <b>of</b> the whole earth

Thus it is highly likely that in Alma 13:10 the original text (and probably  $\mathcal{O}$  itself) read “on account of **their** exceeding faith and repentance”.

Spacing between fragments of  $\mathcal{O}$  also supports the existence of an additional *their* before *repentance*; in other words,  $\mathcal{O}$  may have read “on account of **their** exceeding faith and **their** repentance and **their** righteousness before God” (that is, with a repeated *their* before both the second and third nouns). But nearby in Alma 12:30, we have “according to **their** faith and repentance and **their** holy works”, which shows that “faith and repentance” can co-occur without repeating the *their* before *repentance*. Other conjuncts of “faith and repentance” show a lack of conjunctive repetition—specifically, they lack the repeated preposition:

Alma 22:14	<b>through</b> faith and repentance
Helaman 6:4	<b>to</b> faith and repentance

Thus in Alma 13:10, it is probably best to follow the 1837 emended reading (with *their* before “exceeding faith and repentance”, but without any repeated *their* before *repentance*). It is also worth noting that Oliver Cowdery could have initially written *their repentance* in  $\mathcal{O}$  but ended up correcting the text by crossing out the *their*.

**Summary:** Accept in Alma 13:10 the 1837 emendation “**their** exceeding faith and repentance” as the probable reading of the original text.



## ■ Alma 13:11

*therefore they were called after this holy order  
and [they > NULL 0 | 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST] were sanctified*

Spacing between extant fragments of  $\mathcal{O}$  suggests that the subject pronoun *they* could have occurred before *were sanctified*; that is,  $\mathcal{O}$  may have read “they were called after this holy order and **they** were sanctified”. Or perhaps Oliver Cowdery initially wrote “and they were sanctified” in  $\mathcal{O}$  but then crossed out the *they*. Either reading will, of course, work here in Alma 13:11. There is one clear case where scribe 2 of  $\mathcal{P}$  omitted the subject pronoun *they*, and that was only momentary:

Mosiah 25:16

and he did exhort the people of Limhi and his brethren  
all those that had been delivered out of bondage  
that [NULL > *they* 1 | *they* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST] should remember  
that it was the Lord that did deliver them

On the other hand, we have two cases in  $\mathcal{P}$  where Oliver Cowdery initially added an extra *they* to the text, then deleted it virtually immediately (that is, without any change in the level of ink flow):

Helaman 5:23

and they were as standing in the midst of fire  
and [NULL > *they* > NULL 1 | ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST] were not burned

3 Nephi 11:8

and they durst not open their mouths even one to another  
and [*they* > NULL 1 | ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST] wist not what it meant

The last example shows that in Alma 13:11 Oliver could have initially written “and they were sanctified” in  $\mathcal{O}$  but then crossed out the *they*.

Since either reading, with or without the *they*, is possible here in Alma 13:11, the safest solution is to follow the earliest extant text, namely the reading in  $\mathcal{P}$ . The critical text will therefore assume (based on spacing between extant fragments in  $\mathcal{O}$ ) that Oliver Cowdery momentarily wrote “and **they** were sanctified” in  $\mathcal{O}$ , then he crossed out the *they*.

**Summary:** Maintain in Alma 13:11 the earliest extant reading “they were called after this holy order and were sanctified” (that is, without any repeated *they* before *were sanctified*).

## ■ Alma 13:12

*and there were many  
[ 0 |, 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST]  
[§2 an > §1 NULL 1 | ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST] exceeding great many  
which were made pure and entered into the rest of the Lord their God*

The original manuscript is not extant here for the word *an*; but based on the placement of nearby fragments, there is clearly room for the indefinite article in the original manuscript. Scribe 2 in the printer’s manuscript wrote the text as follows:

Alma 13:12 (lines 36–37, page 201 of  $\mathcal{P}$ )

save it were with abhorrence and there were many, an exceeding great many  
which were made pure and entered into the rest of the Lord their God, and now my

Scribe 2 sometimes punctuated the text as he copied from  $\mathcal{O}$  into  $\mathcal{P}$  (by adding a comma or a period). At this place in  $\mathcal{P}$ , he placed a comma after *many*, which is a clear indication that he was definitely aware of the need for a break between *many* and the following appositive phrase “an exceeding great many”. His use of the comma here means that there was probably an *an* in his copytext, the original manuscript; it is very doubtful that, having paid that much attention to parsing the text here, he accidentally inserted the *an* as he copied into  $\mathcal{P}$ .

Yet the *an* in the printer’s manuscript is distinctly crossed out with heavier ink flow. The cross-out appears to be Oliver Cowdery’s, not scribe 2’s—nor is it Joseph Smith’s (which would have occurred in his editing for the 1837 edition). The ink color is not as black as was Joseph’s ink; and a couple of the crossout strokes are quite thin, unlike Joseph’s broad ink flow. The deletion of the *an* appears to be due to editing, but one cannot think of any good reason for omitting the *an*. Elsewhere in the text, whenever we have “exceeding great many”, the indefinite article *an* always precedes:

<sup>1</sup> Nephi 13:29 (original text)

and because of these things which are taken away out of the gospel of the Lamb  
**an** exceeding great many do stumble

Helaman 3:3

yea there were much contentions and many dissensions  
in the which there were **an** exceeding great many  
which departed out of the land of Zarahemla

What is unusual about the usage in Alma 13:12 is that the noun phrase “(an) exceeding great many” is used appositively after *many*. It is possible that the original intent of the corrector in  $\mathcal{P}$  was to remove the appositive usage by deleting the initial *many* but that he accidentally ended up crossing out the *an* rather than the immediately preceding *many*. In other words, the corrector may have intended to emend the text to read consistently with usage elsewhere in the text (namely, as “and there were **an exceeding great many** which were made pure and entered into the rest of the Lord their God”).

In any event, the deletion of the indefinite article *an* here in Alma 13:12 appears to be an error. The critical text will restore the *an* and place dashes around the appositive phrase: “and there were many—an exceeding great many—which were made pure”.

**Summary:** Restore in Alma 13:12 the original reading with the indefinite article *an* before “exceeding great many”.

#### ■ Alma 13:14

*yea humble yourselves even as the people*

*in the days of [Melchezidek 1 | Melchizedek ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQT | Melchisedec PS]*

The name *Melchizedek* was originally spelled in the Book of Mormon manuscripts in accord with its common pronunciation, the nonstandard /mɛlkɛ'zɛdɪk/ rather than the standard /mɛlki'zɛdɛk/.

The 1830 typesetter provided the Old Testament (King James) spelling *Melchizedek* for the name; for the 1908 RLDS edition, the New Testament (King James) spelling *Melchisedec* was substituted into the RLDS text.

Overall, the name *Melchizedek* is found five times in the Book of Mormon text (all in Alma 13:14–18); and in each case the textual history is identical except in  $\mathfrak{D}$ , where the name is spelled *Melchesidek* for the three last instances:

- *Melchezidek* in  $\mathfrak{D}$ :
  - verse 14 [ *Melchezidek* 1 | *Melchizedek* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRT | *Melchisedec* PS ]
  - verse 15 [ *Melchezidek* 1 | *Melchizedek* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRT | *Melchisedec* PS ]
- *Melchesidek* in  $\mathfrak{D}$ :
  - verse 17 [ *Melchesidek* 1 | *Melchizedek* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRT | *Melchisedec* PS ]
  - verse 18 [ *Melchesidek* 1 | *Melchizedek* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRT | *Melchisedec* PS ]
  - verse 18 [ *Melchesidek* 1 | *Melchizedek* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRT | *Melchisedec* PS ]

It was perhaps this latter spelling in  $\mathfrak{D}$  that led the editors for the 1908 RLDS edition to adopt the New Testament spelling *Melchisedec*, especially since  $\mathfrak{D}$  was extensively used in producing that edition.

As noted in the discussion under 1 Nephi 11:13, Joseph Smith did not spell out known biblical names as he dictated the text to his scribe. Even if the scribe didn't know how to spell a given biblical name, it was presumed that the typesetter would correct the spelling for biblical names (which is what happened for the name *Melchizedek* here in Alma 13). The critical text will retain the Old Testament spelling of the name, although Joseph Smith and his scribes probably pronounced this name differently than the standard spelling would indicate.

*Summary:* Maintain the standard spelling *Melchizedek* in Alma 13:14–18.

## ■ Alma 13:14

*yea humble yourselves even as the people in the days of Melchizedek  
who was also [ a 1ABCEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST | D ] high priest after this same order*

In this passage, the 1841 British edition accidentally omitted the indefinite article *a* before *high priest*. The subsequent 1849 LDS edition restored the *a* to the LDS text. Elsewhere the Book of Mormon has examples of *high priest* both with and without the indefinite article *a*:

Alma 4:18	now Alma did not grant unto him the office of being high priest over the church
Alma 4:18	but he retained the office of high priest
Alma 5:3	to be <b>a</b> high priest over the church of God
Alma 8:11	thou art high priest over the church
Alma 16:5	Alma was high priest over the church
Alma 30:20	Ammon which was <b>a</b> high priest over that people

For each case of “(a) high priest”, the critical text will follow the earliest text.

*Summary:* Maintain in Alma 13:14 the indefinite article *a* before *high priest*, the earliest reading.

## ■ Alma 13:14

*yea humble yourselves even as the people in the days of Melchizedek  
 who was also a high priest after this same order  
 [ 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMOPQRST | of N ] which I have spoken  
 who also took upon him the high priesthood forever*

The relative clause “which I have spoken” seems to be missing the preposition *of*, either at the beginning of the clause or at the end. The 1906 LDS edition added the *of* at the beginning of the clause (“**of** which I have spoken”), but since that edition never served as copytext for any subsequent edition, this reading with the *of* was never continued in the LDS text. The original manuscript is not extant here, nor does the spacing between extant fragments provide much help in determining whether the *of* was there since the lacuna is about three-fourths of a line.

Elsewhere in the text, when the relative clause is of the form “which I have spoken”, we always get the preposition *of* at the beginning of the clause (15 times), as in Mosiah 30:3: “after the book **of which I have spoken** shall come forth”. In one case, Joseph Smith considered shifting the *of* to the end of the clause, but then he decided to keep the *of* at the beginning (see the discussion under 1 Nephi 10:16). In another case, Oliver Cowdery initially omitted the *of* when he copied from  $\mathcal{C}$  into  $\mathcal{P}$ :

Alma 57:27  
 now this was the faith of these  
 [ *of* 0ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST | NULL > *of* 1 ]  
 [ *which* 01A | *whom* BCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST ] I have spoken

For another example of the tendency to omit the initial *of* in a relative clause, see under 1 Nephi 1:16. The tendency to omit the *of* in relative clauses of the form “of which I have spoken” may be due to the frequency (17 times) of relative clauses where the *which* acts as the direct object in the relative clause (rather than as the object of the preposition *of*). Of course, when the relative pronoun is the direct object in the relative clause, there is no need for the *of*. In those 17 cases, the antecedent for *which* is either *words* (ten times), *things* (five times), or *that* (two times), as in the following sampling:

1 Nephi 19:5	I proceed according to <b>that which</b> I have spoken
Alma 5:61	that ye observe to do the <b>words which</b> I have spoken unto you
Alma 7:17	your faith is strong . . . concerning the <b>things which</b> I have spoken

Thus it seems reasonable to assume that early on in the transmission of Alma 13:14 the preposition *of* was accidentally lost from the beginning of the relative clause “which I have spoken”. The critical text will therefore accept the 1906 emendation “**of** which I have spoken”.

**Summary:** Emend Alma 13:14 by supplying *of* at the beginning of the relative clause (“this same order **of** which I have spoken”), in accord with consistent usage elsewhere in the text (and the reading of the 1906 LDS edition).

## ■ Alma 13:15

*and it was [this IABCDEFHGKPRST | the IJLMNOQ] same Melchizedek  
to whom Abraham paid tithes*

The 1879 LDS edition replaced *this* in this passage with *the*; the original *this* was restored to the LDS text in the 1920 edition. The demonstrative *this* occasionally occurs before names, although all other examples lack the word *same* (see the examples of “this <personal name>” listed under Alma 11:21); note, in fact, the nearby example in this chapter: “now **this** Melchizedek was a king over the land of Salem” (Alma 13:17). There are no examples in the original text of “**the** same <personal name>”, while there is one example of “**this** same <personal name>” (namely, here in Alma 13:15). The critical text will maintain the unique occurrence of *this same* in this verse.

**Summary:** Maintain in Alma 13:15 the earliest reading: “and it was **this same** Melchizedek to whom Abraham paid tithes”.

## ■ Alma 13:15

*yea even our father Abraham paid tithes of one-tenth part of all  
[ IABCDEFGHIJLMNOQRT | that HKPS] he possessed*

The 1874 RLDS edition added the relative pronoun *that* before *he possessed*, probably accidentally. This extra *that* has continued in the RLDS text up through the latest edition (1953). Spacing considerations from nearby fragments of the original manuscript support the reading without the *that*; there is room for the word only by supralinear insertion. Similarly, the text consistently lacks the relative pronoun in the expression “of all they possessed”:

Mosiah 11:3	and he laid a tax of one-fifth part of all they possessed
Mosiah 19:15	even one half of all they possessed
Mosiah 19:22	by paying a tribute to the Lamanites of one half of all they possessed
Mosiah 19:26	even one half of all they possessed

Thus the *that* is not expected in Alma 13:15, and the critical text will maintain the original reading. For further discussion of the omitted relative pronoun *that*, see the discussion under WHICH in volume 3.

**Summary:** Maintain in Alma 13:15 the original phraseology without the *that* in “of all he possessed”.

## ■ Alma 13:16

*now [their >js these 1 | these ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] ordinances were given  
after this manner  
that thereby the people might look forward on the Son of God*

Scribe 2 of  $\mathcal{P}$  wrote “**their** ordinances”, which the 1830 printer set as “**these** ordinances”. In his editing for the 1837 edition, Joseph Smith corrected the printer’s manuscript to read the same as the 1830 edition. The original manuscript is not extant here, but surviving fragments indicate that

*there* or *their* would have occurred at the beginning of the line in  $\mathcal{O}$ , a place where the tendency to make errors would have been greater. It is quite possible that scribe 2 misread *these* in  $\mathcal{O}$  as *there*, then mentally corrected the spelling *there* to *their* as he wrote down the word in  $\mathcal{P}$ . The scribes, like all writers of English, would have been very much aware of their tendency to mix up the homophonous spellings of *their* and *there*, as well as the need to correct such errors:

	OLIVER COWDERY ( $\mathcal{O} + \mathcal{P}$ )	SCRIBE 2 ( $\mathcal{P}$ )	HYRUM SMITH ( $\mathcal{P}$ )
□ <i>there</i> misspelled as <i>their</i> :			
with correction	3 = 2 + 1	2	0
without correction	8 = 2 + 6	1	3
□ <i>their</i> misspelled as <i>there</i> :			
with correction	28 = 23 + 5	0	1
without correction	9 = 7 + 2	1	0

Moreover, there is considerable evidence that the scribes sometimes misread *there* as *these*:

2 Nephi 4:2 (Oliver Cowdery's secondary error in  $\mathcal{P}$ )

and the prophecies which he wrote

[*there* > *these* > NULL 1 | ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]

**there** are not many greater

Alma 25:6 (Oliver Cowdery's initial error in  $\mathcal{O}$ )

therefore they began to disbelieve the traditions of their fathers

and to believe in the Lord

and that he gave great power unto the Nephites

and thus [*these* > *there* 0 | *there* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST] were

many of them converted in the wilderness

Helaman 3:19 (Oliver Cowdery's initial error in  $\mathcal{P}$ )

and it came to pass that

[*there* 0ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST | *these* > *there* 1] was still

great contentions in the land

Helaman 5:37 (Oliver Cowdery's initial error in  $\mathcal{P}$ )

and it came to pass that this man did cry unto the multitude

that they might turn and look

and behold [*these* > *there* 1 | *there* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST] was

power given unto them that they did turn and look

Helaman 9:38–39 (Oliver Cowdery's initial error in  $\mathcal{P}$ )

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

and [*these* > *there* 1 | *there* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST] were some of the Nephites

which believed on the words of Nephi

3 Nephi 23:9 (scribe 2's initial error in  $\mathcal{P}$ )

I commanded my servant Samuel the Lamanite that he should testify unto this people

that at the day that the Father should glorify his name in me

that [*these* > % + *there* 1 | *there* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST] were many saints

which should arise from the dead . . .

(For an interesting example of the same misreading, but in the 1837 edition, see Mosiah 15:24.)  
There is also one example of misreading *these* as *there* in the manuscripts:

Alma 30:24 (Oliver Cowdery's initial error in both  $\mathcal{C}$  and  $\mathcal{P}$ )  
ye say that this people is a free people  
behold I say  
[*there > these* 0 | *there > they* 1 | *they* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] are in bondage

From a contextual point of view, “**these** ordinances” is more plausible in Alma 13:16 than “**their** ordinances”. Two earlier references to *ordinance* in Alma 13 suggest that these ordinances are the Lord's:

Alma 13:8  
now they were ordained after this manner :  
being called with a holy calling  
and ordained with a holy **ordinance**  
and taking upon them the high priesthood of the holy order  
which calling and **ordinance** and high priesthood is without beginning or end

On the other hand, “**their** ordinances” implies more of a human origin. Elsewhere the word *ordinance(s)* always refers, either directly or indirectly, to sacred ordinances that are associated with God (including the law of Moses), even when these ordinances are rejected (by Korihor in Alma 30:23 and by the house of Israel in 3 Nephi 24:14):

2 Nephi 25:30  
ye must keep the performances and ordinances of God  
until the law shall be fulfilled which was given unto Moses

Mosiah 13:30  
therefore there was a law given them  
yea a law of performances and of ordinances  
a law which they were to observe strictly from day to day  
to keep them in remembrance of God and their duty towards him

Alma 30:3  
yea and the people did observe to keep the commandments of the Lord  
and they were strict in observing the ordinances of God according to the law of Moses  
for they were taught to keep the law of Moses until it should be fulfilled

Alma 30:23 (referring to the law of Moses)  
and Korihor saith unto him  
because I do not teach the foolish traditions of your fathers  
and because I do not teach this people to bind themselves down  
under the foolish ordinances and performances which are laid down by ancient priests

Alma 50:39  
yea he was appointed chief judge and governor over the people  
with an oath and sacred ordinance to judge righteously

3 Nephi 24:7 (quoting Malachi 3:7)  
even from the days of your fathers  
ye are gone away from mine ordinances and have not kept them

3 Nephi 24:14 (quoting Malachi 3:14)  
 ye have said it is vain to serve God  
 and what doth it profit that we have kept his ordinance  
 and that we have walked mournfully before the Lord of Hosts

4 Nephi 1:12  
 and they did not walk any more after the performances and ordinances  
 of the law of Moses  
 but they did walk after the commandments which they had received  
 from their Lord and their God

Thus “**their** ordinances”, the earliest extant reading in Alma 13:16, appears to be an error, probably for “**these** ordinances”, the emended reading introduced in the 1830 edition. The critical text will accept that reading as the original reading (and also as the probable reading in  $\mathcal{C}$ ).

*Summary:* Accept in Alma 13:16 the 1830 typesetter’s emendation of “**their** ordinances” (the reading in  $\mathcal{P}$ ) to “**these** ordinances”; scribal errors and language usage elsewhere in the text support this emendation.

#### ■ Alma 13:16

*that thereby the people might look forward **on** the Son of God  
 it being a type of his order or it being his order  
 and this that they might look forward **to** him for a remission of their sins*

One wonders here if the preposition *on* in “the people might look forward **on** the Son of God” might not be an error for “the people might look forward **to** the Son of God”, as in the clause later on in this verse: “that they might look forward **to** him”. The preposition *to* is what we expect here; elsewhere in the text there are seven other occurrences of “to look forward **to** X” (including the one later on in Alma 13:16), but there are no other instances of “to look forward **on** X”. There are, however, four occurrences of “to look forward **unto** X” and three of “to look forward **for** X”.

Interestingly, *Literature Online* <lion.chadwyck.com> has a few examples of the expression “to look forward **on** X”, including several clear examples from Aphra Behn, who wrote in the late 1600s (accidentals here regularized):

1684	when I look forward <b>on</b> our coming happiness
1684	look forward <b>on</b> the joys of love and youth
1685	but still look forward <b>on</b> nobler joys to come
1687	that might oblige her with some reason to look forward <b>on</b> new lovers

There is also an example written by the American poet William Cullen Bryant sometime between 1841 and 1844: “thou lookest forward **on** the coming days”. Thus there is evidence for “to look forward **on** X” in addition to the more common “to look forward **to** X”. Here in Alma 13:16, the critical text will maintain the preposition *on* in “the people might look forward **on** the Son of God”.

*Summary:* Maintain in Alma 13:16 the unexpected preposition *on* in “the people might look forward **on** the Son of God”; such usage can be found in Early Modern English as well as in 19th-century American English.



## ■ Alma 13:17

*and his people had waxed strong  
in iniquity and [abominations 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPS | abomination RT]*

Here the 1920 LDS edition accidentally, it would appear, replaced the plural *abominations* with the singular *abomination*. This change was not marked in the committee copy for that edition (a copy of the 1911 LDS Chicago edition), which implies that this 1920 change was unintentional.

Elsewhere in the text, we get considerable variety in the number for the conjoined nouns *iniquity* and *abomination*:

- *iniquity* and *abomination*:
 

Jacob 2:16	from this iniquity and abomination
------------	------------------------------------
- *iniquity* and *abominations*:
 

2 Nephi 27:1	drunken with iniquity and all manner of abominations
3 Nephi 9:2	because of their iniquity and abominations
- *iniquities* and *abominations*:
 

Mosiah 7:20	because of our iniquities and abominations
Mosiah 12:1	in their iniquities and abominations
Mosiah 12:7	because of their iniquities and abominations
Mosiah 28:15	the iniquities and abominations of his people
Mosiah 29:36	all his iniquities and abominations
3 Nephi 9:5	their iniquities and their abominations

This variety argues that in each case we should follow the earliest extant reading. Thus the critical text will restore the plural *abominations* in Alma 13:17.

**Summary:** Restore in Alma 13:17 the original reading “iniquity and abominations”, which is supported by usage in two other places in the text.

## ■ Alma 13:20

*behold the scriptures are before you  
if ye will [arest >js wrest 1 | arrest A | wrest BCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST] them  
it shall be to your own destruction*

Although  $\mathcal{C}$  is not extant here, it probably read *arrest* (spelled as *arest*) rather than *wrest*. This is the first word that Oliver Cowdery wrote in  $\mathcal{D}$  when he took over for scribe 2 in Alma 13:20. Most probably, Oliver was the scribe in  $\mathcal{C}$  since earlier fragments in this chapter (down to verse 16) are in his hand. Oliver wrote *arrest* (again spelled with one *r*) in place of *wrest* one other place in the text:

Alma 41:1  
for behold some have [*arested* 0 | *arested* >js *wrestid* 1 | *arrested* A |  
*wrested* BCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST] the scriptures  
and have gone far astray because of this thing

In this instance,  $\mathcal{C}$  is extant and is in Oliver’s hand.

As explained under Jacob 6:13, Oliver Cowdery was sometimes unfamiliar with certain words in the text, leading him to replace those words with more familiar ones that nonetheless made little sense. Here in the book of Alma, he twice replaced the verb *wrest* with *arrest*, even though “arresting the scriptures” makes virtually no sense at all. Oliver was apparently unfamiliar with the reference to “wresting the scriptures” in the King James Bible:

2 Peter 3:15–16

even as our beloved brother Paul also according to the wisdom given unto him  
hath written unto you as also in all *his* epistles  
speaking in them of these things in which are some things hard to be understood  
which they that are unlearned and unstable **wrest**  
as *they do* also the other scriptures unto their own destruction

The archaic verb *wrest* is historically related to the word *wrestle* and means ‘to twist’ (see under the verbs *wrest* and *wrestle* in the Oxford English Dictionary).

For both instances of *arrest*, the 1830 compositor set *arrest*, thus failing to correctly interpret the word as *wrest*. Perhaps he too was unfamiliar with the word *wrest*. In his editing for the 1837 edition, Joseph Smith recognized that the intended word was *wrest*; his correction has been followed in all printed editions since 1837. The critical text will, of course, accept this emendation in Alma 13:20 and Alma 41:1.

**Summary:** Accept Joseph Smith’s interpretation of Oliver Cowdery’s *arrest* (in Alma 13:20 and Alma 41:1) as the verb *wrest* with its meaning ‘to twist’.

#### ■ Alma 13:22

*yea and the voice of the Lord by the mouth of angels  
doth declare [it 1 ABCDEFGHIJKMNOPQRST | L] unto all nations  
yea doth declare **it** that they may have glad tidings of great joy*

The 1902 LDS missionary edition deleted the object pronoun *it* in this passage. This omission was undoubtedly unintentional, especially since the following *yea*-clause specifically repeats the *it* (“yea doth declare **it**”). The 1902 edition was never used as a copytext for any subsequent LDS edition, so the error was not transmitted. Another example of the loss of *it* after *declare* occurred in the 1852 LDS edition:

Helaman 9:16

and then he might declare [*it* 1 ABCDEGHKPRST | FIJLMNOQ] 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

The 1920 LDS edition restored the *it* to this passage.

We usually expect some kind of direct object for active forms of the verb *declare*, but there are instances in the text that generally refer to declaring without specifying any direct object, as in “and I stood with boldness to declare unto them / yea I did boldly testify unto them saying . . .” (Alma 9:7).

**Summary:** Maintain the object pronoun *it* in Alma 13:22: “the voice of the Lord by the mouth of angels doth declare **it** unto all nations”.

#### ■ Alma 13:22

[NULL > *yea* 1 | *yea* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRT | *Yea* PS]  
*and he doth sound these glad tidings among all his people*

Here Oliver Cowdery initially omitted the *yea* as he copied the text from  $\mathcal{C}$  into  $\mathcal{P}$ . His supralinearly inserted *yea* was supplied almost immediately (there is no change in the level of ink flow). The critical text will accept the corrected reading in  $\mathcal{P}$  since either reading, with or without the *yea*, works.

**Summary:** Maintain in Alma 13:22 the corrected reading in  $\mathcal{P}$ : “**yea** and he doth sound these glad tidings among all his people”.

#### ■ Alma 13:25

*would to God [that 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST | HK] it might be in my day*

Here the 1874 RLDS edition accidentally omitted the subordinate conjunction *that*; the 1908 RLDS edition restored the *that* to the RLDS text. Either reading is theoretically possible, although the text otherwise has *that* after “would to God” (but there are only a couple examples):

Jacob 1:8	we would to God <b>that</b> we could persuade all men not to rebel against God
Alma 39:7	I would to God <b>that</b> ye had not been guilty of so great a crime

The critical text will maintain in Alma 13:25 the *that* in “would to God **that** it might be in my day”. For further discussion regarding the optionality of the subordinate conjunction *that*, see under THAT in volume 3.

Interestingly, the King James Bible typically avoids the subordinate *that* after “would to God”:

Exodus 16:3	would to God we had died by the hand of the LORD in the land of Egypt
Joshua 7:7	would to God we had been content and dwelt on the other side Jordan
Judges 9:29	and would to God this people were under my hand
1 Corinthians 4:8	and I would to God ye did reign
2 Corinthians 11:1	would to God ye could bear with me a little in <i>my</i> folly

Only once do we get the *that*, in Paul’s famous reply to king Agrippa:

Acts 26:29  
 I would to God **that** not only thou but also all that hear me this day were both almost and altogether such as I am except these bonds

**Summary:** Maintain in Alma 13:25 the subordinate conjunction *that* after the expression “would to God”.

## ■ Alma 13:26

*and it shall be [NULL > made 1 | made ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] known  
unto just and holy men*

Oliver Cowdery initially omitted the verb form *made* when he copied from  $\mathcal{O}$  into  $\mathcal{P}$ , but virtually immediately he added it supralinearly (with no increase in the level of ink flow). Undoubtedly,  $\mathcal{O}$  read “it shall be **made** known” since “it shall be known” is theoretically possible. In other words, there would have been no strong motivation for Oliver to emend the text here. Elsewhere the text has ten instances of “shall be made known”, but there is also one of “shall be known”:

3 Nephi 27:25      for by them shall their works **be known** unto men

Here in Alma 13:26, the critical text will follow the corrected reading, “it shall be **made** known unto just and holy men”.

*Summary:* Accept in Alma 13:26 Oliver Cowdery’s virtually immediate correction in  $\mathcal{P}$  to “it shall be **made** known unto just and holy men”.

## ■ Alma 13:26

*and it shall be made known unto just and holy men by the mouth of angels  
at the time of his coming  
that the words of our fathers [might >js may 1 | might A | may BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]  
be fulfilled*

In his editing for the 1837 edition, Joseph Smith sometimes removed the past-tense modal verb *might* if it could be misinterpreted as having a conditional sense. As explained under Jacob 5:13, such uses of *might* in the original text will be restored in the critical text.

*Summary:* Restore the past-tense modal form *might* in Alma 13:26; the nonconditional use of *might* is found elsewhere in the original text.

## ■ Alma 13:30

*that ye may not be [bound 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST | bowed J] down  
by the chains of hell*

Here we have an interesting error in the 1888 LDS edition—namely, the replacement of *bound* with *bowed*. This misreading was not transferred into subsequent LDS editions since the 1888 edition was never used as a copytext. Theoretically, “bowed down by the chains of hell” is possible; note the occurrences of passive “bowed down” in two Isaiah passages quoted in the Book of Mormon:

2 Nephi 12:11      and the haughtiness of men shall be bowed down  
2 Nephi 12:17      and the loftiness of man shall be bowed down

When referring to chains, the text otherwise uses the verb *bind*, never the expression “bowed down”:

*Alma 13*

2 Nephi 1:13	and shake off the awful chains by which ye are <b>bound</b>
2 Nephi 1:13	which are the chains which <b>bind</b> the children of men
2 Nephi 1:23	shake off the chains with which ye are <b>bound</b>
2 Nephi 9:45	shake off the chains of him that would <b>bind</b> you fast

The critical text will, of course, continue with *bound* in Alma 13:30 (“that ye may not be bound down by the chains of hell”).

**Summary:** Maintain in Alma 13:30 the use of *bound* rather than *bowed* (a visual error in the 1888 LDS edition).

# Alma 14

## ■ Alma 14:1

*and [it came to pass that >js NULL 1 | it came to pass that A |  
it came to pass BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]  
after [he >js Alma 1 | he ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] had made an end of speaking  
unto the people  
many of them did believe on his words*

Joseph Smith made a couple of editorial changes here in  $\mathcal{P}$  at this transition in the narrative. First, he deleted “it came to pass that”; and second, he replaced the pronoun *he* with *Alma* in order to prevent any possible misinterpretation of who the text was referring to. In other words, Joseph Smith’s intended text was “**and after Alma** had made an end of speaking unto the people / many of them did believe on his words”. For some reason, Joseph’s changes were not implemented in the 1837 edition. Perhaps they were just missed, or perhaps it was decided that these changes were not crucial. However, the conjunction *that* at the end of “it came to pass” was omitted in the 1837 edition, perhaps unintentionally. The critical text will, of course, restore the original *that* here in Alma 14:1. For further discussion regarding *that* after “it came to pass”, see under 2 Nephi 1:1 as well as more generally under **THAT** in volume 3.

**Summary:** Restore in Alma 14:1 the *that* which was omitted after “it came to pass” in the 1837 edition.

## ■ Alma 14:3

*and they were also angry with Alma and Amulek  
[NULL >+ & 1 | and ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] because they had testified so plainly  
against their wickedness  
they sought to put them away privily*

Here Oliver Cowdery later inserted in  $\mathcal{P}$  an ampersand before the conjunction *because* (the *&* is supralinearly inserted at the beginning of a line and with heavier ink flow). This correction may have occurred when he was proofing  $\mathcal{P}$  against  $\mathcal{C}$ . But it is also possible that this addition represents editing on Oliver’s part. Another editing possibility would have been to insert the *and* before “they sought”:

Alma 14:3 (alternative correction)  
and they were also angry with Alma and Amulek  
because they had testified so plainly against their wickedness  
**and** they sought to put them away privily

Since either reading is theoretically possible here in Alma 14:3, the critical text will accept Oliver's correction as the reading of the original manuscript.

*Summary:* Accept Oliver Cowdery's insertion of *and* before *because* as the probable reading of the original manuscript: “**and** because they had testified so plainly against their wickedness / they sought to put them away privily”.

#### ■ Alma 14:5

*and the people went forth and witnessed against them  
testifying that they had reviled against [their > the 1 | the ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] law  
and their lawyers **and judges** of the land*

Here in the printer's manuscript, Oliver Cowdery initially wrote *their law*, then crossed out the final *ir* to form *the law*, the probable reading of the original manuscript. This *their* probably resulted from the *their* found in the next phrase (“and their lawyers”), although we shall see that language earlier in this chapter may have contributed to this error.

The expression “their lawyers and judges of the land” sounds very strange. Perhaps there is a determiner (such as *the*) missing before *judges*; we expect something here because of the post-modifying prepositional phrase “of the land”. There are five other examples of “judge(s) of the land” in the text, and all of them are preceded by the definite article *the*:

“ <b>the</b> chief judge of the land”	Alma 14:4, Alma 14:5, Alma 14:14, 3 Nephi 7:1
“ <b>the</b> lower judges of the land”	Alma 46:4

These examples suggest that in the original text Alma 14:5 read “they had reviled against the law and their lawyers and **the** judges of the land”. There is a nearby preceding example of “their lawyers and judges”, but without any postmodification:

Alma 14:2  
and they also said that Amulek had lied unto them  
and had reviled against **their** law  
and also against **their** lawyers and judges

Note that the phraseology here in verse 2 is precisely what Oliver Cowdery initially wrote in verse 5: *their* before *law* and no determiner before *judges*. One could argue that in verse 5 Oliver corrected *their law* to *the law* in accord with the reading in  $\mathcal{C}$  but that he neglected to provide the *the* before “judges of the land”.

There is considerable evidence that Oliver Cowdery tended to omit the definite article *the*. Here are some examples where the reading without the *the* is possible:

1 Nephi 12:5 (lost when copying from  $\mathcal{C}$  into  $\mathcal{P}$ )  
and behold I saw [*the* 0 | 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST] multitudes  
which had not fallen

2 Nephi 5:12 (lost when copying from  $\mathcal{C}$  into  $\mathcal{P}$ )  
and also the ball or [*the* 0 | 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST] compass

- Enos 1:8 (initially omitted in  $\mathcal{P}$ )  
 before that he shall manifest himself  
 in [NULL >+ *the* 1 | *the* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] flesh
- Mosiah 3:7 (initially omitted in  $\mathcal{P}$ )  
 so great shall be his anguish for the wickedness  
 and [NULL > *the* 1 | *the* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] abominations of his people
- Mosiah 21:13 (initially omitted in  $\mathcal{P}$ )  
 and they did humble themselves  
 even to [NULL > *the* 1 | *the* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] dust
- Alma 32:2 (initially omitted in  $\mathcal{C}$  and also lost when copying from  $\mathcal{C}$  into  $\mathcal{P}$ )  
 they began to have success among the poorer class  
 of [NULL >+ *the* 0 | 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST] people
- Alma 47:14 (initially omitted in  $\mathcal{P}$ )  
 before they awoke at the dawn  
 of [*the* 0ABCDEFGHIJKPS | NULL > *the* 1 | IJLMNOQRT] day
- Alma 62:9 (initially omitted in  $\mathcal{P}$ )  
 whosoever would not take up arms  
 in [NULL > *the* 1 | *the* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] defense of their country
- Helaman 7:5 (initially omitted in  $\mathcal{P}$ )  
 that they might [NULL >+ *the* 1 | *the* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] more easy  
 commit adultery
- 3 Nephi 3:9 (initially omitted in  $\mathcal{P}$ )  
 and I am the governor of  
 this [NULL >+ *the* 1 | *the* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] secret society of Gaddianton
- 3 Nephi 6:23 (initially omitted in  $\mathcal{P}$ )  
 now there were many of those which testified of  
 [NULL >+ *the* 1 | *the* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] things pertaining to Christ
- 3 Nephi 19:15 (lost when copying from  $\mathcal{C}$  into  $\mathcal{P}$ )  
 while [ 1 | *the* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] angels were ministering  
 unto the disciples

There are also at least 25 instances in the manuscripts where Oliver accidentally omitted a *the* that was obviously required, as in the following two examples where Oliver omitted the *the* after an *and*, thus creating a difficult reading:

- Alma 36:2 (initially omitted in  $\mathcal{C}$ )  
 the God of Abraham  
 and [NULL > *the* 0 | *the* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST] God of Isaac  
 and the God of Jacob
- 3 Nephi 3:23 (lost when copying from  $\mathcal{C}$  into  $\mathcal{P}$ )  
 yea to the line which was between the land Bountiful  
 and [ 1 | *the* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] land Desolation



Thus evidence from scribal errors and language elsewhere in the text supports the possibility that the definite article *the* was lost before *judges* in Alma 14:5.

David Calabro proposes (personal communication) another way to get the reading “the judges of the land”—namely, by emending the text so that the *their* before *lawyers* is replaced by the definite article *the*: “and **the** lawyers and judges of the land”. Yet there are a couple of problems with this particular use of the definite article. First of all, it would be more difficult to explain why Oliver Cowdery initially wrote “against **their** law” just before unless there was a *their* in the following “and **their** lawyers”. And secondly, a conjunctive expression like “and **the** lawyers and judges of the land” would imply that the lawyers were “lawyers of the land”. That expression is found nowhere else in the Book of Mormon text.

*Summary:* In accord with internal evidence, emend “their lawyers and judges of the land” in Alma 14:5 to read “their lawyers and **the** judges of the land”; also accept in this passage the corrected reading in  $\mathcal{P}$  of *the law* rather than the initially written *their law*.

#### ■ Alma 14:5

*and the people went forth and witnessed against them  
testifying that they had reviled against the law and their lawyers and the judges of the land  
and also [ 1APS | of BCDEFGHIJKLMNOQRT ] all the people that were in the land*

The 1837 edition added *of* before “all the people that were in the land”, but this addition obviously changes the meaning of the text. The original text says that Alma and Amulek were accused of reviling against all the people in the land, while the altered text says that the judges were the judges of the land and also the judges of all the people in the land—a truism that doesn’t provide any useful information.

In the book of Helaman, there are a couple of verses that support the idea that a prophet can “revile against the people”:

Helaman 8:2

why seest thou this man  
and hearest him **revile against this people** and against our law

Helaman 8:5

therefore they did cry unto the people saying  
why do ye suffer this man to **revile against us**  
for behold he doth condemn **all this people** even unto destruction

These attacks against Nephi in Helaman 8, like those against Alma and Amulek in Alma 14, are an intentional exaggeration. Nonetheless, in each case the claim is that these prophets were reviling against the people as a whole. In accord with the reading in  $\mathcal{P}$ , the 1908 RLDS edition removed the extra *of* in Alma 14:5. The critical text will do the same.

*Summary:* Remove in Alma 14:5 the intrusive *of* that the 1837 edition incorrectly placed before “all the people that were in the land”.

## ■ Alma 14:5–6

[& >js & now 1 | And A | Now BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]  
 [it came to pass that >js NULL 1 | it came to pass that A | BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]  
 [it >js this 1 | it A | this BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] was done before the chief judge of the land  
 and it [also >js NULL 1 | also A | BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] came to pass that  
 Zeezrom was astonished at the words which had been spoken

Near the end of verse 5, Joseph Smith deleted “it came to pass that” because nothing new had come to pass. This instance of “it came to pass” actually restates the fact that the preceding list of complaints was given before the chief judge of the land:

Alma 14:4–5

but they took them and bound them with strong cords  
 and took them **before the chief judge of the land**  
 and the people went forth and witnessed against them  
 testifying that they had reviled against the law  
 and their lawyers and the judges of the land  
 and also all the people that were in the land  
 and also testified that there was but one God  
 and that he should send his Son among the people  
 but he should not save them  
 and many such things did the people testify against Alma and Amulek  
 and it came to pass that it was done **before the chief judge of the land**

And because the example of “it came to pass that” in verse 5 was deleted, Joseph also deleted in the following verse the *also* that occurred immediately before the next “it came to pass”.

Joseph Smith made two other (more stylistic) changes in verse 5 with respect to the (original) first occurrence of “it came to pass”: (1) he added *now* after the initial *and*, and (2) he replaced the following subject pronoun *it* with *this*. In other words, in the printer’s manuscript Joseph changed “and **it came to pass that it** was done before the chief judge” to “and **now this** was done before the chief judge”. The 1837 edition, however, ended up omitting the sentence-initial *and*, giving “now this was done before the chief judge”. This last change could have been intentional since elsewhere the text consistently prefers *now* over *and now* before “this was done” (although one wonders how sensitive editors or typesetters would have been to such stylistic nuances in the text):

Mosiah 25:20	now this was done because there was so many people that . . .
Alma 8:31	now this was done that the Lord might show forth his power in them
Alma 22:23	now this was done in the presence of the queen
Alma 55:22	now behold this was done in the nighttime
Alma 58:22	now this was done because the Lamanites did suffer . . .
3 Nephi 7:5	now all this was done and there was no wars as yet among them

The critical text will, of course, restore the original text here in Alma 14:5–6. The original text had cases of supposedly unnecessary uses of “it came to pass”; for discussion, see under 1 Nephi 10:17 as well as more generally under COME TO PASS in volume 3. The other changes introduced in the 1837 edition for this passage are simply stylistic.

**Summary:** Restore in Alma 14:5 the original “**and it came to pass that it** was done before the chief judge”; also restore the original *also* in the following verse (“and it **also** came to pass that Zeezrom was astonished”).

#### ■ Alma 14:6

*and his soul began to be harrowed up  
under [a 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST | HK] consciousness of his own guilt*

The 1874 RLDS edition omitted the indefinite article *a* in the phrase “under **a** consciousness of his own guilt”. The 1908 RLDS edition restored the *a* to the RLDS text. The Book of Mormon consistently uses the *a* in the expression “under **a** consciousness of one’s guilt”:

Alma 12:1	he began to tremble under <b>a</b> consciousness of his guilt
Mormon 9:3	do ye suppose that ye shall dwell with him under <b>a</b> consciousness of your guilt
Mormon 9:3	when your souls are racked with <b>a</b> consciousness of your guilt

The critical text will follow the consistent reading with the *a*.

**Summary:** Maintain in Alma 14:6 the use of *a* in “under **a** consciousness of his own guilt”; all other instances in the text of this expression have the *a*.

#### ■ Alma 14:7

*and also all those [who 1BCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST | which A] believed in the words  
**which** had been spoken by Alma and Amulek*

The original text has instances of both *which* and *who* as the relative pronoun for humans, although *which* dominates. Here the 1830 typesetter seems to have accidentally replaced an original *who* with *which*; he may have been influenced by the following occurrence of *which* in “the words **which** had been spoken by Alma and Amulek”. The 1837 edition restored the original *who* here in Alma 14:7, although this would have occurred as a natural result of Joseph Smith’s editing for that edition. In 2 Nephi 9:45, this same error (replacing an original *who* with *which*) was made by the 1830 typesetter; see the discussion under that passage as well as under WHICH in volume 3.

**Summary:** Maintain the original *who* in Alma 14:7: “and also all those **who** believed in the words which had been spoken by Alma and Amulek”.

## ■ Alma 14:7–8

*they spit upon him and cast him out from among them  
and also all those who [ 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST | had HK] believed in the words  
which **had** been spoken by Alma and Amulek  
and they cast them out and sent men to cast stones at them  
and they brought their wives and children together  
and whosoever [had > NULL 1 | ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST] believed  
or **had** been taught to believe in the word of God  
they caused that they should be cast into the fire*

There has been a tendency to add the past perfect auxiliary *had* before *believed* in this passage, but the text seems to be consistent here by maintaining the simple past-tense *believed*. In verse 7, *had* was added in the 1874 RLDS edition (but then removed from the RLDS text in the 1908 RLDS edition). The source for the intrusive *had* was probably the *had* in the following relative clause, “which **had** been spoken by Alma and Amulek”. And in verse 8, Oliver Cowdery initially wrote *had believed* in the printer’s manuscript, but then he crossed out the *had*, probably because the original manuscript (no longer extant here) had only the simple past-tense form *believed*. In this instance, Oliver seems to have been influenced by the use of *had* in the following conjoined predicate: “or **had** been taught to believe”.

**Summary:** In accord with the earliest textual sources, maintain the two simple past-tense occurrences of *believed* in Alma 14:7–8: “who believed in the words . . . and whosoever believed”.

## ■ Alma 14:10

*and it came to pass that  
when Amulek saw the pains of the women and children which were consuming in the fire  
he [was also 1ABCDEFGHKPS | also was FIJLMNOQRT] pained*

Here the 1852 LDS edition accidentally switched the order of “was also” to “also was”. Elsewhere in the original text, when there is a following past participle (acting either verbally or adjectivally), there are ten occurrences of “was also” and two of “also was”, so either order is possible, as in the following pair of contrasting examples:

Mosiah 8:8

having discovered a land which was covered with bones of men and of beasts etc.  
and **was also** covered with ruins of buildings of every kind

Alma 19:14

and he [*also was* 01 | *was also* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST] overpowered with joy

Interestingly, in the second example the 1830 typesetter accidentally switched the order from “also was” to “was also”. The critical text will restore the original word order: namely, “was also” in Alma 14:10 and “also was” in Alma 19:14. For a more general discussion regarding the placement of *also* in verb phrases, see under 2 Nephi 21:13.

**Summary:** Restore the original order “was also” in Alma 14:10; this order is the dominant order, although the order “also was” also occurs.

## ■ Alma 14:11

*for behold the Lord receiveth them up*

[*to* > *unto* 1 | *unto* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *himself in glory*

Oliver Cowdery initially wrote “the Lord receiveth them up **to** himself”, then virtually immediately corrected the *to* to *unto* by inserting inline *un* before the *to* (and without any change in the level of ink flow). Either preposition is theoretically possible here. Elsewhere the text has examples of either preposition after the adverb *up*, as in these two pairs of examples:

2 Nephi 4:35	my voice shall forever <b>ascend up unto</b> thee
2 Nephi 26:3	the cry of the blood of the saints shall <b>ascend up to</b> God
Mosiah 16:11	being <b>delivered up to</b> the devil
Alma 37:15	and ye shall be <b>delivered up unto</b> Satan

Thus the critical text will maintain the corrected reading in  $\mathcal{P}$  for Alma 14:11 (“the Lord receiveth them up **unto** himself”). The original manuscript probably had *unto* rather than *to* since there would have been no motivation for Oliver to have otherwise emended *to* to *unto*.

**Summary:** Maintain in Alma 14:11 the preposition *unto* in “the Lord receiveth them up **unto** himself”, the corrected reading in  $\mathcal{P}$ .

## ■ Alma 14:13

*be it according to the will of* [*God* > *the Lord* 1 | *the Lord* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]

Oliver Cowdery here initially wrote “the will of God”. He immediately caught his error, crossed out *God*, supralinearly wrote *the*, and then continued inline by writing *Lord*. Thus there is no doubt that  $\mathcal{C}$  read “the will of the Lord”. Theoretically, either reading is possible; elsewhere in the text, there are seven occurrences of “the will of God” and three more of “the will of the Lord”. Thus there would have been no motivation for Oliver to have emended the text here.

**Summary:** Maintain in Alma 14:13 the immediately corrected reading in  $\mathcal{P}$ , “the will of the Lord”.

## ■ Alma 14:15

*behold ye see that ye* [*had not* 1ABCDEFGHIJLMNOPQRST | *have no* HK] *power to save these*  
*which had been cast into the fire*  
*neither* [*hath* >js *has* 1 | *hath* A | *has* BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *God saved them*  
*because they were of thy faith*

Here the 1874 RLDS edition changed the past-tense *had* to the present-tense *have*. In addition, the *not* was changed to *no*. The 1908 RLDS edition restored the original *had not* to the RLDS text. It is quite possible that the 1874 change in tense was influenced, in part, by the present-tense usage in the following conjoined clause: “neither **has** God saved them”, the reading of the copytext for that edition (the original text read “neither **hath** God saved them”). Here in Alma 14:15, the critical text will maintain the earliest reading, “that ye **had not** power to save these” (and, of course, “neither **hath** God saved them” in the following clause).

The Book of Mormon definitely prefers the expression “to have **no** power” (there are 16 occurrences), as in Mosiah 23:39: “nevertheless he should **have no power** to do any thing contrary to the will of the king of the Lamanites”. But there is one other example of “to have **not** power” — namely, in Mosiah 13:7: “ye see that ye **have not power** to slay me”.

*Summary:* Maintain in Alma 14:15 the original *had not* (“ye had not power to save these”); also restore the biblically styled *hath* later on in the verse (“neither hath God saved them”).

#### ■ Alma 14:15

*behold ye see that ye had not power to save*

[*them* >+ *these* 1 | *these* ABDEPS | *those* CGHIJKLMNOQRT | *these* > *those* F]

[*which* >js *who* 1 | *which* A | *who* BCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST] *had been cast into the fire*

Here in the printer’s manuscript, Oliver Cowdery initially wrote *them which*, but then he corrected the *them* to *these* by overwriting the *m* with *se*, giving *these which*. The flow of ink for the overwriting is somewhat heavier. Oliver may have initially written *them* simply because he didn’t expect any following relative clause. But it is also possible, at least theoretically, that Oliver decided to edit the nonstandard *them which* to *these which*. However, in 29 other instances of original *them which* (where *which* is restrictive and directly modifies *them*), Oliver never once emended the *them* to *these* or *those*, as in five other examples where *them* is not preceded by a preposition (as here in Alma 14:15):

1 Nephi 17:40 (1837 change to *those*)

and he loveth [*them* 01A | *those* BCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST]

[*which* 0A | *which* >js *who* 1 | *who* BCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST] will have him to be their God

3 Nephi 9:10 (1837 change to *those*)

because of their wickedness in casting out the prophets

and stoning [*them* 1A | *those* BCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST]

[*which* >js *whom* 1 | *which* A | *whom* BCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST] I did send to declare unto them concerning their wickedness and their abominations

3 Nephi 27:31

for I mean **them** [*which* 1A | *who* BCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST] are now alive

Mormon 9:31

condemn me not because of mine imperfection

neither my father because of his imperfection

neither **them** [*which* >js *who* 1 | *which* A | *who* BCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST]

have written before him

Ether 12:16 (1920 LDS change to *those*)

yea and even all they which wrought miracles wrought them by faith

even those which were before Christ

and also [*them* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPS | *those* RT]

[*which* 1A | *who* BCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST] were after

Thus it is very doubtful that Oliver's correction of *them* to *these* in Alma 14:15 is the result of editing. Instead, his change is very probably a correction to the reading of the original manuscript.

In the 1840 edition, the *these* here in Alma 14:15 was changed to *those*. This change may reflect Joseph Smith's editing for that edition, or it may simply be a typesetting error based on the much higher frequency in the Book of Mormon text of "those who(m)/which" than "these who(m)/which" (181 versus 6 in the original text). Another possible cause of the 1840 change is the occurrence in the preceding verse of "those who" (the reading of the 1837 edition, which served as the copytext for the 1840 edition); there the text also refers to being cast into the fire:

Alma 14:14

now it came to pass that when the bodies of **those**  
 [which >]s who 1 | which A | who BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] had been cast  
 into the fire  
 were consumed . . .

As far as Alma 14:15 is concerned, the second printing of the 1852 LDS edition introduced the *those* into the LDS text. This change is most probably the result of consulting the 1840 edition when the 1852 stereotyped plates were corrected for the second printing.

As explained under Mosiah 28:1, the critical text will in each case use the earliest textual sources for determining whether the text reads *these* or *those*. Here in Alma 14:15, the critical text will restore the original *these*.

**Summary:** Restore the original *these* as well as the original *which* in Alma 14:15: "to save **these which** had been cast into the fire"; the initial *them* that Oliver Cowdery wrote in  $\mathcal{P}$  is a simple scribal error that was soon corrected.

#### ■ Alma 14:15

*and the judge smote them [again 1ABCDEFGHIJLMNOQRT | KPS] upon their cheeks*

The 1892 RLDS edition accidentally omitted the *again* here; the RLDS text has continued this incorrect reading even though  $\mathcal{P}$  has the *again*. The use of *again* is quite correct since the judge had already smitten them on their cheeks:

Alma 14:14

the chief judge of the land came and stood before Alma and Amulek  
 as they were bound  
 and he smote them with his hand upon their cheeks

**Summary:** Maintain in Alma 14:15 the use of *again*, the reading of the earliest textual sources; *again* is appropriate since this was not the first time that the chief judge struck Alma and Amulek on their cheeks.

## ■ Alma 14:18

*and it came to pass that when they had been cast into prison three days  
there came many lawyers and judges and priests and teachers  
which were of the profession of Nehor  
and they came in unto the prison to see them  
and they questioned them **about many words***

Douglas Stringer (personal communication, 2 November 2003) suggests that in this passage the preposition *with* would work better than *about*. From a textual point of view, there is no variation in the manuscripts or in the editions to support the accidental replacement of an original *with* by *about*, nor is there any linguistic evidence to support interpreting *about* as meaning ‘with’. It is possible, however, that here in Alma 14:18 *words* has the Hebraistic meaning ‘things’, so that the sentence means ‘they questioned them about many things’ (see any standard dictionary of biblical Hebrew under *dabar* for the meaning ‘thing’). Moreover, there are a number of cases in the transmission of the Book of Mormon text where *words* and *things* have been mixed up (see the list under 1 Nephi 3:28). In addition, there is at least one other case where *words* appears to mean ‘things about which one speaks’:

1 Nephi 8:36

and it came to pass that after my father had spoken  
all the **words** of his dream or vision which were many  
he said unto us  
because of these **things** which he saw in a vision  
he exceedingly feared for Laman and Lemuel

See definition IV for *dabar* in Francis Brown, S. R. Driver, and Charles A. Briggs, *A Hebrew and English Lexicon of the Old Testament* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1952). Thus it may be more reasonable to interpret *words* in Alma 14:18 as meaning ‘things’ rather than considering *about* as an error for an original *with* or proposing that *about* means ‘with’.

**Summary:** Accept in Alma 14:18 the occurrence of *words*, which in this instance appears to have the Hebraistic meaning ‘things’ (as also in 1 Nephi 8:36).

## ■ Alma 14:18–19

**and** *they came in unto the prison to see them*  
**and** *they questioned them about many words*  
[& > *but* 1 | *but* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *they answered them nothing*  
**and** *it came to pass that the judge stood before them and saith . . .*

Here Oliver Cowdery initially wrote *and* (as an ampersand) at the beginning of the clause “they answered them nothing”. Almost immediately Oliver crossed out the ampersand and supralinearly inserted *but* (there is no change in the level of ink flow). The original manuscript probably read *but* here; the most reasonable explanation is that Oliver initially wrote *and* because *and* conjoins all the other clauses in this passage (marked above in bold). For additional evidence that Oliver sometimes miswrote *but* as *and*, see under Mosiah 12:32–33.



*Summary:* Follow in Alma 14:18 the corrected reading in  $\mathcal{P}$ , “**but** they answered them nothing” (the probable reading in  $\mathcal{G}$ , no longer extant here).

■ **Alma 14:19**

know **ye** not that I have power to deliver

[*ye* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPS | *you* RT] up unto the flames

Here in Alma 14:19, the ungrammatical use of the subject pronoun form *ye* in the earliest textual sources may be due to the influence of the preceding *ye*, which is grammatically correct since there the *ye* occurs in subject position: “know *ye* not”. Moreover, Oliver Cowdery sometimes wrote *ye* in object position, but in all other cases he caught his error, as in the following instances:

2 Nephi 26:14	I prophesy unto [ <i>ye</i> > <i>you</i> 1]
Mosiah 2:15	I might accuse [ <i>ye</i> > <i>you</i> 1]
Alma 32:10	I say unto [ <i>ye</i> > <i>you</i> 0]
Alma 37:6	I say unto [ <i>you</i> 0   <i>ye</i> > <i>you</i> 1]
Helaman 9:24	I shewed unto [ <i>ye</i> > <i>you</i> 1] this sign
3 Nephi 27:5	<i>ye</i> must take upon [ <i>ye</i> > <i>you</i> 0   <i>you</i> 1] the name of Christ

Note, in particular, that in the last instance the preceding *ye* (“**ye** must take upon **you**”) could have prompted Oliver to initially write “**ye** must take upon **ye**” in  $\mathcal{G}$ . In one other passage, there has been considerable variation between *ye* and *you*, including one more momentary error in  $\mathcal{P}$  of *ye* in object position (marked below with an arrow):

Alma 54:9  
 and now behold we are prepared to receive **you**  
 yea and except [*you* 01ABCDEFGHIJLMNOQRT | *ye* GHKPS] withdraw your purposes  
 behold [*ye* 0ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST | *you* > *ye* 1] will pull down  
 the wrath of that God  
 whom [*ye* > *you* 0 | *you* > *ye* > *you* 1 | *you* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST]  
 have rejected  
 → upon [NULL > - *you* 0 | *you* > *ye* > *you* 1 | *you* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST]

Thus it is quite possible that the 1920 LDS emendation in Alma 14:19 to “I have power to deliver **you** up unto the flames” may actually be the original text.

On the other hand, this instance in Alma 14:19 of *ye* in object position did survive into the printed editions (and is still found in the RLDS text). This perseverance argues that the earliest reading with *ye* is possibly the original reading. Note further that there are instances in the earliest text of other subject pronoun forms occurring in object position:

1 Nephi 7:6 (“against I Nephi”)  
 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* 0 | 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

1 Nephi 17:44 (“unto **they**”)

and ye are like unto [*they* 0A | *they* >js *them* 1 | *them* BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]

Jacob 2:33 (“unto **they** of old”)

for they shall not commit whoredoms

like unto [*they* >js *them* 1 | *they* A | *them* BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] of old

Thus the earliest reading for Alma 14:19 is possible (although the possibility remains that the second *ye* is an error for *you*). The critical text will restore this use of the subject pronoun form *ye* even though it occurs in object position.

**Summary:** Restore the *ye* in Alma 14:19, the earliest extant reading (“I have power to deliver **ye** up unto the flames”); sometimes pronouns in the Book of Mormon text take subject forms in object position.

### ■ Alma 14:20

*and many came forth also and smote them saying*

*will ye stand **again** and judge this people and condemn our law*

The expression “will ye stand again” sounds strange here when conjoined with “judge this people and condemn our law”. One possibility is that *again* is an error for *against*, although there are two problems with such a suggested emendation. First, there isn’t much scribal evidence for mixing up *again* and *against*; there is only one explicit example:

1 Nephi 16:22

I Nephi did speak much unto my brethren

because that they had hardened their hearts

[*again* 0ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST | *against* >% *again* 1]

even unto complaining **against** the Lord their God

Of course, the reader expects *against* after “they had hardened their hearts”, especially since the expression “to harden one’s heart **against** someone or something” occurs at least 18 times in the text. Moreover, the word *against* does occur later in 1 Nephi 16:22 (“even unto complaining **against** the Lord their God”). So it is not surprising that after “hardened their hearts” in 1 Nephi 16:22, Oliver Cowdery initially wrote *against* in  $\mathcal{P}$ , which he immediately corrected to *again* by erasing the final *st* (his correction is in agreement with  $\mathcal{C}$ , which is extant here). Another possible example where *again* and *against* may have been mixed up is found in Alma 30:45, even though there the textual sources (including  $\mathcal{C}$ ) consistently read “and yet will ye deny **against** all these witnesses” (see the discussion under that passage). In general, there is not much evidence for textual confusion between *again* and *against*.

A more serious problem with emending *again* to *against* in Alma 14:20 is that elsewhere in the Book of Mormon the expression “to stand against” always takes an object (12 times), including one that refers to judging: “or they stand **against you** at the judgment seat of Christ” (Moroni 8:21). One could, I suppose, interpret the following *this people* in Alma 14:20 as the object for *against* (that is, “will ye stand against [this people] and judge this people”), but this kind of conjunctive ellipsis is quite improbable, even in English.

There is one other place in the text where we have the expression “to stand again”, and here *stand* appears to have the figurative meaning ‘to stand in opposition’ rather than the literal meaning ‘to physically stand up’: “and those men **again stood** to scatter their flocks” (Alma 17:33). Similarly, earlier in that chapter, we have “a certain number of the Lamanites . . . **stood** and scattered the flocks of Ammon and the servants of the king” (Alma 17:27). The same figurative meaning of ‘to stand in opposition’ for the verb *stand* may very well apply in Alma 14:20, which would mean that there is no need to emend *again* to *against*.

**Summary:** Accept in Alma 14:20 the use of *again* in “will ye stand again and judge this people”; in this instance, the verb *stand* appears to have the figurative meaning ‘to stand in opposition’.

#### ■ Alma 14:23–24

*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 where Alma and Amulek was bound with cords  
and [the 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST | their s] chief judge stood before them  
and smote them again*

Here in verse 24, the 1953 RLDS edition replaced “**the** chief judge” with “**their** chief judge”, probably because a preceding clause in verse 23 has two instances of *their* (“and many of **their** teachers and **their** lawyers”). Elsewhere in the text, no chief judge is ever referred to as “**their** chief judge”.

**Summary:** Maintain in Alma 14:24 the definite article *the* before *chief judge*.

#### ■ Alma 14:25

*and they [arose 1ABCGHKPS | rose DEFIJLMNOQRT] and stood upon their feet*

The 1841 British edition accidentally replaced *arose* with *rose*, and the LDS text has retained the secondary *rose*. Elsewhere in the text, there are no examples of the conjunctive expression “to **rise** and stand”, but there are seven of “to **arise** and stand”, most of which are in the past tense (as here in Alma 14:25):

Mosiah 27:13	<b>arise</b> and <b>stand</b> forth
Alma 19:29	she <b>arose</b> and <b>stood</b> upon her feet
Alma 19:30	and behold he <b>arose</b> and <b>stood</b> upon his feet
Alma 36:8	and I <b>arose</b> and <b>stood</b> up
3 Nephi 11:20	and he <b>arose</b> and <b>stood</b> before him
3 Nephi 20:2	that they should <b>arise</b> and <b>stand</b> up upon their feet
3 Nephi 20:2	and they <b>arose</b> up and <b>stood</b> upon their feet

The critical text will restore the original “they **arose** and stood upon their feet” in Alma 14:25.

**Summary:** Restore in Alma 14:25 *arose* in “they arose and stood”, which is in agreement with all instances of “to (a)rise and stand” in the Book of Mormon text.

## ■ Alma 14:26

and they [*brake* 1GHJKPS | *break* ABCDEFIL | *break* > *broke* M | *broke* NOQRT] the cords  
with which they were bound

The printer's manuscript here reads *brake*, the archaic Early Modern English past-tense form for the verb *break*; the modern simple past-tense form, of course, is *broke*. The 1830 compositor set the word with the present-tense spelling *break*. The 1858 Wright edition restored the correct *brake*, which has been retained in the RLDS text. The 1888 LDS large-print edition also set the word as *brake*, but this edition was never used as a copytext for any subsequent LDS edition. On the other hand, the 1906 LDS large-print edition replaced *break* with the modern English *broke*; this change was followed in the third printing of the 1905 LDS missionary edition and has been maintained in all subsequent LDS editions. Elsewhere the text has shown a strong tendency to replace *brake* with *broke*:

Alma 44:12 (*brake* > *broke*, 1830 edition)

but as he raised his sword  
behold one of Moroni's soldiers smote it even to the earth  
and it [*brake* 01 | *broke* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] by the hilt

Alma 57:33 (*brake* > *broke*, Oliver Cowdery in  $\mathcal{P}$ )

and it came to pass that they did in a body run upon our swords  
in the which the greater number of them were slain  
and the remainder of them [*brake* 0 | *broke* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOQRST] through  
and fled from us

3 Nephi 20:3 (*brake* > *broke*, Oliver Cowdery correcting  $\mathcal{P}$ )

and it came to pass that  
he [ $\mathcal{S}2$  *berke* >  $\mathcal{S}1$  *brake* > *broke* 1 | *break* ABCDPS | *brake* EFGHIJKLMNOQRT]  
bread again  
and blessed it and gave to the disciples to eat

In the last example, it appears that  $\mathcal{C}$  originally read as either *brake* or *break*, but not *broke* (for this part of the text, both  $\mathcal{P}$  and the 1830 edition are firsthand copies of  $\mathcal{C}$ ). Clearly, for 3 Nephi 20:3 the original text itself must have read *brake*, even if the scribe for  $\mathcal{C}$  (probably Oliver Cowdery) wrote it as *break*. We find the same problem earlier in 3 Nephi:

3 Nephi 18:3

and when the disciples had come with bread and wine  
he took of the bread  
and [*brake* 1BCDEFGHIJKLMNOQRT | *berak* A | *break* PS] and blessed it

Here the 1830 compositor set *berak*, which appears to be a typo for *break* rather than *brake* (the misspelling *berak* results from the simple metathesis of *re* in *break*). Similarly, in 3 Nephi 20:3, the 1830 edition incorrectly reads *break*. And in both 3 Nephi 18:3 and 3 Nephi 20:3, the 1908 RLDS edition, following  $\mathcal{P}$ , has *break*, which is clearly wrong for these two past-tense passages. Here in Alma 14:26, we have explicit evidence that the 1830 compositor sometimes set *brake* as *break*:

Alma 14:26 (*brake* > *break*, 1830 edition)

and they [*brake* 1GHJKPS | *break* ABCDEFIL | *break* > *broke* M | *broke* NOQRT]  
the cords with which they were bound

In summary, *brake* was sometimes changed to *broke* early on in the transmission of the text (in Alma 44:12, Alma 57:33, and 3 Nephi 20:3); and sometimes the 1830 compositor misspelled *brake* as *break* (in Alma 14:26 at least, and perhaps also in 3 Nephi 18:3 and 3 Nephi 20:3).

In three other instances, all the extant textual sources (including the printer's manuscript) consistently read *broke*; but in each of these cases, the original manuscript is not sufficiently extant to determine whether it actually read *brake* or *broke*, although in the transcript of  $\mathcal{O}$  (see volume 1 of the critical text) I assumed that it consistently read *brake*:

Alma 60:15–16

for were it not for the wickedness which first commenced at our head  
we could have withstood our enemies  
that they could have gained no power over us  
yea had it not been for the war  
which **broke** out among ourselves . . .

Ether 6:6

and it came to pass that  
they were many times buried in the depths of the sea  
because of the mountain waves which **broke** upon them

Ether 7:18

and it came to pass as he was about to put him to death  
the sons of Shule crept into the house of Noah by night and slew him  
and **broke** down the door of the prison  
and brought out their father  
and placed him upon his throne in his own kingdom

Since Alma 57:33 shows Oliver Cowdery replacing *brake* with *broke* in  $\mathcal{P}$ , it is possible that Oliver is responsible for these three other instances of *broke* in  $\mathcal{P}$ .

In the King James Bible, the simple past-tense form *broke* does not occur at all, although of course the past participle *broken* is there. The only simple past-tense form for *break* in the King James text is *brake* (including a few of *brakest*). According to the Oxford English Dictionary, the simple-past tense form *broke* dates from at least the early part of the 16th century. Since *broke* is theoretically possible, the critical text of the Book of Mormon will in each case follow the earliest textual sources in determining whether the text should read *brake* or *broke*. This gives us the following results:

- *brake* Alma 14:26, Alma 44:12, Alma 57:33, 3 Nephi 18:3, 3 Nephi 20:3
- *broke* Alma 60:16, Ether 6:6, Ether 7:18

But since the textual tendency has been to replace *brake* with *broke*, the three instances of *broke* may be errors for *brake*.

A similar decision was made with respect to whether the past-tense form for *bear* should be *bare* or *bore* (see under 1 Nephi 11:7) or whether the past-tense form for *swear* should be *sware* or *swore* (see under Enos 1:14). The textual tendency has been to replace *bare* with *bore* and *sware* with *swore*. For general discussion, see under PAST TENSE in volume 3.

We should also note here that Oliver Cowdery frequently misspelled *break* as *brake* in the manuscripts:

1 Nephi 16:18	behold I did [ <i>brake</i> 0   <i>break</i> 1] my bow
1 Nephi 16:18	and after that I did [ <i>brake</i> 0   <i>break</i> 1] my bow
Alma 43:11	and they would not [ <i>brake</i> 01] it
Alma 44:8	which we know that we shall [ <i>brake</i> 01]
Alma 53:14	for they were about to [ <i>brake</i> 01] the oath
Alma 56:7	they were about to [ <i>brake</i> 01] the covenant
Alma 56:8	that they should [ <i>brake</i> 01] this covenant
Alma 57:14	for behold they would [ <i>brake</i> 01] out in great numbers
3 Nephi 16:19	[ <i>brake</i> 1] forth into joy
3 Nephi 18:5	that he shall [ <i>brake</i> 1] bread

More often, Oliver spelled *break* correctly (in at least one of the manuscripts for 17 other passages). Scribe 2 of  $\mathcal{P}$  always spelled *break* correctly (6 times).

**Summary:** Based on the earliest textual sources, restore *brake* in Alma 14:26, Alma 44:12, and Alma 57:33; on the same basis, *brake* should be maintained in 3 Nephi 18:3 and 3 Nephi 20:3 while *broke* should be maintained in Alma 60:16, Ether 6:6, and Ether 7:18 (although these three instances of *broke* may have read *brake* in the original text).

#### ■ Alma 14:27

*and the chief judge and the lawyers*

[NULL > & *priests* 1 | *and Priests* AL | *and priests* BCDEFGHIJKMNOPQRST] *and teachers*

*which smote upon Alma and Amulek*

*were slain by the fall thereof*

Here Oliver Cowdery initially omitted the conjunct *and priests* in  $\mathcal{P}$ . Virtually immediately he supralinearly inserted the phrase, with the *and* written as an ampersand (there is no change in the level of ink flow). Parallel references to lawyers, judges, and teachers earlier in this chapter show that *and priests* is optional:

Alma 14:18

there came many lawyers and judges **and priests** and teachers  
which were of the profession of Nehor

Alma 14:23

the chief judge over the land of Ammonihah  
and many of their teachers and their lawyers  
went in unto the prison where Alma and Amulek was bound with cords

There would have been no strong motivation in verse 27 for Oliver to have emended the text by adding *and priests*. Notice that he did not make that change in verse 23, which lacks *and priests*. The critical text will accept the corrected reading in  $\mathcal{P}$  for Alma 14:27.

**Summary:** Maintain in Alma 14:27 the corrected reading in  $\mathcal{P}$  that includes *and priests*.

## ■ Alma 14:28

and Alma and Amulek came forth out of [the 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNPQRST | O] prison

Here the 1907 LDS vest-pocket edition omitted the definite article *the* before the word *prison*, probably because in English the word *prison* typically lacks the definite article in prepositional phrases (thus “into prison”, “in prison”, and “out of prison”). As discussed under Mosiah 7:8, the Book of Mormon text uses *the* when referring to a specific prison, as is generally the case here in Alma 14:

verse 18	and they came in unto <b>the</b> prison to see them
verse 23	the chief judge . . . went in unto <b>the</b> prison
verse 27	they . . . did not obtain the outer door of <b>the</b> prison
verse 27	and the walls of <b>the</b> prison were rent in twain
verse 28	and Alma and Amulek came forth out of <b>the</b> prison
verse 28	and they straightway came forth out of <b>the</b> prison
verse 28	and <b>the</b> prison had fallen to the earth
verse 29	and when they saw Alma and Amulek coming forth out of <b>the</b> prison

The 1907 edition was not used as a copytext for subsequent LDS editions; thus the reading with the missing *the* was not transmitted. The critical text will retain the original “out of **the** prison” here in Alma 14:28.

**Summary:** Maintain in Alma 14:28 the use of *the* before *prison*, the reading of the earliest textual sources; such usage is expected here in Alma 14 since a specific prison is being referred to.

## ■ Alma 14:28

and every soul [which >js who 1 | which A | who BCDEFGHIJKLPS | who > NULL M | NOQRT]  
 [was 1ABCDEFGHIKPS | were FIJL | were > NULL M | NOQRT]  
 [within 1ABCDEFGHIKNOPQRST | in FIJL | in > within M] the walls thereof  
 save it were Alma and Amulek  
 [were 1ABCDEFGHIKLNOPS | were > was M | was QRT] slain

In this passage, the 1852 LDS edition changed the singular *was* to *were* even though the result was not grammatically correct (“every soul” is grammatically singular); in addition, *within* was changed to *in* in the 1852 edition, probably by accident. These two changes were followed in subsequent LDS editions until the turn of the century. The 1906 edition made two changes: first, *who were* (originally *which was*) was deleted; and second, *within* was restored to the text. These two changes were followed when numerous changes were made to the 1905 LDS missionary edition in its third printing (in 1907). And one more grammatical change was made in that third printing (but not in the earlier 1906 edition): namely, at the end of the passage, *were slain* was changed to *was slain* so as to agree with the grammatically singular “every soul” near the beginning of the passage. All LDS editions since 1906 have followed these changes. The original text permits both singular and plural verb forms with noun phrases headed by *every*, as discussed under Alma 11:41 for “every man”. Here in Alma 14:28, the original plural *were slain* was probably influenced by the immediately preceding use of *were* in “save it were Alma and Amulek”.

Obviously, the restored *within* is the correct reading and should be maintained. On the other hand, the 1906 deletion of *who were* (originally *which was*) was unnecessary. Nor is the original construction difficult to understand. The critical text will restore the earliest text in this passage despite the ungrammaticality of the last *were* (“and every soul . . . were slain”).

**Summary:** Restore the original text in Alma 14:28, including the plural *were* at the end of the sentence: “every soul **which was within** the walls thereof save it were Alma and Amulek **were** slain”.

#### ■ Alma 14:28

*and they [straitway 1 | straightway ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] came forth out of the prison  
and they were loosed from their bands  
and the prison had fallen to the earth  
and every soul which was within the walls thereof save it were Alma and Amulek were slain  
and they [NULL > straitway 1 | straightway ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] came forth into the city*

In this verse, we have two instances of the adverb *straightway*; in fact, these are the only occurrences of that word in the text. In the second instance, Oliver Cowdery initially omitted the *straightway*, but then almost immediately he supralinearly inserted it. Since the use of *straightway* here is optional, it is doubtful that Oliver added the second *straightway* in order to make the two clauses agree. More likely,  $\mathcal{O}$  simply had two occurrences of “and they straightway came forth”.

In both instances, Oliver Cowdery spelled the word as *straitway* in  $\mathcal{P}$ . The 1830 compositor set the correct *straightway* but only because he consistently spelled both *strait* and *straight* as *straight*, no matter what the meaning. For further discussion of the spelling for *strait* and *straight*, see under 1 Nephi 8:20.

**Summary:** Maintain the two occurrences of *straightway* in Alma 14:28; Oliver Cowdery’s addition of the second occurrence most probably derives from  $\mathcal{O}$  itself and not from editing on his part.

#### ■ Alma 14:29

*and when they saw Alma and Amulek coming forth out of the prison  
and [ 1ABCDEFGHIJLMNOPQRST | that HK] the walls thereof had fallen to the earth  
they were struck with great fear*

The 1874 RLDS edition added the subordinate conjunction *that* in this passage, perhaps in an attempt to help the reader interpret the nonparallel conjoining of a gerundive clause (“Alma and Amulek coming forth out of the prison”) with a finite clause (“the walls thereof had fallen to the earth”). The addition of the *that* makes it clear that the finite clause “the walls thereof had fallen to the earth” should be interpreted as a subordinate clause. Nonetheless, the 1908 RLDS edition, following the reading in  $\mathcal{P}$ , restored the original text without the intrusive *that*. In addition, David Calabro points out (personal communication) that the conjoined finite clause could be treated parenthetically:



Alma 14:29 (rephrasing)

and when they saw Alma and Amulek coming forth out of the prison  
—and the walls thereof had fallen to the earth—  
they were struck with great fear

The printed editions have always had commas surrounding this finite clause, but not dashes or parentheses. In any event, the critical text will maintain the original reading here in Alma 14:29, no matter whether the finite clause is treated parenthetically or as part of the direct object for the verb *saw*.

**Summary:** Maintain in Alma 14:29 the finite clause “the walls thereof had fallen to the earth” without any overt *that* conjunction that would force the reader to interpret this clause as a subordinate clause rather than as a parenthetical main clause.

# Alma 15

## ■ Alma 15:1

*and it came to pass that Alma and Amulek were commanded to depart out of [the land >+ that city 1 | that city ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] and they departed and came out **even** into the land of Sidom*

Paul Huntzinger (personal communication, 29 February and 2 March 2004) has suggested a number of possible emendations here in Alma 15:1. The use of *even* seems rather odd here, as if there should be something special or unexpected about the land of Sidom. One possibility Huntzinger suggests is that *even* may be a visual error for *over*, with *even* entering the text as Oliver Cowdery copied from  $\mathcal{G}$  into  $\mathcal{P}$ . In other words, we have the following possible emendation for Alma 15:1:

(1) and they departed and came out **over** into the land of Sidom

There is some manuscript evidence that the scribes occasionally misread *even* as *over* when they copied from  $\mathcal{G}$  into  $\mathcal{P}$  (although there are no examples of *over* being misread as *even*):

Alma 3:13 (*even* miswritten as *over* by scribe 2 of  $\mathcal{P}$ )

yea they set the mark upon themselves

yea [ $\S$ 2 *over* >  $\S$ 1 *oven* > *even* 1 | *even* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]

a mark of red upon their foreheads

Alma 46:7 (*even* initially miswritten as *over* by Oliver Cowdery in  $\mathcal{P}$ )

therefore they dissented

[*even* 0ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST | *over* > *even* 1] from the church

There are also passages which support the phraseology “to come **over into** the land of X”:

Alma 21:12 they departed and came **over into** the land of Middoni

Alma 30:21 he came **over into** the land of Gideon

Alma 35:1 they withdrew themselves from the multitude  
and came **over into** the land of Jershon

Alma 35:2 and the rest of the brethren . . . also came **over into**  
the land of Jershon

Alma 35:6 and they came **over** also **into** the land of Jershon

Alma 35:13 and the people of Ammon departed out of the land of Jershon  
and came **over into** the land of Melek

Alma 43:24 that they might come **over into** the land of Manti

Alma 47:29 they were frightened again and fled into the wilderness  
and came **over into** the land of Zarahemla

Two of these examples (Alma 21:12 and Alma 35:13) indicate that a group of people “departed and came **over into** the land of X”, which is close in phraseology to Alma 15:1. Yet all of these other examples suggest that the occurrence of *out* in the emended “they departed and came **out over into** the land of X” is not quite right since there are no examples in the text of the rather strange “to come **out over into** the land of X”.

One way to view *even* here in Alma 15:1 is that it implies that Alma and Amulek went some distance, perhaps further than what one might have normally expected. Thus we could interpret this clause with *even* as meaning something like ‘they went **all the way** to Sidom’. The word *even* is used with the meaning ‘all the way’ or ‘as far as’ elsewhere in the Book of Mormon text:

Alma 54:12

and I will follow you **even** into your own land

Alma 60:30

behold I come unto you **even** into the land of Zarahemla

Helaman 4:5–6

they succeeded in obtaining possession of the land of Zarahemla  
yea and also all the lands **even** unto the land which was near the land Bountiful  
and the Nephites and the armies of Moronihah were driven **even** into the land  
of Bountiful

Mormon 1:6

and it came to pass that I being eleven years old was carried by my father  
into the land southward **even** to the land of Zarahemla

Mormon 2:16

the Nephites did begin to flee before the Lamanites  
and they were pursued until they came **even** to the land of Jashon  
before it were possible to stop them in their retreat

Ether 2:7

and the Lord would not suffer that they should stop beyond the sea in the wilderness  
but he would that they should come forth **even** unto the land of promise  
which was choice above all other lands

We find similar usage in the King James Bible:

1 Samuel 27:8

for those *nations were* of old the inhabitants of the land  
as thou goest to Shur **even** unto the land of Egypt

2 Chronicles 9:26

and he reigned over all the kings from the river  
**even** unto the land of the Philistines and to the border of Egypt

In these biblical cases, the corresponding Hebrew word for *even* (namely, ‘*ad*’) means ‘as far as’. Thus the use of *even* in Alma 15:1 may not be all that difficult.

Another possibility suggested by Huntzinger is that *even* is correct in Alma 15:1 but that the phrase “(out) of the land” was accidentally omitted during the early transmission of the text;

there are two places where that phrase could have originally occurred in Alma 15:1, giving two additional emendations to consider:

- (2) and they departed **out of the land** and came out even into the land of Sidom
- (3) and they departed and came **out of the land** even into the land of Sidom

Note that earlier in this passage Oliver initially wrote the following in  $\mathcal{P}$ : “Alma and Amulek were commanded to depart **out of the land**”. But then virtually immediately he corrected *the land* to *that city*. (Oliver overwrote the *e* of the *the* with an *a*, inserted inline the final *t* of *that*, crossed out the word *land*, and supralinearly inserted *city*. The level of ink flow for the *a* that overwrites the *e* is somewhat heavier, but the ink flow for the rest of the correction appears unchanged. Perhaps Oliver redipped his quill just before correcting the *e* to *a*.) One could explain this anticipatory error of *the land* in  $\mathcal{P}$  as the result of the following “even into **the land** of Sidom”. But it is also possible that the error could have come from a following occurrence of “(out) of the land”, now lost from the text. The critical text, however, will maintain the earliest text for Alma 15:1, despite its unusualness. There may be some sort of early error here, but it is not readily recoverable. Nor is the original text all that problematic.

*Summary:* Maintain in Alma 15:1 the earliest extant text: “and they departed and came out **even** into the land of Sidom”; here the word *even* appears to mean ‘as far as’ and is probably not an error for *over*; there is a possibility that the phrase “(out) of the land” was accidentally omitted during the early transmission of the text.

### ■ Alma 15:3

*and he supposed that they had been slain*  
 [*by the cause* I ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQS | *because* RT] *of his iniquity*  
 [ 1 | . ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]  
*and* [*by* > NULL 1 | ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *this great sin*  
*and his many other sins did harrow up his mind*

Initially, when copying from  $\mathcal{S}$  into  $\mathcal{P}$ , Oliver Cowdery thought “this great sin” was conjoined with the preceding “the cause of his iniquity”; thus he accidentally repeated the preposition *by* (“by the cause of his iniquity and **by** this great sin”). But “this great sin” actually conjoins with the following “his many other sins” to form the subject for a separate clause (“and this great sin and his many other sins did harrow up his mind”). Almost immediately Oliver caught his error here in  $\mathcal{P}$  and crossed out the intrusive *by* (there is no change in the level of ink flow for the crossout). The original manuscript undoubtedly read as corrected in  $\mathcal{P}$ .

In this verse, the editors for the 1920 LDS edition replaced the analytic “by the cause of” with the expected “because of”. In contrast to 579 examples of “because of” in the original text (with possible variation in the count depending on whether the original text had the *of* or not), there is one other case of “by the cause of” in the original text of the Book of Mormon:

Alma 7:5  
 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

In addition, there is a passage with the phrase “by this cause” (instead of “because of this”) in Ether 7:25: “and **by this cause** the people were brought unto repentance”. There are also examples where the preposition is *for* rather than *by*, as in Alma 60:32: “while your iniquity is **for the cause of** your love of glory and the vain things of the world”. Thus the relatively rare use of “by the cause of” (in Alma 7:5 and Alma 15:3) appears to be fully intended.

Historically, *because* derives from *by cause* (see under *because* in the Oxford English Dictionary). The more analytical but rarer expression “by the cause of” is found from Early Modern English up to the present, as in these examples (with accidentals regularized) from *Literature Online* <lion.chadwyck.com>:

Henry Porter (1599)

the same effects of ruffin outrages comes **by the cause of** malice in your wives

Roger Boyle Orrery (1655)

neither can you doubt **by the cause of** our present

George Meredith (1876)

and in fact she chose to be a little wounded **by the cause of** his absence

The critical text will therefore follow the earliest reading for the two original instances of “by the cause of”, here in Alma 15:3 and earlier in Alma 7:5.

*Summary:* Maintain the original reading “by the cause of” in Alma 7:5 and Alma 15:3.

#### ■ Alma 15:5

*and it came to pass that they went immediately obeying the message which [he had sent 1ABCEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST | had been sent D] unto them*

The typesetter for the 1841 British edition accidentally replaced “he had sent” with the semantically related “had been sent”, a passive form. The subsequent 1849 LDS edition restored the correct reading to the LDS text. Either reading is, of course, theoretically possible.

This verse contains another typo in the 1841 edition:

Alma 15:5

and when he saw **them**

he stretched forth his hand and besought **them**

that they would heal [*him* 1ABCEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST | *them* D]

This error was probably the result of the preceding use of *them* in this passage. Of course, the *them* here at the end of the verse is clearly unacceptable since the text refers to the healing of only one person, Zeezrom.

*Summary:* Ignore in Alma 15:5 the two typos that the 1841 British edition introduced into the text: “had been sent” instead of “he had sent” and, at the very end of the verse, *them* instead of *him*; these two errors were restricted to this edition.

## ■ Alma 15:8

*if thou believest in the redemption of Christ  
thou canst [believe > be healed 1 | be healed ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]*

Here in the printer's manuscript, Oliver Cowdery initially wrote *be healed* as *believe*. Almost immediately, he crossed out the *lieve* part of the word *believe* and supralinearly inserted *healed* (there is no change in the level of ink flow). Oliver's error was undoubtedly influenced by the occurrence of *believest* in the preceding clause ("if thou believest in the redemption of Christ"). A similar misreading involving *be healed* is found later on in the text; in this case, an original *behold* was misread as *be healed*, an incorrect reading that has persisted in the text:

Alma 33:21  
if ye could **be healed** by merely casting about your eyes  
that ye might [*behold* 0 | *be healed* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST]  
would ye not behold quickly

Once more we see the influence of a preceding verb form, in this case *be healed*. For further discussion, see under Alma 33:21.

**Summary:** Maintain in Alma 15:8 Oliver Cowdery's corrected reading in  $\mathcal{P}$ : "thou canst **be healed**".

## ■ Alma 15:11

*and [it came to pass that >js NULL 1 | it came to pass that A | BCD EFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]  
when Alma had said these words [NULL > that >js NULL 1 | that A | BCD EFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]  
Zeezrom leaped upon his feet*

Here the original text has an example of the repeated *that*: "and it came to pass **that** when Alma had said these words **that** Zeezrom leaped upon his feet". Initially in  $\mathcal{P}$ , as Oliver Cowdery copied from  $\mathcal{C}$ , he omitted the repeated *that*. Shortly thereafter, he supralinearly inserted the *that* (there is no difference in the level of ink flow). Most probably,  $\mathcal{C}$  had the repeated *that*.

When Joseph Smith removed the instance of "it came to pass that" in his editing of this passage for the 1837 edition, he also removed the repeated *that* (as one would expect). For further discussion of the occasional elimination of the phrase "come to pass" in the 1837 edition, see under 1 Nephi 10:17 (also see under COME TO PASS in volume 3). The use of the repeated *that* is quite frequent in the original text, although many instances (but not all) were removed by Joseph in his editing for the 1837 edition; for example, the repeated *that* was left in Mosiah 9:11: "therefore it came to pass **that** after we had dwelt in the land for the space of twelve years **that** king Laman began to grow uneasy". For discussion of the repeated *that*, see under 1 Nephi 10:2–3 as well as more generally under THAT in volume 3.

**Summary:** Restore in Alma 15:11 the original "it came to pass that" and the repeated *that* after the subordinate clause: "and **it came to pass that** when Alma had said these words **that** Zeezrom leaped upon his feet".

## ■ Alma 15:16

*Amulek having forsaken all his gold  
and [his 1A | BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] silver  
and his precious things*

The original text here in Alma 15:16 repeats the determiner *his* before each noun phrase in the conjunctive construction “all **his** gold and **his** silver and **his** precious things”. The 1837 edition accidentally omitted the second *his*, which creates a sequence of *his-NULL-his* for these three conjuncts. Elsewhere the text usually repeats the determiner or the preposition for the sequence “\_\_\_ gold and \_\_\_ silver and (all) \_\_\_ precious things”:

1 Nephi 2:4	and <b>his</b> gold and <b>his</b> silver and <b>his</b> precious things
1 Nephi 2:11	and <b>their</b> gold and <b>their</b> silver and <b>their</b> precious things
1 Nephi 3:22	<b>our</b> gold and <b>our</b> silver and <b>our</b> precious things
1 Nephi 3:24	<b>our</b> gold and <b>our</b> silver and all <b>our</b> precious things
Jarom 1:8	<b>in</b> gold and <b>in</b> silver and <b>in</b> precious things
Mosiah 19:15	<b>their</b> gold and <b>their</b> silver and all <b>their</b> precious things
Alma 1:29	and <b>of</b> gold and <b>of</b> silver and <b>of</b> precious things
3 Nephi 6:2	and <b>their</b> gold and <b>their</b> silver and all <b>their</b> precious things
Ether 9:17	and <b>of</b> gold and <b>of</b> silver and <b>of</b> precious things

On the other hand, there are a couple of examples where the repetition does not occur for *silver*, perhaps because gold and silver are semantically linked to each other as means of exchange (and specifically described as such in Alma 11:5–19):

Mosiah 11:9	<b>with</b> gold and silver and <b>with</b> precious things
Mosiah 22:12	all <b>their</b> gold and silver and <b>their</b> precious things

The critical text will therefore follow the earliest reading for each case of “\_\_\_ gold and \_\_\_ silver and (all) \_\_\_ precious things”. Here in Alma 15:16, the repeated *his* before *silver* will be restored in the critical text. For further discussion, see under Jacob 2:12; also see the general discussion under CONJUNCTIVE REPETITION in volume 3.

**Summary:** In accord with the earliest textual sources, restore in Alma 15:16 the repeated *his* before *silver* in “all his gold and **his** silver and his precious things”.

## ■ Alma 15:18

*therefore he took Amulek and came over to the land of Zarahemla and took him to his own house  
and did [administer 1ABCDEFGHIJLMNOPQRST | minister HK] unto him in his tribulations*

The Book of Mormon text basically uses the two verbs *administer* and *minister* interchangeably. In some instances, modern speakers of English prefer *minister* over *administer* (as here in Alma 15:18); in some other instances (discussed below), *administer* is preferred over *minister* in modern English. Nonetheless, there has been relatively little textual variation between these two verbs in the Book of Mormon text. Here in Alma 15:18, the 1874 RLDS edition replaced *administer* with

the expected *minister* (but perhaps unintentionally since that change was never made elsewhere in the 1874 edition).

In the original Book of Mormon text, there are 56 occurrences of the verb *minister* and 29 of *administer*. There are only two other cases that show textual variation:

Alma 17:18

now Ammon being the chief among them  
 or rather he did [*minister* > *administer* > jg *minister* 1 |  
*administer* ABCDEFIJLMNOQRT | *minister* GHKPS] unto them  
 he departed from them after having blessed them according to their several stations  
 having imparted the word of God unto them  
 or **administered** unto them before his departure

Moroni 4:1

and they **administered** it according to the commandments of Christ  
 wherefore we know that the manner to be true  
 and the elder or priest did [*minister* 1ABCEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST | *administer* D] it

The first case shows a strong tendency to replace *administer* with *minister*: (1) Oliver Cowdery initially wrote *minister* in  $\mathcal{P}$ , then virtually immediately corrected *minister* to *administer* (the probable reading in  $\mathcal{O}$ ) by supralinearly inserting the prefixal *ad*; (2) John Gilbert, while preparing the manuscript for typesetting the 1830 edition, used a pencil to cross out Oliver's inserted *ad*; yet when it came to actually setting the type for the 1830 edition, the word was set as *administer*; and (3) the 1858 Wright edition introduced *minister* into the RLDS textual tradition.

A third case of variation between *minister* and *administer* may have occurred in the original manuscript for Alma 22:25. The earliest extant text (the printer's manuscript) here reads "but the king stood forth among them and **administered** unto them". But spacing between extant fragments of  $\mathcal{O}$  suggests that Oliver Cowdery initially wrote *ministered* in  $\mathcal{O}$ , but then he immediately crossed out the whole word and wrote inline the correct, but unexpected, *administered* (for further discussion, see under Alma 22:25). This use of "administer unto someone" instead of the expected "minister unto someone" is found three other times in the text (in addition to the four examples in Alma 15:18, Alma 17:18, and Alma 22:25, cited above):

Alma 19:33      he also **administered** unto them  
 Alma 22:3        but I will insist that ye shall **administer** unto me  
 Alma 35:9        and they did **administer** unto them according to their wants

These three examples have avoided the tendency to replace *administer* with *minister*, the verb that we expect in modern English for this context. But the other examples show the persistent tendency to replace "administer unto someone" with "minister unto someone" in the Book of Mormon text. Overall, the original text has examples of both the unexpected "administer unto someone" (7 times) and the expected "minister unto someone" (42 times).

On the other hand, in modern English we expect "administer the sacrament", not "minister the sacrament". But in this context, the Book of Mormon text is basically divided in its usage, with three examples of *minister* and four of *administer*:



3 Nephi 18:28

ye shall not suffer any one knowingly  
to partake of my flesh and blood unworthily  
when ye shall **minister** it

3 Nephi 18:30

then shall ye receive him  
and shall **minister** unto him of my flesh and blood

4 Nephi 1:27

insomuch that they did receive all manner of wickedness  
and did **administer** that which was sacred unto him  
to whom it had been forbidden because of unworthiness

Moroni 4:1 (three examples)

The manner of their elders and priests  
**administering** the flesh and blood of Christ unto the church—  
and they **administered** it according to the commandments of Christ  
wherefore we know that the manner to be true—  
and the elder or priest did **minister** it  
and they did kneel down with the church  
and pray to the Father in the name of Christ saying . . .

Moroni 5:1

The manner of **administering** the wine :

As noted above, the single instance of *minister* in Moroni 4:1 was replaced by *administer* in the 1841 British edition (but in only that edition).

According to the Oxford English Dictionary, *administer* is historically a 14th-century Latinized re-formation on the French word *minister*, so it is not surprising that the Book of Mormon often uses both words in the same semantic context. Over time, English speakers have differentiated the senses of these two words so that *administer* and *minister* now generally occur in nonoverlapping contexts (thus, a judge **administers** an oath, a reverend **ministers** to his congregation, the elders **administer** to the sick by the laying on of hands, and the priests **administer** the sacrament). But the Book of Mormon shows the earlier variability in the language between *administer* and *minister*. For each case of *(ad)minister*, the critical text will therefore follow the earliest textual sources in determining which verb, *administer* or *minister*, is intended, thus allowing for textual variation that sometimes goes against what we expect in modern English.

**Summary:** Accept in Alma 15:18 the original use of *administer* rather than *minister* (“and did **administer** unto him in his tribulations”); the original text of the Book of Mormon frequently uses the verbs *minister* and *administer* interchangeably in contexts where modern readers expect only one of the verbs.

# Alma 16

## ■ Alma 16:1

*there having been much peace in the land of Zarahemla*  
[NULL > *there* 1 | *there* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *having been no wars nor contentions*  
*for a certain number of years*

Here Oliver Cowdery supralinearly inserted *there* in  $\mathcal{P}$ , probably because  $\mathcal{C}$  had the *there*. There is no change in the level of ink flow, so the correction was probably almost immediate. It is theoretically possible that the *there* is due to editing, given that the preceding present participial clause also reads *there having* (“there having been much peace in the land of Zarahemla”). Besides these two instances in Alma 16:1, there are other examples of *there having* in the text:

The Words of Mormon 1:16  
and after **there having** been much contentions  
and many dissensions away unto the Lamanites . . .

Alma 6:7  
**there having** been a city built which was called the city of Gideon

Since the correction is virtually immediate in Alma 16:1, the critical text will assume that the second occurrence of *there having* in Alma 16:1 is the original reading and was not due to editing on Oliver Cowdery’s part.

**Summary:** Accept the corrected *there having* in Alma 16:1 (“there having been no wars nor contentions for a certain number of years”).

## ■ Alma 16:1

*there was a cry of war heard*  
[*through* > *throughout* 1 | *throughout* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *the land*

Here we have another virtually immediate correction by Oliver Cowdery in  $\mathcal{P}$ . He initially wrote *through*, but then he added the *out* supralinearly and without any change in the level of ink flow. Although *through* is possible here, the text prefers *throughout* in the phrase “through(out) the land”. The critical text will here accept the corrected reading in  $\mathcal{P}$ . For further discussion regarding *through* and *throughout*, see under Mosiah 29:1.

**Summary:** Accept in Alma 16:1 *throughout*, Oliver Cowdery’s virtually immediate correction in  $\mathcal{P}$ .

## ■ Alma 16:2

*for behold the armies of the Lamanites had come in  
[on 1A | upon BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] the wilderness side into the borders of the land  
even into the city of Ammonihah*

Here the 1837 edition replaced the preposition *on* with *upon*. This change does not seem to be due to editing and could well be an error. There are other examples where the 1837 edition accidentally mixed up *upon* and *on*, although in these cases the change was from *upon* to *on*:

Mosiah 28:11

therefore he took the records which were engraven  
[*upon* 1A | *on* BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] the plates of brass

Alma 3:14

and I will set a mark [*upon* 1APS | *on* BCDEFGHIJKLMNOQRT] them

Mormon 1:4

and ye shall engrave  
[*upon* 1APS | *on* BCDEFGHIJKLMNOQRT] the plates of Nephi  
all the things that ye have observed concerning this people

For further discussion regarding the variation between *upon* and *on*, see under Alma 2:38.

Theoretically, either *in upon* or *in on* will work here in Alma 16:2; the text has examples of both *in upon* (four times) and *in on* (two times):

2 Nephi 30:7	and they shall begin to gather in <b>upon</b> the face of the land
Mosiah 11:16	the Lamanites began to come in <b>upon</b> his people
Alma 3:20	there was another army of the Lamanites came in <b>upon</b> the people of Nephi
Alma 16:2	the armies of the Lamanites had come in <b>on</b> the wilderness side
3 Nephi 4:16	and should hem them in <b>on</b> every side
Ether 2:20	and if it so be that the water come in <b>upon</b> thee

Except for the first example, the object for *upon* refers to people while the object for *on* is *side*. In fact, there are no examples anywhere in the text of *upon* as the preposition for the noun *side*, but there are quite a few examples with *on* (ten of them). Besides the example in Alma 16:2 and the one listed above under 3 Nephi 4:16 (“hem them in **on** every **side**”), we have these examples:

1 Nephi 8:26	on the other side of the river of water
Mosiah 21:5	on every side
Mosiah 22:6	on the back side of the city
Alma 2:34	on the west side of the river Sidon
Alma 16:7	on the east side of the river Sidon
Alma 22:29	on the wilderness side on the north
Alma 43:41	on the other side of the river Sidon
Alma 52:9	on every side

Thus the critical text will restore the original *on* in Alma 16:2 (“the armies of the Lamanites had come in **on** the wilderness side”).

*Summary:* Restore the original preposition *on* in Alma 16:2: “the armies of the Lamanites had come in **on** the wilderness side into the borders of the land”; the text consistently prefers *on* rather than *upon* as the preposition for the noun *side*.

■ **Alma 16:2**

*for behold the armies of the Lamanites had come in on the wilderness side  
into the borders of the land even into the city of Ammonihah  
and began to slay the people and [to 1APS | BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRT] destroy the city*

Here the 1837 edition accidentally omitted the infinitival marker *to* before the verb *destroy*. It was restored to the RLDS text in the 1908 RLDS edition. The repeated infinitival *to* for conjuncts is more frequent in the Book of Mormon than the nonrepeated *to*. For instance, when the verb is *begin*, there are 34 occurrences of “begin **to** X and **to** Y” and 15 of “begin **to** X and Y”, as in the following contrastive pair of examples:

Helaman 6:34

and thus we see that the Nephites did **begin to dwindle** in unbelief  
**and grow** in wickedness and abominations  
while the Lamanites began to grow exceedingly in the knowledge of their God  
yea they did **begin to keep** his statutes and commandments  
**and to walk** in truth and uprightness before him

The clear tendency in the history of the text has been to accidentally remove the repeated *to*. Besides the example here in Alma 16:2, we have the following isolated examples involving the verb *begin*:

Jacob 7:2 (1892 RLDS edition)

and it came to pass that he began to preach among the people  
and [to 01ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST | K] declare unto them  
that there should be no Christ

Alma 62:48 (Oliver Cowdery, initially in  $\mathcal{P}$ )

and the people of Nephi began to prosper again in the land  
and began to multiply  
and [to 0ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST | NULL > to 1] wax exceeding strong  
again in the land

3 Nephi 6:4 (1892 RLDS edition)

and they began again to prosper  
and [to 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST | K] wax great

Ether 6:18 (1840 edition)

and it came to pass that they began to spread upon the face of the land  
and [to 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST | C] multiply  
and **to** till the earth

In each case, the critical text will follow the earliest textual sources in determining whether the infinitival *to* is repeated or not. For a complete discussion, see under CONJUNCTIVE REPETITION in volume 3.

*Summary:* Restore in Alma 16:2 the repeated *to* in “and began to slay the people and **to** destroy the city”.

■ Alma 16:3

*and now it came to pass [ 1 ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST | that GHK ] before the Nephites could raise  
a sufficient army to drive them out of the land  
they had destroyed the people which were in the city of Ammonihah*

Here in Alma 16:3, the 1858 Wright edition supplied a *that* between “it came to pass” and the following subordinate conjunction *before*. In accord with the reading of the printer’s manuscript, the 1908 RLDS edition removed this intrusive *that* from the RLDS text. The problem here in Alma 16:3 is whether the conjunction *that* might have originally occurred before the conjunction *before* but was somehow lost in the early transmission of the text (we do not have the original manuscript here). Elsewhere in the text, there are only two occurrences of “it came to pass” followed by a subordinate clause beginning with *before*, and in each instance *that* occurs in front of the *before*:

Alma 52:31

and it came to pass **that** before the Lamanites had retreated far  
they were surrounded by the Nephites

3 Nephi 2:13

and it came to pass **that** before this thirteenth year had passed away  
the Nephites were threatened with utter destruction

Generally speaking, we expect the *that* between “come to pass” and a following subordinate conjunction; even so, there are cases where the *that* is lacking. For instance, when the subordinate conjunction is *after*, the *that* is clearly more common (occurring 67 times in the original text), but there are still cases where the *that* is not there (6 times). For examples and discussion, see under 2 Nephi 1:1. So with only two other examples of “it came to pass **that** before <finite clause>”, the one example of “it came to pass before <finite clause>” here in Alma 16:3 should not be considered an error but simply a part of the overall variation in the text. For further discussion, see under THAT in volume 3.

**Summary:** Maintain in Alma 16:3 the unique instance in the original text of “it came to pass **before** <finite clause>” (that is, without any intervening *that* between “it came to pass” and the subordinate conjunction *before*); variation in the text for other subordinate conjunctions like *after* allows for the *that* to be lacking after “come to pass”.

■ Alma 16:3

*they had destroyed the people  
which were in the city [of 1 ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST | HK] Ammonihah*

As discussed under Alma 8:18, the critical text will in each case follow the earliest textual sources in determining whether *of* should occur in the phrase “the city (of) Ammonihah”. Here in Alma 16:3, the 1874 RLDS edition accidentally omitted the *of*. The 1908 RLDS edition restored it to the RLDS text. The critical text will maintain the *of* here.

**Summary:** Maintain in Alma 16:3 the *of* in “the city of Ammonihah”, the reading of the earliest textual sources.

## ■ Alma 16:3

*they had destroyed the people which were in the city of Ammonihah  
and also some around the borders of Noah  
and [taking 1ABCDEGPS | taken FHIJKLMNOQRT] others captive into the wilderness*

In this passage, the 1852 LDS edition replaced the present participial *taking* with the past participial *taken*, thus creating a conjoined predicate (“they had **destroyed** the people . . . and **taken** others captive into the wilderness”). As discussed under Mosiah 23:13–14, the evidence argues that the conjoined present participial “and taking others captive into the wilderness” here in Alma 16:3 appears to be the intended reading, despite its difficulty for speakers of modern English. The critical text will restore the original *taking*.

**Summary:** Restore the present participial form *taking* in Alma 16:3 (“and **taking** others captive into the wilderness”); evidence elsewhere in the text supports this difficult reading.

## ■ Alma 16:5

*therefore they went unto him and desired of him to know  
[whether >js whither 1 | whether ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRS | whither T]  
the Lord would that they should go into the wilderness in search of their brethren  
who had been taken captive by the Lamanites*

As discussed under 1 Nephi 22:4, Oliver Cowdery had difficulty distinguishing between *whether* and *whither* in the manuscripts. Here in Alma 16:5 the larger context makes it quite clear that *whither* is correct. Zoram and his two sons have already decided that they are going to search for the captured Nephites. They simply want to know where to look for them; they do not need to know whether they should look for them. They already know that the captives are somewhere in the wilderness (see verses 3–4). And Alma’s answer from the Lord gives only the requisite information—namely, where to go in the wilderness to recover the captives:

Alma 16:6

and it came to pass that Alma inquired of the Lord concerning the matter  
and Alma returned and said unto them  
behold the Lamanites will cross the river Sidon in the south wilderness  
away up beyond the borders of the land of Manti

There is nothing in his answer like “yea ye should go into the wilderness in search of your brethren”. Surprisingly, the *whether* of the printer’s manuscript here in Alma 16:5 was retained in the text until the 1981 LDS edition (and it continues in the RLDS text), although Joseph Smith, in his editing of  $\mathcal{P}$  for the 1837 edition, overwrote the first *e* of Oliver’s *whether* with an *i*, giving *whither*. But this change was never implemented in the 1837 edition itself, perhaps because the change in one letter was difficult to notice.

**Summary:** Accept in Alma 16:5 the 1981 LDS emendation of *whether* to *whither*; Joseph Smith marked  $\mathcal{P}$  for this change, but it was never implemented in the 1837 edition; the question is not whether Zoram and the Nephite armies should search in the wilderness for the captive Nephites, but rather where in the wilderness they should search.

## ■ Alma 16:5

*therefore they went unto him and desired of him to know  
whither [they > NULL 1 | ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] the Lord would  
that **they** should go into the wilderness in search of their brethren*

In copying from  $\mathcal{G}$  into  $\mathcal{P}$ , Oliver Cowdery initially skipped the phrase “the Lord would that”, but he immediately caught his error after writing only the *they* of the following “they should go”. Oliver crossed out the *they* and wrote inline the correct “the Lord would that they should go”.

**Summary:** Maintain in Alma 16:5 the corrected reading in  $\mathcal{P}$  that includes the phrase “the Lord would that”.

## ■ Alma 16:8

*and they came upon the armies of the Lamanites  
and the Lamanites were scattered and driven into the wilderness  
[& 1 | and ART | that BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQS] they took their brethren  
which had been taken captive by the Lamanites  
and there was not one soul of them which had been lost that were taken captive  
and they were brought by their brethren to possess their own lands*

In this passage, the 1837 edition replaced the conjunction *and* with *that*, probably accidentally since here either reading will work, providing we interpret the *that* as meaning ‘with the result that’. The *and* seems more natural in this particular passage. The textual history has quite a few examples of the resultive *that* being replaced by the conjunction *and* (the opposite of the change here in Alma 16:8), as in the following example when Oliver Cowdery initially wrote *and* in  $\mathcal{P}$  rather than the correct *that*:

Helaman 13:31

and behold the time cometh that he curseth your riches  
that it becometh slippery  
[& > that 1 | that ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] ye cannot hold them

For other examples of this tendency, see the discussion under 1 Nephi 11:29.

Here in Alma 16:8, the 1920 LDS edition restored the *and* by reference to the 1830 edition. The RLDS text has retained the 1837 reading, even though  $\mathcal{P}$  itself has only the *and* (that is, without any later alteration in  $\mathcal{P}$  of the *and* to *that*).

**Summary:** Maintain in Alma 16:8 the conjunction *and* before the resultive clause “they took their brethren”.

## ■ Alma 16:8

*and there was not one soul of them*

[*which* >js *who* 1 | *which* A | *who* BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQS | RT] *had been lost*

[NULL >jg, 1 |, ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQS | RT]

*that were taken captive*

In this sentence, the 1920 LDS edition removed the relative pronoun *who* (originally *which*) from the LDS text. The expression “there was (not) something <past-tense verb form>” occurs fairly often in the original text, although in today’s American English the preferred form has a relative pronoun, such as “there was (not) something **which** <past-tense verb form>” (see the discussion under Enos 1:23). British English still retains the usage without the relative pronoun. Interestingly, LDS apostle James E. Talmage played a significant role in the editing for the 1920 edition; for instance, the committee copy (which lists the textual changes, mostly grammatical, for that edition) was kept in his possession after 1920. Talmage was born in Britain and immigrated to the United States as a teenager. The removal in the 1920 edition of the relative pronoun here in Alma 16:8 was intentional since its deletion was marked in the committee copy for that edition.

The motivation for the 1920 LDS change was to avoid the nonsensical interpretation of this passage as ‘not one of the lost were captives’; the correct meaning, of course, is ‘not one of the captives were lost’. For modern English readers, the text would read much more clearly if the past participial phrases *lost* and *taken captive* switched places:

Alma 16:8 (possible switching of past participial phrases)

and there was not one soul of them  
which had been taken captive  
that were lost

We find, for instance, the following example in support of this syntax:

Alma 24:6

now there was not one soul among all the people  
which had been converted unto the Lord  
that would take up arms against their brethren

It is theoretically possible in Alma 16:8 that during the early transmission of the text the two participial phrases *lost* and *taken captive* accidentally switched places. But there is very little, if any, evidence in the history of the text for such phrase switching.

Another possibility is that the order of the two relative clauses here in Alma 16:8 was switched during the early transmission of the text; that is, the original text read as follows:

Alma 16:8 (possible switching of the relative clauses)

and there was not one soul of them  
that were taken captive  
which had been lost

Of course, there is also the possibility that the *which* was accidentally inserted during the early transmission of the text. In such a case, the 1920 emendation restored the original text for this passage.



Finally, there is the possibility that the earliest text in Alma 16:8 is the textually correct reading, despite the difficulty it causes for the reader. Under this assumption, the logically more general relative clause “that were taken captive” is interpreted as having been postponed to the end of the sentence. English permits the displacement of restrictive relative clauses to the end of the clause, as in Alma 12:24: “there was a space granted unto man in which he might repent”, instead of something like “there was a space in which man might repent (that was) granted unto him”. For some examples of relative clause postponing in English, see the discussion under “postposing of relative clause” on page 1066 of Rodney Huddleston and Geoffrey K. Pullum, *The Cambridge Grammar of the English Language* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002). Here in Alma 16:8, the postponing of the more general relative clause (“that were taken captive”) after the more specific one (“which had been lost”) creates a difficult reading, but one that appears to have been intended. One way to deal with this difficult reading would be to place a comma before the postponed relative clause, which is precisely how this passage was originally set by the 1830 compositor: “and there was not one soul of them which had been lost, that was taken captive.” This comma was removed in the editing for the 1920 LDS edition, along with the relative pronoun *who* (originally *which*).

**Summary:** Restore the subject relative pronoun *which* in Alma 16:8: “and there was not one soul of them **which** had been lost / that were taken captive”; in order to facilitate this reading in the standard LDS text, the comma between the two relative clauses should also be restored.

#### ■ Alma 16:8

*and they were brought by their brethren to possess  
their own [lands 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST | land HK]*

For this passage, the first two RLDS editions (1874 and 1892) have “their own **land**” rather than the original “their own **lands**”. This change appears to be accidental since elsewhere in the text we have examples of both the plural “their own lands” (nine more times) and the singular “their own land” (five times), yet each of these other instances have remained invariant in number throughout the textual history. The 1908 RLDS edition restored the original plural *lands* here in Alma 16:8.

**Summary:** Retain in Alma 16:8 the perfectly acceptable plural *lands* in “to possess their own lands”, the earliest reading.

#### ■ Alma 16:10

*but behold in one day **it** was left desolate  
and [their 1A | the BCFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] carcasses were mangled  
by dogs and by wild beasts of the wilderness*

Here the 1837 edition replaced *their* with *the*. This change was not marked by Joseph Smith in his editing of the printer’s manuscript for the 1837 edition. It is possible that the use of the pronoun *it* for the city of Ammonihah (“in one day **it** was left desolate”) seemed to clash with the use of the plural *their*, although in reality there is no difficulty at all in interpreting this pronominal form since *their* and *they* are used in the immediately preceding verse:

Alma 16:9

and the people of Ammonihah were destroyed  
 yea every living soul of the Ammonihahites were destroyed  
 and also **their** great city  
 which **they** said God could not destroy because of its greatness

The 1837 replacement of *their* with *the* was most probably a typo. The use of *their* adds cohesion to the narrative and will be restored in the critical text.

**Summary:** Restore in Alma 16:10 the possessive pronoun *their* in “their carcasses were mangled”, the original reading.

#### ■ Alma 16:10

*and their carcasses were mangled by dogs*  
*and [by 1 | ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] wild beasts of the wilderness*

The 1830 edition accidentally omitted the repeated preposition *by* in this passage. Such prepositional repetition is characteristic of the Book of Mormon text and will be restored whenever the earliest textual sources support the repetition. For further discussion of the repetition of the preposition *by*, see under Alma 2:38. For a general discussion, see under CONJUNCTIVE REPETITION in volume 3.

**Summary:** Restore the repeated *by* in Alma 16:10: “their carcasses were mangled by dogs and **by** wild beasts of the wilderness”.

#### ■ Alma 16:11

*nevertheless after many **days** their dead bodies were heaped up upon the face of the earth*  
*and they were covered with a shallow covering*  
*and now so great was the scent thereof*  
*that the people did not go in to possess the land of Ammonihah*  
*for many [days > years 1 | years ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]*

Here Oliver Cowdery initially wrote “for many days” in  $\mathcal{P}$ . As David Calabro points out (personal communication), Oliver was probably influenced by the use of *days* at the beginning of this verse: “after many **days** their dead bodies were heaped up upon the face of the earth”. Almost immediately Oliver crossed out the second *days* and supralinearly inserted *years* (there is no change in the level of ink flow). Either reading is theoretically possible. Elsewhere in the text, there are five occurrences of “for many days” and four more of “for many years”. We get similar variety with the expanded phrases “for the space of many days” and “for the space of many years” (with 11 and 8 occurrences respectively). There doesn’t seem to be any strong motivation for Oliver to have emended *days* to *years* here except that  $\mathcal{O}$  read that way. The city of Ammonihah was rebuilt some years later (Alma 49:3), over eight years later according to the chronology specified in the text (compare Alma 16:1 with Alma 49:1). Thus *years* is fully appropriate here in Alma 16:11,

although *days* would not be impossible. The critical text will assume that the original manuscript read *years*.

**Summary:** Accept Oliver Cowdery’s corrected reading in  $\varnothing$ , “for many **years**”, rather than what he initially wrote, “for many **days**”.

#### ■ Alma 16:11

*and now so great was the scent thereof  
that the people did not go in to possess the land of Ammonihah for many years  
and it was called **Desolation of Nehors**  
for they were of the profession of Nehor which were slain  
and their lands remained desolate*

The noun phrase “Desolation of Nehors” is unusual for English. First of all, the unusual plural *Nehors*, it would appear, is used to refer to the followers of Nehor (the expected form *Nehorites* never occurs in the Book of Mormon text). Elsewhere, the same plural *Nehors* is found in the expression “the order of the Nehors”:

Alma 21:4	for they had built synagogues after <b>the order of the Nehors</b>
Alma 21:4	for many of the Amlicites and the Amulonites were after <b>the order of the Nehors</b>
Alma 24:28	the greatest number of whom were after <b>the order of the Nehors</b>

Given “the order of the Nehors”, the noun phrase “Desolation of Nehors” in Alma 16:11 could be interpreted to mean ‘Desolation of **the** Nehors’, especially since the following pronouns *they* and *their* seem to refer to *Nehors* as their antecedent: “for **they** were of the profession of Nehor which were slain and **their** lands remained desolate”.

A less likely possibility is to interpret *Nehors* as the singular possessive form *Nehor’s*, so that *Nehors* really refers to Nehor the person rather than to the Nehors, his followers. It is even possible that “Desolation of **Nehor’s**” could be an error for “Desolation of **Nehor**”, especially since “the X of **Nehor**” occurs rather frequently in the text:

“the hand of Nehor”	Alma 2:20, Alma 6:7
“the order and faith of Nehor”	Alma 14:16
“the profession of Nehor”	Alma 14:18, Alma 15:15, Alma 16:11
“the order of Nehor”	Alma 24:29

It should be noted that in the manuscripts Oliver Cowdery often added a possessive *s* to the name in constructions involving the preposition *of*, thus creating a double genitive (like the modern English example “this book of John’s”). There are also actual cases of the double genitive in the earliest text of the Book of Mormon. In all these cases of possessive *s*, none were originally written with an apostrophe in the manuscripts. See under Alma 46:24 for a complete discussion of the manuscript evidence for double genitives. Yet here in Alma 16:11, the following *they* and *their* strongly imply that *Nehors* is intended as a plural rather than as the possessive *Nehor’s*.

Another question to consider is whether the phrase “Desolation of Nehors” shouldn’t have the definite article *the* before *Desolation*. In fact, “**the** Desolation of Nehors” is what we expect in modern English. However, other Book of Mormon usage shows that *a* and *the* do not necessarily occur before a noun Y in the expression “X is called Y”, as in Mosiah 28:16: “whosoever has the things is called **seer**”. For further discussion of this kind of usage in the Book of Mormon text, see under Alma 11:42.

One also wonders here if the definite article might be missing from before *Nehors*; that is, perhaps the text should read “Desolation of **the** Nehors” (given that *Nehors* is a plural noun referring to the followers of Nehor). Unfortunately, there are no other occurrences of “Desolation of (the) Nehors” in the text, but there are three instances of “after the order of **the** Nehors” (as noted above). We do not have the original manuscript for Alma 16:11, so we cannot be sure whether the definite article *the* before *Nehors* was accidentally omitted in the early transmission of the text, perhaps under the influence of “the profession of Nehor” in the following clause. The best solution, given the paucity of the evidence, is to follow the earliest reading here in Alma 16:11—namely, “Desolation of Nehors”.

**Summary:** Although several possible emendations suggest themselves here in Alma 16:11, the critical text will maintain the earliest reading, “Desolation of Nehors” (that is, without the definite article *the* before *Desolation* or *Nehors*); the plural *Nehors* should not be reinterpreted as the possessive *Nehor’s* or emended to *Nehor*.

### ■ Alma 16:13

*and Alma and Amulek went forth preaching repentance  
[unto 1A | to BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] the people  
in their temples and in their sanctuaries and also in their synagogues*

Here the 1837 edition accidentally changed the preposition from *unto* to *to*. Elsewhere in the Book of Mormon text we have six occurrences of “to preach repentance **unto** someone”, but none of “to preach repentance **to** someone”:

Mosiah 18:7	and he did teach them and did preach <b>unto</b> them repentance
Mosiah 25:15	preaching <b>unto</b> the people repentance and faith on the Lord
Alma 13:18	but Melchizedek . . . did preach repentance <b>unto</b> his people
Alma 37:33	preach <b>unto</b> them repentance and faith on the Lord Jesus Christ
Helaman 13:2	he did preach many days repentance <b>unto</b> the people
3 Nephi 7:23	and he did preach <b>unto</b> them repentance and remission of sins

The preferred preposition in this construction is definitely *unto*. The critical text will restore the original preposition *unto* here in Alma 16:13.

**Summary:** Restore in Alma 16:13 the original preposition *unto* in “preaching repentance **unto** the people”; elsewhere the text consistently has the preposition *unto* in the construction “to preach repentance **unto** someone”.

## ■ Alma 16:14

*and as many as would hear their words  
unto them they did impart the word of God  
without any [respects >js respect 1 | respects A | respect BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] of persons  
continually*

As discussed under Alma 1:30, there is some minor evidence in the history of the English language in support of the plural *respects*. The critical text will maintain the earliest reading here in Alma 16:14, “without any **respects** of persons”.

## ■ Alma 16:16

*and there was no [unequality 1 | inequality ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] among them*

As discussed under Mosiah 29:32, the original text prefers the nonstandard *unequality* rather than the standard *inequality*. In the discussion there, I also argue that *unequality* (that is, *inequality*) in Alma 16:16 and elsewhere is not an error for *iniquity*.

## ■ Alma 16:16

*and there was no inequality among them  
[for 1APS | BCDEFGHIJKLMNOQRT] the Lord did pour out his Spirit on all the face of the land  
[for >js NULL 1 | for A | BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] to prepare the minds of the children of men  
or to prepare their hearts to receive the word  
which should be taught among them at the time of his coming*

The 1837 edition deleted both *for*’s in this passage, the first one by mistake. The second of these deletions was marked by Joseph Smith in the printer’s manuscript and was motivated by the desire to remove the nonstandard use of *for to* from the text (see the discussion under Mosiah 13:25 and, more generally, under FOR TO in volume 3). Here in Alma 16:16, the 1837 typesetter apparently let his eye stray down from the first *for* to the second one—that is, to the *for* in *for to* that would have been crossed out in his copytext, a copy of the 1830 edition:

Alma 16:16 (proposed 1837 editing of the 1830 edition, page 268, lines 11–12)

And there was no inequality among them, **for** the Lord did  
pour out his spirit on all the face of the land, ~~for to~~ prepare

Thus the 1837 typesetter ended up accidentally omitting the preceding *for* as well. There was clearly no motivation for deleting the first *for*. The following clause is used to explain why there was no inequality among the people: namely, the Lord’s Spirit was upon “all the face of the land”. Obviously, there is nothing syntactically inappropriate about the first *for*. The same precise usage can be found elsewhere in the text, as in the following cases of “for the Lord did <do something>”:

Helaman 6:10      for the Lord did bring Muloch into the land north  
4 Nephi 1:18      for the Lord did bless them in all their doings

**Summary:** Restore the conjunction *for* near the beginning of Alma 16:16: “**for** the Lord did pour out his Spirit on all the face of the land”; also restore the original use of *for to* in “for to prepare the minds of the children of men”.

## ■ Alma 16:17

*that they might not be* [*unbelievers* >% *unbelieving* 1 | *unbelieving* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]

Here Oliver Cowdery initially wrote *unbelievers* in  $\mathcal{P}$  but then immediately corrected the word to *unbelieving*; he actually aborted the final *s* of *unbelievers*, erased it, then overwrote the final *ers* with *ing*. The Book of Mormon has six occurrences of the noun *unbeliever(s)* and four of the adjectival *unbelieving*, so either reading is theoretically possible here in Alma 16:17. There is no doubt that  $\mathcal{C}$  read *unbelieving* since there would have been no motivation for Oliver to have emended the text here.

**Summary:** Accept in Alma 16:17 Oliver Cowdery’s immediate correction, “that they might not be **unbelieving**”.

## ■ Alma 16:18

*now those priests which did go forth among the people  
did preach against all* [*lieings* 1 | *lyings* ABCDEFGIJKLMNOPQRST | *lying* HK]  
*and deceivings and envyings and strifes and malice  
and* [*revilings* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST | *revelings* K]

Here we have two minor errors in the early RLDS text: (1) *lyings* to *lying* in the 1874 edition (and copied as such into the following 1892 edition), and (2) *revilings* to *revelings* in the 1892 edition. In the 1908 RLDS edition, the correct readings were restored to the RLDS text. The discussion under Alma 12:1 and 12:3 shows that for each case of *lying(s)* and *deceiving(s)*, the critical text will accept the number of the earliest textual source, thus “against all *lyings* and *deceivings*” here in Alma 16:18. Of course, this entire passage contains plural forms except for one word that can occur only in the singular (namely, *malice*). For other examples in this chapter where the 1874 RLDS edition replaced plurals with singulars, see under verses 19 and 21.

As far as *revilings* is concerned, the preceding conjoined nouns all deal with mistreating others. The 1892 *revelings* is, of course, inappropriate here. Moreover, there are no examples of the verb *revel* in the Book of Mormon. On the other hand, *revile* is fairly frequent in the text; there is, in fact, one other example of the plural *revilings*: “fear ye not the reproach of men neither be ye afraid of their **revilings**” (2 Nephi 8:7, quoting Isaiah 51:7).

**Summary:** Maintain in Alma 16:18 the original plural form *lyings* and the nominalized verbal noun *revilings*.

## ■ Alma 16:19

*holding forth things which must shortly come  
yea holding forth the coming of the Son of God  
his* [*sufferings* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST | *suffering* HK] *and death  
and the resurrection of the dead*

The 1874 RLDS edition changed the plural *sufferings* to the singular *suffering*, perhaps under the influence of the following singular nouns, *death* and *resurrection*. The 1908 RLDS edition restored

the original plural *sufferings*. In modern English, the singular *suffering* is expected, as in the phrase “Christ’s suffering and death”. Interestingly, the Book of Mormon consistently prefers the plural *sufferings* when it is conjoined with *death*; all the occurrences refer to Christ:

Mosiah 18:2	the power and <b>sufferings</b> and death of Christ
Alma 16:19	his <b>sufferings</b> and death
Alma 21:9	the death and <b>sufferings</b> of Christ
Alma 22:14	the <b>sufferings</b> and death of Christ
3 Nephi 6:20	his death and <b>sufferings</b>
Moroni 9:25	his <b>sufferings</b> and death

In two of these cases (Alma 22:14 and Moroni 9:25), as Oliver Cowdery was copying from  $\mathfrak{C}$  into  $\mathfrak{D}$ , he initially wrote the plural *sufferings* as the singular *suffering*, but in both instances he corrected the singular to the plural. Thus there has been some tendency in the history of the text to replace the unexpected plural *sufferings* with the singular *suffering*. The critical text will, of course, retain the consistently used plural *sufferings* when it is conjoined with the noun *death*.

**Summary:** Retain in Alma 16:19 the plural *sufferings* (and elsewhere in the text when *sufferings* is conjoined with the noun *death*).

#### ■ Alma 16:19

*yea holding forth the coming of the Son of God*

*his sufferings and death and [ 1 | also ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST ] the resurrection of the dead*

Here the 1830 edition added the word *also* before the last conjoined noun phrase (“the resurrection of the dead”). This addition was unnecessary. Perhaps the 1830 typesetter wanted to separate off “the resurrection of the dead” from the previous reference to the sufferings and death of the Son of God. Still, Christ himself was the first one resurrected. We find a similar instance where *sufferings*, *death*, and *resurrection* are all conjoined, and as here in Alma 16:19 there is no *also* associated with the noun *resurrection*:

Mosiah 18:2  
 yea concerning that which was to come  
 and also concerning the resurrection of the dead  
 and the redemption of the people which was to be brought to pass  
 through the power and **sufferings** and **death** of Christ  
 and his **resurrection** and ascension into heaven

The critical text will restore the earliest reading here in Alma 16:19, which lacks the *also* before *resurrection*.

**Summary:** Remove the intrusive *also* that the 1830 typesetter added before “the resurrection of the dead” in Alma 16:19.

## ■ Alma 16:21

*and now after the church [having 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPS | had RT] been established  
throughout all the land*

**having** got the victory over the devil

*and the word of God being preached in its purity in all the land*

*and the Lord pouring out his blessings upon the people*

[& >]s NULL 1 | *and A | BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST* thus ended the fourteenth year  
of the reign of the judges over the people of Nephi

Here the original text has an initial present participial clause which is completed by a main clause that is preceded by a Hebrew-like use of *and*: “and now after the church **having** been established throughout all the land . . . **and** thus ended the fourteenth year of the reign of the judges”. In his editing for the 1837 edition, Joseph Smith removed the extra *and*. Joseph typically removed such Hebraistic *and*’s between subordinate and main clauses, but the critical text will restore them. For further discussion of this kind of editing, see under Alma 2:30 and Alma 9:1.

In the 1920 LDS edition, the present participial *having* was replaced with the finite verb form *had*. One could argue that the initial *having* here in Alma 16:21 was an error in anticipation of the *having* in the following present participial clause, “having got the victory over the devil”. Despite this possibility, there are other instances in the original text of stranded present participial clauses, some of which have been edited to finite clauses; here are some other examples where *having* has been edited to *have* or *had*:

Mosiah 10:7 (Joseph Smith’s 1837 editing)

but [*I having* >]s *I had* 1 | [*I having* A | *I had* BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]  
sent my spies out round about the land of Shemlon  
that I might discover their preparations

Alma 13:4 (Joseph Smith’s 1837 editing)

and thus they [*having* >]s *havi* 1 | [*having* A | *have* BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]  
been called to this holy calling on account of their faith  
while others would reject the Spirit of God  
on account of the hardness of their hearts and blindness of their minds

Mormon 1:7 (1920 LDS editing)

the whole face of the land [*having* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPS | *had* RT]  
become covered with buildings  
and the people were as numerous almost as it were the sand of the sea

In each of these cases, as well as here in Alma 16:21, the critical text will restore the original present participial *having*, despite its difficulty for modern readers.

**Summary:** Restore in Alma 16:21 the first present participial *having* as well as the Hebraistic use of *and*: “and now after the church **having** been established throughout all the land . . . **and** thus ended the fourteenth year of the reign of the judges”; such usage can be found elsewhere in the original Book of Mormon text.



## ■ Alma 16:21

*and the Lord pouring out his [blessings 1ABCDEFGHIJLMNOPQRST | blessing HK]  
upon the people*

Here the 1874 RLDS edition once more replaced a plural noun with its singular (see the nearby examples in verses 18 and 19). As with these other examples, the 1908 RLDS edition restored the correct plural to the RLDS text. Here in verse 21, either the singular *blessing* or the plural *blessings* will work, at least in theory. But in other places in the text where there is a reference to the Lord pouring out a blessing or blessings, the Book of Mormon text favors the plural *blessings* when referring to unspecified blessings (as here in Alma 16:21):

Helaman 3:25

and so great was the prosperity of the church  
and so many **the blessings which were poured out** upon the people  
that even the high priests and the teachers were themselves astonished  
beyond measure

3 Nephi 10:18

and also they which had been called Lamanites which had been spared  
did have great favors shewn unto them  
and **great blessings poured out** upon their heads

Ether 9:20

and thus the Lord **did pour out his blessings** upon this land  
which was choice above all other lands

Only when the blessing is specific do we get the singular *blessing* with the verb *pour*:

3 Nephi 20:27 (referring to the Abrahamic blessing, as cited in Acts 3:25)

and after that ye were blessed then fulfilleth the Father the covenant  
which he made with Abraham saying  
in thy seed shall all the kindreds of the earth be blessed  
unto **the pouring out of the Holy Ghost** through me upon the Gentiles  
**which blessing** upon the Gentiles shall make them mighty above all

3 Nephi 24:10 (referring to the giving of tithes, citing Malachi 3:10)

bring ye all the tithes into the storehouse  
that there may be meat in my house  
and prove me now herewith saith the Lord of Hosts  
if I will not open you the windows of heaven  
and **pour you out a blessing**  
that there shall not be room enough to receive it

**Summary:** Retain the plural *blessings* in Alma 16:21; when referring to the pouring out of unspecified blessings, the Book of Mormon uses only the plural *blessings*.

# Alma 17

## ■ Alma 17:1–2

*behold to his astonishment  
he met [ 1PS | with ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQR ] the sons of Mosiah a journeying  
towards the land of Zarahemla  
now these sons of Mosiah were with Alma  
at the time the angel first appeared unto him*

Here the 1830 compositor accidentally added the preposition *with*. This extra *with* was probably the result of the compositor’s eye straying down from the words *Sons of Mosiah* in one line of  $\mathcal{P}$  to the same *Sons of Mosiah* in the following line, where there was an occurrence of *with*:

Alma 17:1–2 (printer’s manuscript, page 210, lines 24–25)

he met the Sons of Mosiah a journeying towards the land of Zarahemla  
at the time  
now these Sons of Mosiah were with Alma <wh^en> the Angel first appeared unto

The *with* was then accidentally copied into the previous clause as the 1830 compositor set the type, thus creating a unique expression for the Book of Mormon: “he met **with** the sons of Mosiah”. Nowhere else in the Book of Mormon do we have the expression “to meet **with** someone”. Instead, we have 51 occurrences of “to meet someone”, including originally here in Alma 17:1. There is one example of “to meet with”, but only in the idiomatic “he met with a disappointment” (in Alma 51:31), which does not involve meeting people. Finally, there are two references in the text to this same meeting of Alma and the sons of Mosiah, and in both these cases the *with* is lacking:

Alma 27:16  
and it came to pass that as Ammon was going forth into the land  
that he and his brethren **met Alma** over in the place of which has been spoken

Alma 27:19  
now the joy of Alma in **meeting his brethren** was truly great

The 1908 RLDS edition removed the extra *with* here in Alma 17:1, as will the critical text.

**Summary:** Remove in Alma 17:1 the intrusive *with* that the 1830 typesetter added to the clause “he met the sons of Mosiah”.

## ■ Alma 17:2

*now these sons of Mosiah were with Alma*

[*when* > *at the time* 1 | *at the time* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *the angel first appeared unto him*

Here in the printer's manuscript, Oliver Cowdery initially wrote "these sons of Mosiah were with Alma **when** the angel first appeared unto him". Almost immediately Oliver corrected  $\mathcal{P}$  to read "**at the time** the angel first appeared unto him"; the ink flow for his supralinearly inserted *at the time* is unchanged. Either reading is, of course, possible, so there was no motivation for Oliver to have made this change except that  $\mathcal{C}$  read that way. Typically, the text uses *when* in this context, but there are 11 other examples of *at the time* that are equivalent to the subordinate conjunction *when*, including the following one that also refers to when the angel first appeared to Alma and the sons of Mosiah:

Mosiah 27:32

and now it came to pass that

Alma began from this time forward to teach the people

and those which were with Alma **at the time** the angel appeared unto them

The critical text will therefore accept in Alma 17:2 the corrected reading in  $\mathcal{P}$ , "these sons of Mosiah were with Alma **at the time** the angel first appeared unto him".

**Summary:** Maintain in Alma 17:2 the corrected reading in  $\mathcal{P}$  that uses *at the time* as an equivalent for *when*.

## ■ Alma 17:2

*yea and they had waxed strong*

*in the knowledge of [the 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST | D] truth*

Here the 1841 British edition omitted the definite article *the* before *truth*. Although "the knowledge of truth" is theoretically possible, the Book of Mormon text has only "the knowledge of **the** truth" (15 times), including these two other examples in this same chapter of Alma:

Alma 17:4

having had much success in bringing many to the knowledge of **the** truth

Alma 17:9

to bring if it were possible their brethren the Lamanites

to the knowledge of **the** truth

Here in Alma 17:2, the immediately following LDS edition (1849) restored the definite article *the*.

**Summary:** Maintain in Alma 17:2 the expected *the* before *truth* in "the knowledge of **the** truth".

## ■ Alma 17:3

*and when they taught*

*they taught with*

[ 1 ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST | *the* HK ] **power and authority**

□ *even as with* **the power and authority**

IAPS

□ NULL

BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRT

*of God*

The 1837 edition omitted the phrase “even as with the power and authority”, probably because the typesetter’s eye skipped from the first instance of *power and authority* to the second one. It is also possible that the omission was intentional (especially given the near redundancy of the omitted phrase). Yet the deletion was not marked in Ø by Joseph Smith in his editing for the 1837 edition, nor does the resulting “they taught with power and authority of God” sound quite right without the original definite article preceding *power*. In fact, the 1874 RLDS edition made that very change in the text (that is, it supplied the *the* before *power*). There are two other occurrences of “power and authority of God” in the text, and both of these have the definite article before *power*:

Mosiah 18:17      whosoever was baptized by **the** power and authority of God

Mosiah 27:14      to convince thee of **the** power and authority of God

Of course, the original text here in Alma 17:3 did have *the* before *power*, but only before the second *power* (the one followed by the modifying prepositional phrase “of God”). If the original 1837 change were really due to conscious editing, one would think that the definite article before *power* in “the power and authority of God” would have been retained.

In the 1908 RLDS edition, the missing phrase (“even as with the power and authority”) was restored to the text, and the intrusive *the* before the first *power* (the extra *the* introduced in the 1874 RLDS edition) was removed from the RLDS text. The LDS text, on the other hand, has retained the 1837 reading.

One possible reason for consciously omitting the phrase “even as with the power and authority” is the occurrence of the *as*. In current English, the *as* implies a hypothetical aspect, as if the text is saying “even as **if** with the power and authority of God”. Clearly, the sons of Mosiah taught with the power and authority of God. The purpose of the *as* is to indicate that by all appearances their power and authority was from God. Interestingly, there is an example in the text of *as if with* that also has little, if any, hypothetical sense:

Alma 56:56

but behold to my great joy

there had not one soul of them fallen to the earth

yea and they had fought **as if with** the strength of God

yea never was men known to have fought with such miraculous strength

The meaning of “they had fought **as if with** the strength of God” seems to be ‘they fought by all appearances with the strength of God’. The critical text will therefore restore the original reading in Alma 17:3 (“even **as** with the power and authority of God”). Despite the unexpectedness of the *as* in Alma 17:3, its original use here appears to be intentional.

*Summary:* Restore in Alma 17:3 the phrase “even as with the power and authority”, thus maintaining the earliest reading: “and when they taught / they taught with power and authority even as with the power and authority of God”; the use of *as* in the final phrase appears to mean ‘by all appearances’.

■ **Alma 17:5**

*they did suffer much*

[NULL > *both* 1 | *both* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *in body and in mind*

Oliver Cowdery initially wrote simply “in body and in mind”; then he supralinearly inserted *both* before this conjunctive expression. The level of ink flow is the same, so the change appears to be a correction to the reading of the original manuscript (no longer extant here). There is only one other occurrence of *body* conjoined with *mind*, in Mosiah 2:11, and this reads without *both* (as well as without the repeated *in*): “subject to all manner of infirmities **in body and mind**”. The infrequency of the combination of *body* and *mind* argues that in Alma 17:5 there would have been very little, if any, motivation for Oliver to have consciously emended “in body and in mind” to “**both** in body and in mind”.

There are 13 occurrences in the text of “both in X and in Y”, of which 12 form a contrastive pair; we have five basic types:

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| (1) both in word and in deed                 | 2 Nephi 3:24                                  |
| (2) both in the east and in the west         | 2 Nephi 29:11                                 |
| both in the land south and in the land north | Helaman 6:9                                   |
| both in the north and in the south           | Helaman 6:12 (twice)                          |
| both in the land north and in the land south | 3 Nephi 1:17                                  |
| (3) both in heaven and in earth              | Jacob 7:14, Mosiah 4:9 (twice),<br>Alma 22:10 |
| (4) both in body and in mind                 | Alma 17:5                                     |
| (5) both in their front and in their rear    | 3 Nephi 4:25                                  |

There is a sixth type of “both in X and (in) Y” but without the repeated preposition:

- |                                |             |
|--------------------------------|-------------|
| (6) both in towns and villages | Mormon 4:22 |
|--------------------------------|-------------|

There is only one example of “both in X and in Y” that does not form a contrastive pair: “both in buildings and in gold and in silver and in raising grain and in flocks and herds and such things which had been restored unto them” (Ether 10:12). In any event, the use of *both* in Alma 17:5 is consistent with usage elsewhere in the text.

*Summary:* Accept Oliver Cowdery’s virtually immediate insertion of *both* in Alma 17:5 since this pre-determiner very probably represents the reading of the original manuscript.

## ■ Alma 17:6

*having taken leave of their father Mosiah*

*in the first year [of the reign 1ABCDGHKPS | EFIJLMNOQRT] of the judges*

Here the 1849 LDS edition accidentally omitted “of the reign”, thus showing that there might be some textual difficulty with retaining the long expression “in the Xth year of the reign of the judges”. In this case, the missing phrase “of the reign” has never been restored to the LDS text. Elsewhere the text definitely prefers the whole phrase “in the Xth year of the reign of the judges”, but there are two instances where the earliest extant text lacks the phrase “of the reign”. One is nearby in Alma 16:9: “and thus ended the eleventh year of the judges” (the reading in  $\mathcal{P}$  rather than  $\mathcal{O}$ , which is not extant here). The other is in Alma 54:1; based on the extant portions of the manuscript there,  $\mathcal{O}$  must have at least read “in the commencement of the twenty and ninth year of the judges”. If  $\mathcal{O}$  originally had the phrase “of the reign” in Alma 54:1, it must have been supralinearly inserted at the end of a line. Unfortunately, that particular part of  $\mathcal{O}$  is not extant. Here in Alma 17:6, we have clear evidence of the tendency to omit the phrase “of the reign”. For another example of this problem with “of the reign”, see the discussion under Alma 4:20. For a complete discussion, see under Alma 54:1. The critical text will restore here in Alma 17:6 this instance of the phrase “of the reign”.

**Summary:** Restore the phrase “of the reign” in Alma 17:6, the reading of the printer’s manuscript (the earliest extant text here).

## ■ Alma 17:6

*and also this was*

*the [minds >]s mind 1 | minds ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRT | mind PS] of the people*

In the printer’s manuscript, Joseph Smith deleted the plural *s* in *minds* in his editing for the 1837 edition, but this change was not implemented in that edition. The 1908 RLDS edition, however, adopted the change to the singular *mind* since it had been marked in  $\mathcal{P}$ . With regard to the 1837 edition itself, perhaps Joseph changed his mind and decided to leave the plural *minds*. Elsewhere the text consistently refers to “the minds of the people”, never to “the mind of the people”:

Jarom 1:3

behold it is expedient that much should be done among this **people**  
because of the hardness of their hearts and the deafness of their ears  
and the blindness of their **minds** and the stiffness of their necks

Alma 11:4

but they altered their reckoning and their measure  
according to the **minds** and the circumstances of the **people**  
in every generation

Alma 14:6

and he also knew concerning the blindness of the **minds**  
which he had caused among the **people** by his lying words

Alma 31:5

yea it had had more powerful effect upon the **minds** of the **people**

Alma 35:5–6 (two times)

therefore they found out privily the **minds** of all the **people**  
and it came to pass that after they had found out the **minds** of all the **people** . . .

Alma 39:16

this was the ministry unto which ye were called  
to declare these glad tidings unto this **people** to prepare their **minds** . . .

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

3 Nephi 2:1

and the **people** began to forget those signs and wonders . . .  
insomuch that they began to be hard in their hearts and blind in their **minds**

Ether 15:19

and Satan had full power over the hearts of the **people**  
for they were given up unto the hardness of their hearts  
and the blindness of their **minds**  
that they might be destroyed

In none of these other examples did Joseph ever emend *minds* to *mind*. One possible motivation for the singular *mind* in Alma 17:6 could have been the preceding singular subject and verb forms, *this* and *was* (“and also **this was** the minds of the people”). In other words, perhaps Joseph initially emended *minds* to *mind* in Alma 17:6 in order to avoid the clash in number between *this was* and *minds*. In any event, the critical text will maintain in Alma 17:6 the use of the plural *minds*, the earliest reading; such plural usage is found consistently elsewhere in the Book of Mormon.

*Summary:* Ignore in Alma 17:6 Joseph Smith’s emendation in  $\mathcal{P}$  of the plural *minds* to the singular *mind*; the change was never implemented in the 1837 edition, perhaps because elsewhere the text has references to only “the **minds** of the people”.

■ Alma 17:7–8

*and this they done  
that they might provide food for themselves  
while in **the wilderness***

- *and thus they departed into **the wilderness***                      1A B C E F G H I J K L M N O P Q R S T
- NULL    D

*with their numbers which they had selected*

The copytext for the 1841 British edition was the 1837 Kirtland edition. Here the 1841 compositor accidentally omitted the phrase “and thus they departed into the wilderness”. For this portion of the text, the 1837 edition was set as follows:

Alma 17:7–8 (1837 edition, page 286, lines 13–14)  
selves while in the wilderness: and thus they departed  
into the wilderness, with their numbers which they

The placement in the 1837 edition of the two occurrences of the phrase *the wilderness* thus facilitated this visual skip. The subsequent LDS edition (1849) restored the missing text.

*Summary:* Maintain the phrase “and thus they departed into the wilderness” in Alma 17:8.

### ■ Alma 17:8

*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*

Here in Alma 17:8, Oliver Cowdery added in pencil, not ink, the postmodifying phrase *of God* after “the word”. Evidence suggests that whenever we get a correction in  $\wp$  in pencil, that editing appears to have occurred in the print shop and without reference to the original manuscript (a list of examples is found under Alma 10:28). As discussed under 2 Nephi 4:13–14, the text of the Book of Mormon frequently refers to the word of God or the word of the Lord as simply “the word”. When the verb is *preach* (as here in Alma 17:8), the text is otherwise nearly equally divided between “to preach the word” and “to preach the word of God”, with 17 occurrences of the first and 18 of the second (there are no instances of “to preach the word of the Lord”). And for every one of the other cases of “to preach the word (of God)”, the phrase has been invariant in the history of the text. So one might ask, why was *of God* added here in Alma 17:8? One possibility is that elsewhere in this chapter there are cases of only “the word of God”, never of just “the word”:

Alma 17 preface	which rejected their rights to the kingdom for the word of God
Alma 17:2	that they might know the word of God
Alma 17:4	and they had been teaching the word of God
Alma 17:12	to declare unto them the word of God
Alma 17:14	for they had undertaken to preach the word of God
Alma 17:17	according to the word and power of God
Alma 17:18	having imparted the word of God unto them

And in one of these cases, Oliver omitted the phrase *of God* when he initially wrote the text in  $\wp$ , but virtually immediately he made the correction to “the word of God” by supralinearly inserting *of God* (in this case there is no change in the level of ink flow):

Alma 17:12  
and it came to pass that  
the hearts of the sons of Mosiah and also those which were with them  
took courage to go forth unto the Lamanites to declare unto them  
the word [NULL > of God 1 | of God ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]

The two corrections to “the word of God” (in verses 8 and 12) appear on the same page of  $\wp$  (page 211), where the penciled-in *of God* (for Alma 17:8) is found at the end of line 16 while the virtually immediately corrected *of God* (in Alma 17:12) is found near the middle of line 31. One reasonable hypothesis is that while in the print shop, Oliver noticed on line 31 the correction of



“the word” to “the word of God” and therefore decided that the occurrence of “the word” at the end of line 16 was also an error and should have *of God* added to it as well.

Given the secondary nature of penciled-in corrections in  $\mathcal{P}$  (and  $\mathcal{C}$ , for that matter), the critical text will reject the intrusive *of God* that Oliver Cowdery added to “the word” in Alma 17:8. On the other hand, the virtually immediate correction in Alma 17:12 will be accepted.

**Summary:** Remove *of God* after “the word” in Alma 17:8 since this change appears to be due to Oliver Cowdery’s editing in the print shop; on the other hand, the same correction in Alma 17:12 will be accepted since Oliver made that correction virtually immediately while he was copying from  $\mathcal{C}$  into  $\mathcal{P}$ .

### ■ Alma 17:9

*and it came to pass that  
they journeyed many days in the wilderness  
and they fasted **much***

□ *and prayed **much***

IAPRST

□ NULL

BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQ

*that the Lord would grant unto them  
a portion of his Spirit  
to go with them and abide with them*

Here we have another textual omission resulting from the eye of the typesetter skipping from one word to another. In this instance, the 1837 typesetter allowed his eye to skip from the first *much* to the second one. The 1908 RLDS edition restored the phrase, probably by reference to  $\mathcal{P}$ ; the 1920 LDS edition probably used the 1830 edition in restoring the phrase to the LDS text.

Usually the Book of Mormon text conjoins fasting with praying, especially when individuals are seeking help from the Lord. For a list of examples, see under Omni 1:26. In fact, earlier on in Alma 17 the text specifically refers to the sons of king Mosiah as having “given themselves to much prayer and fasting” (verse 3), so the conjunctive occurrence of “they fasted much and prayed much” in verse 9 is fully expected.

**Summary:** Maintain in Alma 17:9 the conjoined expression “they fasted much and prayed much” (the reading of the earliest textual sources).

### ■ Alma 17:11

*and the Lord said unto them also :  
go forth among the Lamanites thy brethren and establish my word  
yet ye shall be patient in long-suffering and afflictions  
that ye may shew forth good examples  
unto [them in >js NULL 1 | them in ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] me*

In his editing for the 1837 edition, Joseph Smith initially decided to emend the rather awkward “unto them in me” to the simpler “unto me”. Of course, the intended meaning here is that these missionaries’ examples of godlike behavior (“good examples in me”) will be shown to the Lamanites.

Ultimately, this emendation was ignored in the actual 1837 edition, probably because Joseph himself decided that the emendation would inappropriately change the meaning.

Basically, what we have here in Alma 17:11 is a case of a displaced prepositional phrase. If we shift the placement of the prepositional phrase *unto them*, the intended meaning becomes more obvious; there are two possibilities:

- (1) that ye may shew forth **unto them** good examples in me
- (2) that ye may shew forth good examples in me **unto them**

The original text, however, allows prepositional phrases to be placed in unexpected positions. For some examples, see under 2 Nephi 25:6; for a general discussion, see under **DISPLACED PREPOSITIONAL PHRASES** in volume 3. The critical text will maintain the original word order here in Alma 17:11 (“that ye may shew forth good examples unto them in me”).

*Summary:* Retain in Alma 17:11 the original reading with its difficult placement of the prepositional phrase *unto them* (“that ye may shew forth good examples **unto them** in me”).

#### ■ Alma 17:12

*and it came to pass that the hearts of the sons of Mosiah  
and also those which were with them  
took courage to go forth unto the Lamanites  
to declare unto them the word [NULL > of God 1 | of God ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]*

Here the inserted *of God* in  $\wp$  represents a virtually immediate correction based on  $\wp$ , unlike the conscious emendation earlier in Alma 17:8. As discussed there, the critical text will accept the corrected reading “the word of God” here in verse 12.

#### ■ Alma 17:13

*they separated themselves and departed one from another  
trusting in the Lord that they should meet again at the close of their harvest  
for they [supposed 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST | suppose H] that great was the work  
which they had undertaken*

The 1874 RLDS edition accidentally changed the past-tense *supposed* to the present-tense *suppose*. This obvious typo was corrected in the subsequent RLDS edition (1892), probably without reference to any other edition. The rest of the passage is in the past tense (“separated . . . departed . . . should meet . . . was . . . had undertaken”). For another example where *supposed* was accidentally replaced by *suppose* (in this instance, when Oliver Cowdery originally took down Joseph Smith’s dictated text), see under Alma 56:37.

*Summary:* Maintain in Alma 17:13 the past-tense *supposed*, the reading of all the textual sources except the 1874 RLDS edition.

## ■ 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 this conjunctive expression, the indefinite article *a* is twice repeated (“**a** wild and **a** hardened and **a** ferocious people”). The 1902 LDS missionary edition accidentally omitted the middle *a*. This edition was never used as a copytext, so its reading here was never transmitted into any subsequent LDS edition. Based on usage elsewhere in the text, the repetition of the *a* is expected here in Alma 17:14. For further discussion of this repetition, see under 1 Nephi 12:23 for the conjunctive phrase “a dark and (a) loathsome and a filthy people”. Also see the general discussion under CONJUNCTIVE REPETITION in volume 3.

**Summary:** Maintain in Alma 17:14 the multiply repeated *a* in “**a** wild and **a** hardened and **a** ferocious people”, the reading of the earliest text.

## ■ Alma 17:14

*a people which delighted in  
[the >]s NULL 1 | the A | B CDEFGHIJKLMNQRST ] murdering the Nephites  
and robbing and plundering them*

As discussed under 1 Nephi 17:32, the original text has examples of a mixed gerundive construction. Here in Alma 17:14, the original text has the definite article *the* but not the expected preposition *of* after *murdering*. In his editing for the 1837 edition, Joseph Smith deleted the *the*, thus making “murdering the Nephites” conform to the following conjoined “and robbing and plundering them”. The critical text will restore the original usage despite its difficulty. For a general discussion, see under GERUNDIVES in volume 3.

**Summary:** Restore in Alma 17:14 the definite article *the* in the original mixed gerundive construction “a people which delighted in **the** murdering the Nephites”; this usage, although unexpected in modern English, is found quite frequently in the original Book of Mormon text.

## ■ Alma 17:15

*thus they were a very indolent people  
many of whom did worship idols  
and the curse of God had fell upon them because of the traditions of their fathers  
[NULL >jg ; 1 | ; ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST ]  
notwithstanding  
[NULL >jg , 1 | , ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPS | RT ]  
the promises of the Lord were extended unto them on the conditions of repentance*

Here the 1920 LDS edition removed the comma after *notwithstanding*, thus creating a sentence fragment. It actually turns out that the semicolon preceding *notwithstanding* should be replaced by a comma. In the original text, the word *notwithstanding* consistently acts as a narrative connector

rather than as an adverb. In other words, *notwithstanding* and its complement are always attached to a main clause; *notwithstanding* never acts alone without a complement (even though the original punctuation in Alma 17:15 with the comma after *notwithstanding* implies it could). In the original text, we have the following statistics for each type of complement after *notwithstanding*:

COMPLEMENT TYPE	NUMBER OF OCCURRENCES (AND AN EXAMPLE)
finite clause	12 “notwithstanding they believed in a Great Spirit” (Alma 18:5)
<i>that</i> + finite clause	2 “notwithstanding <b>that</b> they have been carried away” (2 Nephi 25:11)
nonfinite clause	7 “notwithstanding there being many churches” (Mosiah 25:22)
noun phrase	46 “notwithstanding all their persecutions” (Alma 1:28)

For the two cases of “that <finite clause>”, the subordinate conjunction *that* was removed in the editing for the 1837 edition; see the discussion under 2 Nephi 25:11 and 3 Nephi 16:8. Included in the list of noun-phrase complements is one original case of *nevertheless notwithstanding* for which the *notwithstanding* was deleted, again in the editing for the 1837 edition (see under 2 Nephi 4:17).

In all these cases but three, the punctuation for *notwithstanding* has been assigned in the printed editions so that the associated main clause is correctly identified. Besides the need here in Alma 17:15 to replace the semicolon before *notwithstanding* with a comma, there are two additional cases that should be considered; in both cases, there has been some ambiguity as to which main clause, the preceding or the following, should be associated with the *notwithstanding* clause:

Helaman 12:6

behold they do not desire that  
 the Lord their God who hath created them should rule and reign over them  
 [ 1 |, ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQ |; RST]  
 notwithstanding his great goodness and his mercy towards them  
 [ 1 |; ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQS |, RT]  
 they do set at naught his counsels  
 and they will not that he should be their guide

3 Nephi 7:11

nevertheless they were enemies  
 [ 1 |, ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQS |; RT]  
 notwithstanding they were not a righteous people  
 [ 1 |; ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQS |, RT]  
 yet they were united in the hatred of those who had entered into a covenant  
 to destroy the government

In both cases, the 1920 LDS edition changed the punctuation so that the associated main clause would follow rather than precede the *notwithstanding* clause (see under each of these passages for discussion as to which interpretation is correct). For the first example (Helaman 12:6), unlike the result of the LDS editing, the 1953 RLDS edition ended up isolating the *notwithstanding* clause by surrounding it with semicolons. As already noted, *notwithstanding* clauses are never stranded in the Book of Mormon text.

*Summary:* Replace in Alma 17:15 the semicolon before *notwithstanding* with a comma; in the Book of Mormon, each *notwithstanding* followed by a clause acts as a subordinator and is associated with a main clause; given the way that *notwithstanding* generally functions in the text, the only possible main clause in this instance precedes the *notwithstanding* clause.

#### ■ Alma 17:16

*therefore this was the cause for which the sons of Mosiah had undertaken the work  
that perhaps they might bring them unto repentance  
that perhaps they might bring them to know  
[of 1ABCDEFGHIJLMNOPQRST | HK] the plan of redemption*

Here the 1874 RLDS edition accidentally omitted the preposition *of* after the verb *know*. It was restored to the RLDS text in the 1908 RLDS edition. The verb form “to know **of** something” is quite common in the text. Consider, for instance, the following similar examples where *of* could theoretically be omitted:

1 Nephi 2:16	and also having great desires to <b>know of</b> the mysteries of God
Alma 2:21	that he might <b>know of</b> their plans and their plots
Alma 10:17	now they knew not that Amulek could <b>know of</b> their design
3 Nephi 21:6	and <b>know of</b> the true points of my doctrine

There has been some tendency in the textual transmission to omit the *of* from “to know of something” (besides here in Alma 17:16):

Helaman 8:8 (1840 edition)

as he knoweth [*of* 1ABCDEFGHIJLMNOPQRST | CGHK] our iniquities

Helaman 9:41 (Oliver Cowdery, initially in  $\mathcal{D}$ )

he could not know [NULL >- *of* 1 | *of* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] all things

Helaman 15:7 (1874 RLDS edition)

and to know [*of* 1ABCDEFGHIJLMNOPQRST | HK]  
the wicked and abominable traditions of their fathers

3 Nephi 3:4 (Oliver Cowdery, initially in  $\mathcal{D}$ )

and I knowing [NULL >+ *of* 1 | *of* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]  
their unconquerable spirit

On the other hand, there is no evidence for accidentally inserting *of* after the verb *know*. In any event, either reading with or without the *of* is possible in Alma 17:16. The critical text will follow the earliest reading by maintaining the *of* in this passage.

*Summary:* Maintain in Alma 17:16 the *of* in “to know **of** the plan of salvation”, the earliest reading; such usage is found elsewhere in the text.

## ■ Alma 17:18

*now Ammon being the chief among them  
or rather he did administer unto them*

[NULL >p & 1 | *and* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *he departed from them*

Earlier in verse 8 of this chapter, Oliver Cowdery edited the printer's manuscript in pencil, adding *of God* to "the word". He apparently made this change when he was in the print shop and some time after he had copied that part of the text from  $\mathcal{O}$  into  $\mathcal{P}$ . As discussed under Alma 17:8, the inserted *of God* is unnecessary. Similarly, here in verse 18, Oliver once more edited  $\mathcal{P}$  in pencil. In this instance, he inserted an *and* (written as an ampersand) before "he departed from them". He probably made this emendation because of the preceding finite clause ("or rather he did administer unto them"), which he might have interpreted as a main clause. Yet this clause is parenthetical and could be separated from the text by dashes or parentheses; there is therefore no need for inserting any *and* after this finite clause:

Alma 17:18 (original text, with added dashes)

now Ammon being the chief among them  
—or rather he did administer unto them—  
he departed from them

The insertion of the intrusive *and* actually creates a Hebraistic construction, where the *and* separates an initial present participial clause from its following main clause. This kind of non-English construction is found in the original text, as in this example earlier in the book of Alma:

Alma 9:1

And again I Alma having been commanded of God  
that I should take Amulek and go forth and preach again unto this people  
or the people which was in the city of Ammonihah  
[*and* >js NULL 1 | *And* A | BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] it came to pass  
as I began to preach unto them  
they began to contend with me

For other examples of the Hebraistic *and*, see under HEBRAISMS in volume 3. Of course, there are also many instances in the text without any *and* between an initial present participial clause and its following main clause, as in this example which lacks the *and* before the main clause, "it began to be exceeding difficult":

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  
it began to be exceeding difficult  
yea insomuch that we could obtain no food

Thus there is no textual need to insert the *and* in Alma 17:18; the critical text will restore the earlier text that lacks the *and*.

*Summary:* Remove from Alma 17:18 Oliver Cowdery’s intrusive *and* that he added before the finite clause “he departed from them”; although the Hebrew-like use of *and* between subordinate and main clauses is possible in the original text, it is not required.

■ **Alma 17:18**

*now Ammon being the chief among them  
or rather he did [minister > administer >]g minister 1 |  
administer ABCDEFIJLMNOQRT | minister GHKPS] unto them  
he departed from them after having blessed them according to their several stations  
having imparted the word of God unto them  
or **administered** unto them before his departure*

As discussed under Alma 15:18, the Book of Mormon text uses both *administer* and *minister* when referring to people ministering unto others. Here in Alma 17:18, the original text apparently read *administer* in both places, but the first *administer* was replaced by *minister* three different times in the transmission of the text: (1) by Oliver Cowdery when he initially copied the text from  $\mathcal{O}$  into  $\mathcal{P}$ , (2) by John Gilbert (the 1830 compositor) when he edited  $\mathcal{P}$  prior to setting the type for the 1830 edition, and (3) in the 1858 Wright edition. But the original *administer* was restored when Oliver corrected  $\mathcal{P}$  and when John Gilbert set the actual type for the 1830 edition. We do not have the original manuscript here, but Oliver’s correction appears to be virtually immediate (the supralinearly inserted *ad* shows no difference in the overall level of ink flow). It is true that the verb *administer* is used later on in this passage, so one could argue that this later occurrence was the source for the introduction of *administer* earlier in the passage. The virtual immediacy of Oliver’s correction suggests, however, that he did not wait until reading *administered* later in the passage before deciding to restore the earlier *administer*. (On the other hand, the 1830 compositor was probably influenced by the later *administered* when he came to actually typesetting the 1830 edition, thus overriding his earlier decision to replace *administer* with *minister*.) Elsewhere in the text, Oliver himself never edited any instance of *administer* to *minister* or vice versa, even in cases where there was variation within the same passage:

Moroni 4:1–2

The manner of their elders and priests  
**administering** the flesh and blood of Christ unto the church—  
and they **administered** it according to the commandments of Christ  
wherefore we know that the manner to be true—  
the elder or priest did **minister** it  
and they did kneel down with the church  
and pray to the Father in the name of Christ saying . . .

For one other case where Oliver might have mistakenly first written down *minister* instead of *administer*, see the discussion under Alma 22:25 (also see the general discussion under Alma 15:18). The critical text will therefore accept here in Alma 17:18 Oliver’s corrected reading in  $\mathcal{P}$ : “or rather he did **administer** unto them”.

*Summary:* Accept in Alma 17:18 Oliver Cowdery’s corrected reading in  $\mathcal{P}$  (“or rather he did **administer** unto them”) as the probable reading of the original manuscript, no longer extant here.

## ■ Alma 17:22

*and the king inquired of Ammon*  
*if it [were 1ABCDEFHGHIJKLMPQRST | was NO]*  
*his [desires 1A | desire BCDEFHGHIJKLMNQPQRST] to dwell in the land*  
*among the Lamanites or among his people*

The earliest text here reads “if it **were** his **desires** to dwell in the land”. As discussed under Mosiah 18:10 and 18:11, the original text allows the plural *desires* in existential clauses, as in “if this be the **desires** of your hearts” (Mosiah 18:10) and “this is the **desires** of our hearts” (Mosiah 18:11). Here in Alma 17:22, the 1837 edition changed the plural *desires* to the singular *desire* (the same 1837 grammatical change was made in Mosiah 18:10 and 18:11). The critical text will restore the plural *desires* in Alma 17:22.

We also note here that the 1906 LDS large-print edition (and the 1907 LDS vest-pocket edition) replaced the subjunctive *were* with the indicative *was*, perhaps because the subject noun was now the singular *desire*. Subsequent LDS editions have retained the subjunctive *were*, basically because the subjunctive is common in *if*-clauses in the Book of Mormon text (and neither the 1906 nor the 1907 edition served as copytext for any of the later LDS editions). Notice the use of the present-tense subjunctive *be* in Mosiah 18:10: “if this **be** the desires of your hearts”. The critical text will retain the past-tense subjunctive *were* here in Alma 17:22.

**Summary:** Restore the original plural *desires* in Alma 17:22: “if it were his **desires** to dwell in the land”; also maintain the subjunctive use of *were* in this *if*-clause.

## ■ Alma 17:26

*as he was with the Lamanitish servants a going forth with their flocks*  
*to the place of water which was called the **water** of Sebus*

This passage is the only place where we find the singular “the water of Sebus”. Elsewhere we have five occurrences of “the waters of Sebus”—and without variation:

Alma 17:34	those which stood by the waters of Sebus
Alma 18:7	to stand by the waters of Sebus
Alma 19:20	his servants who had had their flocks scattered at the waters of Sebus
Alma 19:21	those men which had stood at the waters of Sebus
Alma 19:21	which he had slain of their brethren at the waters of Sebus

In fact, excluding this one instance of “the water of Sebus” in Alma 17:26, we get only the plural *waters* (38 times) for the general expression “the water(s) of X”, with the following statistics for each type of X:

Mormon	8
Sidon	8
Sebus	5
the Red Sea	4
the great deep	3



Alma 17

the river	2
life	2
Noah	2
Judah	1
Shiloah	1
Ripliancum	1
baptism	1

The probable source for the error in Alma 17:26 is the preceding singular “the place of **water**”. And although the phraseology “the place of water” sounds strange in English, the text is firm in having *water* in the phrase “place of water” rather than *waters* (or *watering*):

Alma 17:26	to the place of water
Alma 17:27	to this place of water
Alma 17:31	unto the place of water
Alma 17:32	to the place of water
Alma 18:6	at the place of water

In the printer’s manuscript, Oliver Cowdery sometimes miswrote *waters* as *water*, at least initially:

Mosiah 18:8	behold here is the [ <i>water</i> > <i>waters</i> 1   <i>waters</i> ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] of Mormon
Alma 43:40	and they were driven by Lehi into the [ <i>water</i> > <i>waters</i> 1   <i>waters</i> ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] of Sidon

The critical text will correct the singular *water* here in Alma 17:26 to the plural *waters*.

**Summary:** Emend Alma 17:26 to read “the waters of Sebus”, in accord with all other examples of “the waters of X” in the text; Oliver Cowdery probably miswrote *waters* as *water* because of the singular *water* in the immediately preceding “place of water”.

■ **Alma 17:26**

*and all the Lamanites drive their flocks hither  
that they [*might* >js *may* 1 | *might* A | *may* BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] have water*

Here in his editing for the 1837 edition, Joseph Smith changed the past-tense modal *might* to the present-tense *may*. The tendency in modern English is to interpret *might* in this kind of sentence as conditional in meaning. The original Book of Mormon text, on the other hand, often uses *might* without such a conditional sense. For discussion, see under Jacob 5:13. As explained there, the critical text will restore original uses of nonconditional *might*.

**Summary:** Restore the use of the historically past-tense modal *might* in Alma 17:26: “that they **might** have water”.

## ■ Alma 17:27

*therefore* [NULL > *as* 1 | *as* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]

*Ammon and the servants of the king were driving forth their flocks to this place of water  
behold a certain number of the Lamanites who had been with their flocks to water  
stood and scattered the flocks of Ammon and the servants of the king*

Here in the printer's manuscript, Oliver Cowdery initially omitted the subordinate conjunction *as*, but almost immediately he supralinearly inserted the *as* (there is no change in the level of ink flow). The original manuscript, not extant here, most probably had the *as*. Elsewhere the original text has at least ten occurrences of *therefore as*, including a nearby one that also has a following *behold*-clause:

Alma 21:5

**therefore as** Aaron entered into one of their synagogues to preach unto the people  
and **as** he was speaking unto them  
**behold** there arose an Amlicite and began to contend with him

For one additional case where the *as* in *therefore as* has been deleted (in this case, when the 1830 compositor set the type), see under Helaman 7:10. Here in Alma 17:27, the critical text will accept the almost immediately corrected reading in  $\mathcal{D}$ : "therefore **as** Ammon and the servants of the king were driving forth their flocks".

**Summary:** Accept Oliver Cowdery's inserted *as* in Alma 17:27; this virtually immediate correction in  $\mathcal{D}$  appears to be based on the reading of  $\mathcal{C}$ , no longer extant here.

## ■ Alma 17:27

*behold a certain number of the Lamanites who had been with their **flocks** to water  
stood and scattered the [flock 1 | flocks ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]  
of Ammon and the servants of the king*

In one place in this verse, the printer's manuscript reads *flock*, in the singular rather than the plural. The 1830 typesetter emended the singular to the plural *flocks*, and this plural reading has continued in all the printed editions. The singular is theoretically possible, but in the Book of Mormon text it is clearly found in only two situations—namely, when referring to a wild flock or to a single flock that an individual shepherd tends:

Mosiah 8:21

yea they are as **a wild flock** which fleeth from the shepherd

Mosiah 17:17

even as **a wild flock** is driven by wild and ferocious beasts

Alma 5:59 (two times)

for what shepherd is there among you having many sheep  
doth not watch over them that the wolves enter not and devour **his flock**  
and behold if a wolf enter **his flock** doth he not drive him out

Everywhere else in the text, we have the plural *flocks* (76 times, excluding the one instance here in Alma 17:27). In fact, there are 29 other references to the flocks of king Lamoni that Alma and the king's servants were tending, as in this sampling:

Alma 17:25	he was set among other servants to watch <b>the flocks</b> of Lamoni
Alma 17:27	Ammon and the servants of the king were driving forth <b>their flocks</b>
Alma 17:29	in restoring <b>these flocks</b> unto the king
Alma 17:33	I go and contend with these men which do scatter <b>our flocks</b>
Alma 18:2	the faithfulness of Ammon in preserving <b>his flocks</b>
Alma 18:16	I defended thy servants and <b>thy flocks</b>
Alma 19:21	and scattered <b>the flocks</b> which belonged to the king

Moreover, there has been a clear tendency in the textual history to replace the plural *flocks* with the singular *flock* (but no evidence for *flock* ever being accidentally replaced by *flocks*):

Alma 17:39 (error in the 1906 LDS edition)

and they watered their [*flocks* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMOPQRST | *flock* N]

Alma 18:3 (error in the 1874 RLDS edition)

neither can they scatter the king's [*flocks* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOQRT | *flock* HKPS]

3 Nephi 20:16 (initial error by scribe 2 of  $\mathcal{P}$ )

as a young lion

among the [*flock* >+ *flocks* 1 | *flocks* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST] of sheep

Thus internal evidence and textual errors strongly suggest that the singular *flock* is an error in Alma 17:27, especially since Alma is working with other shepherds in herding the king's sheep. The critical text will assume that *flocks* is correct, thus accepting the 1830 emendation.

**Summary:** In accord with consistent usage elsewhere in the text, accept in Alma 17:27 the 1830 emendation of *flock* (the reading in  $\mathcal{P}$ ) to *flocks*.

#### ■ Alma 17:29–30

*I will shew forth my power unto these my fellow servants*

*—or the power which is in me—*

*in restoring these flocks unto the king*

*that I may win the hearts of these my fellow servants*

*that I may lead them to believe in my words*

[*now* 1 | *Now* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPS | *And now* RT]

[ 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPS | , RT]

*these were the thoughts of Ammon when he saw the affliction*

*of those which he termed to be his brethren*

At the beginning of verse 30 in this passage, the 1920 LDS edition added an *and* before the *now* that initiates the sentence, yet it was not marked in the 1920 committee copy (a copy of the 1911 LDS edition used to show the editing changes for the 1920 edition). Nonetheless, the addition of the *and* seems to have been a conscious change since a comma was also added after the *now*. There is really no reason to have added the *and* here. There are hundreds of sentences in the text that begin with *and now* as well as hundreds that begin with *now* alone. Moreover, since this sentence in Alma 17:30 refers to what Ammon had been thinking at that moment, the more natural transition is simply *now*.

**Summary:** Remove the extra *and* (as well as the comma after *now*) that was added in the 1920 LDS edition at the beginning of Alma 17:30.

## ■ Alma 17:30

when he saw the [*affliction* 1MOQ | *afflictions* ABCDEFGHIJKLNPRST]  
of those which he termed to be his brethren

The printer's manuscript has the singular *affliction*, which the 1830 typesetter changed to the plural *afflictions*. Since Oliver Cowdery frequently added or dropped plural *s*'s, the singular reading in the printer's manuscript could be a copy error on Oliver's part. Or the 1830 typesetter may have incorrectly added the *s*. Interestingly, the 1905 LDS missionary edition restored the singular *affliction*, but probably unintentionally since *Œ* was not available for that edition.

There are four other cases of "the affliction(s) of X" in the text, and in each case the earliest text has the plural *afflictions*:

1 Nephi 18:19	because of the afflictions of their mother
Mosiah 8:7	being grieved for the afflictions of my people
Mosiah 21:5	and now the afflictions of the Nephites was great
Alma 4:15	having seen the afflictions of the humble followers of God

These four examples suggest that the 1830 emendation in Alma 17:30 was correct.

But more generally, there is considerable evidence in the text that the noun *affliction* can occur in either the singular or the plural, although the plural is preferred overall. The critical text will therefore determine the number for each case of *affliction(s)* on the basis of the earliest textual evidence. The discussion under Mosiah 9:3 provides considerable evidence for this decision; also see under 1 Nephi 16:35 for additional examples of the variation regarding *affliction(s)*. Thus the critical text will accept the singular *affliction* in "the affliction of those which he termed to be his brethren", the reading of the printer's manuscript for Alma 17:30. Even though the singular usage here is unique for this particular expression, this does not mean that the singular is an error. There is nothing inherently wrong with the singular *affliction* in "when he saw the **affliction** of those which he termed to be his brethren".

**Summary:** Restore in Alma 17:30 the singular *affliction* in "the affliction of those which he termed to be his brethren"; although this instance of the singular is unique for the expression "the affliction(s) of X", general usage in the text permits both singular *affliction* and plural *afflictions*.

## ■ Alma 17:31

my brethren be of good cheer  
and let us go in search of the flocks  
and we will gather them together and bring them back unto the place of water  
and thus we will [*reserve* 1ABCDGHKPS | *preserve* EFIJLMNOQRT] the flocks unto the king  
and he will not slay us

The initial question here is whether *reserve* in the printer's manuscript is a mistake for *preserve*. The nearby reading in Alma 18:2 suggests that *preserve* is correct:

Alma 18:2  
and when they had all testified to the things which they had seen  
and he had learned of the faithfulness of Ammon in **preserving his flocks**

In Alma 17:31, the 1849 LDS edition replaced *reserve* with *preserve*, and this reading has been followed by all subsequent LDS editions. But the RLDS text has kept the earlier *reserve*, despite its obvious difficulty for modern readers. In support of the 1849 emendation, there is one clear example in the text where Oliver Cowdery misread *preserve* as *reserve*:

Alma 37:18

for he promised unto them  
that he would [*preserve* 0T | *reserve* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPS] these things  
for a wise purpose in him  
that he might shew forth his power unto future generations

Here Oliver misread *preserve* as *reserve* when he copied from  $\mathcal{O}$  into  $\mathcal{P}$ . We might conjecture that the same error occurred in Alma 17:31. If so, the 1849 LDS emendation to *preserve* restored the original reading.

On the other hand, the earliest extant *reserve* will work. The Oxford English Dictionary lists under definition 7 for the verb *reserve* the meaning ‘to retain or preserve alive’; this meaning is identified as “now rare”. All but one of the OED examples listed under this meaning date prior to 1650 (in the following, the accidentals have been regularized):

John Wycliffe (1382)

they shall slay me and thee they shall **reserve**

William Caxton (1483)

thou hast power over my flesh but Christ **reserveth** my soul

Richard Eden (1555)

**reserving** such as were overcome in the wars  
and converting them to a better mind

Thomas Kyd (1592)

men of war such as war's fortune hath **reserved** from death

William Shakespeare (1603)

one in the prison that should by private order else have died  
I have **reserved alive**

Francis Bacon (1625)

the remnant of people which hap to be **reserved**  
are commonly ignorant and mountainous people

Anna Jameson (1848)

the legend which supposes St. John **reserved alive**  
has not been generally received in the Church

The 1848 citation refers to the traditional Christian view that John the Beloved did not suffer death. In fact, Jameson's own use of the verb *reserve* in this sentence is preceded by the same language in a citation from an earlier source, not identified:

Anna Jameson (1848)

St. John, habited in priest's garments, descends the steps of an altar into an open grave, in which he lays himself down, not in death, but in sleep, until the coming of Christ; "being **reserved alive** with Enoch and Elijah (who also knew not death), to preach against the Antichrist in the last days."

Here the passage is given in its original accidentals; see page 139 in volume 1 of Anna Jameson, *Sacred and Legendary Art* (London: Longman, Brown, Green, and Longmans, 1848). Note, in particular, the original quote marks in Jameson's citation.

From the OED as well as *Literature Online* <lion.chadwyck.com> and <www.google.com>, we obtain a few more examples in Early Modern English of the specific phrase *reserved alive*, including the following ones after 1650 (here I maintain the original accidentals):

Roger Boyle Orrery, *Parthenissa* (1669)

But when I find, that to all these Sorrows,  
I was **reserved alive**, but to see my Princess in captivity . . .

John Milton, *Samson Agonistes* (1671)

But now hath cast me off as never known,  
And to those cruel enemies,  
Whom I by his appointment had provok't,  
Let me all helpless with th' irreparable loss  
Of sight, **reserv'd alive** to be repeated  
The subject of thir cruelty, or scorn.

*Complete Family-Piece and Country Gentleman and Farmer's Best Guide* (1741)

Sometimes he is **reserved alive**, and hunted another Day,  
which is called a Bag-Fox.

There is also an example from the early 20th century, which shows that this phrase, although rare, has maintained itself:

H. Rider Haggard, *The Yellow God: An Idol of Africa* (1908)

Therefore very soon they overtook the dwarfs, and even got in front of them, heading them off from the forest. The end may be guessed—save a few whom they **reserved alive**, they killed them mercilessly, and almost without loss to themselves, since the little forest folk were too terrified and exhausted to shoot at them with their poisoned arrows, and they had no other weapons.

But perhaps the most interesting example is from William Whiston's 18th-century translation of Josephus's *War of the Jews*. Within the same passage (book 7, chapter 8, section 7), Whiston used both *reserved alive* and *preserved alive* (just like the earliest Book of Mormon text does in Alma 17–18 with its instance of *reserve the flocks* followed by *preserving his flocks*):

William Whiston (1737)

Some have been half-devoured by wild beasts, and yet have been **reserved alive** to be devoured by them a second time, in order to afford laughter and sport to our enemies; . . . some unfortunate old men also lie upon the ashes of the temple, and a few women are there **preserved alive** by the enemy, for our bitter shame and reproach.

The original OED editors (working from 1884 to 1928) considered the older meaning of ‘to preserve’ for *reserve* as “now rare”. In addition, the 1849 LDS change to *preserve* in Alma 17:31 is a clear sign that in general *reserve* had lost its meaning of ‘to preserve’ for either Orson Pratt (the editor of the 1849 LDS edition) or the British compositor in Liverpool who set the type for that edition. In general, the historical information, especially the Whiston quote showing variation, argues that the verb *reserve* with the meaning ‘to preserve’ may very well be intended in Alma 17:31.

There is, however, another possibility for this verb in Alma 17:31. Earlier in verse 29, Ammon silently considers how he might take advantage of the difficult situation resulting from the scattering of the flocks:

Alma 17:29

now they wept because of the fear of being slain  
 now when Ammon saw this / his heart was swollen within him with joy  
 for said he : I will shew forth my power unto these my fellow servants  
 —or the power which is in me—**in restoring these flocks unto the king**  
 that I may win the hearts of these my fellow servants  
 that I may lead them to believe in my words

This earlier passage strongly suggests that verse 31 originally read as follows:

Alma 17:31 (conjectural emendation)

my brethren be of good cheer  
 and let us go in search of the flocks  
 and we will gather them together  
 and bring them back unto the place of water  
 and thus **we will restore the flocks unto the king**  
 and he will not slay us

Under this emendation, both references to getting back the flocks read almost identically. Moreover, the emendation suggests that Ammon’s words to his fellow servants (in verse 31) are directly based on what he had just thought of (in verse 29). And finally, it is quite possible that an original *restore* could have been misread as the visually similar *reserve*, either when Oliver Cowdery copied the text from  $\mathcal{O}$  into  $\mathcal{P}$  or earlier when Joseph Smith dictated the text. In fact, we have an unambiguous example in the text where the verb *restore* was misread by Oliver as he copied from  $\mathcal{O}$  into  $\mathcal{P}$ :

Alma 41:5

the one [*restored* 0 | *raised* 1 ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] to happiness

This misreading of *restored* as *raised* shows that a similar misreading of *restore* as *reserve* is quite possible, although in this case the *raised* was prompted by two previous occurrences of that word in Alma 41:4 (for discussion, see under Alma 41:5).

Ultimately, the virtual identity as well as the logical connection and proximity of the phrases “restoring these flocks unto the king” (verse 29) and “restore the flocks unto the king” (verse 31 as emended) argues that the original verb in verse 31 was most probably *restore*, although *reserve* (the earliest reading) and *preserve* (the 1849 LDS emendation) are also possible. The preposition *unto* seems to work especially well with *restore*, just as it does in the following passage in the book of Ether that refers to other possessions being restored to the people of Morianton:

Ether 10:12

and it came to pass that Morianton built up many cities  
and the people became exceeding rich under his reign  
both in buildings and in gold and in silver  
and in raising grain and in flocks and herds  
and such things **which had been restored unto them**

Also note that with the verb *preserve*, when it is correctly used in Alma 18:2, does not use the preposition *unto* (“and he had learned of the faithfulness of Ammon in preserving his flocks”). Thus the critical text will accept the conjectural emendation *restore* in Alma 17:31 since “restore unto X” works the best.

**Summary:** Based on the nearby reading in Alma 17:29 (“in restoring the flocks unto the king”), Alma 17:31 should probably be emended to read “we will **restore** the flocks unto the king”; the earliest extant reading, *reserve*, is also possible (given its archaic meaning ‘preserve’), as is the 1849 LDS emendation *preserve* (especially in light of the accidental change of *preserve* to *reserve* in Alma 37:18).

#### ■ Alma 17:34

*therefore they did as Ammon [had 1| ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] commanded them*

The 1830 typesetter deleted the perfective *had*, probably by accident. Elsewhere in the text, after “did (do) . . . as” and before *commanded*, used in the active, there are six occurrences with *had* and two without:

1 Nephi 2:3	wherefore he did as the Lord commanded him
1 Nephi 2:14	wherefore they did do as he commanded them
Jacob 5:70	and the servant went and did as the Lord <b>had</b> commanded him
Omni 1:13	he did according as the Lord <b>had</b> commanded him
Mosiah 1:18	Mosiah went and did as his father <b>had</b> commanded him
3 Nephi 26:20	they did do all things even as Jesus <b>had</b> commanded them
Mormon 3:16	and I did even as the Lord <b>had</b> commanded me
Ether 2:21	the brother of Jared did so according as the Lord <b>had</b> commanded

(Also see the discussion under Omni 1:13, where the *had* was momentarily lost when copying from  $\mathcal{C}$  into  $\mathcal{P}$ .) Since either reading (with or without the *had*) is possible, the critical text will accept in Alma 17:34 the reading with the *had* (the reading of the earliest extant source, the printer’s manuscript).

**Summary:** Restore the perfective *had* in Alma 17:34, the reading in  $\mathcal{P}$ : “therefore they did as Ammon **had** commanded them”.



## ■ Alma 17:34–35

*and he went forth and stood to contend  
with those which stood by the waters of Sebus*

- *and they were not in number a very few*      1\*A
- *and they were in number not a few*      1<sup>c</sup>BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST

*therefore they did not fear Ammon*

Here the original text read “and they were **not** in number a **very** few”, which Joseph Smith edited for the 1837 edition to read “and they were in number **not** a few”. He moved the *not* to after *in number* and deleted the word *very*. Joseph’s editing is the result of an attempt to eliminate the awkwardness of the original phraseology. Another possible emendation would have been to place *in number* after “not a (very) few”, as suggested by the only other example, a nearby one, where *few* occurs with *in number*:

Alma 17:37

for he did withstand their blows by smiting their arms with the edge of his sword  
insomuch that they began to be astonished and began to flee before him  
yea and they were not **few in number**

Yet the occurrence of *in number* before “not a (very) few” is possible, especially since prepositional phrases are sometimes placed awkwardly in the Book of Mormon text; see, for instance, the discussion under Mosiah 26:23 and, more generally, under **DISPLACED PREPOSITIONAL PHRASES** in volume 3.

The equivalent statement in Alma 17:37 (“yea and they were not few in number”) suggests various emendations for Alma 17:34, not only moving *in number* (discussed above) but also removing the *a* before *few* (as well as the *very*). Even here, there is independent evidence in the text for the *a* before *few* (but not for the *very*) in the phrase “not a (very) few”:

2 Nephi 20:7	but in his heart it is to destroy and cut off nations <b>not a few</b>
Alma 17:38	and they were <b>not a few</b>

It should be noted that the first of these comes from an Isaiah quotation (Isaiah 10:7).

Despite the awkwardness of Alma 17:34 (“and they were not in number a very few”), the critical text will restore this reading since it appears to be fully intended.

**Summary:** Restore in Alma 17:34 the original reading: “and they were not in number a very few”; the meaning here is essentially the same as in Alma 17:37: “yea and they were not few in number”.

## ■ Alma 17:35

*therefore they delighted in the destruction of their brethren  
[& 1|and ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST| D] for this cause they stood  
to scatter the flocks of the king*

The 1841 British edition omitted the conjunction *and* here, undoubtedly by accident since either reading is theoretically possible. The subsequent LDS edition (1849) restored the *and*. Elsewhere the text has 12 other examples of “and for this cause”. There are also examples of “for this cause”

preceded by other connectors (such as *and now*, *therefore*, *wherefore*, and even *for* itself). There are also a couple of examples where “for this cause” begins a sentence:

Mosiah 10:18      for this very cause hath king Laman . . . deceived me  
Helaman 13:23    for this cause hath the Lord God caused that . . .

The critical text will maintain the earliest text with the *and* here in Alma 17:35.

**Summary:** Maintain in Alma 17:35 the connective *and* before “for this cause”, the reading of the earliest textual sources.

### ■ Alma 17:38

*now six of them had fallen by the sling  
but he slew none save it were their leader*  
[NULL >js with this sword >js with his sword 1 | A | with his sword BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]  
*and he smote off as many of their arms as was lifted against him  
and they were not a few*

The earliest text here in Alma 17:38 is clearly defective since it first says that Ammon had killed six with the sling but then that he slew only the leader. One could, I suppose, argue that those that “had fallen by the sling” were only wounded, but this is directly contradicted by the preceding text:

Alma 17:36  
but Ammon stood forth and began to cast stones at them with his sling  
yea with mighty power he did sling stones amongst them  
and thus he **slew** a certain number of them  
insomuch that they began to be astonished at his power  
nevertheless they were angry because of the **slain** of their brethren

We also have a later reference to what king Lamoni was told, as referred to by Ammon in the next chapter:

Alma 18:16  
is it because that thou hast heard that I defended thy servants and thy flocks  
and **slew seven** of their brethren **with the sling and with the sword**

In his editing for the 1837 edition, Joseph Smith deduced from the difference between the number *seven* in Alma 18:16 and the number *six* in Alma 17:38 that Ammon had killed only one with his sword, so he inserted here in Alma 17:38 the phrase “with his sword” after “he slew none save it were their leader”. It is quite probable that the original text had some phrase like “with his sword” and that it was lost during the early transmission of the text. It is also possible that Mormon himself accidentally omitted the phrase in his own account. In any event, Joseph’s emendation here is quite reasonable and seems necessary. But three issues regarding the emendation need to be considered:

- (1) Was the determiner *his* or *the*?
- (2) Was the preposition *with* or *by*?
- (3) Did the phrase come after or before the *save*-clause?

We should note here that Joseph Smith's phrase was not based on the original manuscript. All indications are that his editing for the 1837 edition was based on comparing the printer's manuscript with the 1830 edition. Since the phrase is missing from  $\mathcal{P}$ , we can assume that Joseph himself is responsible for choosing the specific phrase "with his sword" and placing it after the *save*-clause.

In the description of the battle between Ammon and the gang of robbers at the waters of Sebus, the text first refers to Ammon's weapons as *his*: "with **his** sling" (verse 36), "with **his** sword" (verse 37), "with the edge of **his** sword" (verse 37). But later, in Alma 18, the determiner is *the*, not *his*: "and slew seven of their brethren with **the** sling and with **the** sword" (Alma 18:16). Since Alma 17:38 also reads "by **the** sling", the odds are that the definite article *the* should be chosen for whatever phrase we supply in that verse in order to account for the death of the leader, the only one slain with the sword.

The second question is whether the preposition should be *by* or *with*. The preposition *by* occurs earlier in the verse ("fallen **by** the sling"), but for that prepositional phrase the verb is the intransitive *fall* (not the transitive *slay*). When referring to weapons, the preposition *by*, not *with*, occurs with the intransitive verb *fall*:

2 Nephi 13:25	thy men shall fall <b>by</b> the sword
2 Nephi 23:15	and every one that is joined to the wicked shall fall <b>by</b> the sword
Omni 1:17	and had fallen <b>by</b> the sword from time to time
Alma 17:38	now six of them had fallen <b>by</b> the sling
Alma 56:51	for Antipus had fallen <b>by</b> the sword
Alma 58:39	yea and kept them from falling <b>by</b> the sword
Alma 60:5	yea thousands have fallen <b>by</b> the sword
Alma 60:8	and have saved thousands of them from falling <b>by</b> the sword
Alma 60:12	there are many which have fallen <b>by</b> the sword
Alma 60:22	thousands . . . which are falling <b>by</b> the sword
Mormon 6:15	ten more which did fall <b>by</b> the sword
Ether 14:4	and many thousands fell <b>by</b> the sword
Ether 14:24	that Coriantumr should not fall <b>by</b> the sword
Ether 15:23	they had all fallen <b>by</b> the sword
Ether 15:29	when they had all fallen <b>by</b> the sword
Moroni 9:2	and Archeantus has fallen <b>by</b> the sword

On the other hand, we get *with* as the preposition when the verb is the transitive "to fall upon someone":

Alma 58:18	and were about to fall upon us <b>with</b> the sword
Mormon 6:9	they did fall upon my people <b>with</b> the sword and <b>with</b> the bow . . .

So the occurrence of "fallen **by** the sling" in Alma 17:38 is perfectly consistent with usage elsewhere in the text (that is, when the verb is the intransitive *fall*).

On the other hand, when the verb is *slay*, the text favors *with* when referring to weapons, providing the verb *slay* is in the active, although *by* does occur twice under those conditions:

1 Nephi 16:15	slaying food by the way <b>with</b> our bows and our arrows . . .
Alma 2:1	the man that slew Gideon <b>by</b> the sword
Alma 2:31	he slew Amlici <b>with</b> the sword
Alma 18:16	and slew seven of their brethren <b>with</b> the sling and <b>with</b> the sword
Alma 20:14	that he should slay Ammon <b>with</b> the sword
Alma 24:21	and began to slay them <b>with</b> the sword
Alma 50:26	and they were determined <b>by</b> the sword to slay them
Helaman 10:18	and began to slay one another <b>with</b> the sword
Ether 9:27	for he slew him <b>with</b> his own sword
Ether 15:5	that he might slay him <b>with</b> his own sword

The text is equally divided between *with* and *by* when the verb *slay* is in the passive:

Alma 1:9	therefore he was slain <b>by</b> the sword
Alma 2:20	that Gideon which was slain by the hand of Nehor <b>with</b> the sword
Alma 3:1	the Nephites which were not slain <b>by</b> the weapons of war
Alma 3:2	now many women and children had been slain <b>with</b> the sword
Alma 6:7	the man which was slain by the hand of Nehor <b>with</b> the sword
Alma 19:22	one of them whose brother had been slain <b>with</b> the sword of Ammon
Ether 13:18	there was many people which was slain <b>by</b> the sword
Ether 15:2	there had been slain <b>by</b> the sword already nearly two millions of his people

Since the verb *slay* in Alma 17:38 is in the active, the statistically more plausible preposition for the proposed emendation would be *with*. The choice of *by* on the grounds that it would parallel the preceding “fallen **by** the sword” is not particularly significant as an argument since there is really no possibility for the preposition *with* when the verb is the intransitive *fall*. Overall, *with* seems the more probable for the emendation here in Alma 17:38, which agrees in that respect with Joseph Smith’s own choice of *with* in his emendation, “with his sword”. Nonetheless, *by* remains a possibility.

The final question is where to place “with the sword”; there are three reasonable possibilities:

- (1) but **with the sword** he slew none save it were their leader
- (2) but he slew none **with the sword** save it were their leader
- (3) but he slew none save it were their leader **with the sword**

Usage elsewhere in the text argues that the second possibility is the most plausible. Normally in the text, instrumental adverbial phrases come after the verb, not before. For instance, in the preceding list where occurrences of the verb *slay* in the active have an instrumental prepositional phrase headed by either *with* or *by*, there is only one case where the prepositional phrase precedes the verb, namely, in Alma 50:26: “and they were determined by the sword to slay them” (instead of “and they were determined to slay them by the sword”). Normally, we expect “to slay X with the sword”, not “with the sword to slay X” (or “to slay with the sword X”):

Alma 2:31	he slew Amlici <b>with the sword</b>
Alma 18:16	and slew seven of their brethren <b>with the sling and with the sword</b>
Alma 20:14	that he should slay Ammon <b>with the sword</b>
Alma 24:21	and began to slay them <b>with the sword</b>
Helaman 10:18	and began to slay one another <b>with the sword</b>
Ether 9:27	for he slew him <b>with his own sword</b>
Ether 15:5	that he might slay him <b>with his own sword</b>

Thus here in Alma 17:38, “he slew none with the sword” is more plausible than “with the sword he slew none” (or, even worse, “he with the sword slew none” or “he slew with the sword none”).

As far as placing “with the sword” after the *save*-clause, usage elsewhere in the text shows quite clearly that prepositional phrases acting adverbially are kept close to their verbs and not placed after the *save*-clause:

1 Nephi 2:4	and took nothing <b>with him</b> save it were his family and provisions and tents
Jacob 5:57	pluck not the wild branches <b>from the trees</b> save it be those which are most bitter
Mosiah 19:18	and it came to pass that they met the people <b>in the wilderness</b> all save the king and his priests
3 Nephi 4:2	and there was no game <b>for the robbers</b> save it were in the wilderness
3 Nephi 28:12	he touched every one of them <b>with his finger</b> save it were the three which were to tarry
Ether 15:29	and it came to pass that when they had all fallen <b>by the sword</b> save it were Coriantumr and Shiz behold Shiz had fainted with loss of blood

In accord with the consistency of these patterns, here in Alma 17:38 the critical text will place the phrase “with the sword” after “he slew none” but before the *save*-clause:

Alma 17:38 (proposed emendation)	now six of them had fallen by the sling but he slew none <b>with the sword</b> save it were their leader
----------------------------------	---

**Summary:** The text in Alma 17:38 requires some kind of emendation like Joseph Smith’s 1837 insertion of “with his sword”; based on usage elsewhere in the text, the critical text will insert “with **the** sword” (rather than “with **his** sword”) and will place it right before the *save*-clause, giving “but he slew none **with the sword** save it were their leader”.

■ Alma 17:38

*but he slew none with the sword  
save it [were 1ABDEFIJLMNOPQRST | was CGHK] their leader*

Here the 1840 edition changed the subjunctive *were* to the indicative *was*. The *was* continued in the RLDS textual tradition until the 1908 RLDS edition. As discussed under 1 Nephi 17:31, this 1840 change was probably a typo. In the earliest text, there are 77 instances of “save it were” and only 3 of “save it was”. In each case the critical text will let the earliest textual sources determine whether the verb form should be the subjunctive *were* or the indicative *was*.

**Summary:** Maintain the subjunctive *were* in Alma 17:38 (“save it **were** their leader”) since this is the reading of the earliest textual sources for this passage.

■ Alma 17:39

*and they watered their [flocks 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMOPQRST | flock N]  
and returned them to the [pastures > pasture 1 | pasture ABCDEFGHIJKLMOPQRST] of the king*

Here we see some variation in number for the words *flocks* and *pasture*. As discussed earlier under Alma 17:27, the plural *flocks* is correct. The change to the singular *flock* in the 1906 LDS edition was most likely a typo.

In his copying from  $\mathcal{O}$  into  $\mathcal{P}$ , Oliver Cowdery initially wrote the plural form *pastures*; then virtually immediately he corrected *pastures* to the singular *pasture* (there appears to be no change in the level of ink flow for the crossout of the plural *s* at the end of the word). Since either reading is possible here, there would have been no motivation for Oliver to emend *pastures* to *pasture*; the original manuscript most probably read *pasture*. There are only two other occurrences in the text of *pasture(s)*, neither of which shows any variation in number. The first, in 1 Nephi 21:9, is an Isaiah quote that has the plural *pastures*; the second one, in 1 Nephi 22:25, uses the idiomatic expression “to find pasture”, which is also found in John 10:9: “he shall be saved and shall go in and out and find pasture”. Here in Alma 17:39 we must therefore rely on the earliest textual sources rather than on internal linguistic evidence. The best solution is to accept Oliver Cowdery’s virtually immediate correction to the probable reading of the original manuscript.

**Summary:** Maintain the plural *flocks* in Alma 17:39, the reading of the earliest textual sources; also accept Oliver Cowdery’s singular *pasture*, his corrected reading in  $\mathcal{P}$ .

# Alma 18

## ■ Alma 18:1–2

*and it came to pass that **king Lamoni** caused that **his** servants should stand forth  
and testify to all the things which they had seen concerning the matter  
and when they had all testified to the things which they had seen  
and [NULL >p- he 1 | he ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] had learned of the faithfulness of Ammon  
in preserving **his** flocks  
and also of his great power in contending against those who sought to slay him  
**he** was astonished exceedingly*

In this passage Oliver Cowdery, it would appear, supralinearly inserted in light pencil the subject pronoun *he*. As discussed under Alma 17:8 and Alma 17:18, penciled-in changes in  $\mathcal{P}$  were probably made in the print shop. The two changes in Alma 17 were unnecessary and will be removed from the critical text. Here in Alma 18:2, without the inserted *he*,  $\mathcal{P}$  most naturally reads as if the preceding subject pronoun *they* is the intended subject (“and when **they** had all testified to the things which **they** had seen and had learned of the faithfulness of Ammon”), but quite obviously the referent should be king Lamoni, who has “learned of the faithfulness of Ammon in preserving **his** flocks”. It is possible that the original manuscript had the subject pronoun *he* and that it was accidentally lost while copying from  $\mathcal{O}$  into  $\mathcal{P}$ . Or perhaps the *he* was lost during the dictation of  $\mathcal{O}$ . Other possible omitted subjects would have been longer (such as *the king* or *king Lamoni*). However, the most probable subject would have been the shortest candidate (namely, *he*). Elsewhere, there is considerable evidence that the subject pronoun *he* was sometimes omitted. See, for instance, the discussion and examples listed under Jacob 5:1–2.

**Summary:** Although Oliver Cowdery’s secondary *he* in Alma 18:2 was probably inserted in the print shop and without reference to  $\mathcal{O}$ , the original text most probably had the *he*.

## ■ Alma 18:2

*and when they had all testified to the things which they had seen  
and he had learned of the faithfulness of Ammon in preserving his flocks  
and also of his great [power 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST | powers HK] in contending  
against those who sought to slay him  
he was astonished exceedingly*

Here the RLDS 1874 edition introduced the plural *powers* into the RLDS text. However, elsewhere in the text, there are 20 occurrences of the singular phrase *great power*, but none of *great powers*.

Nearby, there is one other example in the text of *his great power*, in Alma 26:16: “who can say too much of his great power”. The plural is, of course, theoretically possible here in Alma 18:2; consider the occurrence of *powers* in Mormon 4:17: “and in this year they did come down against the Nephites with all their **powers**”. For each instance of *power(s)*, the critical text will follow the earliest textual sources, thus the singular *power* here in Alma 18:2.

**Summary:** Accept in Alma 18:2 the singular *power* when preceded by *great*, as with 20 other instances of *great power* in the text.

### ■ Alma 18:3

*whether he be the Great Spirit or [a 1ABCDEFGHIJLMNOPQRST | GHK] man  
we know not*

Here the indefinite article *a* was accidentally lost before *man* in the 1858 Wright edition. The 1908 RLDS edition restored the *a* to the RLDS text. The *a* is, of course, expected, as in the following cases where “(a) man” serves as the complete subject predicate; in each of these cases, the subject is *I*:

Alma 18:17	behold I am a man
Alma 18:34	I am a man
Alma 29:3	but behold I am a man
Moroni 9:18	behold I am but a man

The first two examples were spoken by Ammon in his attempt to convince king Lamoni that he, Ammon, was not the Great Spirit, thus the appropriateness of *a man* here in verse 3. The critical text will maintain the *a* before *man* in this passage.

**Summary:** Retain the indefinite article *a* before *man* in Alma 18:3 (“whether he be the Great Spirit or **a** man / we know not”).

### ■ Alma 18:3

*for we know [that 1ABCGHKPS | DEFIJLMNOQRT] he cannot be slain*

The 1841 British edition accidentally omitted the conjunction *that* after *know*. Normally in the Book of Mormon text, we expect the *that* in this kind of subordinate construction, although there are a few cases where the *that* is lacking, as nearby in Alma 10:9: “wherefore I know he is a holy man”. For each case of “to know (that) S”, where S stands for a sentence, the critical text will follow the earliest textual sources in determining whether the *that* is there or not. For some statistics regarding the occurrence of *that* after the verb *know*, see under 1 Nephi 1:3. Also see the general discussion under THAT in volume 3.

**Summary:** Restore in Alma 18:3 the subordinate conjunction *that* which was accidentally skipped by the 1841 typesetter.



## ■ Alma 18:3

*neither can they scatter the king's [flocks 1ABCDEFGHIJLMNOQRT | flock HKPS]  
when he is with us*

In this passage the 1874 RLDS edition changed the plural *flocks* to the singular *flock*, probably accidentally since for virtually all other references to *flocks* in this narrative in Alma 17–19 regarding king Lamoni's sheep, we have the plural *flocks* in the earliest text (29 out of 30 cases). The only exception is in Alma 17:27, where  $\mathcal{P}$  reads *flock* but the original text probably read *flocks*. See the discussion under that passage. Here in Alma 18:3, the RLDS text has continued with the singular *flock*, but the critical text will maintain the plural *flocks*, the earliest reading.

*Summary:* Maintain the plural *flocks* in Alma 18:3, the reading of the earliest textual sources.

## ■ Alma 18:4

*and now [ 1ABCDGHKPRST | that EFIJLMNOQ ] when the king heard these words  
he said unto them : now I know that it is the Great Spirit*

In this passage an extraordinary error was introduced into the 1849 LDS edition: namely, an intrusive *that* between *now* and *when*. What is especially surprising is that this totally unacceptable reading persisted in all subsequent LDS editions until the 1920 edition. There are no other examples of “now that when” anywhere in the history of the text. Here in Alma 18:4, it is possible that the following “**now I know that**” led the 1849 typesetter to accidentally insert the extra *that* after the *now* earlier in the passage.

*Summary:* Accept the current (and original) reading in Alma 18:4 without a *that* between *now* and *when*.

## ■ Alma 18:7

*now it was the practice of [the > these 1 | the ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRS | these T] Lamanites  
to stand by the waters of Sebus to scatter the flocks of the people*

Oliver Cowdery initially wrote “the practice of **the** Lamanites”, but then virtually immediately he corrected “**the** Lamanites” to “**these** Lamanites”. The 1830 typesetter, however, reverted to the *the* that Oliver had originally written in  $\mathcal{P}$ . Perhaps the many occurrences of *the* in this sentence (“**the** practice . . . by **the** waters of Sebus . . . **the** flocks of **the** people”) led to the persistence of this error. Moreover, one could conceive of the practice of raiding others' flocks as a Lamanite practice in general. Since the correction is virtually immediate (there is no change in the level of ink flow for the *se* that was squeezed inline between the *the* and *Lamanites*), the critical text will restore the original *these*. The 1981 LDS edition restored the corrected reading *these*, but the 1908 RLDS edition did not, even though the reading is found in  $\mathcal{P}$ . There seems to have been little motivation for Oliver to have edited “the Lamanites” to “these Lamanites”; the use of *the* seems quite innocuous here, especially when we consider the fact that no printed edition made the change to *these* until the 1981 edition (and there the change resulted from consulting  $\mathcal{P}$ ).

*Summary:* Accept Oliver Cowdery's corrected reading in  $\mathcal{P}$ , “it was the practice of **these** Lamanites”; the correction appears to have been virtually immediate, and it makes perfectly good sense.

## ■ Alma 18:9

*now the king had commanded his servants  
previous to the time of [the watering of 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST | watering HK] their flocks  
that they should prepare his horses and his chariots*

Here the 1874 RLDS edition replaced the nominal gerundive form “the watering of their flocks” with the verbal form “watering their flocks”. Either reading is theoretically possible. The critical text will maintain the earliest reading here. For further discussion of the three types of gerundive constructions in the original Book of Mormon text, see under 1 Nephi 17:32; also see the general discussion under GERUNDIVES in volume 3.

**Summary:** Maintain the nominal form of the gerund in Alma 18:9 (“previous to the time of **the watering of** their flocks”) rather than the verbal form (“previous to the time of **watering** their flocks”).

## ■ Alma 18:9

*now the king had commanded his servants previous to the time of the watering of their flocks  
that they should prepare his horses and [his 1 | ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST] chariots*

Here the 1830 typesetter accidentally dropped the repeated *his*. Elsewhere the Book of Mormon text always repeats the determiner in conjuncts involving *horses* and *chariots*, including two examples in the next few verses:

Alma 18:10	that Ammon was preparing <b>his</b> horses and <b>his</b> chariots
Alma 18:12	when Ammon had made ready <b>the</b> horses and <b>the</b> chariots
Alma 20:6	that his servants should make ready <b>his</b> horses and <b>his</b> chariots
3 Nephi 3:22	and they had taken <b>their</b> horses and <b>their</b> chariots and . . .

For additional discussion of the tendency to omit the repeated determiner in conjunctive structures, see under CONJUNCTIVE REPETITION in volume 3.

**Summary:** Restore the repeated *his* before *chariots* in Alma 18:9; this repetition of the determiner is in agreement with all other conjoined examples of *horses* and *chariots* in the text.

## ■ Alma 18:12

*and [ 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST | when CGHK] it came to pass that  
**when** Ammon had made ready the horses and the chariots for the king and his servants  
he went in unto the king*

In this passage the 1840 typesetter inserted an extra *when* before “it came to pass”, undoubtedly in anticipation of the following *when* in “when Ammon had made ready the horses and the chariots”. Surprisingly, this obvious typo persisted in the RLDS textual tradition until it was removed in the third RLDS edition (1908). There are no other examples in the text of “come to pass” preceded by the subordinate conjunction *when*. There is one example of the conjunction *before* preceding “come to pass”, namely in 1 Nephi 20:5 (a quotation of Isaiah 48:5): “before it came to pass / I shewed them thee”. As expected, the *before* is not repeated here.

*Summary:* Maintain the earliest reading in Alma 18:12 without the intrusive *when* that was inserted in the 1840 edition before “it came to pass”.

■ **Alma 18:12**

*and it came to pass that when Ammon had made ready  
the [NULL > horses & the 1 | horses and the ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] chariots for the king . . .*

Oliver Cowdery initially wrote “Ammon had made ready the chariots”; then almost immediately he supralinearly inserted *horses & the*, thus giving the expected conjoined construction “the horses and the chariots”, just as it appears earlier in this chapter and later in chapter 20 (except that the determiner here in Alma 18:12 is *the* rather than *his*):

Alma 18:9	that they should prepare his horses and his chariots
Alma 18:10	that Ammon was preparing his horses and his chariots
Alma 20:6	that his servants should make ready his horses and his chariots

Although this insertion in verse 12 could be due to editing, the virtual immediacy of the correction (there is no change in level of ink flow) suggests that Ⓞ had the complete conjoined construction, “the horses and the chariots”.

*Summary:* Maintain in Alma 18:12 the corrected reading in Ⓞ, the conjoined expression “the horses and the chariots”.

■ **Alma 18:12**

*and he saw that the countenance of the king  
[had > was 1 | was ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] changed*

In modern English, we expect “had changed” rather than “was changed” for this sentence, which probably explains why Oliver Cowdery initially wrote *had* here. Almost immediately he corrected the *had* to *was* (there is no change in the level of ink flow for the supralinear *was*). The corrected usage here parallels cases found in the book of Daniel in the King James Bible that directly refer to a king’s facial expression:

Daniel 3:19	and the form of his visage <b>was</b> changed
Daniel 5:6	then the king’s countenance <b>was</b> changed
Daniel 5:9	and his countenance <b>was</b> changed in him

Book of Mormon usage also supports the use of the *be* verb rather than *have* in references to changes in one’s heart, as in Mosiah 5:7: “your hearts **are** changed” (instead of “your hearts **have** changed”). Also note the use of *was* rather than *had* in 3 Nephi 8:12: “the whole face of the land **was** changed”.

*Summary:* Accept Oliver Cowdery’s virtually immediate correction of “had changed” to “was changed”, in accord with both King James and Book of Mormon usage.

## ■ Alma 18:17

*therefore whatsoever thou desirest which is right*  
*that* [NULL >+ *will* 1 | *will* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *I do*

Here Oliver Cowdery initially omitted the helping verb *will*; somewhat later, probably when he proofed  $\mathcal{P}$  against  $\mathcal{C}$ , he supralinearly inserted the word (the correcting *will* has a more even ink flow than does the original inline writing). It is possible, however, that the original text here read “that I will do” and that Oliver inserted the *will* before the subject *I* rather than after it. Theoretically, either word order is possible. There are no other examples in the Book of Mormon of this kind of conditional statement, but instances in the King James Bible show that either word order is possible:

2 Samuel 19:38	and whatsoever thou shalt require of me / <i>that will I</i> do for thee
2 Samuel 21:4	what ye shall say / <i>that will I</i> do for you
John 14:13	and whatsoever ye shall ask in my name / <i>that will I</i> do
2 Corinthians 11:12	but what I do / <i>that I will</i> do

The closest parallel to Alma 18:17 is John 14:13, which has the same word order, “that will I do”. The original text in Alma 18:17 most probably read as corrected in  $\mathcal{P}$ : “whatsoever thou desirest which is right / *that will I* do”.

**Summary:** Accept in Alma 18:17 Oliver Cowdery’s corrected reading in  $\mathcal{P}$ , with the *will* preceding the *I* (“whatsoever thou desirest which is right / *that will I* do”); similar usage is found in the King James Bible.

## ■ Alma 18:18

*but notwithstanding this*  
*king Lamoni did open his mouth*  
*and* [ 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST | *he* GHK] *said unto him*

The 1858 Wright edition added the subject pronoun *he* to the conjoined predicate “said unto him”, probably accidentally. Elsewhere in the text, when referring to opening one’s mouth, conjoined predicates always lack a subject:

Mosiah 4:4	and king Benjamin again opened his mouth <b>and began</b> to speak unto them
Alma 12:1	he opened his mouth <b>and began</b> to speak unto him
Helaman 7:13	and it came to pass that he opened his mouth <b>and said</b> unto them

The last example, from Helaman 7:13, is very similar in phraseology to the example here in Alma 18:18. The 1908 RLDS edition removed the intrusive *he* here in Alma 18:18.

**Summary:** Maintain the original reading in Alma 18:18 without the subject pronoun *he* for the conjoined predicate “and said unto him”.

## ■ Alma 18:18

*king Lamoni did open his mouth and said unto him  
 who [art 1ABCDEFGHIJKLNPRST | are MOQ] thou  
 art thou that Great Spirit which knows all things*

As discussed under Alma 9:2, there are quite a few cases in the printed editions of the Book of Mormon where the second person singular verb form *art* was mis-set as *are*. Only here in Alma 18:18 did the error persist into any subsequent edition. In this case, the incorrect *are* introduced in the 1905 LDS missionary edition was followed by the 1907 LDS vest-pocket edition and the 1911 LDS large-print edition. The persistence of *are thou* here seems particularly strange since the very next sentence reads “**art thou** that Great Spirit which knows all things”. In any event, the 1920 LDS edition finally restored the correct *art* to the LDS text. As pointed out under Alma 9:2, there were no instances of “thou are” in the original text.

*Summary:* Maintain the original two occurrences of *art thou* in Alma 18:18.

## ■ Alma 18:18–19

*king Lamoni did open his mouth and said unto him : who art thou  
 art thou that Great Spirit which knows all things  
 Ammon answered and said unto him : I am not*

The sentence beginning verse 19, “Ammon answered and said unto him”, could be missing an initial *and*. Elsewhere in the Book of Mormon text, narrative uses of “X answereth/answered” are almost always connected to the previous text by *and* (15 times). There is only one case where the connective element is something other than *and*; in that one case, the connective element is *now* followed by a subordinate clause:

Alma 20:19

**now** when Ammon had said these words unto him  
**he answered** him saying . . .

So the use here in Alma 18:18 of “X answereth/answered” without any connective element is quite unique for the Book of Mormon. Even so, the *and* is not required, as can be seen from narrative uses of “X saith/said” in the text. In almost every case, there is a connective element, usually *and*, before “X saith/said”; yet there are two instances of “X saith/said” without any connective element:

Alma 18:33–34

and king Lamoni saith  
 I believe all these things which thou hast spoken  
 art thou sent from God  
**Ammon saith** unto him  
 I am a man

Alma 46:22–23

now this was the covenant which they made  
 and they cast their garments at the feet of Moroni saying  
 we covenant with our God that we shall be destroyed  
 even as our brethren in the land northward  
 if we shall fall into transgression  
 yea he may cast us at the feet of our enemies  
 even as we have cast our garments at thy feet  
 to be trodden under foot  
 if we should fall into transgression  
**Moroni saith** unto them  
 behold we are a remnant of the seed of Jacob . . .

These examples suggest that not only can “X saith/said” begin a sentence in discourse narratives, but so can “X answereth/answered”. Note further that in all three examples without a connecting *and*, the subject is a name rather than a pronoun (thus *Moroni* in Alma 46:23 and *Ammon* here in Alma 18:19 as well as in Alma 18:34). In other words, there may be a tendency for the connective *and* to be lacking when the sentence begins with a name rather than with a pronoun. The critical text will therefore leave the unique instance here in Alma 18:19 of “X answereth/answered” without any *and* (or any other connective element).

In this regard, biblical usage in the King James Bible is more mixed than Book of Mormon usage. Consider, for instance, the conjoined predicate “answered and said”. In the Old Testament, “answered and said” almost always has *and* or some other connector (such as *then*, *but*, or *furthermore*) in front of the subject. The only exceptions are ten occurrences in the book of Daniel, as in “the king answered and said” (Daniel 2:8). In the New Testament, usage is basically evenly divided between having some connector (*and*, *but*, or *then*) versus none (52 to 43). Thus the current text for Alma 18:19 without any *and* preceding “Ammon answered” is quite acceptable in terms of King James language.

**Summary:** Accept in Alma 18:19 the occurrence of “Ammon answered and said” without any connecting *and* between it and the preceding narrative.

#### ■ Alma 18:20

*how knowest thou the [thoughts 1ABCEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST | thought D] of my heart*

The 1841 British edition replaced *thoughts* with *thought*, probably unintentionally since other instances referring to a single person’s thoughts were left unchanged in the 1841 edition. The subsequent LDS edition (1849) restored the original plural *thoughts* here in Alma 18:20.

The text normally prefers plural *thoughts* for a single person (11 times), as here in nearby verses:

Alma 18:16	therefore he perceived the <b>thoughts</b> of the king
Alma 18:18	for he beheld that Ammon could discern his <b>thoughts</b>

The singular *thought* is possible, as in the following example involving a plurality of people:

Alma 21:6  
 how knowest thou the **thought** and intent  
 of our [*heart* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPS | *hearts* RT]

For discussion of the 1920 LDS change to the plural *hearts*, see under that passage.

There is one other example where an original plural *thoughts* was replaced by the singular (initially in the 1840 edition, then later in the 1920 LDS edition):

Alma 36:14  
 so great had been my iniquities  
 that the very [*thoughts* 01ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPS | *thought* CGHKRT]  
 of coming into the presence of my God  
 did rack my soul with inexpressible horror

For discussion of this example, see under Mosiah 28:3.

**Summary:** Maintain in Alma 18:20 the plural *thoughts* in “how knowest thou the thoughts of my heart”, the earliest extant reading.

#### ■ Alma 18:25

*and he answered* [ 1 | *and said* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST ] *unto him*  
*I do not know what that meaneth*

Here the earliest extant text, the printer’s manuscript, reads “and he answered unto him”. The 1830 typesetter considered this usage as strange, perhaps impossible, so he added *and said*, thus giving “and he answered and said unto him”. There are no examples of “to answer **unto** someone” anywhere else in the Book of Mormon text, but there are 14 occurrences of “to answer someone”; in fact, four of these are conjoined with the phrase *and said* (each marked below with an asterisk):

1 Nephi 11:22	and I answered <b>him</b> saying . . .
Mosiah 2:25	I answer <b>you</b> : nay
Mosiah 12:19	but he answered <b>them</b> boldly
Alma 11:21	will ye answer <b>me</b> a few questions which I shall ask you
Alma 14:17	Alma and Amulek answered <b>him</b> nothing
Alma 14:18	but they answered <b>them</b> nothing
* Alma 18:3	and they answered <b>the king</b> and said . . .
Alma 18:14	and the king answered <b>him</b> not for the space of an hour
Alma 18:15	but the king answered <b>him</b> not
* Alma 18:23	and the king answered <b>him</b> and said . . .
Alma 20:19	he answered <b>him</b> saying . . .
* Alma 22:7	and Aaron answered <b>him</b> and said <b>unto him</b> . . .
Alma 30:6	and Korihor answered <b>him</b> : yea
* 3 Nephi 23:10	and his disciples answered <b>him</b> and said . . .

The example from Alma 22:7 also has *unto him* after *and said* (“answered him and said unto him”). Similarly, there are five instances in the text of “answered and said”, of which two are of the form “answered and said unto him” (each marked here with an asterisk):

Mosiah 12:32	and they answered and said . . .
* Alma 11:34	and Amulek answered and said <b>unto him</b> . . .
Alma 15:7	and he answered and said . . .
* Alma 18:19	Ammon answered and said <b>unto him</b> . . .
Helaman 9:12	and they answered and said . . .

Thus the 1830 typesetter’s emendation here in Alma 18:25 makes the phraseology agree with the nearby reading in Alma 18:19: “Ammon answered and said unto him”. All the printed editions have retained the easier 1830 reading for Alma 18:25. And indeed, the original text may have read with *and said*, which would mean that sometime during the early transmission of the text *and said* was lost.

Contrary to these findings, two facts suggest that the original text in Alma 18:25 may have read without *and said*. First, there are no examples in the history of the text where any phrase involving the word *say* has ever been accidentally omitted. There are, to be sure, a few examples where a phrase involving *say* was intentionally deleted by Joseph Smith (these changes, each specifically marked below with an arrow, were made during the editing for the 1837 edition):

1 Nephi 13:34

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**

wherefore I will be merciful unto the Gentiles in that day

→ [*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

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

Alma 44:13–14

and it came to pass that

the soldier which stood by which smote off the scalp of Zerahemnah

took up the scalp from off the ground by the hair

and laid it upon the point of his sword

and stretched it forth unto them

**saying** unto them with a loud voice

→ [*saying* 0A | *saying* >js NULL 1 | BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]

even as this scalp hath fallen to the earth . . .



In each of these passages, Joseph removed the redundant repetition of the same phrase involving *say*. But of the numerous instances of “and saith/said” in the text, none of these have ever been omitted, either accidentally or intentionally.

The second fact to consider is that the King James Bible has a number of examples of the expression “to answer **unto** someone”:

Judges 11:13	and the king of the children of Ammon answered <b>unto</b> the messengers of Jephthah
Daniel 2:47	the king answered <b>unto</b> Daniel and said . . .
Acts 3:12	and when Peter saw <i>it</i> / he answered <b>unto</b> the people
Acts 5:8	and Peter answered <b>unto</b> her

There are also numerous examples of “to answer unto someone” from Early Modern English up through the 19th century, as in this sampling from the online Oxford English Dictionary and *Literature Online* <lion.chadwyck.com>, with accidentals regularized:

<i>Plumpton Correspondence</i> (1461)	ye may not fail to send hither all your books and some ready man for to answer <b>unto</b> him
John Perkins (1642)	the plaintiff is essoined so that I cannot answer <b>unto</b> him
Richard Brome (about 1652)	and he hath fairly answered <b>unto</b> me
Erastus Brown (1827)	then Adam answered <b>unto</b> deity
Richard Watson Dixon (1861)	then she answered <b>unto</b> him
William Butler Yeats (1893)	Earl Paul stood on the bed of straw and answered <b>unto</b> him

So the earliest reading in Alma 18:25, “and he answered unto him”, is quite possible.

One other emendation to consider here is that the original text for Alma 18:25 may have read “and he **said** unto him” rather than “and he **answered** unto him”. This possibility would imply that at some time in the transmission of the text, an original *said* was accidentally replaced by *answered*, perhaps prompted by previous occurrences of the verb *answer* in this chapter (five times). Moreover, the immediately preceding text in verse 24 and the following text, from verse 26 through verse 34, have only the verb *say* except for the one case of *answer* here in verse 25 (marked below with an arrow):

Alma 18:24–34 (the earliest reading)	and Ammon began to speak unto him with boldness and <b>said</b> unto him . . .
→	and he <b>answered</b> unto him . . .
	and then Ammon <b>saith</b> . . .
	and he <b>saith</b> . . .

and Ammon **saith** . . .  
 and Ammon **saith** unto him again . . .  
 and he **saith** . . .  
 and Ammon **saith** unto him . . .  
 and king Lamoni **saith** . . .  
 and Ammon **saith** . . .  
 and king Lamoni **saith** . . .  
 Ammon **saith** unto him . . .

Thus *answered* in Alma 18:25 could be an error for *said*. On the other hand, there is no explicit evidence that *answer* and *say* have ever been mixed up in the history of the text. The only possible case is found in 2 Nephi 16:11, where the Book of Mormon text reads “and he **said**” while the corresponding King James text in Isaiah 6:11 reads “and he **answered**”. The discussion under 2 Nephi 16:11 suggests the possibility that the Book of Mormon text there could have originally read *answered* but that it was replaced by *said* (as a result of the earlier occurrence in the verse of “then **said** I”). As argued under that passage, the critical text will retain the consistent reading of all the Book of Mormon textual sources for 2 Nephi 16:11 (namely, *said* rather than the King James *answered*). Ultimately, there is no specific evidence for mix-ups between *answer* and *say* in the Book of Mormon text. Thus the critical text will maintain the verb *answer* in Alma 18:25: “and he answered unto him”.

**Summary:** Remove the intrusive *and said* from Alma 18:25, thus restoring the earliest extant reading (in  $\mathcal{P}$ ) of “and he answered unto him”; although this is a difficult reading, there is considerable evidence for the expression “to answer unto X” in Early Modern English (including the King James Bible) as well as throughout the 19th century.

#### ■ Alma 18:29–30

*but I do not know the heavens*  
*and Ammon saith unto him*  
*the [heavens 1BCDEFGIJLMNOPQRST | Heavens A | heaven HK]*  
*[is >js are 1 | is ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] a place*  
*where God dwells and all his holy angels*

The conflict in number agreement for “the **heavens is** a place” has led to a couple of emendations in the text. In his editing for the 1837 edition, Joseph Smith changed the singular verb *is* to *are* in  $\mathcal{P}$ , but this editorial change was never implemented in the 1837 (or any later) edition. This change may be grammatically preferable to the current reading (“the **heavens is** a place”), yet both readings are awkward because of the inherent clash between *the heavens* and *a place*. (Compare this example to the difficulties with a sentence like “Scissors **are** a handy tool”, which nonetheless in standard English is clearly preferable to “Scissors **is** a handy tool”.) There are two passages in the text where the subject *heavens* takes plural verb forms:

3 Nephi 28:13	and behold the heavens <b>were</b> opened
Ether 4:9	and at my command the heavens <b>are</b> opened and <b>are</b> shut

Of course, in both these cases there is no conflict between a plural subject and a singular predicate subject (as in Alma 18:30). On the other hand, there is one passage where the singular pronoun *it* is used to refer to a plural *heavens*:

1 Nephi 17:39        he ruleth high in the **heavens** / for **it** is his throne

The *it* works here because the corresponding subject complement is the singular *his throne*.

An alternative solution to the conflict in number between *heavens* and *a place* here in Alma 18:30 has been to change the plural subject *heavens* to the singular *heaven*, as in the 1874 RLDS edition (and followed by the second RLDS edition in 1892): “the **heaven** is a place”. But this change has its own problems since at the end of the preceding verse king Lamoni says, “but I do not know the **heavens**”. Of course, one might try to change this preceding occurrence of *the heavens* to *heaven*. In fact, the first occurrence of *heaven(s)* in verse 28 is already in the singular. Thus a “consistent” editing to the singular *heaven* would read as follows:

Alma 18:28–30 (with the second and third occurrences of *heavens* emended to *heaven*)  
 and Ammon saith unto him again  
 believest thou that this Great Spirit which is God  
 created all things which is in **heaven** and in the earth  
 and he saith  
 yea I believe that he created all things which is in the earth  
 but I do not know the **heaven**  
 and Ammon saith unto him  
 the **heaven** is a place where God dwells and all his holy angels

Of course, this solution also produces its own awkwardness: namely, “but I do not know **the** heaven”. Even changing *the heaven* to simply *heaven* (by omitting the definite article *the*) would not help particularly.

In accord with the reading of  $\mathcal{P}$ , the 1908 RLDS edition restored the plural *heavens* here in Alma 18:30. The critical text will maintain the earliest reading, despite its awkwardness (“the **heavens is** a place where God dwells and all his holy angels”). In the standard edition, the text could be grammatically emended to “the heavens **are** a place” (Joseph Smith’s emendation in  $\mathcal{P}$ ). For a complete discussion of this grammatical problem, see under SUBJECT-VERB AGREEMENT in volume 3.

**Summary:** Maintain in Alma 18:30 the subject-verb disagreement that is found in the earliest extant reading: “the **heavens is** a place where God dwells and all his holy angels”.

### ■ Alma 18:32

*yea and he looketh down upon all the children of men*  
*and he [knows 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST | knoweth HK] all the thoughts and intents of the heart*

Here the 1874 RLDS edition made an interesting change from the modern English *knows* to the Early Modern English *knoweth*. The probable source for the *-eth* ending was the preceding use of *looketh*: “and he looketh down upon all the children of men”. The 1908 RLDS edition restored the earliest reading, *knows*, to the RLDS text. We have a parallel mixture of usage in the 1 Nephi preface:

“Nephi **taketh** his brethren and **returns** to the land of Jerusalem” (the original reading). For discussion, see under that passage (or more generally under INFLECTIONAL ENDINGS in volume 3). Theoretically, either *knows* or *knoweth* will work in Alma 18:32; here the critical text will follow the earliest textual sources.

*Summary:* Maintain the third person singular *knows* in Alma 18:32 despite its stylistic conflict with the verb form *looketh* in the preceding clause.

#### ■ Alma 18:34

*and I am called by his Holy Spirit*

*to teach these things unto [this 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST | his HK] people*

Here the 1874 RLDS edition accidentally replaced *this* in “unto this people” with *his*, probably because of the *his* earlier in this sentence (“by his Holy Spirit”). Theoretically, either reading will work, although it does seem a little strange for Ammon to refer to these Lamanites as the Lord’s people prior to their conversion. The critical text will, of course, maintain the original *this* in this passage. The 1908 RLDS edition restored the *this* to the RLDS text.

*Summary:* Maintain in Alma 18:34 the original *this* in “I am called by his Holy Spirit to teach these things unto **this** people”.

#### ■ Alma 18:36

*now when Ammon had said these words he began*

*[to 1ABCDEGP | at FHIJKLMNOQRST] the creation of the world*

*and also [to 1A | BCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST] the creation of Adam*

Since the preposition *to* was repeated in the printer’s manuscript (“he began **to** the creation of the world and also **to** the creation of Adam”), its use here in Alma 18:36 appears to be fully intentional. In modern English, however, we expect *at*, *with*, or *from* as the preposition in this context. The 1852 LDS edition made the change from *to* to *at*, and the 1874 RLDS edition followed that same change. Based on the reading of  $\varnothing$ , the 1908 RLDS edition reverted to the original *to*, but in 1953 the RLDS text adopted once more the preposition *at*.

Elsewhere the Book of Mormon uses the prepositions *at* and *from* when the verb *begin* is used to refer to a topic or to a list of items:

1 Nephi preface

An account of Lehi and his wife Sariah and his four sons  
being called beginning **at** the eldest Laman Lemuel Sam and Nephi

Alma 22:12

he began **from** the creation of Adam

Note, in particular, the second example, which parallels Alma 18:36 in that both refer to the preaching by the sons of Mosiah to Lamanite kings. Sometimes in the text the use of *at* itself is strange for modern English readers:

Helaman 6:38

the Nephites did build them up and support them  
beginning **at** the more wicked part of them

For this example, modern speakers prefer the preposition *with* rather than *at*. But it should be noted that “to begin **with** something” is not found in the Book of Mormon text at all.

We get a similar use of *at* and *from* with the verb *begin* in the King James Bible, but (as with the Book of Mormon) there are no instances of “to begin **with** something”:

Luke 24:27

and beginning **at** Moses and all the prophets  
he expounded unto them in all the scriptures the things concerning himself

Acts 1:21–22

wherefore of these men which have companied with us  
all the time that the Lord Jesus went in and out among us  
beginning **from** the baptism of John  
unto that same day that he was taken up from us . . .

It should also be noted that there are no instances in the King James Bible of “to begin **to** something”.

However, there are examples of “to begin to something” in the history of the English language. Here are two examples from *Literature Online* <lion.chadwyck.com>, one from the early 17th century, the other from the 19th century (here the accidentals are regularized):

Samuel Daniel (1604)

they began **to** the music of the viols and lutes

William Black (1871)

they began **to** the French-looking repast which had been served for them

For these two instances, we would expect the preposition *with* in modern English.

It is also worth noting that the original text of the Book of Mormon has a number of places where we might expect *at* or *in* in modern English. There are four readings with original *to* that were emended to *at* in the 1920 LDS edition:

1 Nephi 18:23	we did arrive <b>to</b> the promised land
Mosiah 18:7	there were a goodly number gathered together <b>to</b> the place of Mormon
Alma 52:18	Moroni did arrive with his army <b>to</b> the land of Bountiful
Alma 58:27	insomuch that we did arrive before them <b>to</b> the city of Manti

And there are four more readings with original *to* that were emended to *in* in the 1920 LDS edition:

1 Nephi 17:14	after ye have arriven <b>to</b> the promised land
Mosiah 10:15	when they had arriven <b>to</b> the promised land
Mosiah 24:25	they arrived <b>to</b> the land of Zarahemla
Alma 20:30	even until they had arriven <b>to</b> the land of Middoni

All eight of these examples refer to geography rather than topics of discussion, and seven of them involve the verb *arrive*. It should also be pointed out that there is one example involving *arrive* where the preposition is *at*:

Alma 56:15

and these are the cities which they possessed  
 when I arrived [*at* 0ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST | *to* > *at* 1] the city of Judea

The original manuscript is extant for this example and it reads *at*. In this case, Oliver Cowdery made an interesting error when he copied the text from  $\mathcal{O}$  into  $\mathcal{P}$ : he initially wrote *to*, but then virtually immediately he crossed out the *to* and supralinearly inserted the correct *at* (there is no change in the level of ink flow). We could interpret this momentary error as evidence that *to* was not an especially difficult reading for Oliver or as evidence that he had become used to the expression “to arrive **to** a place”. In any event, *to* was sometimes used in the Book of Mormon text where we, as modern readers, expect *at*.

The critical text will maintain the original preposition *to* in Alma 18:36 despite its difficulty. In the 1837 edition, however, the repeated *to* was omitted, perhaps accidentally. Prepositional repetition in conjunctive structures is common in the Book of Mormon text, as explained under CONJUNCTIVE REPETITION in volume 3. The critical text will restore not only the *to* in Alma 18:36 but also its repetition.

**Summary:** Restore the original preposition *to* and its repetition in Alma 18:36: “he began **to** the creation of the world and also **to** the creation of Adam”, despite the difficulty of the preposition *to* with the verb *begin*.

#### ■ Alma 18:36

*now when Ammon had said these words*  
*he began to the creation of the world and also to the creation of Adam*  
*and told him all the things concerning the fall of man*  
*and rehearsed and laid before him*  
*the [record > records 1 | records ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST]*  
*[of >+ & 1 | and ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST] the holy scriptures of the people*  
*[& 1 | and A | BCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST] which had been spoken by the prophets*  
*even down to the time that their father Lehi left Jerusalem*

Here at the end of verse 36, we have a number of errors in  $\mathcal{P}$ . First of all, Oliver Cowdery initially wrote *records* as *record*, but then almost immediately he inserted inline the plural *s* in the original space between *record* and the following original *of*. As described below, this *of* was later corrected to *and* (and with somewhat heavier ink flow), but there is no change in the level of ink flow for the inserted plural *s*. The plural is probably the correct reading since elsewhere in the text we always get the plural form of the word *record* (that is, *records*) when it occurs with the word *scriptures*:

Alma 14:8

and they also brought forth **their records**  
 which contained **the holy scriptures**

Alma 18:38

and he expounded unto them **all the records and scriptures**

Alma 37:3

and these plates of brass which contain these engravings  
which have **the records of the holy scriptures** upon them . . .

As explained under 1 Nephi 5:21, for each case of *record(s)* the critical text will follow the earliest textual sources. Thus the plural *records* is very probably the original reading here in Alma 18:36.

Besides initially writing *record* in  $\mathcal{P}$ , Oliver Cowdery also wrote “**of** the holy scriptures of the people”. In this instance, Oliver corrected the first *of* to *and* (supralinearly writing it as a ampersand) and with somewhat heavier ink flow, which suggests that he made this correction when he proofed  $\mathcal{P}$  against  $\mathcal{C}$ . Either *and* or *of* will work here. Note, for instance, the phraseology in Alma 18:38 and Alma 37:3 (both listed just above): the first uses *and* to connect *records* and *scriptures*; the second places *scriptures* in a postmodifying prepositional phrase headed by *of*. One possible source for Oliver’s initial *of* here in Alma 18:36 is the *of* later on in the phrase (“the holy scriptures **of** the people”). Less plausible in my view is the possibility that Oliver was prompted by the nearby “all the records **and** scriptures” (in verse 38) to consciously emend the earlier “the records **of** the holy scriptures” (in verse 36) to “the records **and** the holy scriptures”. The critical text will accept Oliver’s correction of *of* to *and* in Alma 18:36.

Finally, we need to consider the *and* that comes right before the relative clause “which had been spoken by the prophets”. This *and* is found in  $\mathcal{P}$  and the 1830 edition, yet elsewhere in the Book of Mormon text whenever *and* introduces a relative clause, we always have a preceding relative clause conjoined with it. In the earliest text, there are 24 other occurrences of *and which*, and for each of these there is a preceding relative clause, as in the following example:

Alma 22:27

the king sent a proclamation throughout all the land amongst all his people  
which was in all his land which was in all the regions round about  
**which** was bordering even to the sea on the east and on the west  
**and which** was divided from the land of Zarahemla by a narrow strip of wilderness

There is also one instance of “and also which”, and it too has a preceding relative clause:

Alma 37:14

God hath entrusted you with these things which are sacred  
**which** he hath kept sacred  
**and also which** he will keep and preserve for a wise purpose in him

The *which* in eight of the 25 cases refers to people and has thus been edited to *who*. There are also five instances of *and who* in the original text, and each of these also has a preceding relative clause (here I exclude, of course, cases where the *who* is an interrogative pronoun). In other words, the occurrence of *and which* in the earliest text for Alma 18:36, besides being highly awkward, is completely unsupported by usage elsewhere in the text.

One obvious emendation would be to remove the extra *and*. The 1837 edition introduced this correction into the text, and it has been retained in all subsequent printed editions. It may seem strange to refer to scriptures as having been spoken, but actually there is another passage later on in the text that supports this reading—in fact, the relative clause is identical to the one here in Alma 18:36:



3 Nephi 10:11  
 and thus far were the scriptures fulfilled  
**which had been spoken by the prophets**

Further support for the corrected reading in Alma 18:36 (where scriptures are referred to as being spoken) can be found in a revelation given through Joseph Smith to Oliver Cowdery in April 1829, during the time that the Book of Mormon was being translated:

Book of Commandments 7:1 (Doctrine and Covenants 8:1)  
 even so sure shall you receive a knowledge  
 of whatsoever things you shall ask in faith with an honest heart  
 believing that you shall receive a knowledge  
 concerning the engravings of old records which are ancient  
 which contain **those parts of my scripture**  
**of which have been spoken by the manifestation of my Spirit**

The language is not the same, but it expresses the same idea: namely, that the scriptures contain the spoken word of God.

We might also note that in Alma 18:36 an extra *and* could have been inserted before the *which* because of the quite frequent use of *and* in the preceding text:

Alma 18:36  
 he began to the creation of the world  
**and** also to the creation of Adam  
**and** told him all the things concerning the fall of man  
**and** rehearsed  
**and** laid before him the records  
**and** the holy scriptures of the people  
 → **and** which had been spoken by the prophets

Thus accidentally adding an extra *and* before “which had been spoken by the prophets” (marked above with an arrow) could have readily happened.

Another possible emendation for Alma 18:36 is that during the early transmission of the text, some word or words were omitted between the *and* and the *which*. One possibility is that the single word *that* was accidentally deleted:

Alma 18:36 (another possible emendation)  
 and rehearsed and laid before him the records  
 and the holy scriptures of the people  
 and **that** which had been spoken by the prophets  
 even down to the time that their father Lehi left Jerusalem

One problem with this emendation is that it ends up distinguishing between the holy scriptures and the spoken words of the prophets. Yet those words would have been in some written form, especially here in Alma 18 since the text specifically refers to Ammon relying on the records and scriptures in his teaching of king Lamoni: “and he expounded unto them all the records and scriptures from the time that Lehi left Jerusalem down to the present time” (Alma 18:38). Thus the 1837 reading that removed the *and* in verse 36 seems more reasonable as an emendation since



it specifically claims that the written record (which included the holy scriptures) contained the words of the prophets.

*Summary:* Accept in Alma 18:36 the 1837 emendation that removed the *and* before the relative clause “which had been spoken by the prophets”; elsewhere in the Book of Mormon text, a conjoined relative clause is always preceded by another relative clause.

### ■ Alma 18:36

*even down to the time that*

[NULL > *their father* 1 | *their father* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST | *their Father* HK]

*Lehi left Jerusalem*

Oliver Cowdery initially wrote “even down to the time that Lehi left Jerusalem”, but then almost immediately he supralinearly inserted *their father* before *Lehi*. (The level of ink flow for the correction itself is unchanged, but the insert mark is written in heavier ink, perhaps after Oliver had redipped his quill.) Oliver was undoubtedly correcting  $\wp$  to  $\wp$  since normally the text refers to simply “the time (that) Lehi left Jerusalem” (eight times, including a nearby example in Alma 18:38: “from the time that Lehi left Jerusalem”). But there are two other occurrences of this expression where the name *Lehi* acts as an appositive to *our father*:

Enos 1:25	from the time that <b>our father</b> Lehi left Jerusalem
Mosiah 2:34	even down to the time <b>our father</b> Lehi left Jerusalem

The critical text will maintain the fuller expression here in Alma 18:36.

*Summary:* Maintain in Alma 18:36 the corrected reading in  $\wp$  with the added noun phrase *their father*: “even down to the time that **their father** Lehi left Jerusalem”.

### ■ Alma 18:37

*and he also rehearsed unto them . . .*

*all the journeyings of their fathers in the wilderness*

*and all their sufferings with hunger and thirst*

*and their [travel 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPS | travail T] etc.*

As discussed under 2 Nephi 29:4, the correct interpretation for the spelling *travel* in this passage is the word *travail*. One further question here in Alma 18:37 is whether the singular form *travail* might be a mistake for the plural *travails*. Elsewhere in the text, the number for *travail(s)* in conjoined constructions always agrees with the number for the conjoined nouns:

2 Nephi 29:4 (all plural)	the <b>travails</b> and the <b>labors</b> and the <b>pains</b> of the Jews
Mosiah 27:33 (all singular)	with <b>long-suffering</b> and much <b>travail</b>

Mosiah 29:33 (all plural)

all the **trials** and **troubles** of a righteous king  
yea all the **travails** of soul for their people  
and also all the **murmurings** of the people to their king

Here in Alma 18:37, *travail* is conjoined with two plural nouns, *journeyings* and *sufferings*, which suggests that *travails* may be the correct reading. Perhaps the singular *travail* entered the text because of the two immediately preceding singular nouns, *hunger* and *thirst* (“and all their sufferings with hunger and thirst”). It seems very reasonable that given the immediately preceding singulars *hunger* and *thirst*, the plural *s* could have been accidentally dropped in writing the text for either  $\mathcal{O}$  or  $\mathcal{P}$ .

On the other hand, the singular *travail* will work. Besides the example of the singular *travail* in Mosiah 27:33 (listed above), we have *travail* in Mosiah 14:11, which quotes Isaiah 53:11: “he shall see of the **travail** of his soul”. Although *travail* in Alma 18:37 may be an error for *travails*, the critical text will follow the singular *travail* since there is nothing inherently wrong with it.

**Summary:** Maintain in Alma 18:37 the singular *travail*, the 1981 LDS reading; the singular *travail* works here even though it could be an error for the plural *travails*.

# Alma 19

## ■ Alma 19:1

*they were about to take his body*

*and lay it [in > into 1 | in ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] a sepulchre*

In the printer's manuscript, Oliver Cowdery initially wrote "in a sepulchre"; then he supralinearly inserted *to*, thus changing the *in* to *into*. The 1830 typesetter, however, ignored this change and restored the earlier *in*. Oliver's correction in  $\mathcal{O}$  appears to be virtually immediate (there is no change in the level of ink flow), so most probably the original manuscript actually read *into*. On the other hand, the King James Bible supports the use of the preposition *in* with the verb *lay* and the noun *sepulchre*:

Mark 15:46	and laid him <b>in</b> a sepulchre which was hewn out of a rock
Luke 23:53	and laid it <b>in</b> a sepulchre . . . where <b>in</b> never man before was laid
John 19:41	and in the garden a new sepulchre where <b>in</b> was never man yet laid
Acts 7:16	and laid <b>in</b> the sepulchre that Abraham bought
Acts 13:29	they took <i>him</i> down from the tree and laid <i>him</i> <b>in</b> a sepulchre

The well-known language referring to the burial of Christ seems to have been the source for the tendency in Alma 19:1 to adopt the phraseology "to lay **in** a sepulchre". There is also a similar example in the Book of Mormon of the use of *in* with *sepulchre*:

2 Nephi 25:13	and after that he is laid <b>in</b> a sepulchre for the space of three days
---------------	---

See under that passage for discussion of the passive phraseology "to be laid in a sepulchre".

Similarly, the scriptures consistently support the use of *in* when the verb is *bury* ("to bury **in** a sepulchre") in 14 passages in the King James Bible as well as one in the Book of Mormon, again referring to the burial of Christ:

1 Nephi 19:10	and to be buried <b>in</b> a sepulchre
---------------	--

Further support for *in* comes from a nearby example in Alma 19 involving the verb *place*:

Alma 19:5	that he ought to be placed <b>in</b> the sepulchre
-----------	--

Despite all this support for *in*, the corrected *into* seems to have been the reading of the original manuscript, for there is clearly no motivation for Oliver Cowdery to have corrected the expected *in* to *into* except that  $\mathcal{O}$  read that way. Of course, it is possible that the reading in  $\mathcal{O}$  itself may have been faulty. There are quite a few examples in the history of the text of *into* and *in* being mixed up; for a list of examples, see under 1 Nephi 4:33. But overall, the reading with *into* is not

impossible. Thus the critical text will accept the difficult reading with the preposition *into* here in Alma 19:1 since it will work and it seems to be intended. For another example in the Book of Mormon text where readers expect *in* rather than an original *into*, see the discussion under Mosiah 23:26; this passage originally read “the brethren of Alma . . . gathered themselves together **into** the city of Helam”, but the LDS text now has the expected *in*.

**Summary:** Restore the original but unexpected preposition *into* in Alma 19:1: “they were about to take his body and lay it **into** a sepulchre”.

### ■ Alma 19:3

*and it came [to 01ABCDEFGHIJKLMNPQRST | INO] pass that Ammon did as he was commanded*

The loss in the 1879 LDS edition of the *to* from the familiar phrase “it came to pass” is, of course, quite unacceptable. Surprisingly, this typo continued in two subsequent LDS editions that derive from the 1879 edition, the 1906 large-print edition and the 1907 vest-pocket edition. On the other hand, the 1888, 1902, and 1905 LDS editions, which also derive from the 1879 edition, corrected this obvious error.

**Summary:** Completely unacceptable typos are sometimes copied from one edition to another, as in the case of “it came pass” in Alma 19:3.

### ■ Alma 19:5

*and that he ought to be placed in [the 1ABCDEFGHIJLMNOQRT | a HKPS] sepulchre*

Scriptural language typically refers to “in a sepulchre” (see, for instance, the examples listed above under Alma 19:1). But the earliest text in Alma 19:5 reads “in **the** sepulchre”. Here the 1874 RLDS edition replaced the definite article *the* with the indefinite *a*, which will work, of course. The RLDS text has retained this secondary reading. But there is nothing wrong with the definite article here in verse 5. Earlier in Alma 19:1 the text had already referred to the sepulchre (“they were about to take his body and lay it into a sepulchre”). So the use of the definite article later on is perfectly acceptable. In fact, the queen may have simply been referring to a generic place of burial in verse 5. The critical text will maintain the original *the* here in Alma 19:5: “and that he ought to be placed in **the** sepulchre”.

**Summary:** Maintain in Alma 19:5 the definite article *the* before *sepulchre*, the earliest reading.

### ■ Alma 19:5

*but as for myself*

*to me he [doath 0 | doth 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNPQRST] not stink*

As discussed under Alma 3:19, there is at least one case in the earliest text where we find the stressed verb form *doeth* in place of the expected unstressed form *doth*. The original manuscript is extant here in Alma 19:5 and it has the spelling *doath* for *doth*. One wonders whether this

misspelling *doath* might be an attempt to spell *doeth* rather than *doth*, but the evidence argues otherwise. First of all, the main verb form *doeth* occurs 24 times in the text and not once was it misspelled as *doath*. Secondly, there are four other instances of the misspelling *doath*, all in the original manuscript and all by Oliver Cowdery. In each instance, Oliver copied the word correctly into  $\mathfrak{P}$  as *doth* (just as here in Alma 19:5):

Alma 24:14

therefore in his mercy

he [*doath* 0 | *doth* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST] visit us by his angels

Alma 26:8

for he [*doath* 0 | *doth* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST] work righteousness forever

Alma 26:10

thy joy [*doath* 0 | *doth* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST] carry thee away unto boasting

Alma 54:6

and the sword of his almighty wrath

which [*doath* 0 | *doth* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST] hang over you . . .

Joseph Smith, as he dictated the text to Oliver, may have pronounced *doth* as /douθ/ (not as /dəθ/), perhaps under the influence of the word *both*, which would imply that Joseph was unfamiliar with the correct pronunciation of the biblically styled *doth*. This mispronunciation then led Oliver to occasionally spell *doth* in  $\mathfrak{O}$  as *doath* (based on the spelling for the word *oath* rather than *both*). In any event, the critical text will maintain the standard spelling *doth* for all five cases where Oliver misspelled the word in  $\mathfrak{O}$  as *doath*. Oliver usually spelled *doth* correctly in  $\mathfrak{O}$ —and always in  $\mathfrak{P}$ .

**Summary:** The misspelling *doath* in Alma 19:5 and elsewhere in the text (only in  $\mathfrak{O}$  and in Oliver Cowdery’s hand) is an error for *doth* and not *doeth*.

#### ■ Alma 19:6

*now this was what Ammon desired*

*for he knew that king Lamoni **was** under the power of God*

*he knew that the dark veil of unbelief*

[ 01ABCDEFGHIJKLOPS | NULL > was M | was NQRT ] *being cast away from his mind*

The original manuscript is extant here and reads “the dark veil of unbelief being cast away from his mind”. In agreement with the *was* in the preceding clause (“for he knew that king Lamoni **was** under the power of God”), the 1906 LDS large-print edition supplied the expected finite verb form *was*, which was then followed in the third printing (in 1907) of the 1905 LDS missionary edition as well as in all subsequent LDS editions (from 1911 on). The RLDS text has retained the earliest reading with its nonfinite clause form.

If an original *was* was lost from the text, it must have occurred as Joseph Smith was dictating the text since, as noted above,  $\mathfrak{O}$  is extant here and lacks the *was*. To be sure, a *was* could have been accidentally omitted during the early transmission of the text, as in the following list of initial errors in the two manuscripts:

Alma 47:3 (error by Oliver Cowdery in  $\mathcal{C}$ , virtually immediately corrected)  
 therefore he gave Amalickiah the command of that part of his army  
 which [NULL > was 0 | was 1] obedient unto his commands

3 Nephi 24:16 (error by scribe 2 of  $\mathcal{P}$ , later corrected by Oliver Cowdery)  
 and a book of remembrance [ $\mathcal{S}2$  NULL >  $\mathcal{S}1$  was 1] written before him  
 for them that feared the Lord

Mormon 9:19 (error by scribe 2 of  $\mathcal{P}$ , virtually immediately corrected)  
 and if there [NULL > was 1] miracles wrought  
 then why has God ceased to be a God of miracles

There are no other examples of “to know that <present participial clause>” in the text (original or otherwise), but there are examples in the original text of “to know that <infinitive clause>”; in each case the infinitive form involves the verb *be* (and is thus similar in that respect to the non-finite form *being* in Alma 19:6):

1 Nephi 1:3	and I know that the record which I make <b>to be</b> true
Moroni 4:1	wherefore we know that the manner <b>to be</b> true

In the editing for the 1837 edition, the *to be* in 1 Nephi 1:3 was replaced by *is*, while in Moroni 4:1 the *that* was deleted. We should also note that there are examples in the text of present participial clauses in subordinate contexts that are never completed (see the examples listed under Alma 16:21). Thus the earliest reading here in Alma 19:6 may be intended.

Ultimately, it is difficult to decide the original reading here. But since there are two similar examples in the original text of nonfinite *be* used in the same context of “to know that <nonfinite clause>”, the critical text will accept the earlier but difficult reading in Alma 19:6: “he knew that the dark veil of unbelief **being** cast away from his mind”. Here we may have a case of a Hebrew-like present participial clause where the finite form of the *be* verb (here *was*) is understood. For other possible examples of unattached present participial clauses in the original text, see under 1 Nephi 3:17. Of course, the possibility remains that an original *was* was accidentally omitted from the subordinate clause in this sentence.

**Summary:** Accept in Alma 19:6 the earliest reading without the finite verb form *was* (“he knew that the dark veil of unbelief **being** cast away from his mind”); despite the difficulty and uniqueness of this present participial construction without the *was*, the original text has similar examples involving the infinitival form *to be*.

#### ■ Alma 19:6

*yea this light had infused*

[*such* 1ABDEFIJLMNOPQRST | *much* CGHK] *joy into his soul*

The 1840 edition introduced the reading *much joy* in place of the original *such joy*. This reading was maintained in the RLDS textual tradition until the third RLDS edition in 1908. The use of *much* appears to be a typo rather than the result of editing on the part of Joseph Smith for the

1840 edition; apparently the 1840 typesetter accidentally replaced *such* with *much* because both words are orthographically similar.

Elsewhere the text has evidence for both *such joy* and *much joy*; there is one other example with *such* and two with *much*:

Alma 2:8	now this did cause <b>much</b> joy in the hearts of those which were against him
Alma 30:35	that causeth <b>such</b> joy in their hearts
Alma 56:17	yea those sons of mine gave them great hopes and <b>much</b> joy

The other example of *such joy* (in Alma 30:35) is extant in the original manuscript.

**Summary:** Reject the 1840 change in Alma 19:6 from *such joy* to *much joy*; the introduction of *much* into the 1840 edition was probably a simple typo.

### ■ Alma 19:6

*yea this light had infused such joy into his soul  
the cloud of darkness having been dispelled  
and [NULL >js that 1| A| that BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] the light of everlasting life  
was lit up in his soul*

Joseph Smith, in his editing for the 1837 edition, inserted the subordinate conjunction *that* into this passage, perhaps in an attempt to link the resulting subordinate clause to the two *that*-clauses earlier in this verse:

Alma 19:6 (Joseph Smith's emendation, with the extra *that* marked with an arrow)  
for he knew **that** king Lamoni was under the power of God  
he knew **that** the dark veil of unbelief being cast away from his mind . . .  
→ and **that** the light of everlasting life was lit up in his soul

Yet the immediately following text in this same verse shows that the repetition of the *that* is not necessary:

Alma 19:6  
yea he knew **that** this had overcome his natural frame  
and he was carried away in God

Moreover, we are not required to interpret "the light of everlasting life was lit up in his soul" as a subordinate clause. Instead, this final clause can be interpreted as providing another way of referring to the change that had overcome king Lamoni. In other words, we basically have a sequence of two main clauses, with a present participial clause intervening between those two clauses (and separated off by dashes in the following):

Alma 19:6 (the original text)  
yea this light had infused such joy into his soul  
— the cloud of darkness having been dispelled —  
and the light of everlasting life was lit up in his soul

In this instance, the original text works well enough and does not need to be emended by adding an additional *that*.

Another possibility is that Joseph's extra *that* was an attempt to provide a resultive clause for the preceding occurrence of *such*. Yet if this were so, the *and* should have been deleted:

Alma 19:6 (Joseph Smith's emendation, plus removal of the *and*)  
 yea this light had infused **such** joy into his soul  
 —the cloud of darkness having been dispelled—  
 → **that** the light of everlasting life was lit up in his soul

Although the original manuscript is not extant for this precise part of the text, spacing between extant fragments argues that there was no room in  $\mathcal{O}$  for a *that* except by supralinear insertion. The critical text will therefore restore the original phraseology in Alma 19:6—that is, without any *that* after the *and*: “and the light of everlasting life was lit up in his soul”.

**Summary:** Remove in Alma 19:6 the unnecessary *that* introduced by Joseph Smith after the *and* that precedes the clause “the light of everlasting life was lit up in his soul”.

#### ■ Alma 19:6

*and the light which did light up his mind  
 which was the light of the glory of God  
 which was a marvelous light of his goodness  
 yea this light had infused such joy into his soul  
 the cloud of darkness having been dispelled  
 and the light of everlasting [light 0ABCDEFGHIKPS | light >js life 1 | life FIJLMNOQRT]  
 was lit up in his soul*

This passage is filled with many instances of the word *light*, yet there is probably one example of *light* in the earliest reading that is a mistake for *life*: namely, the second *light* in the phrase “the light of everlasting light”. We have a fragment of the original manuscript for the latter end of this phrase, and it definitely reads *light*, not *life*. However, the dominance of *light* throughout the passage (as well as the phonetic similarity between *light* and *life*) readily suggests that Oliver Cowdery accidentally wrote *light* rather than *life* here in the original manuscript. There is, in fact, specific evidence that *light* and *life* can get mixed up in the text:

Alma 32:35 (Oliver Cowdery's initial error in  $\mathcal{O}$ )  
 yea because it is [*life* > *light* 0 | *light* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST]  
 Ether 3:14 (error in the 1830 edition)  
 in me shall all mankind have [*life* 1PST | *light* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOQR]

These two examples clearly show that *life* and *light* can be mixed up (misheard in the first case, misread in the second).

In his editing of Alma 19:6 for the 1837 edition, Joseph Smith changed the second *light* in “the light of everlasting **light**” to *life*, yet the 1837 compositor did not set *life* but retained *light* (perhaps accidentally). The 1852 LDS edition independently substituted *life* for *light*, and this reading has been retained in all subsequent LDS editions. The RLDS text has retained the earlier *light*,



even though Joseph marked the change to *life* in the printer's manuscript, the major source for correcting the text in the 1908 RLDS edition.

Internal evidence strongly argues that *life* is indeed the correct reading in Alma 19:6. First, the expression "light of everlasting light" is excessively redundant and does not make sense. Second, although there are a few occurrences in the scriptures that have the phrase "everlasting light", in those cases the phrase "everlasting light" makes sense:

Isaiah 60:19–20 (King James Bible)

the sun shall be no more thy light by day  
neither for brightness shall the moon give light unto thee  
but the LORD shall be unto thee **an everlasting light** and thy God thy glory  
thy sun shall no more go down  
neither shall thy moon withdraw itself  
for the LORD shall be **thine everlasting light**  
and the days of thy mourning shall be ended

Alma 26:15

yea they were encircled about with everlasting darkness and destruction  
but behold he hath brought them into **his everlasting light**

Note particularly in Alma 26:15 the contrast between "everlasting darkness" and "everlasting light", or in the two Isaiah verses the promised replacement of the light of the sun and moon with the Lord's everlasting light. In no instance do we get anything like the redundancy of "the **light** of everlasting **light**".

In contrast to these legitimate occurrences of "everlasting light", there are many occurrences of "everlasting life" in the scriptures. Besides ten occurrences in the King James New Testament (and one in the Old Testament), there are six invariant occurrences in the Book of Mormon:

Alma 32:41	it shall be a tree springing up unto everlasting life
Alma 33:23	it will become a tree springing up in you unto everlasting life
Helaman 12:26	they that have done good shall have everlasting life
Helaman 14:8	the same shall have everlasting life
3 Nephi 5:13	that they might have everlasting life
3 Nephi 26:5	if they be good / to the resurrection of everlasting life

And finally, David Calabro (personal communication) points out an interesting biblical parallel to the phraseology of the emended reading in Alma 19:6—namely, this passage not only contrasts darkness with light, but also has the phrase "the light of life":

John 8:12

then spake Jesus again unto them saying  
I am the light of the world  
he that followeth me shall not walk **in darkness**  
but shall have **the light of life**

Thus Joseph Smith's emendation to *life* (as well as the same change in the 1852 LDS edition) most probably restored the original text for Alma 19:6 (namely, "the light of everlasting **life**").

*Summary:* Accept in Alma 19:6 Joseph Smith’s and the 1852 edition’s emendation of “the light of everlasting **light**” to “the light of everlasting **life**”; internal evidence and scribal errors strongly support this emendation.

#### ■ Alma 19:7

*therefore he went in to see the king  
according as the queen had desired* [ 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST | of HK] *him*

The 1874 RLDS edition inserted the preposition *of* before the object of the verb *desire*. The 1908 RLDS edition restored the original reading by deleting the extra *of*. Either reading, with or without the *of*, is possible, as in the following pair of contrasting examples where the verb *desire* takes a *that*-clause as its complement:

1 Nephi 3:24	and desired him <b>that</b> he would give unto us the records
Mormon 6:2	and desired <b>of</b> him <b>that</b> he would grant unto us that . . .

The example here in Alma 19:7 involves an ellipted infinitive clause, as if the text read “the queen had desired him to see the king”. The critical text will maintain the original reading without the *of* before the *him*.

*Summary:* Maintain in Alma 19:7 the original reading without any *of* before the object *him* (“according as the queen had desired him”).

#### ■ Alma 19:9

*and she said* [NULL >+ unto him 1 | unto him ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST]

Here in Alma 19:9, Oliver Cowdery initially wrote “and she said” in  $\emptyset$ . Somewhat later he supralinearly inserted “unto him” at the end of the clause (the inserted text is written with slightly heavier ink flow, perhaps after Oliver redipped his quill).  $\mathcal{O}$  is not extant here, but there is definitely room between extant fragments for “unto him”. Here in this exchange between the queen and Ammon (verses 4–10), the phrase “unto X” occurs after each narrative use of the verb *say* (five times, including here in verse 9). But earlier, in Alma 18:24–34, in the exchange between the king and Ammon, the prepositional phrase “unto him” occurs four times after the verb *say* in the original text, but in seven instances that phrase is lacking. Elsewhere there is no evidence that Oliver ever consciously added “unto X” to narrative uses of the verb *say*. Interestingly, there is one other example where Oliver initially missed “unto him” in his copywork; in that instance,  $\mathcal{O}$  is extant and has “unto him”:

Jacob 7:14  
and I said [*unto him* 0ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST | NULL >+ *unto him* 1]  
what am I that I should tempt God to shew unto thee a sign

Thus there is considerable evidence in support of the claim that Alma 19:9 read “unto him” in  $\mathcal{O}$ .

*Summary:* Maintain the prepositional phrase “unto him” after the narrative verb *say* whenever it is supported by the earliest reading, as in the corrected reading in  $\emptyset$  for Alma 19:9.

## ■ Alma 19:9

*and she said unto him*  
*I have [had 1ABCEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST | D] no witness*  
*save thy word and the word of our servants*

The 1841 British edition replaced the present perfect *have had* with the simple present-tense *have* (by omitting the *had*). Either reading is theoretically possible here. For another example where the 1841 edition accidentally omitted the perfect, see under Mosiah 23:31. The critical text will follow the earliest textual sources in maintaining the perfect in Alma 19:9.

**Summary:** Maintain in Alma 19:9 the use of the present perfect in “I **have had** no witness”.

## ■ Alma 19:9

*and she said unto him*  
*I have had no witness save thy word and the word of our servants*  
*nevertheless I believe [that 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST | HK] it shall be*  
*according as thou hast said*

The subordinate conjunction *that* was omitted by the 1874 RLDS edition and restored to the RLDS text in the third RLDS edition (1908). Either reading, with or without the *that*, is theoretically possible in English, although in almost every instance in the Book of Mormon text when the verb *believe* takes a finite clause as its complement, the subordinate conjunction *that* precedes the clause (67 times). In one place, the *that* was omitted when Oliver Cowdery copied the text from  $\mathcal{C}$  into  $\mathcal{D}$ :

Alma 44:9  
 but we believe [*that* 0ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST | 1] it is your cunning  
 that hath preserved you from our swords

In this instance, the 1830 edition restored the *that*, apparently by reference to the original manuscript ( $\mathcal{C}$  was used to proof the 22nd gathering of the 1830 edition, covering Alma 41:8 – 46:30). See the discussion accompanying plate 11 of volume 1 of the critical text.

There is only one instance in the earliest text where there is no *that* before the finite-clause complement of the verb *believe*:

Alma 32:25  
 for I verily believe [ 01A | *that* BCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST]  
 there are some among you which would humble themselves

In this instance, the 1837 edition added the *that*, with the result that now in the current LDS and RLDS texts there is no example of the verb *believe* where its finite-clause complement lacks the subordinate conjunction *that*. The critical text will in each case follow the earliest textual sources, thus removing the intrusive *that* in Alma 32:25 (for further discussion, see under that passage). For a general discussion of the use of the subordinate conjunction *that* after other verbs, see under THAT in volume 3.

**Summary:** Maintain the normally expected *that* after *believe* in Alma 19:9: “I believe **that** it shall be according as thou hast said”.

## ■ Alma 19:12–13

*blessed be the name of God*  
 [NULL >+ & *blessed art thou* 1 | *and blessed art thou* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]  
*for as sure as thou livest*  
*behold I have seen my Redeemer*  
*and he shall come forth and be born of a woman*  
*and he shall redeem all mankind who believe on his name*

Here in the printer’s manuscript, Oliver Cowdery initially skipped the conjoined clause “and blessed art thou”. The reoccurrence of the word *blessed* seems to have led Oliver to skip this second clause. Somewhat later, probably when he proofed  $\mathcal{P}$  against  $\mathcal{C}$ , Oliver supplied the clause (the level of ink flow for the supralinear insertion is somewhat heavier). Obviously, there would have been absolutely no motivation to emend the text here by adding the extra clause, which (along with the following “for as sure as thou livest”) seems to be formulaic rather than substantive in meaning.

**Summary:** Maintain in Alma 19:12 the formulaic phrase “and blessed art thou” that Oliver Cowdery initially omitted when he copied from  $\mathcal{C}$  into  $\mathcal{P}$ .

## ■ Alma 19:13

*now when he had said these words*  
*his heart was swollen within him*  
*and he **sunk** again with joy*  
*and the queen also [sunk 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNO PQR T | sank s] down*  
*being overpowered by the Spirit*

Standard English allows both *sank* and *sunk* for the simple past tense of the verb *sink*. In the Book of Mormon, we have only three examples of the simple past-tense form for *sink*; all three read *sunk* in the original text, twice here in Alma 19:13 and once in the small plates of Nephi:

Enos 1:3            and the words of my father **sunk** deep into my heart

The 1953 RLDS edition replaced the second of the two *sunk*’s in Alma 19:13 with *sank*, probably accidentally since the first was not changed. Unlike the Book of Mormon text (which only has *sunk*), the King James Bible itself shows more variation for the simple past-tense form for *sink*, with two cases of *sank* and four of *sunk*. For additional discussion of this kind of variation in the text, see under PAST TENSE in volume 3.

The standard past-participial form for the verb *sink* is *sunk*. As we might suspect, the Book of Mormon text consistently has *sunk* for the past participle (eight times). There are no examples of *sank*, the alternative past-tense form, acting as the past participle. For discussion of this possible usage, see under PAST PARTICIPLE in volume 3.

**Summary:** Retain the three instances of the simple past-tense form *sunk* in Enos 1:3 and Alma 19:13; there are no examples in the original text of *sank*, as either the simple past-tense form or as the past participle for the verb *sink*.

## ■ Alma 19:14

*now Ammon seeing the Spirit of [the Lord 0ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST | God >- the Lord 1]  
poured out according to his prayers upon the Lamanites his brethren . . .*

Here in the printer's manuscript, Oliver Cowdery initially wrote "the Spirit of God". Some time later, with uneven ink flow, he crossed out *God* and supralinearly inserted *the Lord*. The original manuscript is sufficiently extant here to determine that it read "the Spirit of the Lord". Either reading is, of course, possible: there are 40 occurrences in the text of "the Spirit of the Lord" (including one of "the Spirit of the Lord Omnipotent", in Mosiah 5:2) while there are 17 occurrences of "the Spirit of God", including a nearby preceding one in Alma 18:16 (which may have prompted Oliver to initially write "the Spirit of God" here in Alma 19:14). For each instance of "the Spirit of God" and "the Spirit of the Lord", the critical text will follow the reading of the earliest textual sources.

**Summary:** Maintain in Alma 19:14 the reading in  $\mathfrak{C}$  (and the corrected reading in  $\mathfrak{D}$ ): "the Spirit of the Lord".

## ■ Alma 19:14

*now Ammon seeing the Spirit of the Lord poured out according to his prayers  
upon the Lamanites his brethren  
which had been the cause of so much mourning among the Nephites or among all the people of God  
because of their iniquities and their [traditions 0ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST |  
tradition > traditions 1]*

Although the original manuscript is not very clear here, the reading appears to be the plural *traditions*. When Oliver Cowdery was copying the text from  $\mathfrak{C}$  into  $\mathfrak{D}$ , he initially wrote the singular *tradition*, but then soon thereafter he inserted the plural *s* at the end of *tradition*. The question of *tradition* versus *traditions* is discussed under Mosiah 1:5. For each case of *tradition(s)*, the critical text will follow the earliest textual sources, thus *traditions* here in Alma 19:14. Also see the discussion under Alma 21:17 for a list of all cases of the expression "tradition(s) of one's fathers".

**Summary:** Retain in Alma 19:14 the original plural reading *traditions*, as it apparently reads in the original manuscript.

## ■ Alma 19:14

*now Ammon seeing the Spirit of the Lord  
poured out according to his prayers upon the Lamanites his brethren  
which had been the cause of so much mourning among the Nephites or among all the people of God  
because of their iniquities and their traditions  
[& Ammon 0 | & Ammon >]s & Ammon he 1 | and Ammon A |  
he BCDEFGHIJKLMNOQRT | He PS] fell upon his knees  
and began to pour out his soul in prayer and thanksgiving to God  
for what he had done for his brethren*

Here in the original text, we have another example of the Hebraistic *and* between an initial present participial clause and its following main clause. Such usage is found elsewhere in the original text,

as noted in the discussion under Alma 2:30. Joseph Smith, in his editing for the 1837 edition, removed this extra *and* here in Alma 19:14. In addition, he replaced the repeated subject *Ammon* with its pronominal form, *he*. (In his editing of  $\mathcal{P}$ , after supralinearly inserting the *he*, Joseph seems to have forgotten to cross out the original *& Ammon*; the 1837 edition has only the *he*, Joseph’s intended emendation.) The critical text will restore the original usage here despite its difficulty.

**Summary:** Restore in Alma 19:14 the original Hebrew-like use of *and* after the subordinate present participial clause, plus the full subject noun *Ammon*: “now Ammon seeing the Spirit of the Lord poured out . . . **and Ammon** fell upon his knees and began to pour out his soul in prayer”.

#### ■ Alma 19:14

*and he [also was 01 | was also ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] overpowered with joy*

As discussed under Alma 14:10, either word order, *also was* or *was also*, is possible in the Book of Mormon text. For any given case, the critical text will follow the earliest extant reading. Thus the original “and he **also was** overpowered with joy” will be restored here in Alma 19:14. In this instance, the 1830 typesetter switched the word order, as he also did in the next chapter of Alma:

Alma 20:13

and now his children

[*also are 1 | are also ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST*] come amongst us

For additional examples of changes in the placement of *also*, see the discussion under 2 Nephi 21:13.

**Summary:** Restore the original word order *also was* in Alma 19:14: “and he **also was** overpowered with joy”.

#### ■ Alma 19:15

*for it was they which [had 1ABCDEFGHIJLMNOPQRST | HK] stood before the king and testified unto him concerning the great power of Ammon*

The 1874 RLDS edition omitted the perfect auxiliary *had* in this sentence. Either reading is possible in theory, but the perfect works better here since the Lamanite servants being referred to were those that earlier (in Alma 17:39 – 18:3) had told king Lamoni about how Ammon had defended the king’s flocks. The 1908 RLDS edition restored the original *had* here in Alma 19:15.

**Summary:** Maintain in Alma 19:15 the original use of the perfect auxiliary *had* since this is the reading of the earliest text.

## ■ Alma 19:16

*and it came to pass that they did call on*  
 [NULL > *the name of* 0 | *the name of* 1 ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *the Lord*  
*in their might*

Spacing between extant fragments of  $\mathcal{O}$  suggests that Oliver Cowdery initially wrote “they did call on the Lord” in  $\mathcal{O}$ , then supralinearly inserted *the name of* (or *name of the*). Elsewhere the text has examples of both phrases, “to call (up)on the Lord” and “to call (up)on **the name of** the Lord” (or equivalent examples involving *God* rather than *the Lord*):

Mosiah 4:11	calling on <b>the name of</b> the Lord daily
Mosiah 16:12	having never called upon the Lord
Mosiah 24:11	whosoever should be found calling upon God
Mosiah 26:4	for they would not call upon the Lord their God
Alma 24:21	and began to call on <b>the name of</b> the Lord
3 Nephi 4:30	so long as they shall call on <b>the name of</b> their God
Ether 2:14	because he remembered not to call upon <b>the name of</b> the Lord
Ether 2:15	and did call upon <b>the name of</b> the Lord

The King James Bible also shows similar instances with and without the phrase “the name of”, as in the following contrastive pair:

2 Samuel 22:4	I will call on the LORD
1 Kings 18:24	and I will call on <b>the name of</b> the LORD

There are also nine examples in the Book of Mormon text of “to call (up)on his (holy) name”. It is doubtful that Oliver Cowdery, the scribe in both  $\mathcal{O}$  and  $\mathcal{P}$ , decided to consciously emend the text in Alma 19:16 by adding the phrase *the name of* to “they did call on the Lord” since he did it nowhere else in the text.

**Summary:** Maintain in Alma 19:16 the fuller reading “they did call on **the name of** the Lord”, the reading of the earliest extant textual source (namely,  $\mathcal{P}$ ); spacing between fragments of  $\mathcal{O}$  suggests that Oliver Cowdery initially wrote “they did call on the Lord” in  $\mathcal{O}$ .

## ■ Alma 19:16

*even* [untill 1 | until ABDEFIJLMNOQRT | till CGHKPS] *they had all fallen to the earth*

The 1840 edition replaced the word *until* with *till*, probably unintentionally. This reading with *till* continues in the current RLDS text. The Book of Mormon text clearly prefers *until* (with at least 201 occurrences elsewhere in the original text). There is one other passage that shows variation in the textual history:

4 Nephi 1:14	yea and in fine [until 1PS   till ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRT] the seventy and ninth year had passed away
--------------	--

In this case, both  $\mathcal{D}$  and the 1830 edition are firsthand copies of  $\mathcal{C}$ , so we cannot be sure whether  $\mathcal{C}$  read *until* or *till* (for further discussion, see under 4 Nephi 1:14). Finally, there are seven cases where the earliest text reads *till* instead of *until*:

2 Nephi 15:8	till there can be no place
Alma 52:30	till they should meet Moroni and his army
Alma 55:10	till we go against the Nephites to battle
3 Nephi 1:25	till it should all be fulfilled
3 Nephi 3:21	till they shall come against us
3 Nephi 8:14	till the buildings thereof had fallen to the earth
3 Nephi 17:12	till they had all been brought unto him

So *till* is always possible. In general, the critical text will in each case follow the earliest textual sources in determining whether the reading should be *until* or *till*.

**Summary:** Maintain the occurrence of *until* rather than *till* in Alma 19:16: “even **until** they had all fallen to the earth” (the earliest extant reading).

#### ■ Alma 19:16

*even until they had [all 01ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST | K] fallen to the earth*

The 1892 RLDS typesetter accidentally omitted the pronominal *all*, probably because of its similarity with the following word, *fallen*. The 1908 RLDS edition restored the original *all*.

**Summary:** Maintain the original *all* in Alma 19:16 (“even until they had **all** fallen to the earth”).

#### ■ Alma 19:16

*she having been converted unto the Lord for many years  
on account of a remarkable vision of her [fathers >% father 1 | father ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST]*

We do not have the original manuscript for the word *father*. Oliver Cowdery initially wrote *fathers* in the printer’s manuscript, probably because the use of the double genitive (as in “a remarkable vision **of her father’s**”) is highly expected by English speakers. In accord with his writing habits, Oliver did not supply the apostrophe for the possessive *s*. In this instance, he immediately corrected the form *fathers* by erasing the possessive *s*. The original manuscript undoubtedly had the more difficult nonpossessive form *father* in “a remarkable vision of her father”.

In the manuscripts Oliver Cowdery often added a possessive *s* to nouns, especially names, in constructions involving the preposition *of*, thus creating instances of the double genitive. Yet there is also evidence for actual double genitives in the original text. See under Alma 46:24 for a complete discussion of this issue. Here in Alma 19:16 the critical text will accept Oliver’s immediate correction in  $\mathcal{D}$  to “a remarkable vision of her **father**”.

**Summary:** Maintain in Alma 19:16 the corrected reading in  $\mathcal{D}$  for the genitive construction “a remarkable vision of her **father**” rather than the double genitive “a remarkable vision of her **father’s**”, which is what Oliver Cowdery initially wrote in  $\mathcal{D}$  (but without the apostrophe).



## ■ Alma 19:16–17

*save it were one of the Lamanitish women whose name was Abish  
**she having** been converted unto the Lord for many years  
 on account of a remarkable vision of her father  
 —thus having been converted to the Lord—  
 [never had 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPS | and never having RT] made it known  
 therefore when she saw that all the servants of Lamoni had fallen to the earth . . .*

From a textual point of view, the original syntax works perfectly well here, providing we interpret the intervening text as parenthetical, so that the main sentence reads as “**she** having been converted unto the Lord for many years on account of a remarkable vision of her father . . . never had made it known”. Similar usage of this type, but without any parenthetical statement, can be found elsewhere in the text:

Mosiah 18:32

but behold it came to pass that  
**the king having** discovered a movement among the people  
**sent** his servants to watch them

Here in Alma 19:16–17, since the parenthetical *having*-clause (“thus having been converted to the Lord”) makes it rather difficult to process the complex syntax of this passage, the editors for the 1920 LDS edition emended the finite predicate “never had made it known” to a *having*-clause (“never having made it known”). They also added a connective *and*, thus creating a sequence of three *having*-clauses: “she having been converted . . . thus having been converted . . . and never having made it known”. Besides simple examples like Mosiah 18:32, there are much more complex examples with the same original syntax as in Alma 19:16–17. Consider the following passage which has a sequence of six intervening present participial clauses before the main sentence is completed:

3 Nephi 7:15–16

and it came to pass that  
**Nephi having** been visited by angels and also by the voice of the Lord  
 therefore **having** seen angels  
 and **being** eyewitness  
 and **having** had power given unto him that he might know  
     concerning the ministry of Christ  
 and also **being** eyewitness to their quick return from righteousness  
     unto their wickedness and abominations  
 therefore **being** grieved for the hardness of their hearts  
     and the blindness of their minds  
**went** forth among them in that same year and began to testify boldly . . .

Interestingly, the words in this example have never been edited in any way to alleviate the complexity of the syntax. The critical text will restore the earliest text in Alma 19:16–17 since it is quite acceptable.

Another possible emendation worth considering here in Alma 19:16–17 is that in the original text there was a repeated pronoun *she* at the beginning of verse 17:

Alma 19:16–17 (possible emendation)

she having been converted unto the Lord for many years  
 on account of a remarkable vision of her father  
 thus having been converted to the Lord  
**she** never had made it known

However, there seems to be little room between extant fragments of the original manuscript for the pronoun *she* to have occurred before “never had made it known” (except by supralinear insertion). Note further that the example from 3 Nephi 7:15–16 cited above does not repeat the subject just before the final main clause (that is, it does not read “**he** went forth among them”). Of course, there are examples where the subject is repeated, at least in the original text:

Mosiah 21:23

and the king having been without the gates of the city with his guard  
 [*he* 1A | BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] discovered Ammon and his brethren

In this instance, the 1837 edition removed the repeated subject, the pronoun *he*.

**Summary:** Restore the original syntax in Alma 19:16–17: “**she** having been converted unto the Lord for many years on account of a remarkable vision of her father . . . never had made it known”; this kind of construction exists elsewhere in the Book of Mormon text, as in the complex example found in 3 Nephi 7:15–16.

#### ■ Alma 19:21

*for they were angry [at >% with 0 | with 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQRST] Ammon*

In the Book of Mormon text, we consistently find the expression “to be angry **with** someone” (50 times), never “to be angry **at** someone” (the more expected expression in modern English). There is one example of “angry at” (in 2 Nephi 33:5), but this passage refers to being “angry at the **words** which I have written”.

Here in Alma 19:21, Oliver Cowdery initially wrote down “angry at” in the original manuscript, then immediately erased the *at* and overwrote it with the beginning *wi* of the preposition *with*; then finally, without crossing out the *wi*, he wrote inline the whole word *with*. The critical text will maintain the consistent use of the preposition *with* in the phrase “to be angry **with** someone”.

**Summary:** Follow in Alma 19:21 Oliver Cowdery’s immediate correction of “angry at” to “angry with” in the original manuscript.

#### ■ Alma 19:23

*therefore Mosiah **trusted** him unto the Lord*

In modern English we expect the verb *entrust* for this passage rather than *trust*, yet the textual evidence is firm here for *trusted* rather than *entrusted*: in the original manuscript, sufficiently extant here, the word clearly begins with *tr*, not *entr*. In earlier English, we have examples of *trust*

with the modern meaning of *entrust*, as exemplified by citations in the Oxford English Dictionary (under definition 5 for the verb *trust*) dating from 1340 to 1908, including the following examples (with accidentals regularized):

Fynes Moryson (1617)

neither would I advise Angelica if she were alive in these days  
to **trust** her self alone and in desert places to the protection of wandering knights

Edward Gibbon (1781)

he **trusted** the event to valor and to fortune

Here are some additional uses in the Book of Mormon of the verb *trust* with the meaning ‘entrust’:

Mosiah 21:19

and the king himself did not **trust** his person without the walls of the city  
unless he took his guards with him

Alma 37:32

and now my son / remember the words which I have spoken unto you  
**trust** not those secret plans unto this people  
but teach them an everlasting hatred against sin and iniquity

The critical text will, of course, retain these unusual examples in the text of the verb *trust* with the meaning ‘entrust’. There is no evidence in the textual history of the Book of Mormon for mix-ups of *trust* and *entrust*, nor is there any evidence that the verb *trust* as used in Alma 19:23 and elsewhere in the text should be emended to *entrust*.

**Summary:** Accept the few instances in the text where the verb *trust* has the meaning ‘entrust’ (including here in Alma 19:23).

#### ■ Alma 19:26

*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]*

Originally this passage ended in a direct quote (“which **hath** been sent from the Nephites to torment **us**”). There have been two separate emendations in this passage to change the direct quote into an indirect one. First, in his editing for the 1837 edition, Joseph Smith converted the present-tense *hath* to the past-tense *had*. And second, the 1920 LDS edition replaced the first-person *us* with the third-person *them* (the RLDS text has retained the original *us* but not the *hath* since Joseph marked only the change to *had* in Ø). Thus the current LDS text is fully consistent with the surrounding indirect quotes from the speech of others in the crowd (the emended line is marked with an arrow):

Alma 19:25–27

and it came to pass that there was many among them  
 who said that Ammon **was** the Great Spirit  
 and others said he **was** sent by the Great Spirit  
 but others rebuked them all  
 saying that he **was** a monster  
 → which **had** been sent from the Nephites to torment **them**  
 and there were some which said that Ammon **was** sent by the Great Spirit  
 to afflict **them** because of **their** iniquities  
 and that it **was** the Great Spirit that had always attended the Nephites  
 which **had** ever delivered them out of **their** hands

In this case, quote marks would help the reader deal with the original direct quote in the middle of this sequence of indirect quotes:

Alma 19:26 (with quote marks)

but others rebuked them all saying that he **was** a monster  
 which “hath been sent from the Nephites to torment us”

There is one clear case where the text intentionally shifts from a first-person direct quote to a third-person description; this rather striking shift in the narrative is found in the middle of Helaman’s letter to Moroni as recorded in Alma 56–58. For discussion of this example, see under Alma 56:52–53. Here in Alma 19:26 we also seem to have an intentional shift in person and tense, but only within part of a sentence. Even so, the critical text will restore the partial direct quote here.

There is one additional possibility that should be considered here. Perhaps in the original text for Alma 19:26, the direct quote actually began earlier in the sentence:

Alma 19:26 (possible emendation, with quote marks)

but others rebuked them all saying that  
 “he **is** a monster which hath been sent from the Nephites to torment us”

It should be pointed out here that the Book of Mormon text allows direct quotes to follow *saying that*, as in the following example:

1 Nephi 4:14

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

(For additional examples, see the discussion under 1 Nephi 7:1.) Thus one could argue that in Alma 19:26 the direct quote began immediately after *saying that* and that an original *is* was changed to *was* (marked below with an arrow) because of the many surrounding instances of “X said that he/Ammon **was** . . .” in the statements made by the crowd:

Alma 19:25–27 (earliest extant text)

there was many among them who **said** that Ammon **was** the Great Spirit  
 and others **said** he **was** sent by the Great Spirit  
 → but others rebuked them all / **saying** that he **was** a monster . . .  
 and there were some which **said** that Ammon **was** sent by the Great Spirit

Clearly, it would be much easier for an original *is* to have been changed to *was* in this passage than to have both an original *had* changed to *hath* and an original *them* changed to *us*. But the earliest text in Alma 19:26, with its mixed use of tense and person, will work. The critical text will accept that reading, thus interpreting the sentence as switching midstream from an indirect quote to a direct one: “but others rebuked them all / saying that he **was** a monster which **hath** been sent from the Nephites to torment **us**”. Nonetheless, the possibility remains that the past-tense *was* in this sentence is an error for a present-tense *is*.

**Summary:** Restore in Alma 19:26 the original use of a partial direct quote in the middle of a sequence of indirect quotes: “he **was** a monster which **hath** been sent from the Nephites to torment **us**”; it is possible that the past-tense *was* in this sentence is an error for the present-tense *is*.

### ■ Alma 19:27

*and that it was the Great Spirit*

[*that* 1ABDEFIJLMNOPQRST | *who* CGHK] *had always attended the Nephites*

Here in verse 27, the 1840 edition replaced the relative pronoun *that* with *who*. The reading of the 1837 edition, the copytext for the 1840 edition, shows that the 1840 change from *that* to *who* made the entire passage read with only *who* as the relative pronoun (the original *that* is marked below with an arrow):

Alma 19:25–27 (the 1837 text)

and it came to pass that there were many among them  
**who** said that Ammon was the Great Spirit  
 and others said he was sent by the Great Spirit  
 but others rebuked them all / saying that he was a monster  
**who** had been sent from the Nephites to torment us  
 and there were some  
**who** said that Ammon was sent by the Great Spirit  
 to afflict them because of their iniquities  
 and that it was the Great Spirit  
 → **that** had always attended the Nephites  
**who** had ever delivered them out of their hands  
 and they said that it was this Great Spirit  
**who** had destroyed so many of their brethren the Lamanites

The 1840 change may, in fact, have been unintended. In any event, the 1908 RLDS edition restored the original *that* to the RLDS text, most probably by reference to  $\emptyset$ . The critical text will, of course, maintain the original *that* here in Alma 19:27; the original use of *which* will also be restored for the four cases in this passage that were changed to *who* in the editing for the 1837 edition (only the first instance of *who*, in verse 25, was original to the text). For further discussion, see under WHICH in volume 3.

**Summary:** Follow all the original forms of the relative pronoun in Alma 19:25–27 (four cases of *which* and one of *that*); the original text showed considerable variation in the selection of the relative pronoun, with instances of *which*, *who(m)*, and *that*.

■ **Alma 19:27**

*and that it was the Great Spirit that had always attended the Nephites  
which had [ever/even 1 | ever ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] delivered them out of their hands*

The word *ever*, as written here in  $\mathcal{P}$  by Oliver Cowdery, looks like the word *even*. (For discussion of the similarity of Oliver’s *n*’s and *r*’s, see under Mosiah 2:15–16.) Here in Alma 19:27, the 1830 typesetter correctly interpreted the word as *ever* rather than *even*, as in other instances of the adverb *ever* that occur with the past-tense perfect auxiliary *had*. In these cases, the *ever* can occur either before or after the *had*:

1 Nephi 8:11	above all that I <b>ever had</b> before tasted
1 Nephi 8:11	to exceed all the whiteness that I <b>had ever</b> seen
Alma 53:12	and they <b>ever had</b> been protected by the Nephites
Alma 56:46	for as I <b>had ever</b> called them my sons

The last example is especially similar to Alma 19:27, having the same placement of the *ever* after the *had* and with the same meaning of ‘always’. In contrast, the word *even* would not really work in Alma 19:27.

**Summary:** Maintain in Alma 19:27 the 1830 typesetter’s interpretation of *ever/even* as *ever* (with its meaning ‘always’) in the relative clause “which had **ever** delivered them out of their hands”.

■ **Alma 19:29**

*O blessed God  
have mercy [on 1ABCDEFGHIJLMNOQRT | upon HKPS] this people*

Here the 1874 RLDS edition changed “have mercy **on** this people” to “have mercy **upon** this people”. This reading with *upon* has been retained in all subsequent RLDS editions, despite the fact that the printer’s manuscript reads *on*. Elsewhere in the text, there are ten occurrences of “to have mercy **on** someone”, but there are also five occurrences of “to have mercy **upon** someone”. So either preposition is possible in this expression. Elsewhere the 1874 RLDS edition tended to replace *upon* with *on* (there are three examples listed under Alma 2:38), but there are no other examples where that edition replaced *on* with *upon*. The uniqueness of the 1874 change from *on* to *upon* here in Alma 19:29 suggests that this change was simply a typo.

**Summary:** Retain in Alma 19:29 the original preposition *on* in the phrase “have mercy **on** this people”, the reading of the earliest textual sources.

■ **Alma 19:30**

*and when she had said this  
she [claped 1 | clasped ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRT | clapped PS] her hands*

The printer’s manuscript here reads *claped*. The single *p* is typical of Oliver Cowdery’s spelling practice; that is, he frequently neglected to double consonants after short vowels when adding an

inflectional ending such as *-ed* (see the list of examples under Alma 11:2). Here in Alma 19:30, the 1830 typesetter accidentally misread *claped* as *claped*, which ended up removing the more emotional, even pentecostal, *clap* of the original event in favor of the rather anemic *clasp*. Elsewhere in the text, the 1830 typesetter correctly interpreted Oliver Cowdery's *claped* as *clapped*:

Mosiah 18:11

and now when the people had heard these words  
they [*claped* 1 | *clapped* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] their hands for joy  
and exclaimed : this is the desires of our hearts

Alma 31:36 (two times)

now it came to pass that when Alma had said these words  
that he [*claped* 1 | *clapped* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] his hands  
upon all they which were with him  
and behold as he [*claped* 1 | *clapped* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] his hands  
upon them  
they were filled with the Holy Spirit

The example from Mosiah 18:11 is particularly relevant here since it represents the same situation as in Alma 19:30—namely, the spiritual joy of the moment leads participants to clap their hands, not clasp them. In fact, the word *clasp* is used only once in the actual Book of Mormon text, and the context there is completely different: “that they might have been clasped in the arms of Jesus” (Mormon 5:11). The 1908 RLDS edition restored the original *clapped* in Alma 19:30, as will the critical text.

**Summary:** Replace in Alma 19:30 the 1830 typesetter's error *claped* with the original reading, *clapped* (spelled by Oliver Cowdery in  $\mathcal{P}$  as *claped*); the use of the verb *clap* is consistent with a similar event in Mosiah 18:11.

#### ■ Alma 19:32

*but there was many among them who would not hear his words*  
[ 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMOPQRST | *and* N] *therefore they went their way*

The 1906 LDS large-print edition added a second connective element here before the sentence-initial *therefore*, namely *and*. This edition was never used as a copytext for subsequent LDS editions; thus the intrusive *and* was restricted to that edition. Either reading is, of course, possible. Most of the time *therefore* is not preceded by any other connective element, but there are 18 occurrences in the text of *and therefore*. Here in Alma 19:32, the critical text will maintain the earliest text without the *and*.

**Summary:** Maintain the earliest text in Alma 19:32: namely, the *therefore* without any preceding *and*.

## ■ Alma 19:36

*and we see that his arm is extended to all people*

*who [will 1ABCDEFHIJKLMNOPQRST | G] repent and believe on his name*

The 1858 Wright edition dropped the modal verb *will* here in Alma 19:36, but the first RLDS edition (1874), following the 1840 edition, restored the *will* to the RLDS text. Either reading, with or without the *will*, works in this context, as exemplified elsewhere in the text:

2 Nephi 30:2	save it be with them that repent and believe in his Son
Alma 26:35	to those who <b>will</b> repent and believe on his name
Helaman 7:23	save it be unto those who repenteth of their sins
Helaman 12:23	blessed are they who <b>will</b> repent and hearken unto the voice of the Lord their God
Helaman 13:11	blessed are they who <b>will</b> repent and turn unto me
Helaman 13:13	but blessed are they who <b>will</b> repent
3 Nephi 18:11	unto those who repent and are baptized in my name

In each case the critical text will follow the earliest textual sources; thus here in Alma 19:36 we have “to all people who **will** repent and believe on his name”.

**Summary:** In accord with the earliest textual sources, maintain the auxiliary verb *will* in Alma 19:36: “to all people who **will** repent and believe on his name”.



# Alma 20

## ■ Alma 20:3

[*now* 1 | *Now* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST | *And* HK] *it came to pass that when Ammon had heard this he saith unto Lamoni . . .*

The 1874 RLDS edition accidentally replaced *now* with *and*. The 1908 RLDS edition restored the correct *now* to the RLDS text. Of course, either reading is theoretically possible; thus the critical text will follow the earliest reading, *now*.

*Summary:* Maintain in Alma 20:3 the original *now* that precedes “it came to pass”.

## ■ Alma 20:4

*now Lamoni saith unto him who told thee that [thy 1CFGHIJKLMNOPQRST | my ABDE] brethren were in prison*

Here the 1830 typesetter accidentally misread *thy* as *my*, with the result that king Lamoni ends up referring to Ammon’s brethren as his own. This reading is not impossible if we interpret *brethren* here as referring to brethren in the gospel and realize that king Lamoni, having been converted, could accept these brethren as his own. Of course, the printer’s manuscript reads *thy*, so there is no reason to maintain the 1830 error. The correct *thy* was restored in the 1840 and 1852 editions but without reference to  $\mathcal{P}$  since it was unavailable for those editions. Although Joseph Smith had access to  $\mathcal{O}$  at the time he edited the text for the 1840 edition, it is doubtful that he used  $\mathcal{O}$  to restore this minor change since there are so many nearby errors in the text that were left unchanged in the 1840 edition. For that edition, Joseph seems to have used  $\mathcal{O}$  to correct errors that involved the loss of a phrase; moreover, those corrections are found only in 1 Nephi. For a list, see the discussion regarding the phrase “they call the name of the place Bountiful” in the 1 Nephi preface. Here in Alma 20:4, Joseph decided that *my* must be an error for *thy*, probably because a few verses later king Lamoni refers to Ammon’s missionary brethren as “thy brethren”, not “my brethren”:

Alma 20:7

and he saith unto Ammon  
come I will go with thee down to the land of Middoni  
and there I will plead with the king  
that he will cast **thy brethren** out of prison

The editors for the 1852 edition (Franklin and Samuel Richards) seem to have come to the same conclusion when they independently emended the *my* to *thy*. They later used the 1840 edition to correct the 1852 stereotyped plates for the second 1852 printing, but the change to *thy* is found in the first 1852 printing, prior to their use of the 1840 edition.

*Summary:* Accept the restoration of the original *thy* in Alma 20:4 (“who told thee that thy brethren were in prison”).

#### ■ Alma 20:8

*and it came to pass that*

*as Ammon* [NULL >+ & *Lamoni* 1 | *and Lamoni* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]

[*was* >js *were* 1 | *was* A | *were* BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *a journeying thither*

that **they** met the father of *Lamoni* who was king over all the land

When Oliver Cowdery copied from  $\mathcal{O}$  into  $\mathcal{P}$ , he initially omitted “and Lamoni”, perhaps because the associated verb form was the singular *was* (“as Ammon . . . **was** a journeying thither”). Oliver soon caught his error and supralinearly inserted & *Lamoni* (the level of ink flow for the correction is slightly heavier, perhaps because he redipped his quill before making the correction). It is theoretically possible that the following plural pronoun *they* led Oliver to emend the preceding text by inserting “and Lamoni”, but the critical text will assume that the corrected reading in  $\mathcal{P}$  represents the original reading. Of course, the use of the singular form *was* with plural subjects is quite prevalent in the original text, as discussed under 1 Nephi 4:4.

*Summary:* Maintain in Alma 20:8 the corrected reading in  $\mathcal{P}$  (namely, the conjunctive subject in “as Ammon and Lamoni was a journeying thither”).

#### ■ Alma 20:10

*whither art thou going with this Nephite*

*which is one of the* [*Sons* > *children* 1 | *children* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *of a liar*

Here in the printer’s manuscript, Oliver Cowdery initially wrote “sons of a liar”; then he crossed out the word *sons* and inserted *children* supralinearly (there is no change in the level of ink flow). This correction does not seem to be due to editing; instead, it appears to be a correction to the original manuscript (no longer extant here). A few verses later on, in Alma 20:13, we have a case of “sons of a liar”, but verse 13 also uses *children* to refer to these “sons of a liar”:

Alma 20:13

Lamoni thou art going to deliver these Nephites which are **sons of a liar**

behold he robbed our fathers and now **his children** also are come amongst us

So the use of “the children of a liar” in Alma 20:10 is possible. There are no other instances in the text of either “sons of a liar” or “children of a liar”, but since either *sons* or *children* can theoretically be used in this expression, the critical text will follow Oliver Cowdery’s virtually immediate correction in verse 10 to “children of a liar”.

**Summary:** Accept in Alma 20:10 Oliver Cowdery’s almost immediate correction in  $\mathcal{P}$  of “sons of a liar” to “children of a liar”; either reading is possible, which means that the corrected reading in  $\mathcal{P}$  was probably the reading in  $\mathcal{C}$ .

#### ■ Alma 20:13

*and now his children*

[*also are* 1 | *are also* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *come amongst us*

As discussed under Alma 14:10, *also* can come either before or after the past-tense verb form *was*. Here in Alma 20:13, we have an example involving the present-tense verb form *are*. Since either order is possible, we accept the earliest word order, “also are come” (the reading in  $\mathcal{P}$ ) rather than the alternative order “are also come” (introduced into the 1830 edition). For a more general discussion, see under 2 Nephi 21:13.

**Summary:** Restore in Alma 20:13 the original word order, with *also* coming before the helping verb *are* (“and now his children **also are come** amongst us”).

#### ■ Alma 20:13

*and now his children also are come*

[*among* > *amongst* 1 | *amongst* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *us*

Both *among* and *amongst* are found in the Book of Mormon text, but by far the more frequent one is the modern English *among*, with 582 occurrences in the original text. Still, there are 14 occurrences of the archaic *amongst*. Here in  $\mathcal{P}$ , Oliver Cowdery initially wrote the more expected form *among*, but then almost immediately he corrected the word to *amongst* by inserting inline the *st*, with the *t* slightly raised (there is no change in the level of ink flow for the entire correcting *st*). Most probably, the original manuscript had the archaic *amongst* here in Alma 20:13. This same initial error is found a little later in the text:

Alma 22:27

and it came to pass that the king sent a proclamation throughout all the land

[ $\S$ 1 *among* >+  $\S$ 2 *amongst* 1 | *amongst* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] all his people

In this instance, the correction in  $\mathcal{P}$  was made by the unknown scribe 2, who seems to have been proofing  $\mathcal{P}$  against  $\mathcal{C}$  for that part of the text (see the discussion under Alma 22:27).

**Summary:** Accept in Alma 20:13 Oliver Cowdery’s virtually immediate correction of the expected *among* to the more difficult archaic form *amongst*.

## ■ Alma 20:13

*that they may by their cunning and their lyings*  
*deceive* [NULL > *us* 1 | *us* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]

In the printer's manuscript, Oliver Cowdery initially wrote *deceive* without any direct object, then supralinearly inserted the object pronoun *us*. The word *deceive* is found at the end of a line in Ø, which implies that Oliver initially omitted the *us* simply because he missed the word as he ended one line in Ø and started another. The correcting *us* shows no change in level of ink flow, so the correction seems to have been virtually immediate. This correction is probably in accord with the reading of the original manuscript (no longer extant here). The critical text will accept the use of *us* here in Alma 20:13.

Theoretically, a general direct object could be lacking here, as in the well-known phraseology from Ephesians 4:14: "whereby they lie in wait to deceive". In the Book of Mormon, there is one gerundive use of the verb *deceive*, and in that one instance the object of *deceive* is left unstated: "Amulek had caught him in his lying and deceiving" (Alma 12:1). But when *deceive* is used as a verb proper in the active voice, we always have an explicit direct object (ten times, including here in Alma 20:13).

**Summary:** Maintain in Alma 20:13 Oliver Cowdery's inserted direct object *us*, which is in accord with all other instances in the text of the verb *deceive* in the active voice.

## ■ Alma 20:16

*now when his father* [ 1A | *had* BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *heard these words*  
*he was angry with him*

Here the 1837 edition inserted the perfective *had* in the *when*-clause. This addition was probably unintentional since elsewhere in the text there are six other examples of "now when X (had) heard these words" yet none of these have ever had the perfective *had* added or deleted. Four of the six other instances have the *had*, but two lack it:

1 Nephi 4:14	and now when I Nephi <b>had</b> heard these words
Mosiah 13:1	and now when the king <b>had</b> heard these words
Mosiah 18:11	and now when the people <b>had</b> heard these words
Alma 18:4	and now when the king heard these words
Alma 18:18	now when the king <b>had</b> heard these words
Alma 55:9	now when the Lamanites heard these words

So the best solution is to accept in each case the earliest extant reading, which means that here in Alma 20:16 there is no perfect auxiliary in "now when his father heard these words".

**Summary:** Restore the earliest reading for Alma 20:16, the one without the perfective *had* ("now when his father heard these words").

## ■ Alma 20:18

for if thou [shouldst 1ABCDEFIJKLMNOPQRST | HK] slay thy son  
 he being an innocent man  
 his blood [would 1ABCDEFIJKLMNOPQRST | will HK] cry from the ground  
 to the Lord his God for vengeance to come upon thee  
 and perhaps thou **wouldst** lose thy soul

Here the 1874 RLDS edition changed the past-tense conditional *if*-statement to a present-tense one by omitting the modal verb *shouldst* and changing *would* to *will*. This appears to be a conscious decision since both auxiliary verbs were altered. Nonetheless, the conditional *wouldst* in the following clause was maintained in the 1874 edition. The 1908 RLDS edition restored the original reading to the RLDS text.

**Summary:** Maintain the original past-tense conditional modals *shouldst* and *would* in Alma 20:18 (“if thou **shouldst** slay thy son . . . his blood **would** cry from the ground to the Lord his God”).

## ■ Alma 20:23

now the king fearing [that 1AHKNPS | BCDEFIJKLMOQRT] he should lose his life said . . .

The 1837 edition dropped the subordinate conjunction *that* after *fearing*, probably accidentally. The *that* has been restored on two different occasions, first in the 1874 RLDS edition and second in the 1906 LDS large-print edition. The RLDS text has continued with the *that*, probably because it is found in  $\mathcal{P}$ . The 1906 LDS edition was never used as a copytext for any subsequent LDS edition; the original *that* continues to be lacking in the LDS text.

Elsewhere in the original text there are four occurrences of the present participial “fearing that <finite clause>”, but there are no occurrences of this construction without the subordinate conjunction *that*:

Mosiah 20:3	yea and also fearing <b>that</b> the people would slay them
Mosiah 21:19	fearing <b>that</b> he might by some means fall into the hands of the Lamanites
Alma 46:29	therefore fearing <b>that</b> he should not gain the point
Alma 58:15	and fearing <b>that</b> we should cut them off from their support

Interestingly, the 1874 RLDS edition accidentally omitted the *that* from the example in Alma 46:29. (Also see under Mosiah 28:4 for an example of an original gerundive *fearing* that has been edited so that it now functions in the LDS text as the head of a present participial clause.) There is also one example where the participle *fearing* is followed by the subordinate conjunction *lest*:

Alma 56:55	fearing <b>lest</b> there were many of them slain
------------	---

In general, whenever *fearing* heads a present participial clause, there is a subordinate conjunction immediately after *fearing*.

**Summary:** Restore the subordinate conjunction *that* after *fearing* in Alma 20:23 (“fearing that he should lose his life”).

## ■ Alma 20:23

*if thou wilt spare me*

*I will grant unto thee whatsoever thou wilt ask*

*even to [the 1APS| BCDEFGHIJKLMNOQRT] half of the kingdom*

The 1837 edition omitted the definite article *the* before *half* here in Alma 20:23. It was restored to the RLDS text in the 1908 RLDS edition. Usage elsewhere supports the use of *the* before *half* in the phrase “half of X”, as in the following sampling:

Alma 11:17	and a leah is <b>the</b> half of a shilum
Helaman 4:10	they succeeded in retaining even <b>the</b> half of their possessions
Ether 8:2	until he had gained <b>the</b> half of the kingdom
Ether 8:4	he was in captivity <b>the</b> half of his days

Besides the instances of “**the** half of the kingdom” in Alma 20:23 and in Ether 8:2, there are five other examples with the exact phraseology (all are found in Ether 8–11). So clearly, the use of the *the* here in Alma 20:23 is correct. The 1837 loss of the *the* in this phrase was probably unintentional since that phrase (“**the** half of the kingdom”) was left unchanged elsewhere in the 1837 edition.

In the original text, there are nine instances of “**one** half of X” (including two of “**the one** half of X”), one instance of “**a** half of X”, and one of “half of X” (the last of these is what we typically expect in current English). For discussion of the tendency to omit the *a* from “a half” in the Book of Mormon text, see under Alma 11:15. Obviously, variation is possible. The critical text will, in each instance, follow the evidence from the earliest textual sources in assigning the determiner for “half of X”. Here in Alma 20:23, the original *the* will be restored.

Interestingly, the precise phrase “the half of the kingdom” occurs three times in the King James Bible, all in the book of Esther:

Esther 5:3	it shall be even given thee to <b>the</b> half of the kingdom
Esther 5:6	even to <b>the</b> half of the kingdom it shall be performed
Esther 7:2	and it shall be performed <i>even to</i> <b>the</b> half of the kingdom

There is also a related example in Mark 6:23 that has the *the*: “whatsoever thou shalt ask of me I will give *it* thee / unto **the** half of my kingdom”. Thus the use of “**the** half of the kingdom” is undoubtedly correct in Alma 20:23.

**Summary:** Restore in Alma 20:23 the original *the* to the phrase “even to **the** half of the kingdom”.

## ■ Alma 20:24

*if thou wilt grant that my brethren **may** be cast out of prison*

*and also that Lamoni [may 1ABCEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST | might D] retain his kingdom . . .*

In this passage, the 1841 British edition accidentally replaced the second instance of *may* with *might*. The following 1849 LDS edition restored the correct *may*. For other instances of mix-ups between *may* and *might*, see under Jacob 5:13.

**Summary:** Maintain the consistent use of *may* in Alma 20:24 (“that my brethren **may** be cast out of prison and also that Lamoni **may** retain his kingdom”).

#### ■ Alma 20:24

*if thou wilt grant that my brethren may be cast out of prison  
and also that Lamoni may retain his kingdom  
and that ye be not displeased with him  
but grant that he may do according to his own desires in whatsoever thing he thinketh  
[& >]s NULL 1 | and A | BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] then will I spare thee*

The original text here had an *and* after the long initial subordinate *if*-clause and before the main clause (“then will I spare thee”). Joseph Smith removed this Hebrew-like use of *and* in his editing for the 1837 edition. The critical text will restore such instances. See the discussion under 1 Nephi 17:50 as well as more generally under HEBRAISMS in volume 3.

**Summary:** Restore in Alma 20:24 the Hebraistic *and* that originally occurred after the *if*-clause and before the main clause (thus “if thou wilt grant that my brethren may be cast out of prison . . . **and** then will I spare thee”).

#### ■ Alma 20:26

*and when he saw that  
Ammon had no [desire > desires >]s desire 1 | desires A | desire BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]  
to destroy him . . .*

Here in his editing for the 1837 edition, Joseph Smith emended the plural *desires* to the singular *desire*. As discussed under Mosiah 18:10 and 18:11, Joseph frequently altered the plural *desires* in his editing. Evidence elsewhere in the text shows that either singular *desire* or plural *desires* is theoretically possible; the critical text will in each case restore the earliest reading. Here in Alma 20:26, Oliver Cowdery himself initially wrote the noun in the singular, but almost immediately he inserted the plural *s* in the space that he originally left between *desire* and *to* (there is no change in the level of ink flow for this inserted *s*). Joseph crossed out this plural *s* in his later editing for the 1837 edition.

**Summary:** Restore the plural *desires* in Alma 20:26, the reading of the earliest textual sources (“Ammon had no desires to destroy him”).

#### ■ Alma 20:26

*because this is all [that 1ABCDEFGHIJLMNOPQRST | HK] thou hast desired  
that I would release thy brethren . . .*

The 1874 RLDS edition omitted the relative pronoun *that* here in “because this is all **that** thou hast desired”, perhaps because of the awkwardness of this *that* when it is followed by another *that*,

the subordinate conjunctive *that* in “**that** I would release thy brethren”. The 1908 RLDS edition restored the original *that* to the RLDS text. The relative pronoun *that* is quite acceptable following *all*, as in the similar language in Alma 11:46: “or this is **all that** I have written”. Also see the more general discussion regarding “all (that)” under 2 Nephi 25:23. The critical text will maintain the reading of the earliest text here in Alma 20:26, despite its awkwardness.

**Summary:** Maintain in Alma 20:26 the relative pronoun *that* in “because this is all **that** thou hast desired”, the earliest extant reading.

#### ■ Alma 20:28

*therefore the brethren of Ammon was brought*  
[NULL > *forth* 1 | *forth* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *out of prison*

In the printer’s manuscript, Oliver Cowdery initially wrote “brought out of prison” without the *forth*; almost immediately Oliver supralinearly inserted the *forth* (there is no change in the level of ink flow). This change is probably not due to editing but instead represents a correction to the reading of the original manuscript, especially since either reading is possible. In Alma 37:25, we have another example of “to bring forth” where the *forth* is not required:

Alma 37:25  
I will bring **forth** out of darkness unto light  
all their secret works and their abominations

On the tendency of the scribes to omit the word *forth*, see the discussion regarding the clause “their cry shall go” under 2 Nephi 3:20.

**Summary:** Retain in Alma 20:28 Oliver Cowdery’s virtually immediate insertion in  $\mathcal{D}$  of *forth* (thus “the brethren of Ammon was brought forth out of prison”).

#### ■ Alma 20:29

*and they also had suffered hunger thirst*  
*and all* [*kind* 1ABCDEFGHIKPS | *kinds* FIJLMNOQRT]  
*of* [*afflictions* 1ABCDEFGHIJLMNOQRT | *affliction* HKPS]

Here we have four possible readings, at least in theory: “all kind of afflictions” (the earliest extant reading), “all **kinds** of afflictions” (starting with the 1852 LDS edition), “all kind of **affliction**” (starting with the 1874 RLDS edition), and “all **kinds** of **affliction**” (which has not appeared in any edition). But as explained under *kind* in Merriam Webster’s Dictionary of English Usage, the singular *kind* in the expression “these/those kind of <plural count noun>” has a long history, with examples dating from the 1500s, including this one from Philip Sidney (1595): “those kind of objections”. Another example is found in the King James Bible (1611): “and I planted trees in them of all *kind of* fruits” (Ecclesiastes 2:5). Such usage continues in modern English, including my own speech and writing.



Elsewhere in the Book of Mormon text we have three examples of “all kinds of X”, where X is either a mass noun or a plural count noun:

Jacob 5:32	all kinds of bad fruit
Helaman 6:11	all kinds of ore
Moroni 10:15	all kinds of tongues

These examples imply that *kind* in Alma 20:29 could be an error for *kinds* and that Oliver Cowdery in his copying for the printer’s manuscript accidentally omitted the plural *s*. There is one example in the manuscripts which suggests that Oliver favored “all kind of X”; in this example, he initially wrote in  $\mathcal{P}$  “all kind of wild animals” instead of “all manner of wild animals”:

Alma 22:31  
 it being the wilderness which was filled  
 with all [*kind* > *manner* 1 | *manner* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] of wild animals  
 of every **kind**

Here the occurrence of the singular *kind* in the initial reading (“all kind of wild animals”) may have been influenced by the singular *kind* in the immediately following phrase, “of every kind”.

But there is stronger evidence that the singular *kind* can occur in these sort of plural contexts:

Ether 9:18  
 and also many other [*kind* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPS | *kinds* QRT] of animals  
 which were useful for the food of man

In this case, the 1911 LDS edition emended the singular *kind* to the plural *kinds*. But this example argues that in the original Book of Mormon text the singular *kind* is possible in plural contexts. The critical text will therefore restore the singular *kind* in Alma 20:29 and in Ether 9:18.

No matter whether *kind* or *kinds* is the original reading here in Alma 20:29, we can have either *affliction* or *afflictions*. With the singular form *affliction*, we have a mass noun; with *afflictions*, we have a plural count noun. The issue here is whether a plural *s* might have been accidentally added to *affliction* during the early transmission of the text. But as already discussed under 1 Nephi 16:35, Mosiah 7:23, and Mosiah 9:3, the critical text will in each case let the earliest textual sources determine the number for the noun *affliction(s)*. The example from Ether 9:18 supports the original use of the plural count noun with the singular *kind*, in this instance *animals* (“many other kind of animals”). In addition, there are nine examples in the text of the phrase “all manner of **afflictions**”, but none of “all manner of **affliction**”. Thus other examples support the plural *afflictions* here in Alma 20:29.

**Summary:** Restore in Alma 20:29 the earliest reading, “all kind of afflictions”; the use of the singular *kind* in this construction appears to be intended here, especially since there was originally an example of this same nonstandard usage in Ether 9:18.

## ■ Alma 20:29

*nevertheless they were patient in [all 1ABCDEFGHIJLMNOPQRST | HK] their sufferings*

Here the 1874 RLDS edition accidentally omitted the word *all*; the 1908 RLDS edition restored it to the RLDS text. Another example of this same loss of *all* in the 1874 edition can be found in 2 Nephi 9:14 (see the discussion there for the loss of the *all* in the phrase “all our guilt”). Clearly, “all their sufferings” is perfectly fine here in Alma 20:29; in fact, there are two other instances of that phrase in the text (including one in this same section of the text):

Alma 18:37            and **all** their sufferings with hunger and thirst

Alma 60:10           all their cries and **all** their sufferings

*Summary:* Maintain in Alma 20:29 the occurrence of *all* in the phrase “all their sufferings”.

## ■ Alma 20:30

*it was their lot to have fallen into the hands  
of a more hardened and [a 1ABCDEFGHIJKMNOPQRST | L] more stiff-necked people*

Here the 1902 LDS missionary edition accidentally omitted the repeated indefinite article *a*. As discussed under Alma 9:5, the repeated determiner is expected in expressions referring to “hard-hearted and stiff-necked people”. For a more general discussion, see under CONJUNCTIVE REPETITION in volume 3.

*Summary:* Maintain the repeated *a* in Alma 20:30: “into the hands of **a** more hardened and **a** more stiff-necked people”.

## ■ Alma 20:30

*even until they had arriven [to 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQS | in RT] the land of Middoni*

Here the editors for the 1920 LDS edition changed the preposition from *to* to *in*. As discussed under 1 Nephi 17:14, the critical text will restore the preposition *to* in this kind of construction whenever it is supported by the earliest textual sources.