Alma 21

■ **Alma 21:1**

Now when Ammon and his brethren separated themselves
in the [NULL > *borders of the* 1 | *borders of the* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *land*
of the Lamanites . . .

Here in the printer's manuscript, Oliver Cowdery initially wrote "in the land of the Lamanites", but almost immediately he supralinearly inserted "borders of the". Undoubtedly, the original manuscript read "in the borders of the land of the Lamanites" since there is nothing actually wrong with what Oliver initially wrote in 𝓟. The corrected reading also agrees with the text's earlier reference to the separation of these missionaries at the beginning of their mission:

> 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

Summary: Accept in Alma 21:1 the virtually immediate correction in 𝓟: "in the borders of the land of the Lamanites".

■ **Alma 21:1**

Now when Ammon and his brethren separated themselves in the borders of the land of the Lamanites
behold Aaron took his journey towards the land which was called by the Lamanites Jerusalem
calling *it after the land of their* [*fathers* >jg *fathers'* 1 | *fathers'* ABCDEGHKPRST |
father's > *fathers,* F | *father's* IJLMNOQ] *nativity*

Here the present participle *calling* refers to what the Lamanites called the land, not what Aaron called it. The phrase "their fathers' nativity" refers, of course, to the fathers of the Lamanites (presumably Laman, Lemuel, and the sons of Ishmael), not Aaron's fathers. Oliver Cowdery wrote the possessive form *fathers* without any apostrophe, as was his normal practice. The 1830 typesetter correctly added the apostrophe to the end of the word. The 1852 LDS edition replaced the plural possessive *fathers'* with the singular possessive *father's*, probably unintentionally since in the second printing there was an attempt to correct *father's* to *fathers'* in the stereotyped plates. Unfortunately, a comma was added rather than the apostrophe, giving *fathers,* (an error which was perpetuated in all the later impressions that derive from those plates, from 1854 through 1877). When the 1879 LDS edition was produced, *fathers,* (that is, *fathers* with its comma) was misinterpreted as

father's, thus reintroducing once more the original 1852 error into the LDS text. This error was finally removed from the LDS text in the 1920 edition. The critical text will maintain the plural possessive form *fathers'.*

Summary: Retain in Alma 21:1 the plural possessive *fathers'* since the text is referring to the fathers of the Lamanites.

■ **Alma 21:3**

therefore they did cause the Lamanites that they should harden their hearts
that they should wax [*stronger* 1A | *strong* BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *in wickedness*

Here the 1837 edition replaced "wax stronger" with "wax strong". Occasionally, there have been mix-ups in the text of comparative and base forms of adjectives; for a list of examples, see the discussion regarding the word *nearer* in 1 Nephi 2:5. Here in Alma 21:3, both the LDS and RLDS texts have retained the 1837 reading with *strong* rather than the original *stronger.*

The use of the comparative with the verb *wax* does occur elsewhere in the Book of Mormon text, but only in the repetitive expression "wax stronger and stronger" (Helaman 3:35 and Helaman 11:37). Other examples of repetitive comparatives are found in the King James Bible: "wax louder and louder" (Exodus 19:19), "wax stronger and stronger" (2 Samuel 3:1), "wax weaker and weaker" (2 Samuel 3:1), "wax greater and greater" (1 Chronicles 11:9 and Esther 9:4), and "wax worse and worse" (2 Timothy 3:13).

Elsewhere in the Book of Mormon text, the verb *wax* almost always takes the base form of the adjective. There are 20 occurrences with *strong* as the adjective and 13 with other adjectives: *old* (5 times), *great* (4 times), and *bold, hard, pale,* and *proud* (once each). However, there is one other case where we have a comparative adjectival form, but this is with the periphrastic *more:*

> Alma 8:28
> the people did wax **more gross** in their iniquities

Thus there is one other example of a nonrepetitive comparative adjectival form occurring with *wax.*

The text here in Alma 21:3 is saying that the Amlicites and Amulonites were causing the Lamanites, who were already wicked, to become even more wicked. Thus the use of the comparative *stronger* is perfectly appropriate in this passage and will be restored in the critical text.

Summary: Restore in Alma 21:3 the comparative *stronger* since this is the original reading and it makes perfectly good sense in this passage.

■ **Alma 21:3**

therefore they did cause the Lamanites that they should harden their hearts
that they should wax stronger in wickedness and **their** *abominations*

Here the conjunctive "in wickedness and their abominations" seems rather odd. One wonders whether an intrusive *their* has been accidentally inserted before *abominations* or whether a *their* is accidentally missing from before *wickedness:*

Alma 21:3 (two possible emendations)

▫ that they should wax stronger in wickedness and abominations
▫ that they should wax stronger in **their** wickedness and **their** abominations

The discussion under Mosiah 3:7 shows that there are two typical cases for conjoined instances of *wickedness* and *abomination(s):* (1) the determiner occurs only before the first conjunct (as in "their wickedness and abominations"), or (2) the determiner occurs before both conjuncts (as in "their wickedness and their abominations"). These typical cases suggest that here in Alma 21:3 the earliest reading ("in wickedness and **their** abominations") may derive from an original instance of "in **their** wickedness and **their** abominations". On the other hand, there are instances in the text of "wickedness and abominations" (that is, without any determiner at all):

Helaman 6:34
the Nephites did begin to dwindle in unbelief
and grow in **wickedness and abominations**

3 Nephi 2:3
the people began to wax strong in **wickedness and abominations**

Mormon 2:15
a continual scene of **wickedness and abominations** has been before mine eyes
ever since I have been sufficient to behold the ways of man

Interestingly, the example in 3 Nephi 2:3 uses the same verbal expression as Alma 21:3, namely "to wax strong(er)", yet there is no determiner for either conjunct, thus providing some support for emending Alma 21:3 to read "that they should wax stronger in wickedness and abominations".

Another emendation that would at least partially relieve the awkwardness of the earliest reading would be to insert a repeated *in* before the second conjunct:

Alma 21:3 (a third possible emendation)

▫ that they should wax stronger in wickedness and **in** their abominations

Ultimately, it seems rather difficult to decide which emendation to accept. And there always remains the possibility that the earliest text, however awkward, may be the original text. Despite the difficulty of the earliest reading, the critical text will retain that reading but with the understanding that this may represent an early error in the text.

Summary: Retain in Alma 21:3 the earliest but difficult reading: "that they should wax stronger in wickedness and their abominations"; various emendations suggest themselves: place a *their* before *wickedness,* remove the *their* from before *abominations,* or insert a repeated *in* before *their abominations.*

■ **Alma 21:4**

and it came to pass that Aaron came to the city of Jerusalem
and [*firstly* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMOPQS | *first* NRT] *began to preach to the Amlicites*

As discussed under Jacob 1:17, the critical text will restore archaic uses of *firstly* in the text. In this instance, the 1906 LDS large-print edition and the 1920 LDS edition independently replaced *firstly* with *first.*

■ **Alma 21:4**

Aaron came to the city of Jerusalem and firstly began to preach
[NULL > *to the Amalekites* 1 | *to the Amalekites* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
and [NULL >+ *he* 1 | *he* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *began to preach to them*
in their synagogues

In this passage, Oliver Cowdery initially missed a prepositional phrase ("to the Amalekites") and a subject pronoun, *he*. Almost immediately he supplied the prepositional phrase (by supralinear insertion and without any change in the level of ink flow). Somewhat later, he inserted the *he* inline. The level of ink flow for that insertion is only slightly heavier; perhaps Oliver redipped his quill just before making that correction.

Here in Alma 21, Oliver Cowdery consistently wrote *Amalekites* in 𝓟 instead of *Amelicites,* the probable reading in 𝓞; *Amelicites* is apparently an error for the correct name, *Amlicites* (see the complete discussion under Alma 2:11–12). Clearly, the prepositional phrase "to the Amlicites" is necessary here in Alma 21:4; otherwise the text, as initially given, sounds like a dittography: "Aaron came to the city of Jerusalem and firstly **began to preach and began to preach** to them in their synagogues". Undoubtedly, the prepositional phrase was in 𝓞.

In the same way, 𝓞 probably also had the repeated subject, the pronoun *he*. Although the *he* doesn't seem to be required, it is worth noting that elsewhere in the text, whenever there is a con-joining of "began to X" with itself (that is, where the verb X is repeated), the subject is also repeated (as a pronoun):

> Mosiah 6:4
> and Mosiah **began to reign** in his father's stead
> **and he began to reign** in the thirtieth year of his age

> Helaman 11:7
> and they **began to remember** the Lord their God
> **and they began to remember** the words of Nephi

Thus the occurrence of the subject pronoun *he* in Alma 21:4 is consistent with these two other examples of repeated "began to X". But there would have been no motivation in Alma 21:4 for Oliver to have supplied the *he* on his own since here the *he* is not required in English.

Summary: Accept in Alma 21:4 Oliver Cowdery's two corrections in 𝓟, giving "Aaron came to the city of Jerusalem and firstly began to preach **to the Amlicites** and **he** began to preach to them in their synagogues"; these two corrections are undoubtedly based on the reading of 𝓞 (not extant here).

■ **Alma 21:5**

behold there arose an Amlicite
and *began to contend with him saying . . .*

The syntax here seems quite strange. What we expect is something like "there arose an Amlicite **who** began to contend with him", as in the following:

4 Nephi 1:36 (*which was* edited to *who were* in the 1837 edition)
    and it came to pass that
    in this year there arose a people
    which was called the Nephites

Another possible emendation for Alma 21:5 is that the original text had a pronoun *he:* "behold there arose an Amlicite and **he** began to contend with him". And there is also evidence for this construction:

Ether 11:17
    and it came to pass that
    there arose another mighty man
    and **he** was a descendant of the brother of Jared

Ether 13:23
    and it came to pass that
    there arose up Shared
    and **he** also gave battle unto Coriantumr

Ether 14:3
    behold there arose the brother of Shared
    and [NULL > *he* 1 | *he* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] gave battle unto Coriantumr

The last example shows Oliver Cowdery initially omitting the subject pronoun *he;* without the correction, 𝒫 read "there arose the brother of Shared and gave battle unto Coriantumr", just like in Alma 21:5. Thus Oliver could have accidentally omitted the subject pronoun *he* in Alma 21:5. Also note that just before, in the preceding verse, Oliver initially omitted the subject pronoun *he* in 𝒫 (see the preceding discussion under Alma 21:4).

Despite these arguments for emending Alma 21:5, there is one other example in the text of this strange construction:

Ether 11:15
    and there arose a mighty man among them in iniquity
    and gave battle unto Moron

Nor has this example ever been edited, just like Alma 21:5. It appears that this existential construction, although strange in modern English, is intended. In fact, there is also one example of this construction in the King James Bible:

Mark 14:57
    and there arose certain
    and bare false witness against him saying . . .

The critical text will therefore maintain the two Book of Mormon instances of "there arose X and did something", despite the difficulty of this construction.

Summary: Accept in Alma 21:5 the strange syntactic construction in "there arose an Amlicite **and began** to contend with him"; a similar instance occurs in Ether 11:15 as well as in Mark 14:57 of the King James Bible.

■ **Alma 21:5**

what is that [*that* 1A | BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *thou hast testified*

Here the 1837 edition deleted the second *that*. This deletion may actually be a typo since it was not marked by Joseph Smith in the printer's manuscript. The first *that* is a pronominal subject, and the second is the relative pronoun *that,* which can be omitted in English, although the resulting "what is that thou hast testified" seems almost as awkward as the original "what is that that thou hast testified". It should be noted that the use of the repeated *that that* in Alma 21:5 is not ungrammatical.

Perhaps what we expect here is *this that* ("what is **this that** thou hast testified"), as in the following three examples, all of them in this same part of the book of Alma:

Alma 12:20	what is **this that** thou hast said that man should rise from the dead
Alma 22:5	what is **this that** ye have said concerning the Spirit of the Lord
Alma 22:6	and also what is **this that** Ammon said

It is quite possible that the reading *that that* in Alma 21:5 is an early error for *this that*. Unfortunately, the original manuscript is not extant here.

It should be pointed out that there are two examples of the equally awkward *it that* in the text, where *that* is the relative pronoun and its antecedent is the subject pronoun *it:*

3 Nephi 28:1	what is **it that** ye desire of me
Moroni 7:41	and what is **it that** ye shall hope for

One could, of course, propose that the original text here in Alma 21:5 was actually a case of *it that* (thus "what is **it that** thou hast testified"). Ultimately, it appears that we have three different possibilities, each followed by a relative clause headed by *that:* (1) "what is **this**", (2) "what is **it**", and (3) "what is **that**". In the earliest text, there are three occurrences of the first, two of the second, and one of the third. In each case, the critical text will follow the earliest reading.

Summary: Despite its unusualness, restore in Alma 21:5 the earliest reading: "what is **that that** thou hast testified".

■ **Alma 21:5**

hast thou seen an angel
why do not [1ABCDEFGIJLMNOPQRST | *the* HK] *angels appear unto us*

Here the 1874 RLDS edition accidentally added the definite article *the* before *angels*. Although such a reading is possible, the earlier reading without the *the* works better. The 1908 RLDS edition restored the correct reading, "why do not angels appear unto us", to the RLDS text.

Summary: Maintain in Alma 21:5 the occurrence of *angels* without any definite article.

■ **Alma 21:6**

how knowest thou the thought and intent
of **our** [*heart* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQS | *hearts* RT]

The 1920 LDS edition changed the singular *heart* to the plural *hearts* in the LDS text since the context is plural (note the use of the plural *our*). Even so, the singular *heart* agrees with the preceding singular nouns *thought* and *intent,* the implication being that these Amlicites are of the same mind. A good example of a similar use of the singular *heart* in the Book of Mormon is found in a quotation from the King James Bible:

> 2 Nephi 27:25 (citing Isaiah 29:13, which reads *heart*)
> forasmuch as this people draw near unto me with their **mouth**
> and with their lips do honor me
> but have removed their [*heart* 1 | *hearts* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
>   far from me . . .

Note here the use of the singular *mouth* along with the original singular *heart.* But in Alma 21:6, one could argue that the singular nouns *thought* and *intent* led to an error in the early transmission of the text (namely, the replacement of an original *hearts* with the singular *heart*). Yet there is evidence in the original text that the singular *heart* can refer to a plurality, even in the immediate context of *hearts* or of a clear pronominal reference to *hearts:*

> Helaman 13:22
> yea your [*heart is* 1ABCDEHKP | *hearts are* FGIJLMNOQRST] not drawn out
>   unto the Lord
> but **they** do swell with great pride

> Helaman 13:27
> yea he will say
> walk after the pride of your own **hearts**
> yea walk after the pride of your eyes
> and do whatsoever your [*heart* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLNOPRST | *hearts* MQ] desireth

In the first example, the pronoun *they* is used to refer to an implied plural *hearts,* even though the preceding text originally reads "your **heart is** not drawn out"; in the second example, we get both a singular and a plural form of *heart* within the same passage. In both these examples, we see the tendency in the history of the text to replace the singular *heart* with the plural *hearts.* In general, the critical text will restore instances of singular *heart* with plural reference whenever they are supported by the earliest textual sources.

There are two other cases of a plural context where the original text may have had the singular *heart:*

> Alma 32:28 (𝒪 is not extant here)
> that a seed may be planted in your **heart**

> Alma 34:4 (both 𝒪 and 𝒫 initially read *heart*)
> yea even that ye would have so much faith as even to plant the word
> in your [*heart >+ hearts* 01 | *hearts* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]

For discussion, see under these two passages.

Summary: Restore in Alma 21:6 the singular *heart,* the earliest reading; the Amlicites are here characterized as being one in "thought and intent", which is consistent with the use of the singular *heart.*

■ **Alma 21:10**

and it came to pass [*that* 1A| BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
as he began to expound these things unto them
they were angry with him

> Here the 1837 edition dropped the conjunction *that* before the subordinate conjunction *as.* This deletion appears to be accidental since elsewhere usage is fairly evenly divided in the original text between "it came to pass **that** as . . ." (15 occurrences) and "it came to pass as . . ." (14 occurrences). For each case of "it came to pass (that) as . . .", the critical text will follow the earliest textual sources in determining whether the subordinate conjunction *that* should be there. Thus here in Alma 21:10, the *that* will be restored. Also see the discussion under THAT in volume 3.

Summary: Restore the subordinate conjunction *that* in Alma 21:10; in this case the 1837 deletion seems to be accidental.

■ **Alma 21:11**

therefore when he saw that they would not hear his words
he departed out of [*the* 1A|*their* BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *synagogue*

> Here the 1837 edition replaced "**the** synagogue" with "**their** synagogue". Either reading ("the synagogue" or "their synagogue") will theoretically work. Earlier in verse 5, the text established that Aaron had "entered into one of their synagogues", so "the synagogue" is perfectly acceptable here in verse 11. In fact, "their synagogue" implies that they had only one in the city of Jerusalem, which would be incorrect:

>> Alma 21:4−5
>>> and it came to pass that Aaron came to the city of Jerusalem
>>> and firstly began to preach to the Amlicites
>>> and he began to preach to them in their **synagogues**
>>> for they had built **synagogues** after the order of the Nehors . . .
>>> therefore as Aaron entered into one of their **synagogues**
>>>> to preach unto the people . . .

> In fact, the two instances of "**their** synagogues" in verses 4 and 5 may have prompted the 1837 compositor to set "**their** synagogue" in verse 11. The critical text will restore the original use of *the* before *synagogue* in Alma 21:11.

Summary: Restore in Alma 21:11 "**the** synagogue" since the text is referring to the synagogue that Aaron had entered (mentioned in verse 5); "their synagogue" implies that the Amlicites in the city of Jerusalem had only one synagogue, which was not the case.

■ **Alma 21:11**

therefore when he saw that they would not hear his words
he departed out of the synagogue and came over to a village which was called
[*Anianti > Ani Anti >+ Ani-Anti* 1 | *Ani-anti* ABCDEGHKPS | *Ani-Anti* FIJLMNOQRT]

The original manuscript is not extant for the name of this village. In the printer's manuscript, Oliver Cowdery initially wrote *Anianti;* then he immediately crossed out the whole name and wrote inline *Ani Anti.* A little later, with somewhat heavier ink flow, Oliver inserted a hyphen between *Ani* and *Anti,* giving *Ani-Anti.* The 1830 compositor set this as *Ani-anti;* the 1852 LDS edition ended up capitalizing *Anti,* thus unintentionally restoring *Ani-Anti,* Oliver's final reading in 𝒫.

Oliver Cowdery's initial spelling in 𝒫 was *Anianti,* but his subsequent immediate correction of *Anianti* to *Ani Anti* implies that 𝒪 read *Ani anti.* In writing the name initially in 𝒫, Oliver miswrote *Ani anti* as one word, *Anianti.* But in his subsequent correction, he split up the two words and capitalized *anti.* There is independent evidence that *Anti* represents a distinct morpheme; see the discussion of the name *Anti-Nephi-Lehi* under Alma 23:17. The critical text will assume as much and will accept Oliver's corrections in 𝒫 (separating *anti* from *Ani,* capitalizing *anti,* and adding a hyphen) as an indication that the *Anti* in *Ani-Anti* should be explicitly treated as a distinct morpheme. The hyphen will be maintained since hyphens have been used elsewhere in the text to show the morphemes or words within a single name, such as the biblical names *Shear-jashub* (in 2 Nephi 17:3) and *Maher-shalal-hash-baz* (in 2 Nephi 18:1, 3). These two names, however, are sentences in Hebrew; thus in English translation, only the first word has been capitalized in those two cases. The critical text will treat *Anti* here in Alma 21:11 as an independent morpheme, thus *Ani-Anti* (the LDS spelling) rather than *Ani-anti* (the RLDS spelling).

Summary: Accept the LDS spelling *Ani-Anti* for the name of the village in Alma 21:11; this spelling also agrees with Oliver Cowdery's final spelling of the name in the printer's manuscript.

■ **Alma 21:12**

therefore they departed and came over
[*into* 1ABCDEFGIJLMNOPQRST | *to* HK] *the land of Middoni*

The 1874 RLDS edition replaced the preposition *into* with *to;* the 1908 RLDS edition restored the original *into.* Either reading is possible, although the text generally favors *into,* as we can see from the following cases of "and came over (in)to the land of X":

Alma 15:18	and came over **to** the land of Zarahemla
Alma 35:1	and came over **into** the land of Jershon
Alma 35:13	and came over **into** the land of Melek
Alma 47:29	and came over **into** the land of Zarahemla

In the last example, the 1837 edition replaced the preposition *into* with *in* (see the discussion under that passage). Here in Alma 21:12, the critical text will maintain the original preposition, *into.*

Summary: Maintain in Alma 21:12 the preposition *into,* the reading of the earliest textual sources ("they departed and came over **into** the land of Middoni").

■ **Alma 21:13**

and the remainder of them fled out of the land of Middoni
[*unto* 1ABCEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST | *into* D] *the regions round about*

Here the 1841 British edition replaced the preposition *unto* with *into*. The subsequent LDS edition (1849) restored the earlier preposition. There is a possibility that *into* is actually correct. Elsewhere, when the text refers to fleeing to a place, the preposition is either *into* (19 times) or *to* (13 times). There are no other instances of "fleeing **unto** a place", although the use of *unto* in this phraseology should be possible since *unto* and *to* are basically synonymous.

There is evidence that "fleeing **into** a place" was once changed to "fleeing **unto** a place", but only momentarily:

> 1 Nephi 5:8
> now I know of a surety that the Lord hath commanded my husband to flee
> [*into* 0ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST | *unto* > *into* 1] the wilderness

𝒪 is extant in 1 Nephi 5:8 and reads *into*. Moreover, there are 14 additional occurrences of "fleeing **into** the wilderness". (There is also one occurrence of "fleeing **to** the wilderness", in Ether 14:14: "they fled again **to** the wilderness of Akish".) It is therefore possible that here in Alma 21:13, an original *into* could have been mistakenly changed to *unto* during the early transmission of the text. And there are quite a few cases in the history of the text where the prepositions *unto* and *into* have been mixed up; for some statistics, see under 1 Nephi 7:2.

Ultimately, here in Alma 21:13, the safest solution is to accept *unto,* the earliest reading, simply because there are examples of "fleeing **to** a place" and *unto* is synonymous with *to*. In addition, as David Calabro points out (personal communication), there is an excellent example in the King James Bible of the phraseology "to flee **unto** a region . . . round about":

> Acts 14:6
> they were ware of *it* and fled unto Lystra and Derbe cities of Lycaonia
> and **unto** the region that lieth round about

Such biblical usage argues that *unto* is perfectly acceptable in Alma 21:13.

Summary: Maintain in Alma 21:13 the preposition *unto* in the phrase "**unto** the regions round about", the reading of the earliest textual sources; nonetheless, there is a chance that this phrase originally read "**into** the regions round about".

■ **Alma 21:17**

yea they did convince many of their sins
and of the [*tradition* 1ABCDEGPS | *traditions* FHIJKLMNOQRT] *of their fathers*
which **were** *not correct*

For this passage, the 1852 LDS edition changed the singular *tradition* to the plural *traditions,* probably because of the following plural *were* (thus eliminating the subject-verb disagreement found in the earliest text, "and of the **tradition** . . . which **were** not correct"). Oliver Cowdery was

the scribe here in 𝒫 and probably also in 𝒪 (extant fragments of 𝒪 in nearby Alma 20 and Alma 22 are in Oliver's hand). And there is considerable manuscript evidence that Oliver frequently mixed up the number for *tradition(s);* for six examples, see under Mosiah 1:5. Thus here in Alma 21:17, one could interpret this occurrence of *tradition* in 𝒫 as an error for *traditions,* especially since the verb in the following relative clause is in the plural ("which **were** not correct").

Yet we also find in the original text that the number agreement for the verb in the relative clause is often determined by the number of the nearest preceding noun, as in 1 Nephi 13:23: "a record of the **Jews** which **contain** the covenants of the Lord" (see the discussion under that passage). Therefore, the critical text will accept the earliest extant reading here in Alma 21:17, "the **tradition** of their fathers which **were** not correct", despite its problems with subject-verb agreement. Even so, we must still recognize that *tradition* could be an error for *traditions.*

Summary: Restore the singular *tradition* in Alma 21:17, despite the fact that the verb in the following relative clause is in the plural ("which **were** not correct"); such subject-verb disagreement derives, it would appear, from the nearer plural noun, *fathers:* "the tradition of their **fathers** which **were** not correct".

■ **Alma 21:18**

and it came to pass that Ammon and Lamoni returned
[*to > from* 1 | *from* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *the land of Middoni*
to *the land of Ishmael which was the land of their inheritance*

Here in the printer's manuscript, Oliver Cowdery initially wrote "**to** the land of Middoni" instead of "**from** the land of Middoni", probably in anticipation of the *to* in the following "**to** the land of Ishmael". His correction of *to* to *from* is virtually immediate; there is no change in the level of ink flow for the supralinear *from.* Earlier in the text, Alma 17 identifies the land of Ishmael, under king Lamoni, as the land that Ammon entered to preach the gospel; and Alma 20 refers to the land of Middoni as the land where Ammon and Lamoni went to release Ammon's brethren.

Summary: Maintain in Alma 21:18 the corrected reading in 𝒫, the preposition *from* rather than *to* in "**from** the land of Middoni".

■ **Alma 21:21**

and he did also declare unto them
that they were a people which was under him
and that they were a free people
that they were free from the [*oppressions* 1ABDEFIJLMNOPQRST | *oppression* CGHK]
of the king his father

Here the 1840 edition changed the plural *oppressions* to the singular *oppression.* This change could be due to Joseph Smith's editing, or it may simply represent an error in the 1840 edition. The RLDS text restored the original plural *oppressions* in the third RLDS edition (1908), probably by reference to 𝒫.

Here in Alma 21:21, either the singular or the plural is possible, although normally in English we expect the singular *oppression* since the noun is usually a mass noun. But the Book of Mormon text frequently uses nouns in the plural when English speakers would prefer the singular. Consider, for instance, the discussion under 2 Nephi 10:6 regarding the occurrence of the plural *bloodsheds* in the Book of Mormon text as well as the tendency to replace *bloodsheds* with *bloodshed*.

Elsewhere in the text we have three occurrences of the expected singular *oppression* but none of the plural *oppressions:*

> 2 Nephi 15:7   and he looked for judgment and behold **oppression**
>
> Helaman 4:12   yea it was because of their **oppression** to the poor
>
> 3 Nephi 22:14   thou shalt be far from **oppression**

The first and the third of these are quotes from the King James version of Isaiah (namely, from Isaiah 5:7 and Isaiah 54:14). So in the nonbiblical text of the Book of Mormon, there is one occurrence of the singular *oppression* (in Helaman 4:12) but also one of the plural *oppressions* (here in Alma 21:21). The critical text will maintain the original plural *oppressions* in Alma 21:21 despite its unexpectedness in current English.

Summary: Retain the original plural reading *oppressions* in Alma 21:21 despite its unique occurrence in the text.

■ **Alma 21:21**

and he did also declare unto them
that *they were a people which was under him*
and that *they were a free people*
that *they were free from the oppressions of the king his father*
for that *his father had granted unto him*
that *he might reign over the people which were in the land of Ishmael*

Here one might consider the occurrence of the subordinate conjunction *that* after the conjunction *for* to be an error, perhaps the result of the four surrounding occurrences of *that* in the passage. Nonetheless, we can find support for *for that*. In this case, the conjunction *for* is acting like *because* and *since,* and in the original text of the Book of Mormon we regularly have *that* following these two conjunctions (see the discussion under 1 Nephi 1:14 for *because that* and under 1 Nephi 22:5 for *since that*). The expression *for that* parallels this usage, especially since here *for* has the meaning 'because, since'.

Although there are no other examples of this use of *for that* in the Book of Mormon text, there are a number of examples in the King James Bible, as in the following:

> 1 Chronicles 29:9
> > then the people rejoiced
> > **for that** they offered willingly
>
> Romans 5:12
> > and so death passed upon all men
> > **for that** all have sinned

In a modern English translation such as the Revised Standard Version (1952), these two instances of *for that* are translated as *because* (and, of course, without the archaic *that* following the conjunction *because*). For further discussion of the archaic *for that,* see definition 21 under the preposition and conjunction *for* in the Oxford English Dictionary. The OED explains that *for that* with the meaning 'because' dates from the 13th century. In addition, the King James examples show the continuing use of *for that* up into the 17th century. For further discussion of *for that* as well as *because that* and *since that,* see under SUBORDINATE CONJUNCTIONS in volume 3. The critical text will therefore maintain this archaic use of *for that* despite its uniqueness in the text.

Summary: Maintain in Alma 21:21 the unique occurrence of the archaic *for that,* which has the meaning 'because, since'; such usage was fairly common in Early Modern English.

■ **Alma 21:23**

and they gave heed [*unto* 1ABCEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST | *to* D] *his word*

The 1841 British edition accidentally replaced the preposition *unto* in this passage with *to*. The 1849 LDS edition restored the original *unto*. Either usage is theoretically possible, of course, with the use of *to* as the more modern alternative. Elsewhere in the text, there are eight examples of "to give heed **to** X" and eight of "to give heed **unto** X". Here's a passage where both prepositions are used in this expression:

> 1 Nephi 15:25
> > wherefore I Nephi did exhort them to **give heed unto** the word of the Lord
> > yea I did exhort them with all the energies of my soul
> > and with all the faculty which I possessed
> > that they would **give heed to** the word of God

For each case of "to give heed (un)to X", the critical text will follow the earliest reading.

Summary: Maintain in Alma 21:23 the original preposition *unto* in "they gave heed unto his word".

Alma 22

■ **Alma 22:1**

now as Ammon was thus teaching the people of Lamoni continually
we will return to the account of Aaron
and his [other 1PS| ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOQRT] brethren

The 1830 typesetter removed the modifier *other* in this passage, probably because one tends to interpret the possessive pronoun *his* in "his other brethren" as referring to the nearest noun, *Aaron,* thus making the *other* seem unnecessary. The intended meaning, of course, is that the narrative is now returning to discuss the missionary work of Aaron (Ammon's brother) and Ammon's other brethren (namely, his other brothers and their missionary companions, also referred to in the text as "brethren", as in the preface before Alma 21: "An account of the preaching of Aaron and Muloki and their **brethren** to the Lamanites"). With the *other* deleted here in Alma 22:1, *his brethren* now clearly refers to Aaron's brethren. A similar kind of pronominal reference using *other* occurs later in the text:

> Alma 45:15
> and now it came to pass that
> after **Alma** had said these things to Helaman
> he blessed him and also his **other** sons

Here the possessive pronoun *his* refers to Alma, not Helaman; the use of *other* forces this interpretation and is required in Alma 45:15. The critical text will restore the *other* in Alma 22:1.

Summary: Restore *other* in Alma 22:1 ("and his other brethren") since *his* refers to Ammon rather than Aaron.

■ **Alma 22:7**

and I have granted unto them that they should build sanctuaries
that they [might >js may 1| might a| may BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] assemble
themselves together to worship him

As discussed under Jacob 5:13, the critical text will restore all original instances of the modal *might,* even in cases where this modal does not have any conditional sense. Here in Alma 22:7, Joseph Smith replaced the past-tense form *might* with the present-tense form *may,* but there is nothing inappropriate about the use of *might* in this case.

Summary: Restore the modal *might* in Alma 22:7: "that they might assemble themselves together".

■ **Alma 22:12**

he began from the creation of Adam
reading the scriptures unto the king
how God created man after his own image
and that God gave [NULL > *him* 1 | *him* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *commandments*
and that because of transgression man had fallen

Here in his copying from 𝒪 into 𝒫, Oliver Cowdery initially wrote "God gave commandments"; then virtually immediately Oliver supralinearly inserted the indirect object pronoun *him* (there is no change in the level of ink flow). Most probably, 𝒪 read that way. The indirect object, *him,* is not required here, as we can see from the following example: "for he gave commandment that all men must repent" (2 Nephi 2:21). There would have been little, if any, motivation for Oliver to emend the text here in Alma 22:12.

Summary: Accept in Alma 22:12 Oliver Cowdery's corrected reading in 𝒫: "and that God gave **him** commandments".

■ **Alma 22:14**

but the [*suffering* > *sufferings* 1 | *sufferings* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *and death of Christ*
atoneth for their sins through faith and repentance etc.

Here Oliver Cowdery produced a virtually immediate correction in 𝒫 by adding the plural *s* to his initially written *suffering* (there is no change in the level of ink flow for the inserted *s*). In theory, either singular or plural will work here, although the Book of Mormon text has only instances of the plural *sufferings* when referring to Christ's suffering and death (see the discussion under Alma 16:19). The critical text will maintain the plural *sufferings* here in Alma 22:14.

Summary: Retain in Alma 22:14 the plural *sufferings,* the corrected reading in 𝒫; the text consistently uses the plural *sufferings* when referring to Christ's atonement.

■ **Alma 22:15**

yea I will forsake my kingdom
that I [*may* 1ABCEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST | *might* D] *receive this great joy*

The 1841 British edition accidentally replaced the modal *may* with *might.* The subsequent LDS edition (1849) restored the correct *may.* For another example of variation between *may* and *might,* see the nearby discussion under Alma 22:7. For a general list of cases of this variation, see under Jacob 5:13. For each case of *may/might,* the critical text will follow the earliest extant reading.

Summary: Maintain the modal verb *may* in Alma 22:15, the earliest reading ("that I may receive this great joy").

■ **Alma 22:15**

yea I will forsake my kingdom
that I may receive [*this* 1ABCGHIJKLMNOPQRST | *the* DE | *the* > *this* F] *great joy*

Here the 1841 British edition accidentally replaced *this* with *the* in the phrase "this great joy". The phrase "the great joy" is odd here because for such a phrase headed by *the* we expect some kind of postmodification, as in Alma 7:4: "**the** exceeding great joy **of** knowing that they are established again in the way of his righteousness".

The two following LDS editions (1849 and 1852) followed the reading with *the* in Alma 22:15, but in the second printing of the 1852 edition the original *this* was restored (in the stereotyped plates), probably by reference to the 1840 edition. The critical text will here maintain the earliest reading, "**this** great joy".

Summary: Maintain in Alma 22:15 the demonstrative *this* in "this great joy".

■ **Alma 22:16**

if thou **desirest** *this thing*
if thou [*will* 1 | *wilt* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *bow down before God*
yea if thou [1A | *wilt* BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *repent of all thy sins*
and [NULL > *will* 1 | *will* ABCEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST | D] *bow down before God*
and call on his name in faith . . .

The earliest Book of Mormon text here uses the indicative *desirest* after the first *thou* ("if thou desirest this thing"), but then switches to the subjunctive (that is, base) verb forms after the second and third occurrences of *thou* ("if **thou will** bow down before God / yea if **thou repent** of all thy sins") as well as with the conjoined predicate that follows: "and **will** bow down before God and call on his name in faith". (Here I treat the last part of this conjunct, "and call on his name in faith", as a case of ellipsis of the modal verb *will,* as if the text read "and will bow down before God and **will call** on his name in faith". One could treat the verb *call* as a finite verb form, as if the text read "and thou will bow down before God and **thou call** on his name in faith". The following analysis would need to be slightly altered, but not crucially, if *call* were treated as a finite verb form.)

This passage in Alma 22:16 has manifested some variation in its use of indicative and subjunctive verb forms, but none of the changes have ended up making the entire passage read consistently in either the indicative or the subjunctive. The first change occurred when Oliver Cowdery initially wrote "and bow down before God" as he copied the text from 𝓞 into 𝓟. Then almost immediately he supralinearly inserted the modal verb form *will* (not *wilt*), giving "and **will** bow down before God" (there is no change in the level of ink flow for the inserted *will*). This correction means that the reading in 𝓟 ("and **will** bow down before God") agrees with the similar clause earlier in this passage ("if thou **will** bow down before God"), at least in its use of *will.* The corrected reading in 𝓟 is probably the reading in 𝓞 and, as far as we can tell, the original text itself. We also note that the typesetter for the 1841 British edition, like Oliver Cowdery initially in 𝓟, accidentally omitted the *will* here, giving once more "and **bow** down before God". The subsequent LDS edition, in 1849, restored the original *will.* The omission of this *will* makes the following conjoined

predicate lack the modal verb *will/wilt* for both verbs: "and **bow** down before God and **call** on his name in faith".

The first permanent change in the reading here in Alma 22:16 occurred in the 1830 edition. There the typesetter replaced the first occurrence of *will* with *wilt,* undoubtedly because this instance of *will* was immediately preceded by *thou* (thus giving "if thou **wilt** bow down before God"). But the 1830 typesetter left the two following instances of the subjunctive verb form: "yea if thou **repent** of all thy sins and **will** bow down before God and call on his name in faith".

The second permanent change took place in the 1837 edition when the subjunctive *repent* was emended to the indicative *wilt repent* (thus giving "if thou **wilt** repent of all thy sins"). Even so, the remaining instance of the subjunctive verb form was left unchanged ("and **will** bow down before God and call on his name in faith"). Here the standard text has retained the 1837 reading. But no edition has completed the process of grammatical emendation that would make all the verb forms indicative:

> Alma 22:16 (all remaining subjunctive forms emended to the indicative)
> if thou **desirest** this thing
> if thou **wilt** bow down before God
> yea if thou **wilt** repent of all thy sins
> and **wilt** bow down before God and call on his name in faith . . .

Of course, in the earliest text there was no modal verb before *repent,* so based on that reading, an alternative reading with consistent grammatical emendation would be the following:

> Alma 22:16 (all original subjunctive forms emended to the indicative)
> if thou **desirest** this thing
> if thou **wilt** bow down before God
> yea if thou **repentest** of all thy sins
> and **wilt** bow down before God and call on his name in faith . . .

(As noted above, one could treat *call* in "and **call** on his name in faith" as a finite verb form, which would mean that the two indicative readings listed above would end in "and **callest** on his name in faith".)

The earliest Book of Mormon text allows both indicative and subjunctive (or base) verb forms for the subject pronoun *thou*. For a list of other examples, see the discussion under Alma 12:23. The critical text will therefore restore in Alma 22:16 the earliest reading (the corrected reading in 𝔓):

> Alma 22:16 (original text)
> if thou **desirest** this thing
> 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 . . .

The King James Bible, it should be noted, is fairly equally divided between the use of the indicative versus the subjunctive after *if thou* (107 occurrences with the indicative and 97 with the subjunctive), as in the following variation involving the verb *do* (either as a main verb or as a helping verb):

Genesis 4:7	if thou **doest** well . . . and if thou **doest** not well
Deuteronomy 8:19	if thou **do** at all forget the LORD thy God
Ezekiel 33:8	if thou **dost** not speak to warn the wicked from his way
John 7:4	if thou **do** these things
Romans 13:4	but if thou **do** that which is evil
1 Corinthians 4:7	now if thou **didst** receive *it*

However, if the verb is the modal *will* or *shall,* the King James Bible always has the indicative form *wilt* (46 times) or *shalt* (15 times), never the subjunctive *will* or *shall.* But as noted under Mosiah 12:11 and Alma 8:20, there are a few instances of *thou shall* and *thou will* in the original Book of Mormon text. As a result, Book of Mormon usage is not fully identical to King James usage. For further discussion, see under SUBJUNCTIVE in volume 3.

Summary: Maintain the original subjunctive verb forms in Alma 22:16: "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".

■ **Alma 22:16**

and call on his name in faith
believing that [*ye* 1ABCEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST | *he* D] *shall receive*

Here the 1841 British edition accidentally replaced the subject pronoun *ye* with *he,* probably under the influence of the *his* in the immediately preceding "and call on **his** name in faith". The 1849 LDS edition restored the obviously correct *ye.*

Summary: Maintain the subject pronoun *ye* in Alma 22:16: "believing that **ye** shall receive".

■ **Alma 22:16**

then shalt thou receive the hope
[*which* 1ABCDEFGIJLMNOPQRST | *that* HK] *thou desirest*

Here the 1874 RLDS edition replaced the restrictive relative pronoun *which* with *that.* One might propose that this change was intentional since there is a prescriptive rule that does not permit the restrictive use of *which*. Yet the Book of Mormon is full of such usage and most instances of the restrictive *which* have been retained in the text, although cases of *which* referring to persons have typically been edited to *who(m).* There has never been any systematic effort in the editing of the Book of Mormon text to change restrictive *which* to *that.* For a brief discussion of this editing practice, see under 1 Nephi 13:23; for a complete discussion, see under WHICH in volume 3. As far as the relative pronouns *which* and *that* are concerned, the critical text will in each case follow the earliest textual sources (thus *which* here in Alma 22:16).

Summary: Maintain in Alma 22:16 the restrictive use of the relative pronoun *which,* the reading of the earliest textual sources; restrictive *which* is very frequent in both the original and the current texts of the Book of Mormon.

■ **Alma 22:17**

yea even he did prostrate himself upon the earth
[& *cried* 1 | *and cried* ABCEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST | *crying* D] *mightily*
saying . . .

Once more the 1841 British edition introduced an error which was corrected in the following LDS edition (in 1849): namely, the replacement of the conjoined finite predicate *and cried* with the present participial form *crying*. This error was probably the result of the typesetter anticipating the following present participial form *saying*. For another example of this kind of anticipatory error (but involving "prophesying seeing"), see under Mosiah 12:2.

In all cases but one, the verb *cry* does not take the present participial form when followed by *saying;* the only exception (marked below with an asterisk) has a sequence of "and crying . . . saying":

Mosiah 18:12	and **cried** saying
Alma 9:25	and **cry** mightily unto this people saying
Alma 10:25	and **cried** the mightier unto them saying
Alma 13:21	and **cried** with a mighty voice saying
Alma 19:29	and **cried** with a loud voice saying
Alma 31:14	and **cry** with a loud voice saying
Alma 31:26	and **cried** saying
* Alma 46:19	and **crying** with a loud voice saying
Helaman 9:16	and **did cry** out against Nephi saying
3 Nephi 4:28	and **did cry** with a loud voice saying
3 Nephi 4:30	and **cry** again with one voice saying
3 Nephi 12:1	and **cried** unto them saying
Ether 3:1	and **cried** again unto the Lord saying

One might think that the example in Alma 46:19 of "crying with a loud voice saying" could be an error, just like the 1841 reading here in Alma 22:17 ("crying mightily saying"). However, the larger context for the Alma 46 passage shows that the present participial form *crying* is conjoined with an earlier present participial form, *waving:*

Alma 46:19
and when Moroni had said these words
he went forth among the people
waving the rent of his garment in the air
that all might see the writing which he had wrote upon the rent
and **crying** with a loud voice saying . . .

Thus in Alma 46:19, there is nothing inappropriate about "crying . . . saying". But here in Alma 22:17, the 1841 change to "crying . . . saying" is clearly a textual error, although not syntactically impossible. The critical text will follow the earliest reading *and cried* in Alma 22:17.

Summary: Maintain in Alma 22:17 *and cried,* the earliest reading, rather than the innovative and somewhat unexpected *crying* that showed up only in the 1841 British edition.

■ **Alma 22:19**

and when she saw him [*lay* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLPRST | *lay > lying* M | *lying* NOQ]
   as if he were dead
and also Aaron and his brethren standing as though they had been the cause of his fall
she was angry with them

Here the 1906 LDS edition emended the original *lay* to *lying,* thus changing the verb from *lay* to *lie* and the form of the verb from the infinitive to the present participle. This change was probably influenced by the fact that the following conjoined complement takes the present participial form: "and also Aaron and his brethren **standing** as though they had been the cause of his fall". The change to *lying* was followed in the immediately following LDS editions and printings: the third printing (in 1907) of the 1905 Chicago missionary edition, the 1907 vest-pocket edition, and the 1911 large-print Chicago edition. However, the editors for the 1920 LDS edition intentionally restored the original verb form *lay* (the change is marked in the committee copy).

There are two issues here: (1) should the infinitive or the present participial form of the verb be used; and (2) which verb should be used, *lie* or *lay?* Let us first consider the question of whether the verb form should be the infinitive or the present participle. Elsewhere in the text, there are examples of the verb *see* taking either complement form, as in the following contrastive pair of examples:

> 3 Nephi 29:4
>   and when ye shall see these sayings **coming** forth among you
>   then ye need not any longer spurn at the doings of the Lord

> Ether 8:24
>   wherefore the Lord commandeth you
>   when ye shall see these things **come** among you
>   that ye shall awake to a sense of your awful situation
>   because of this secret combination which shall be among you

In this contrasting pair there is not much difference between *coming* and *come,* but in other instances the infinitive implies the completion of an action while the present participial form implies a continuing action:

> 1 Nephi 12:21
>   I saw many generations **pass away**

> Alma 47:29
>   now when the servants of the king saw an army **pursuing** after them
>   they were frightened again

In the case of Alma 22:19, the context implies a continuing action (that is, the king is lying on the ground), so in modern English we expect the present participial form *lying* or *laying.* Interestingly, in the King James Bible, we have examples of both the infinitive and present participial forms for the verb *lie* in this construction, yet in each instance we have a continuing action:

John 5:5–6

    and a certain man was there
    which had an infirmity thirty and eight years
    when Jesus saw him **lie**
    and knew that he had been now a long time *in that case*
    he saith unto him : wilt thou be made whole

John 20:4–6

    so they ran both together
    and the other disciple did outrun Peter
    and came first to the sepulchre
    and he stooping down *and looking in*
    saw the linen clothes **lying**
    yet went he not in
    then cometh Simon Peter following him
    and went into the sepulchre
    and seeth the linen clothes **lie**

Thus the occurrence of the infinitive form *lay* (or *lie*) in Alma 22:19 is quite possible and will be accepted in the critical text.

On the other hand, these biblical examples read with the verb *lie* rather than *lay*. Historically, *lie* is the intransitive verb form and, according to prescriptive grammar, is supposed to be used only intransitively, while *lay* is supposed to be the transitive form. Yet modern English speakers do not readily make this distinction. See, for instance, the discussion under *lay* in Merriam Webster's Dictionary of English Usage. Also see the discussion under Omni 1:30 and more generally under LAY in volume 3. The critical text will, of course, restore the original *lay* here in Alma 22:19.

Summary: Maintain the original use of the verb *lay* in Alma 22:19, although prescriptive grammarians prefer the intransitive *lie;* since the action is continuous in this passage, modern English speakers prefer the present participial form (*lying* or *laying*) over the infinitive form (*lie* or *lay*); the use of the infinitive form in Alma 22:19 is supported by usage in the King James Bible.

■ **Alma 22:20**

why commandest thou that [*we* 1ABCDFGHIJKLMNOPQRST | *us* E] *should slay these men*
when behold one of them is mightier than [*us* 1ABCEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST | *we* D] *all*
therefore **we** *shall fall before them*

The 1841 British edition replaced the object pronoun form *us* after *than* with the subject form *we,* perhaps under the influence of the following "therefore **we** shall fall before them". The original *us* was restored in the subsequent LDS edition (1849). Interestingly, this edition also replaced the correct *we* in the preceding line of text with *us,* giving the impossible reading "why commandest thou that **us** should slay these men"; there seems to have been some contamination from the copytext for the 1849 edition, a copy of the 1841 edition in which the later *we* (in "than we all") had been corrected to *us.*

Even though the 1841 change from *us* to *we* was probably accidental, it turns out that according to the prescriptive rule *we* is grammatically correct since the text means 'one of them is mightier than **we are**'. The grammatical issue for the Book of Mormon text is whether prescriptive grammar should be followed or not. Pronouns after *than,* if semantic subjects, are supposed to take subject forms (*I, thou, he, she, we,* and *they*), not object forms (*me, thee, him, her, us,* and *them*). In Old and Middle English, we would also have had the subject form *ye* versus the object form *you,* while in Early Modern English *ye* was eventually replaced by *you*. In the Book of Mormon, both *ye* and *you* serve as subject pronoun forms (see the discussion under Mosiah 4:14 and, more generally, under YE in volume 3). The problem with the prescriptive rule regarding the pronoun form after *than* is that speakers of modern English frequently—in fact, usually—select the object form ("Jim's better **than me**"). Of course, if we expand the sentence by supplying the elllipted verb, we always use the subject form ("Jim's better than **I am**"). The example here in Alma 22:20 shows the long-term preference in the text for the nonstandard *us* after *than* instead of the prescriptive *we*. For additional discussion regarding this prescriptive rule, see the first entry under *than* in Merriam Webster's Dictionary of English Usage.

The King James Bible basically follows the prescriptive rule. Whenever a pronoun without a verb follows *than* and that pronoun is semantically a subject, then the subject form of the pronoun is nearly always selected (60 times), as in John 14:28: "for my Father is greater **than I**". But there is one exception:

Proverbs 27:3
    a stone *is* heavy and the sand is weighty
    but a fool's wrath *is* heavier **than them** both

In the Book of Mormon text, there is only one case of *than I:*

1 Nephi 10:8   and he is mightier **than I**

This one instance of *than I* is related to John the Baptist's language in the Synoptic Gospels (as given in the King James Bible), especially in the example from Matthew 3:11: "but he that cometh after me is mightier **than I**". Much more frequent in the Book of Mormon is *than they* (with 11 occurrences), but there are none of *than them*. Here I provide a sampling:

1 Nephi 17:34   our fathers would have been more choice **than they**
Alma 7:7   there is one thing which is of more importance **than they** all
Alma 18:21   thou art more powerful **than** all **they**
3 Nephi 7:18   he had greater power **than they**

There are two cases of *than you:*

Jacob 3:5   the Lamanites your brethren . . . are more righteous **than you**
Helaman 7:24   they are more righteous **than you**

As noted above, *you* can be interpreted as either a subject or an object form. And finally, there are two cases with object forms, the one involving *us* here in Alma 22:20 and one with *thee:*

Alma 20:17   nevertheless it were better that he should fall **than thee**

The only case of textual variation between the subject and object pronoun forms after *than* is here in Alma 22:20, which is probably accidental rather than intentional. The critical text will in each case follow the earliest textual sources in choosing between the subject and object form of the pronoun after *than*. For further discussion, see under PRONOUNS in volume 3.

Summary: The critical text will follow the earliest textual sources in determining whether the subject or object pronoun form should occur after *than* (given that the pronoun is semantically the subject); there are two cases where the object form shows up, Alma 20:17 ("than thee") and Alma 22:20 ("than us").

■ **Alma 22:22**

now when Aaron saw the determination of the queen
[& 1|and ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQS| RT] he also knowing the hardness of the hearts of the people
feared lest that a multitude should assemble themselves together
and there should be a great contention and a disturbance among them
therefore he put forth his hand and raised the king from the earth
and said unto him . . .

In this passage the 1920 LDS edition deleted the *and* before "he also knowing". The apparent intent of this editing was to connect the initial *when*-clause to the immediately following finite clause ("he . . . feared"). However, this independent clause should be considered parenthetical, with the result that the initial *when*-clause is actually completed by the subsequent *therefore*-clause. Such an analysis suggests that this long intervening clause should be separated off by dashes (or parentheses) from the rest of the sentence:

> Alma 22:22 (original text, with dashes added)
> now when Aaron saw the determination of the queen
> —and he also knowing the hardness of the hearts of the people
> feared lest that a multitude should assemble themselves together
> and there should be a great contention and a disturbance among them—
> therefore he put forth his hand and raised the king from the earth
> and said unto him . . .

Of course, the syntax here is complicated no matter what is done. The proposed dashes (or parentheses) do, however, capture the original intent of the passage. For a similar complex example involving a long parenthetical clause, see the discussion under 2 Nephi 25:16–17.

Summary: Restore in Alma 22:22 the original *and* that immediately precedes the long parenthetical clause "he also knowing the hardness of the hearts of the people feared lest that a multitude should assemble themselves together and there should be a great contention and a disturbance among them"; the initial *when*-clause in this passage is completed by the final *therefore*-clause.

■ **Alma 22:22**

and he also knowing the hardness of the hearts of the people feared
lest [that 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRT | s] a multitude should assemble themselves together
and there should be a great contention and a disturbance among them

In modern English we do not expect *that* after the subordinate conjunction *lest*. In this passage, the 1953 RLDS edition removed the *that,* perhaps unintentionally. Elsewhere in the Book of Mormon text, we have 72 occurrences of *lest* without any *that* before the following finite clause, as in 1 Nephi 8:36: "yea he **feared lest** they should be cast off from the presence of the Lord". But there are two other original cases in the text where *lest* is followed by *that:*

> Alma 36:11
> I was struck with such great fear and amazement
> **lest** perhaps [*that* 0A | *that* >js NULL 1 | BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
>   I should be destroyed
> that I fell to the earth and I did hear no more

> Helaman 2:11
> he feared **lest that** he should be destroyed

The first of these was grammatically emended by Joseph Smith in his editing for the 1837 edition, but the last one has never been altered. The fact that the 1953 RLDS edition maintained the *that* in this last example suggests that its omission in Alma 22:22 was accidental. Of course, the natural tendency would be for modern English speakers to remove the *that* after subordinate conjunctions like *lest*. The original text generally permitted *that* after subordinate conjunctions (such as *after* and *because*). For further discussion of such archaic usage in the original text, see under SUBORDINATE CONJUNCTIONS in volume 3.

There are numerous citations of *lest that* (with that precise spelling) on the online Oxford English Dictionary, with dates from 1385 to 1671; of course, that phraseology is now obsolete. For some examples of *lest that* from the printed OED (all with alternative spellings of *lest that*), see the section *lest that* under the conjunction *lest*. The King James Bible normally has just *lest,* but there are two examples of *lest that:*

> Genesis 38:9
> and it came to pass
> when he went in unto his brother's wife
> that he spilled *it* on the ground
> **lest that** he should give seed to his brother

> 1 Corinthians 9:27
> but I keep under my body and bring *it* into subjection
> **lest that** by any means when I have preached to others
> I myself should be a castaway

The critical text will accept all the original instances of *lest that* in the Book of Mormon text.

Summary: Maintain in Alma 22:22 the original *that* after the subordinate conjunction *lest;* similar usage can be found elsewhere in the original (and current) text of the Book of Mormon as well as in the King James Bible.

■ **Alma 22:22–23**

and he stood upon his feet receiving his strength
now this was done in the presence of the queen
and many of [*his* 0 | *his* >p *the* 1 | *the* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *servants*

In Alma 22:23, Oliver Cowdery edited "many of **his** servants" to "many of **the** servants". He made this change in pencil. As discussed under Alma 10:28, corrections in pencil apparently took place in the 1830 print shop and were made by Oliver or by John Gilbert (the 1830 typesetter)—and without reference to the original manuscript. These changes do not necessarily represent the reading of the original text, although some apparently do. But in every instance, they involve conscious editing. For some nearby examples, see under Alma 17:8, Alma 17:18, and Alma 18:1–2; only the last of these three appears to have restored the original reading. For the example here in Alma 22:23, we have definite proof that the original manuscript did not read according to Oliver's editing: 𝓞 is extant here and reads "many of **his** servants".

For Oliver Cowdery, the immediate difficulty was that the king (the referent for the *his* in verse 23) is not mentioned at all in that sentence but in the previous sentence (in verse 22): "and **he** stood upon **his** feet receiving **his** strength". In verse 23, on the other hand, "and many of his servants" is immediately preceded by "the queen", and that conjunctive combination leads the reader to expect a possessive pronoun referring to the queen, not the king. So Oliver chose the more general determiner *the*. As we shall see, *her* will not work here.

The narrative here in Alma 22:17–23 refers to both the servants of the king and the servants of the queen. Initially, we have only the king's servants, who are described as running to the queen and getting her to come to the king's room:

> Alma 22:18–19
>
>   and now when the king had said these words
>   he was struck as if he were dead
>   and it came to pass that **his servants** ran
>   and told the queen all that had happened unto the king
>   and she came in unto the king

The queen then commands the king's servants to kill Aaron and his fellow missionaries:

> Alma 22:19
>
>   and when she saw him lay as if he were dead
>   and also Aaron and his brethren standing
>   as though they had been the cause of his fall
>   she was angry with them and commanded that
>   **her servants or the servants of the king** should take them and slay them

Here Mormon seems to have initially miswritten "her servants" on the plates, not unsurprisingly since the preceding text refers to the actions of the queen ("and when **she** saw him lay . . . **she** was angry"). But in reality, she did not command her own servants but the king's servants to kill Aaron and his companions. So Mormon corrected what he had written by adding "or the servants of the king".

The Book of Mormon text has many examples of the corrective *or*. Probably the most striking example in the entire Book of Mormon occurs nearby:

Alma 24:19
> and thus we see that they buried the weapons of peace
> **or they buried the weapons of war for peace**

Another striking example of the corrective *or* removes an obvious syntactic error that Mormon appears to have initially written on the plates:

Alma 43:38
> while on the other hand
> there was now and then a man fell among the Nephites
> by their wounds and the loss of blood
> they being shielded from the more vital parts of the body
> **or the more vital parts of the body being shielded**
> **from the strokes of the Lamanites**
> by their breastplates and their armshields and their headplates

There are also two original instances of the corrective *or* that have been removed from the standard text, the first accidentally and the second one consciously:

Mormon 6:10 (*or* omitted by the 1830 typesetter)
> and it came to pass that my men were hewn down
> yea **or** even my ten thousand which were with me

Ether 9:2 (for the 1837 edition Joseph Smith retained only the corrective part)
> nevertheless the Lord was merciful unto Omer
> and also to his sons and to his daughters
> **which were not or** which did not seek his destruction

In these two examples, I give the original text and in bold I indicate the words that were removed. The second example is interesting in that Moroni had written on the plates only the equivalent first part of "**which were not** seeking his destruction" when he decided to adjust the syntax; in this instance, the corrective *or* corrects an error midstream. For a third example where an original *or* may have been omitted when Oliver Cowdery copied from 𝓞 into 𝓟, see under Alma 58:18 (there the original text may have read "I caused that my men **or** those which were with me should retreat into the wilderness").

Mormon's corrective *or*-statement in Alma 22:19 is supported by the subsequent narrative where the king's servants protest against doing anything to these Nephites because of their great powers:

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
> and they pled with the queen saying
> why commandest thou that we should slay these men
> when behold one of them is mightier than us all
> therefore we shall fall before them

So when the queen realized that the king's servants would not do her bidding, she commanded her own servants to get help from the people:

Alma 22:21

> now when the queen saw the fear of **the servants**
> she also began to fear exceedingly
> lest there should some evil come upon her
> and she commanded **her servants** that they should go and call the people
> that they might slay Aaron and his brethren

One might ask why the queen did not command her own servants to kill Aaron and the others. The probable reason is that the queen's servants were female and were not armed.

One might then ask why the original text in verse 23 read "many of **his** servants" rather than Oliver Cowdery's "many of **the** servants". The main reason is that the queen's servants had actually left the room to do the queen's bidding, as explained later in the narrative:

Alma 22:24

> now there was a multitude gathered together
> **because of the commandment of the queen**
> and there began to be great murmurings among them
> because of Aaron and his brethren

All of this evidence thus argues that in Alma 22:23 the original reading "many of **his** servants" is indeed correct and did not need to be emended to "many of **the** servants".

We should also note that in verse 23 Mormon used the restrictive expression "**many of** his servants" rather than the full "his servants" (as earlier in the narrative, in verse 19). Perhaps Mormon wanted to make clear that not all of the king's servants were there in the room to witness what happened but that many were.

Summary: Restore "many of **his** servants" in Alma 22:23; although the language is somewhat jarring given the preceding conjunct "the queen", readers can figure out that the *his* must refer to the king; the use of *his* is definitely correct since the queen's servants had left the room and were not there to witness the restoration of the king to consciousness.

■ **Alma 22:23**

insomuch that his whole household [*were* 1ABDEFIJLMNOPQRST | *was* CGHK] *converted unto the Lord*

In this passage we have the collective singular noun *household*. Although *household* occurs elsewhere in the Book of Mormon, this is the only place where it occurs as a subject requiring verb agreement. The 1840 edition replaced the original plural *were* with the singular *was*. This change could be the result of intentional editing on Joseph Smith's part. In accord with the reading in 𝒫, the 1908 RLDS edition restored the original *were* to the RLDS text. For a similar case, consider Mosiah 23:25, where the original text read "behold an army of the Lamanites **were** in the borders of the land". As discussed under that passage, the Book of Mormon sometimes treats the collective noun *army* as a singular, other times as a plural. Also see the general discussion under SUBJECT-VERB AGREEMENT in volume 3.

In current English, American speakers favor singular verb agreement with groups that can act as a unit ("the committee was", "the team was", "the United States is", and "the family is").

British speakers, on the other hand, favor the plural ("the committee were", "the team were", "the United States are", and "the family are"). Merriam Webster's Dictionary of English Usage (under *collective nouns*) indicates that in American English the singular verb is more common for *family,* but the plural is "not at all rare", including this 1925 example from F. Scott Fitzgerald: "His family **were** enormously wealthy". The evidence suggests that American speakers would naturally choose the singular in Alma 22:23 but still the plural is quite understandable.

Summary: Maintain in Alma 22:23 the original plural *were* for the collective noun *household;* as with the word *army,* either the singular or the plural interpretation for *household* is possible.

■ **Alma 22:25**

but the king stood forth among them
and [*ministered* >? NULL 0│ 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *administered unto them*

The original manuscript is not extant here for the word *administered,* but spacing between extant fragments suggests that Oliver Cowdery initially wrote *ministered,* then immediately crossed out the whole word and wrote inline the correct *administered.* This interpretation is followed in the transcript of 𝒪 for this passage:

Alma 22:25 (lines 23–24 on page 261ʹ of 𝒪)

```
(   )ng stood forth among the(                                        )
 KI                             M & <            > ADMINISTERED UNTO THEM & IT CAME
to pass that they were pa(                                            )
                    SIFIED TOWARDS AARON & THOSE WHICH WERE WITH
```

Of course, we can't really be sure that this is the initial error that Oliver made here in 𝒪. But such an error is supported by one other case (in Alma 17:18) where Oliver initially wrote *minister* in 𝒫, then virtually immediately corrected it to *administer.* In that case, Oliver did not rewrite the whole word inline; instead, he supralinearly inserted the *ad* in front of the already written *minister.* Here in Alma 22:25, the critical text will maintain *administered,* the reading actually recorded in 𝒫, the earliest extant source for this particular instance of the verb.

Summary: Maintain in Alma 22:25 the verb form *administered,* the earliest extant reading (in 𝒫); Oliver Cowdery may have initially written the verb as *ministered* in 𝒪.

■ **Alma 22:25**

and it came to pass that they were pacified towards Aaron
and [*his brethren > those* 1│*those* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *which were with him*

Here in the printer's manuscript, Oliver Cowdery initially wrote "Aaron and his brethren"; then he virtually immediately corrected *his brethren* to *those* (there is no change in the level of ink flow for the supralinear correction). Spacing between extant fragments of 𝒪 supports the shorter *those.* Oliver probably wrote "Aaron and his brethren" because that phraseology had been used four times in the preceding text:

verse 19	and also Aaron and his brethren standing as though . . .
verse 20	they durst not lay their hands on Aaron and his brethren
verse 21	that they might slay Aaron and his brethren
verse 24	because of Aaron and his brethren

The unexpected "Aaron and those which were with him" was undoubtedly the original reading in verse 25.

Summary: Maintain in Alma 22:25 the corrected reading in 𝒫: "Aaron and those which were with him".

■ **Alma 22:27**

the king sent a proclamation throughout all the land
[𝔰1 *among* >+ 𝔰2 *amongst* 1 | *amongst* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *all his people*

As discussed under Alma 20:13, *amongst* is relatively infrequent in the Book of Mormon when compared with *among*. Here in Alma 22:27, Oliver Cowdery copied an original *amongst* as *among*. Later, scribe 2 of 𝒫, who was proofing 𝒫 against 𝒪 for this part of the text, corrected *among* to *amongst* by adding the *st* inline. Scribe 2 made one other proofing correction, nearby in Alma 24:11, where he supralineary inserted an ampersand between "our sins" and "the many murders which we have committed" (see the discussion there).

It is very doubtful that this correction in Alma 22:27 of *among* to *amongst* was due to editing on scribe 2's part since elsewhere in Alma 22–24 there are ten occurrences of *among,* none of which did he edit to *amongst.* Moreover, Oliver Cowdery's mistake in writing *among* here in verse 27 was probably due to the three preceding occurrences of *among* which he had just copied into 𝒫:

verse 22	and there should be . . . a disturbance **among** them
verse 24	and there began to be great murmurings **among** them
verse 25	but the king stood forth **among** them

The critical text will accept *amongst* as the correct reading here in Alma 22:27; 𝒪 is not extant for the word but presumably read that way.

Summary: Accept in Alma 22:27 *amongst,* scribe 2's correction in 𝒫 to the probable reading of the original manuscript, no longer extant here.

■ **Alma 22:27**

and the borders of the wilderness which was on the north
by the land [*of* 1ABCEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST | D] *Zarahemla*

Here the 1841 British edition accidentally omitted the *of* in "the land of Zarahemla". The 1849 LDS edition restored the original *of.* As explained under Alma 2:15, the original text had only instances of "the land **of** Zarahemla", even though "the land Zarahemla" is theoretically possible.

Summary: Maintain in Alma 22:27 the original phraseology "the land **of** Zarahemla"; the original text consistently uses the *of* in this particular phrase.

■ **Alma 22:27**

and thus were the Lamanites and [*the* 1ABDEFIJLMNOPQRST | CGHK] *Nephites divided*

Here the 1840 edition accidentally omitted the repeated *the* for the conjunctive noun phrase "the Lamanites and **the** Nephites". The 1908 RLDS edition restored the *the* to the RLDS text. As discussed under Enos 1:24, this conjunctive structure always has the repeated *the*. For general discussion, see under CONJUNCTIVE REPETITION in volume 3.

Summary: Maintain the repeated *the* in "the Lamanites and **the** Nephites" in Alma 22:27 (and elsewhere in the text).

■ **Alma 22:28**

now the more [NULL >+ *idle* 1 | *idle* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *part of the Lamanites lived in the wilderness*

We do not have the original manuscript here; and the nearest fragment is almost three manuscript lines away, so we cannot tell from spacing considerations whether *idle* was in 𝒪. In the printer's manuscript, Oliver initially wrote "the more part"; then somewhat later (with heavier ink flow) he inserted *idle* supralinearly. There would have been no reason for Oliver to have made this substantive change in the reading except that 𝒪 read "the more idle part". Elsewhere in the text, there are 13 other examples of a modifier occurring between *more* and *part:*

2 Nephi 4:14	a more **history** part
2 Nephi 5:33	the more **particular** part of the history of my people
2 Nephi 10:3	the more **wicked** part of the world
Omni 1:5	the more **wicked** part of the Nephites
Alma 35:3	the more **popular** part of the Zoramites
Alma 43:24	the more **weak** part of the people
Helaman 3:34	the more **humble** part of the people
Helaman 6:18	the more **wicked** part of the Lamanites
Helaman 6:37	the more **wicked** part of them
Helaman 6:38	the more **wicked** part of them
3 Nephi 7:7	the more **righteous** part of the people
3 Nephi 10:12	the more **righteous** part of the people
4 Nephi 1:40	the more **wicked** part of the people

The first example ("a more history part") is quite striking, given the indefinite article *a* and the use of a noun rather than an adjective as the modifier between *more* and *part*. The phrase "the more part" is quite frequent in the text (occurring at least 23 times), so it is not difficult to understand why Oliver initially wrote "the more part" here in 𝒫. (For two additional cases where the original text may have read "the more part", see under Helaman 6:21 and 4 Nephi 1:27. Parallel to 2 Nephi 4:14, there is also one example of "a more part", in Helaman 6:32.)

Summary: Maintain in Alma 22:28 Oliver Cowdery's corrected text in 𝒫, "the more **idle** part of the Lamanites", which was undoubtedly the reading in 𝒪 (not extant here).

■ **Alma 22:28**

*now the more idle part of the Lamanites lived in the wilderness
and [lived >p dwelt 1 | dwelt ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] in tents*

Here Oliver Cowdery edited the printer's manuscript in pencil, which strongly suggests that this change of "lived in tents" to "dwelt in tents" was made in the 1830 print shop and without reference to the original manuscript (which, unfortunately, is not extant here). For further discussion regarding the use of pencil in emending 𝒫 in the print shop, see the references listed above under Alma 22:22–23.

Perhaps Oliver Cowdery could not accept the reading "lived in tents" since everywhere else in the Book of Mormon we have people "dwelling in tents", not "living in tents":

1 Nephi 2:15	and my father dwelt in a tent
1 Nephi 9:1	as he dwelt in a tent
1 Nephi 10:16	as my father dwelt in a tent
1 Nephi 16:6	as my father dwelt in a tent
Enos 1:20	dwelling in tents
Helaman 3:9	and the people . . . did dwell in tents
Ether 2:13	and they dwelt in tents

We get similar results for the King James Bible, with 14 occurrences where the verb is *dwell* (as in Genesis 25:27: "and Jacob *was* a plain man dwelling in tents"), but there are no biblical examples of people "living in tents". So familiarity with the King James Bible may have also influenced Oliver's decision to replace *live* with *dwell*.

Normally the Book of Mormon uses the verb *live* to refer to being alive or keeping alive or to how one lives. When referring to people living in a place or in some kind of habitation, the text almost always uses the verb *dwell*. People dwell in cities, lands, houses, tents, and caves, or they dwell with someone. There is even one case of "dwelling in the wilderness"—namely, in Ether 14:7: "Coriantumr dwelt with his army in the wilderness". The only other example that seems to refer to "living in the wilderness" actually refers to how the people of Lehi kept themselves alive in the wilderness: "while we did live upon raw meat in the wilderness" (1 Nephi 17:2). And once more, the King James Bible consistently refers to "dwelling in the wilderness" (nine times), as in Genesis 21:20: "and he grew and dwelt in the wilderness". Thus both examples of *live* in Alma 22:28 are unusual for the scriptural text. In fact, we are left wondering why Oliver Cowdery didn't also replace the first example of *lived* with *dwelt*. In modern English, of course, we expect the verb *live* rather than *dwell,* which is now archaic and formal sounding. Although *live* is the expected word in modern English, references to "living somewhere" can be found as far back as Middle English and Early Modern English (see the examples in the Oxford English Dictionary listed under definition 12a for the verb *live*).

Despite this overall tendency for *live* and *dwell* to occur in different semantic domains, there is some minor overlap in addition to the case of "living in the wilderness" and the case of "living in tents" (both in Alma 22:28): namely, when referring to being in captivity, the Book of Mormon text almost always prefers the verb *dwell* over the verb *live,* but there is one instance of "living in captivity" (marked below with an asterisk):

	Ether 7:7	Kib **dwelt** in captivity
*	Ether 10:31	and Heth **lived** in captivity all his days
	Ether 10:31	and Aaron **dwelt** in captivity all his days
	Ether 10:31	and Amnigaddah also **dwelt** in captivity all his days
	Ether 10:31	and Coriantum **dwelt** in captivity all his days
	Ether 11:9	and he **did dwell** in captivity all his days
	Ether 11:18	Moron **dwelt** in captivity all the remainder of his days
	Ether 11:19	Coriantor **dwelt** in captivity all his days
	Ether 11:23	and he died **having dwelt** in captivity all his days

Thus in the Book of Mormon text, the verb *live* can substitute for the more common *dwell*. The first example from Ether 10:31 provides support for the earliest reading in Alma 22:28 ("**lived** in the wilderness and **lived** in tents").

One possibility here in Alma 22:28 is that Oliver Cowdery's emendation from *lived* to *dwelt* could be correct; that is, the original manuscript could have read "**lived** in the wilderness and **dwelt** in tents". Under the influence of "lived in the wilderness", Oliver could have accidentally repeated the *lived* when he came to copying "dwelt in tents" from 𝒪 into 𝒫, especially since the verb *live* is what is normally expected in modern English. On the other hand, it seems less likely to assume that the original text read "**dwelt** in the wilderness and **dwelt** in tents", since this emendation would require Oliver Cowdery to have twice replaced *dwelt* with *lived*.

Ultimately, the reading of the earliest textual source, with *lived* occurring both times in Alma 22:28, is possible, just as it occurs once in Ether 10:31 ("and Heth **lived** in captivity all his days"). Thus the critical text will restore the earliest extant reading in Alma 22:28: "**lived** in the wilderness and **lived** in tents", despite the repetition of the verb and the unusualness in the scriptural text of using *live* where *dwell* is expected.

Summary: Restore in Alma 22:28 the earliest extant text, the reading in 𝒫: "now the more idle part of the Lamanites **lived** in the wilderness and **lived** in tents"; the use in this passage of the verb *live* to refer to "dwelling in the wilderness" and to "dwelling in tents" is unexpected when compared to other usage in the scriptural text, but *live* is nonetheless perfectly acceptable in English; apparently Oliver Cowdery corrected the second *lived* to *dwelt* while in the print shop and without reference to 𝒪; he seems to have been influenced by the scriptural style that favors "dwelling in tents" rather than "living in tents".

■ **Alma 22:28**

> now the more idle part of the Lamanites lived in the wilderness and lived in tents
> and they were spread through the wilderness
> (1) *on the west **in** the land of Nephi*
> (2) *yea and also on the west **of** the land of Zarahemla in the borders by the seashore*
> (3) *and on the west **in** the land of Nephi*
> *in the place of their fathers' first inheritance*
> *and thus bordering along by the seashore*

David Calabro (personal communication) notes here that the current text seemingly refers twice to the same wilderness area, namely the wilderness "on the west in the land of Nephi" (listed

above as 1 and 3). He suggests the possibility that the preposition *in* in the second occurrence of "on the west **in** the land of Nephi" is an error for *of,* which would mean that the original text actually referred to three different wilderness areas:

> Alma 22:28 (with revised preposition)
>> now the more idle part of the Lamanites lived in the wilderness
>>> and lived in tents
>> and they were spread through the wilderness
> (1) on the west **in** the land of Nephi
> (2) yea and also on the west **of** the land of Zarahemla
>> in the borders by the seashore
> (3) and on the west **of** the land of Nephi
>> in the place of their fathers' first inheritance
>> and thus bordering along by the seashore

The original land of Nephi is definitely not the place of the Lamanites' first inheritance. Instead, as Calabro notes, it was the land that Nephi and his people originally fled to (see 2 Nephi 5:5–8); it is also the land that Nephites like Zeniff refer to as "the land of our fathers' inheritance":

> Mosiah 9:1
>> I Zeniff having been taught in all the language of the Nephites
>> and having had a knowledge of **the land of Nephi**
>> or of **the land of our fathers' first inheritance**
>> and I having been sent as a spy among the Lamanites
>> that I might spy out their forces . . .

Calabro also asks why the text in Alma 22:28 should twice refer to the same wilderness area. Note especially that the purpose of the *yea*-clause is to identify additional wilderness areas ("yea and **also** on the west of the land of Zarahemla . . . and on the west **of** the land of Nephi", as emended), both of which are near the seashore. Also note the use of the logical connector *thus* in reference to the last wilderness area: "and **thus** bordering along by the seashore". The writer expects the reader to recognize that the original land of inheritance for the Lamanites was by the seashore since that is where Lehi and his people landed in the beginning and it was the Lamanites, not the Nephites, that had remained in that area.

The reason for the error is also readily explainable. First of all, the immediately following phrase begins with *in* ("**in** the place of their fathers' first inheritance). And secondly, as Calabro points out, the preceding occurrence of "on the west **in** the land of Nephi" could have led Oliver Cowdery, in either writing down 𝓞 or in copying from 𝓞 into 𝓟 (𝓞 is not extant here), to accidentally change "on the west **of** the land of Nephi" to "on the west **in** the land of Nephi". On the other hand, "on the west **of** X" is clearly possible since it also occurs in this same passage ("yea and also on the west **of** the land of Zarahemla"). Finally, in support of this proposed mix-up between *of* and *in,* there are similar examples of this error tendency in the history of the text:

> 1 Nephi 3:19 (*in > of,* scribe 2's initial error in 𝓞)
>> and behold it is wisdom [*of >% in* 0 | *in* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] God
>> that we should obtain these records

3 Nephi 8:15 (*in* > *of,* error in the 1981 LDS edition, corrected in 1983)
> and there were many [*in* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRS | *of* > *in* T] them
> which were slain

3 Nephi 25:2 (*of* > *in,* error in the 1830 edition; Malachi 4:2 has *of*)
> and ye shall go forth and grow up
> as calves [*of* 1PS | *in* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOQRT] the stall

Moroni 7:44 (*of* > *in,* error in the 1841 British edition)
> for none is acceptable before God
> save the meek and lowly [*of* 1ABCGHKPS | *in* DEFIJLMNOQRT] heart

Despite these arguments for emending the preposition *in* to *of,* there is also evidence for retaining the *in.* First of all, it is worth noting that *yea*-clauses can repeat text providing some additional information is added. Consider, for instance, this nearby example:

Alma 22:16
> 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 . . .

Notice how the *yea*-clause has two parts: an initial clause that introduces something new ("if thou repent of all thy sins"), which is then followed by a repetition of the earlier clause that precedes the *yea*-clause ("if thou will bow down before God yea . . . and will bow down before God") but with an additional stipulation ("and call on his name in faith"). In other words, a *yea*-clause may revise an earlier statement by providing additional information. One can interpret the earliest text for Alma 22:28 in the same way:

Alma 22:28
> and they were spread through the wilderness **on the west in the land of Nephi**
> yea and also on the west of the land of Zarahemla in the borders by the seashore
> and **on the west in the land of Nephi** in the place of their fathers' first inheritance
>   and thus bordering along by the seashore

This *yea*-clause has an initial phrase that introduces new information ("and also on the west of the land of Zarahemla in the borders by the seashore"), which is then followed by a repetition of the earlier phrase "on the west in land of Nephi" but with the added information that the west in the land of Nephi was the place of the Lamanite fathers' first inheritance, which bordered on the seashore.

Another factor that affects the analysis of "the land of Nephi" is that this phrase can refer either to the specific land that Nephi and his people originally settled or to the whole land inhabited by the Lamanites. The earliest occurrences of "the land of Nephi" almost all refer to the more specific land, while later occurrences usually refer to the entire Lamanite territory. In the original text, there are 28 references to the specific "land of Nephi" and 26 to the general "land of Nephi" or "land Nephi". (In calculating these statistics, I exclude the two instances of "the land of Nephi" here in Alma 22:28; I also exclude one example where "the land of Nephi" may be an error for "the land of the Nephites"; for that case, see the discussion under Alma 53:6.)

We can see the difference between the specific "land of Nephi" and the general "land of Nephi" right here in chapter 22 of Alma. At the beginning of the chapter, we have a reference to three specific lands, one of which is the specific "land of Nephi":

Alma 22:1
>   for after he departed from **the land of Middoni**
>   he was led by the Spirit to **the land of Nephi**
>   even to the house of the king which was over all the land
>   save it were **the land of Ishmael**

This specific "land of Nephi", originally settled by Nephi and his people, had become the ruling center of the Lamanites, which may explain why its name was extended to apply to the entire Lamanite territory (although we should keep in mind that the generalized "land of Nephi" appears to be the Nephite term). In contrast to the specific use of "the land of Nephi" in Alma 22:1, later on in the chapter there are clear references to the general "land of Nephi":

Alma 22:32
>   and thus the land of Nephi and the land of Zarahemla
>   was nearly surrounded by water
>   there being a small neck of land between the land northward
>   and the land southward

Alma 22:34
>   therefore the Lamanites could have no more possessions /
>   only in the land of Nephi and the wilderness round about

These two references to the general "land of Nephi" follow closely upon the two references to "the land of Nephi" in Alma 22:28; in fact, all four references are found in the same passage that describes the general territories occupied by the Nephites and the Lamanites (from verse 27 through verse 34). Thus it is more reasonable to assume that the two occurrences of "the land of Nephi" in Alma 22:28 refer to the general "land of Nephi".

The critical text will therefore maintain both occurrences of the phrase "on the west **in** the land of Nephi" in Alma 22:28. Despite the initial attractiveness of emending the preposition *in* to *of* in the second occurrence of the phrase, other factors relating to the generalized meaning of "the land of Nephi" and the structure of *yea*-clauses support the earliest reading.

Summary: Maintain in Alma 22:28 the repeated reference to the same wilderness area "on the west **in** the land of Nephi"; the text here intends to refer twice to the same area, but the second reference occurs in a *yea*-clause that provides additional information regarding this wilderness area; moreover, "the land of Nephi" here refers to the general Lamanite territory, not the specific "land of Nephi" that the Nephites originally inhabited.

■ **Alma 22:28**

in the place of their [*fathers* >jg *father's* >jg *fathers'* 𝟷 | *fathers'* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
first inheritance

John Gilbert, the 1830 typesetter, initially interpreted Oliver Cowdery's *fathers* in 𝒫 as the possessive singular *father's:* using pencil in the print shop, Gilbert placed in 𝒫 an apostrophe before the final *s.* He soon changed his mind, crossed out that apostrophe, and wrote one after the final *s.* Thus he ended up interpreting "their fathers inheritance" as "their fathers' inheritance", which is obviously correct given that the Lamanites' fathers were Laman, Lemuel, and the sons of Ishmael.

We have a similar situation regarding the apostrophe in Alma 21:1. There the phrase "their fathers' nativity" was originally misinterpreted by the 1852 typesetter as "their father's nativity". As explained under Alma 21:1, the text there is referring to the Lamanites and their fathers: namely, Laman, Lemuel, and the sons of Ishmael.

Summary: Accept in Alma 22:28 the 1830 typesetter's interpretation of *fathers* in 𝒫 as the possessive plural *fathers'* (thus "in the place of their **fathers'** inheritance").

■ **Alma 22:29**

nevertheless the Nephites had taken possession
of all the northern parts of the land bordering on the wilderness
at the head of the river Sidon from the east to the west
round about on the wilderness [*sides* 1|*side* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *on the north*

The printer's manuscript has the plural *sides* in the phrase "the wilderness sides on the north". The 1830 compositor set this in the singular since this is what we expect: geographically there should only be one side on the north. Elsewhere in the text there are three other occurrences of "the wilderness side" but none with the plural *sides:*

Alma 8:5   all the borders of the land which was by the wilderness **side**

Alma 16:2   the armies of the Lamanites had come in on the wilderness **side**

Alma 58:13   and we did pitch our tents by the wilderness **side**

The original manuscript is not extant here in Alma 22:29 but may have read in the singular, which would mean that Oliver Cowdery added a plural *s* to *side* as he copied the text from 𝒪 into 𝒫. There is considerable evidence that Oliver frequently added and deleted plural *s*'s while copying. See, for instance, the cases of *border(s)* and *shore(s)* discussed under 1 Nephi 2:5. In fact, we have one case in 𝒪 where Oliver initially wrote the plural *sides* instead of the correct *side,* and in that instance he immediately corrected his error by erasing the plural *s:*

Alma 43:41
    Moroni and his army met the army of the Lamanites in the valley
    on the other [*sides* >% *side* 0|*side* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
      of the river Sidon

In all probability, the original text read "on the wilderness **side**" in Alma 22:29.

Summary: Accept in Alma 22:29 the 1830 compositor's emendation of the text from the plural *sides* to the singular *side* in "on the wilderness **side** on the north".

■ **Alma 22:30**

and it [*bored* 1|*bordered* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *upon the land*
which they called Desolation

Although 𝒪 is not extant here, it most probably read *bordered,* which Oliver miswrote as *bored* when he copied the text from 𝒪 into 𝒫. Of course, *bored* is impossible here, and *bordered* (the

1830 typesetter's emendation) is undoubtedly correct. The verb *border* occurs only five times elsewhere in the text, but three of these are found in the immediately preceding verses 27–29 (see the list below in the following discussion). The critical text will maintain the reading *bordered* here in verse 30.

Summary: Maintain the occurrence of the verb *bordered* in Alma 22:30, the 1830 typesetter's obviously correct emendation.

■ **Alma 22:30**

and it bordered [*upon* 1ABDEFIJLMNOPQRST | *on* CGHK] *the land which they called Desolation*

Here the 1840 edition replaced the preposition *upon* with *on*. The 1908 RLDS edition restored the correct *upon* to the RLDS text. Elsewhere the verb *border* can take various prepositions in its complement, including *upon* and *on*:

Alma 22:27	in all the regions round about which was bordering even **to** the sea
Alma 22:28	and thus bordering along **by** the seashore
Alma 22:29	all the northern parts of the land bordering **on** the wilderness
Alma 31:3	a land . . . which lay nearly bordering **upon** the seashore
Alma 31:3	the land Jershon which also bordered **upon** the wilderness south

The two examples from Alma 31:3 show that *upon* can occur with the verb *border.* The 1840 change to *on* here in Alma 22:30 was probably influenced by the multiple occurrence of *on* in the preceding text: "all the northern parts of the land bordering **on** the wilderness . . . round about **on** the wilderness side **on** the north" (Alma 22:29). Mix-ups between *on* and *upon* have been quite frequent in the history of the text. For a list of examples, see under 1 Nephi 12:4. Generally speaking, the critical text will follow the earliest textual sources for each case of *(up)on,* thus *upon* here in Alma 22:30.

Summary: Retain the original preposition *upon* in Alma 22:30; the 1840 change to *on* was probably a typo resulting from the preceding use of "bordering on" in verse 29.

■ **Alma 22:30**

it being so far northward that it came into the land which **had** *been peopled and* [*had* 1A | BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *been destroyed*

The 1837 edition deleted the repeated perfect auxiliary *had* here in Alma 22:30. This change was not marked by Joseph Smith in his editing of the printer's manuscript for the 1837 edition. Since in this instance the repeated *had* is awkward for English speakers (it is very close to the preceding *had*), the 1837 typesetter may have just accidentally dropped the word. The critical text will restore the repeated *had* here in Alma 22:30.

Elsewhere in the text there are at least 35 other occurrences of the repeated *had,* as in the following sampling of similarly awkward instances involving only one or two words between the initial *had* and the following *and had:*

1 Nephi 4:28	that he **had** slain me **and had** sought to take away their lives also
Alma 8:13	when the people **had** said this **and had** withstood all his words
Alma 19:34	that they **had** seen angels **and had** conversed with them
Alma 51:29	who **had** slain Morionton **and had** headed his people
Alma 59:1	after Moroni **had** received **and had** read Helaman's epistle
Helaman 13:33	O that I **had** repented and **had not** killed the prophets

In two cases, other editions have accidentally omitted the repeated *had:* Alma 8:13 in the 1849 British edition and Alma 52:12 in the 1840 edition (see under each for discussion). But there have been only these idiosyncratic losses of the repeated *had,* as here in the 1837 edition for Alma 22:30. For a general discussion of the conjunctive repetition of the perfect auxiliary, see under the Words of Mormon 1:15.

Summary: Restore the repeated *had* in Alma 22:30: "which had been peopled and **had** been destroyed".

■ **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* 01A | *is* BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *filled*
  with all manner of wild animals of every kind
a part of which **had** *come from the land northward for food*

Originally this whole passage describing the geography was in the past tense, but in one place the 1837 typesetter replaced the past-tense *was* with *is*, probably by mistake since the change was not marked by Joseph Smith in the printer's manuscript and this change contradicts usage elsewhere in the verse as well as in the following verse:

> Alma 22:32
>   and now it **was** only the distance of a day and a half's journey for a Nephite . . .
>   and thus the land of Nephi and the land of Zarahemla **was** nearly surrounded
>   by water

In general, the Book of Mormon text uses the past tense to refer to geographical descriptions that would have still held true at the time the historian wrote the passage (see the discussion under 1 Nephi 2:5 and Alma 8:18). The critical text will restore the past-tense *was* here in Alma 22:31.

Summary: Restore in Alma 22:31 the past-tense *was* in the geographical description found in Alma 22:31: "it being the wilderness which **was** filled with all manner of wild animals of every kind".

■ **Alma 22:31**

it being the wilderness which was filled
with all [*kind > manner* 1 | *manner* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *of wild animals of every kind*

The Book of Mormon text has examples of both "all manner of X" and "all kind(s) of X", with 110 examples of the first and 4 of the second. (For discussion of the nonstandard "all kind of X",

see under Alma 20:29.) In modern English, "all kind(s) of X" is expected while "all manner of X" is either archaic or formulaic.

Here in the printer's manuscript, Oliver Cowdery initially wrote "all kind of wild animals of every kind", but then virtually immediately he corrected the first *kind* to *manner* (there is no change in the level of ink flow for the supralinearly inserted *manner*). His initial error was probably influenced by the *kind* that follows ("wild animals of every **kind**"). There are 11 other occurrences in the text of "all manner of X of every kind", including a similar one in Enos 1:21 that also refers to animals: "and flocks of all manner of cattle of every kind". In Alma 22:31, the original manuscript undoubtedly read "all manner of wild animals of every kind".

Summary: Accept in Alma 22:31 Oliver Cowdery's correction of "all kind of" to "all manner of", the undoubted reading of the original manuscript.

■ **Alma 22:32**

and now it was only the distance of a day and a half's journey for a Nephite
on the line Bountiful *and the land Desolation*
from **the east** *to the west sea*

Some suggestions for emendation have been made regarding this passage. The most significant ones deal with the odd phraseology "on the line Bountiful". Elsewhere in the text, the place-name *Bountiful* is always referred to as a place, land, or city. In other words, except for here in Alma 22:32, *Bountiful* always occurs with the word *place, land,* or *city;* nowhere else is there a "line Bountiful". Greg Wright (personal communication, 14 December 2004) suggests that there is a missing relative clause "which was between the land" between *line* and *Bountiful*—that is, the original text read "on the line **which was between the land** Bountiful and the land Desolation". Usage elsewhere for the noun *line* suggests that something like this is indeed missing here in Alma 22:32:

> Alma 50:11
>> and thus he cut off all the strong holds of the Lamanites
>> in the east wilderness / yea and also on the west
>> fortifying **the line** between the Nephites and the Lamanites
>> **between the land of Zarahemla and the land of Nephi**

> 3 Nephi 3:23
>> and the land which was appointed was the land of Zarahemla
>> and the land which was between the land of Zarahemla and the land Bountiful
>> yea to **the line which was** [*betwixt* 1 | *between* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
>> **the land Bountiful and the land Desolation**

The language in Alma 50:11 suggests the shorter emendation "on the line **between the land** Bountiful and the land Desolation" for Alma 22:32 (that is, without *which was*). On the other hand, Wright's emendation for Alma 22:32 ("which was between the land Bountiful and the land Desolation") follows the 1830 reading of 3 Nephi 3:23. There the reading of the printer's manuscript has the prepositional *betwixt,* which suggests a third emendation for Alma 22:32: "on the line **which was betwixt the land** Bountiful and the land Desolation". And combining the language of Alma 50:11 and

3 Nephi 3:23, we could propose a fourth emendation: "on the line **betwixt the land** Bountiful and the land Desolation". As far as 3 Nephi 3:23 is concerned, both 𝒫 and the 1830 edition are first-hand copies of 𝒪, so either preposition is theoretically possible. However, elsewhere in the text the preposition *betwixt* is never used to describe geography. For that reason, the last two emendations using *betwixt* seem less likely. (For a complete discussion of the original text for 3 Nephi 3:23, see under that passage.)

The original manuscript is partially extant for Alma 22:32 and is transcribed as follows in volume 1 of the critical text:

Alma 22:31–32 (lines 21–23, page 262′ of 𝒪)

```
(                              ) & now it was only the
  HAD  COME  FROM  THE  LAND  NORTHWARD  FOR  FOOD

(                                i)te on the line <%w%> bounti
  DISTANCE  OF  A  DAY  &  A  HALFS  JOURNEY  FOR  A  NEPH

(                                )t Sea & thus the land of Nep
  -FUL  &  THE  LAND  DESOLATION  FROM  THE  EAST  TO  THE  WES
```

Here there is no room between extant fragments of 𝒪 for the phrase "(which was) between the land" except by supralinear insertion. Normally Oliver Cowdery correctly copied into 𝒫 supralinear insertions that originated in 𝒪, so if there is an omission here in the text, it probably occurred as Oliver took down Joseph Smith's dictation. One possible indication of an error here is that after Oliver had written "on the line" in 𝒪, he initially started to write some word that began with *w* (see the extant portion for line 22 in the above transcription). Oliver immediately erased this *w,* which suggests that the original text did not have a word here beginning with *w.* Thus the transcript in 𝒪 provides some minor evidence in favor of the following proposal: the original text here read "on the line between the land Bountiful and the land Desolation", but Oliver started to write "on the line **which**"; Oliver caught his error and erased the *w* that he had initially written, but then he ended up skipping *between the land.*

Since the extant reading for Alma 22:32 is quite unacceptable, the critical text will assume that some phrase was accidentally omitted in 𝒪 as Oliver Cowdery took down Joseph Smith's dictation. Given what Oliver actually wrote in 𝒪 as well as usage elsewhere in the text, the most probable phrase that he omitted was "between the land". He skipped from *between* to *Bountiful,* facilitated by the phonetic similarity of *line* and *land* (especially since *land* would most readily have been pronounced as /læn/—that is, without its final *d*—when followed by the consonant-initial *Bountiful*).

Another problem here in Alma 22:32, brought up by Albert Story (personal communication, 7 October 2003), deals with the question of how to interpret the phrase "from the east"—namely, does the text here mean simply from the eastern region, or does it more specifically involve ellipsis of the word *sea?* In fact, it's even possible that the word *sea* was accidentally omitted here during the early transmission of the text. In dealing with this issue, we first note that the text has three cases where the word *sea* is repeated in conjunctive noun phrases referring to the west and east sea:

Alma 22:27
and which was divided from the land of Zarahemla by a narrow strip of wilderness
which ran from **the sea east** even to **the sea west**

Helaman 3:8
    they did multiply and spread and did go forth
    from the land southward to the land northward
    and did spread insomuch that they began to cover the face of the whole earth
    from the sea south to the sea north
    from **the sea west** to **the sea east**

Helaman 11:20
    the people of Nephi began to prosper again in the land
    and began to build up their waste places
    and began to multiply and spread
    even until they did cover the whole face of the land
    both on the northward and on the southward
    from **the sea west** to **the sea east**

But there are even more cases where *sea* is ellipted, sometimes for the word *east,* sometimes for *west,* yet all seem to be referring to the same geographic "sea west" and "sea east":

Alma 22:27 (ellipsis of *the sea* before "on the west")
    which was in all the regions round about
    which was bordering even to **the sea on the east** and **on the west**

Alma 22:33 (ellipsis of *sea* after "the east")
    the Nephites had inhabited the land Bountiful
    even from **the east** unto **the west sea**

Alma 50:8 (ellipsis of *sea* after "the west")
    and the land of Nephi did run in a straight course
    from **the east sea** to **the west**

Alma 50:34 (ellipsis of *the sea* before "on the east")
    and there they did head them by the narrow pass
    which led by the sea into the land northward
    yea by **the sea on the west** and **on the east**

Helaman 4:7 (ellipsis of *sea* after "the east")
    and there they did fortify against the Lamanites
    from **the west sea** even unto **the east**
    it being day's journey for a Nephite
    on the line which they had fortified and stationed their armies

Note the variety for those cases that specifically refer to narrow regions:

Alma 22:27	a strip of wilderness: "from **the sea east** even to **the sea west**"
Alma 22:32	a line between two lands: "from **the east** to **the west sea**"
Alma 50:34	a narrow pass: "by **the sea on the west** and **on the east**"
Helaman 4:7	a line of defense: "from **the west sea** even unto **the east**"

The first case listed here (Alma 22:27) supports interpreting the three other cases as meaning 'the east sea' rather than simply 'the east'. Similarly, we should interpret all the other cases as instances of ellipted *sea.* Moreover, there is no evidence in the manuscripts for *sea* ever being accidentally

added or omitted, even momentarily, in these geographical descriptions. Thus the critical text will leave unchanged all those instances of *east* and *west* for which *sea,* it would appear, has been ellipted.

Summary: Emend Alma 22:32 by adding the phrase *between the land* between *line* and *Bountiful,* thus giving "on the line **between the land** Bountiful and the land Desolation"; the phrase "from the east" should be left unchanged, with the understanding that the word *sea* is purposely ellipted; this analysis holds for other conjunctive occurrences involving *sea* and the compass directions *east* and *west.*

■ **Alma 22:33–34**

that thereby they should have no more
[*possesion > possession* o | *possession* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *on the north*
that they might not overrun the land northward
therefore the Lamanites could have no more [*possessions* 1ABCDEFGIJLMNOPQRST | *possession* HK]
only in the land of Nephi

Here the earliest text has the singular *possession* in verse 33, followed by the plural *possessions* in verse 34. The 1874 RLDS edition eliminated the difference in number by changing the plural in verse 34 to the singular; for that instance of *possession(s)* the 1908 RLDS edition restored the plural to the RLDS text.

For the first instance of *possession(s),* the original manuscript is extant. Oliver Cowdery initially wrote *possesion* (that is, with one *s* before the *-ion* ending). He corrected the spelling by inserting an *s* supralinearly above the *i.* This correction should probably not be interpreted as adding a plural *s* to the end of the word. In other instances, Oliver normally corrected a missing final *s* by inserting it in the space at the end of the word. If he did insert the letter supralinearly, it was always near the end of the word. Thus the supralinear *s* above the *i* in 𝒪 probably indicates an attempt on Oliver's part to correct the spelling from *possesion* to *possession.*

One could argue here that Oliver Cowdery's correction in 𝒪 of *possesion* to *possession* in Alma 22:33 could have distracted him from noticing that he had accidentally omitted a plural *s.* In support of the plural, we not only have the plural in the next verse ("the Lamanites could have no more **possessions** / only in the land of Nephi") but also the plural in the one other occurrence of "no more possession(s)" in the Book of Mormon text, in Helaman 4:18: "Moronihah could obtain no more **possessions** over the Lamanites". Thus in two out of three instances, the earliest reading has the plural "no more possessions".

There is some evidence that Oliver Cowdery occasionally mixed up the number for *possession(s),* although in each case the error was an initial one in 𝒫 and was corrected virtually immediately by him:

> 2 Nephi 29:14
>> and it shall come to pass that
>> my people which are of the house of Israel
>> shall be gathered home unto the lands
>> of their [*possession > possessions* 1 | *possessions* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]

Alma 50:32

    and thus he would obtain
    [*possession* 0ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST | *possessions* >% *possession* 1]
    of those parts of the land

Alma 57:4

    and fled to their other cities which they had
    [*possession* 0ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST | *possessions* >% *possession* 1] of
    to fortify them

In the first case, the initial error was the singular *possession,* but in the two other cases, the initial error was the plural *possessions.*

    As discussed under 2 Nephi 29:14, either *possession* or *possessions* is possible for the phrase "the land(s) of one's possession(s)". The same decision should probably be made with respect to the phrase "no more possession(s)", especially since there are only three instances of the phrase in the text. In other words, in each case we follow the earliest textual sources, which means that the critical text will accept the occurrence of both "no more possession" and "no more possessions" in Alma 22:33–34.

Summary: In accord with the earliest textual sources, accept the singular "no more possession" in Alma 22:33 and the plural "no more possessions" in Alma 22:34 and in Helaman 4:18.

■ **Alma 22:34**

therefore the Lamanites could have no more possessions
only in the land of Nephi
[0 | NULL >jg , 1 |, ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
and the wilderness round about

As discussed under Alma 12:9, there should be a comma placed before the word *only* in Alma 22:34 since here the word has the now-archaic meaning 'except'. Moreover, since the text is saying that the Lamanites' only possessions were in the land of Nephi and in the surrounding wilderness, there should be no comma after "in the land of Nephi". Thus the entire sentence should read in the standard text as follows: "Therefore the Lamanites could have no more possessions, only in the land of Nephi and the wilderness round about."

Summary: In Alma 22:34 a comma should be placed before the word *only* since its meaning is 'except'; at the same time, the 1830 comma after "only in the land of Nephi" should be removed since the scope of the *only* includes the following "and the wilderness round about".

■ **Alma 22:34**

therefore the Lamanites could have no more possessions
only in the land of Nephi
and [1ABDEFIJLMNOPQRST | *in* CGHK] *the wilderness round about*

The 1840 edition added a repeated *in* before "the wilderness round about", thus creating a typical Hebraistic coordinate structure ("in X and in Y"). The original manuscript is not extant here,

and the spacing between extant fragments is quite long, so it is difficult to determine if the repeated *in* was in the original manuscript.

The 1840 addition of *in* could be due to Joseph Smith's editing, although such a change is not at all typical of his editing. If anything, we expect the text to accidentally drop out repeated prepositions rather than add them. On the other hand, we know that Joseph used the original manuscript to restore in the 1840 edition a handful of phrases that had been accidentally deleted in preparing the printer's manuscript. But the insertion of this single short preposition *in* is uncharacteristic of Joseph's restoration of whole phrases in the 1840 edition. The most probable reason for this 1840 change is that it simply represents a typo on the part of the typesetter for that edition. Even if the repeated *in* was in the original manuscript, its possible restoration in the 1840 edition would have been simply fortuitous. For further discussion of prepositional repetition, see under CONJUNCTIVE REPETITION in volume 3.

Elsewhere in the Book of Mormon text there are numerous examples of repeated *in*'s. There is, however, only one other case where *wilderness* is conjoined within a prepositional phrase headed by *in:*

> Alma 34:26 (℧ is extant):
> ye must pour out your souls **in** your closets and your secret places
> and **in** your wilderness

We note here that the *in* is repeated, but only before "your wilderness", not before "your secret places". This irregularity may actually be due to the fact that earlier in English the word *closet* referred to a secret or private place—as in the King James text for Matthew 6:6 ("when thou prayest / enter into thy closet"), also quoted this way in 3 Nephi 13:6. In other words, one could argue that the *in* is not repeated before "your secret places" in Alma 34:26 because this phrase is closely associated with "your closets".

If we consider the possible repetition of other prepositions with a following conjoined *wilderness,* we get two more examples:

> Helaman 11:25
> and then they would retreat back
> **into** the mountains and **into** the wilderness and secret places

> 3 Nephi 4:1
> those armies of robbers had prepared for battle
> and began to come down and to sally forth from the hills
> and **out of** the mountains and the wilderness and their strong holds
> and their secret places

The first example shows a repetition of *into,* but the second one does not repeat the *out of,* so it appears that a conjoined *wilderness* does not necessarily require a repetition of the preposition. (Incidentally, the first example also shows another case where the conjunct "secret places" avoids repetition of the preposition.) Thus it is probably best to retain the earliest attested reading in Alma 22:34, the one without the repeated preposition ("and the wilderness round about").

Summary: Retain in Alma 22:34 the earliest attested reading without the repeated preposition *in* ("and the wilderness round about").

■ **Alma 22:35**

and now I after having said this
return again to the account of Ammon
and **Aaron Omner** *and Himni and their brethren*

The original manuscript is extant here for the phrase "Ammon and Aaron Omner and Himni". One might wonder here why there is no *and* between the names *Aaron* and *Omner,* while there are *and*'s separating the other pairs of names. Note, for instance, that in the very next verse, in Alma 23:1, the text places *or*'s and a final *nor* between each of these items in the same conjunctive sequence:

> Alma 23:1
> the king of the Lamanites sent a proclamation among all his people
> that they should not lay their hands
> on Ammon **or** Aaron **or** Omner **or** Himni **nor** neither of their brethren

Moreover, all other conjunctive structures involving the names *Ammon* and *Aaron* place an *and* between each pair of conjuncts:

> Mosiah 27:34
> and their names were Ammon **and** Aaron **and** Omner **and** Himni

> Alma 25:17
> and now behold Ammon **and** Aaron **and** Omner **and** Himni **and** their brethren
> did rejoice exceedingly

> Alma 27:25
> and Alma also related unto them his conversion
> with Ammon **and** Aaron **and** his brethren

> Alma 31:6 (*Himni* is explicitly excluded from the conjunctive structure)
> therefore he took Ammon **and** Aaron **and** Omner
> and Himni he did leave in the church in Zarahemla
> but the former three he took with him

Thus it is possible that Oliver Cowdery accidentally omitted the *and* between *Aaron* and *Omner* in Alma 22:35, especially since we have evidence of Oliver occasionally omitting the *and,* as in the first *and* in the phrase "Abraham **and** Isaac and Jacob" (see the discussion under 1 Nephi 17:40). One possibility, suggested by Jonathan Saltzman (personal communication), is that the *and* after *Aaron* would have been pronounced as /ən/ in casual speech, the same as at the end of *Aaron* /ærən/, with the result that the *and* would have been hard to distinguish; in other words, *Aaron and* /ærənən/ was misheard as simply *Aaron* /ærən/.

On the other hand, it is possible that in Alma 22:35 Mormon intends to say that he is returning to two separate accounts, one dealing with Ammon (who worked alone as a missionary) and one dealing with Aaron, Omner, and Himni as well as their missionary brethren (who all seemed to have coordinated their missionary work). In fact, when Oliver Cowdery copied the text from 𝒪 into 𝒫, he apparently expected Mormon to return to the account of Aaron, Omner, and Himni and their brethren, so he initially omitted in 𝒫 the initial *Ammon and* for this passage:

Alma 22:35 – 23:0 (lines 26–27, page 230 of 𝒪)

```
                                             Ammon &
having said this return again to the account of ^ Aaron Omner &

Himni & their brethren ～～～～～～～～～ Chapter XIV
```

But 𝒪 is firm here in Alma 23:35 and reads "Ammon and Aaron Omner and Himni", so there is no question that *Ammon* is included in this conjunctive structure.

We have one conjunctive example where *Ammon* is excluded from the list of names, and in that case there is no *and* between *Aaron* and *Omner:*

Alma 27:17–19
now the joy of Ammon was so great
even that he was full
yea he was swallowed up in the joy of his God
even to the exhausting of his strength
and he fell again to the earth
now was not this exceeding joy . . .
now the joy of Alma in meeting his brethren was truly great
and also the joy **of** Aaron **of** Omner **and** Himni
but behold their joy was not that to exceed their strength

But this conjunctive structure is odd in that the preposition *of* is repeated for *Omner* but not for *Himni,* yet it does suggest that there need be no *and* between *Aaron* and *Omner* in Alma 22:35. (There may be some primitive error in Alma 27:19, although this reading is found in all the textual sources, including 𝒪. For further discussion, see under Alma 27:19.)

Since the original manuscript is extant for Alma 22:35 and reads without any *and* before *Omner,* the critical text will accept that reading. Even so, we should keep in mind that the original text itself may have had an *and* between *Aaron* and *Omner* and that it was lost as Oliver Cowdery took down Joseph Smith's dictation.

Summary: Accept in Alma 22:35 the reading of the original manuscript (as well as all subsequent textual sources), which lacks an *and* between the names *Aaron* and *Omner:* "the account of Ammon and **Aaron Omner** and Himni and their brethren"; this reading is supported by the fact that Ammon worked separately from his brothers and the other missionaries; nonetheless, it is quite possible that the original text read "the account of Ammon and Aaron **and** Omner and Himni and their brethren".

Alma 23

■ **Alma 23:1**

that they should not lay their hands on Ammon
[NULL > *or* 1 | *or* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *Aaron*
[*or* 0ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST | NULL > *or* 1] *Omner*
or Himni nor neither of their brethren

When Oliver Cowdery initially wrote the text here in the printer's manuscript, he omitted the *or*'s between the names except for the *or* before the last name, *Himni.* The lack of the repeated *or*'s is, of course, what we expect in modern English. For the most part, the original manuscript is extant for "Ammon **or** Aaron **or** Omner **or** Himni"; although the first *or* is not extant in 𝓞, the second one is; the third *or,* the expected one before *Himni,* is also extant. In his copy work, Oliver almost immediately realized that he had omitted the first and second *or*'s in 𝓟, which he then inserted, the first one inline between *Ammon* and *Aaron,* the second supralinearly between *Aaron* and *Omner* (there is no change in the level of ink flow for both correcting *or*'s).

When the text lists the sons of king Mosiah, it typically supplies a conjunction (normally *and*) between each pair of names. For discussion, see nearby under Alma 22:35. Here in Alma 23:1, the critical text will follow the extant reading in 𝓞 and the corrected reading in 𝓟, both of which support the occurrence of *or* between each pair of names.

Summary: Accept in Alma 23:1 the use of *or* between each pair of names: "Ammon **or** Aaron **or** Omner **or** Himni" (the reading of the two manuscripts).

■ **Alma 23:1**

that they should not lay their hands on Ammon or Aaron or Omner or Himni
nor [*neither* 1ABDEPS | *either* CGHIJKLMNOQRT | *neither* > *either* F] *of their brethren*

The original text here had a multiple negative, *nor neither.* The 1840 edition changed *neither* to *either,* most likely the result of Joseph Smith's editing for that edition. The LDS text made the change to *either* in the second printing of the 1852 edition, undoubtedly as a result of consulting the 1840 edition.

There are no other instances of this usage *nor neither* (or *nor either*) in the original text. There are, however, similar examples of *nor* followed by an *n*-initial negative word, such as *nor never* (see under Jacob 7:9) and *nor no* (see under Mosiah 2:12–13). The critical text will restore all instances of multiple negation whenever they are supported by the earliest textual sources. For a general discussion of multiple negatives in the original text, see under NEGATION in volume 3.

Summary: Restore in Alma 23:1 the original multiple negative *nor neither* ("that they should not lay their hands on Ammon or Aaron or Omner or Himni **nor neither** of their brethren").

■ **Alma 23:1**

nor neither of their brethren
which should go forth preaching the word of God
in *whatsoever place they should be*
in *any part of their land*

Here 𝒪 is not extant for the end of the relative clause "in whatsoever place they should be", but spacing between extant fragments of 𝒪 indicates that the original text for the relative clause probably read "in whatsoever place they should be **in**"—that is, with an *in* at the end as well as at the beginning of the relative clause. The transcript of 𝒪, as provided in volume 1 of the critical text, assumes as much:

Alma 23:1–2 (lines 6–7, page 263ʹ of 𝒪)

```
go forth preaching the word of Go(d                                    )
                              IN WHATSOEVER PLACE THEY SHOULD BE IN

in any part of their land yea he sent a (                             )
                              DECREE AMONG THEM THAT THEY SHOULD
```

Without the *in,* there would be excessive gapping between the words in the lacuna.

As discussed under 2 Nephi 2:22, there are three established instances in the original text of the relative clause with the form "**in** whatsoever location one is **in**"—that is, in all three cases, the relative clause both begins and ends with *in:*

Alma 21:22	**in** whatsoever place they were **in**
Alma 26:37	**in** whatsoever land they may be **in**
Alma 34:38	**in** whatsoever place ye may be **in**

The first one is extant in 𝒫, but not in 𝒪; the two others are extant in 𝒪. Another example involving *whatsoever* also had the *in* at both the beginning and ending of the relative clause:

Helaman 6:21
that they would protect and preserve one another
in whatsoever difficult circumstances
they should be placed [*in* 1A | BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]

In this case, the 1837 edition deleted the *in* at the end of the relative clause, probably accidentally. As pointed out by David Calabro (personal communication), there is one example involving *whatsoever* where there is no *in* at the end of the relative clause:

Alma 32:25
for I verily believe there are some among you which would humble themselves
let them be **in** whatsoever circumstances
[*he* 1 | *they* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] might

But we should also note that for this passage the verb *be* is omitted, which means that the ellipsis of the *in* at the end of the relative clause is expected. 𝒪 is not extant for the end of the relative

clause in Alma 32:25, but spacing between extant fragments shows that there is no room for *be in* in 𝒪 except by supralinear insertion. (For discussion of the conflict in number between *them* and *he* in Alma 32:25, see under that passage.) Basically, in *whatsoever*-clauses the preposition *in* is repeated at the end of the clause providing the verb is not ellipted. These examples suggest that here in Alma 23:1, the original text read with an *in* both at the beginning and at the end of the relative clause, thus "**in** whatsoever place they should be **in**".

Evidence elsewhere shows that when Oliver Cowdery copied from 𝒪 into 𝒫, he sometimes deleted short words at the ends of lines (see the discussion and examples under Alma 11:21). And the fact that here in Alma 23:1 the next line of 𝒪 also began with an *in* (that is, "**in** any part of their land") may have facilitated the loss of the *in* at the end of the relative clause when 𝒪 was copied into 𝒫. Another *in* can follow the final *in* of the relative clause, as in the example from Alma 34:38: "and worship God in whatsoever place ye may be **in** / **in** spirit and in truth". Based on the spacing between extant fragments of 𝒪, it is quite likely that here in Alma 23:1 the original manuscript read "preaching the word of God in whatsoever place they should be **in** / **in** any part of their land"; all similar relative clauses involving *whatsoever* support *in* both at the beginning and end of "**in** whatsoever place they should be **in**".

Summary: Emend Alma 23:1 so that the relative clause both begins and ends with *in:* "**in** whatsoever place they should be **in**"; similar usage elsewhere in the text and spacing between extant fragments of 𝒪 support the occurrence of the repeated *in* in Alma 23:1.

■ **Alma 23:2**

yea he sent a decree among them
that they should not lay their hands on them to bind them or to cast them into prison
neither should they spit upon them nor smite them
nor cast them out of their [*Synagogue* 0 | *synagogues* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
nor scourge them neither should they cast stones at them
but that they should have free access to their houses and also their temples and their sanctuaries

Here in the original manuscript, Oliver Cowdery wrote *Synagogue* (thus "nor cast them out of their synagogue"). There is no evidence in the ultraviolet photographs of 𝒪 for any plural *s* being added later in weaker ink flow at the end of *Synagogue*. There is some noise in the photographs between the end of *Synagogue* and the following *nor,* but apparently no inserted *s* (either inline or supralinearly). When Oliver copied the word from 𝒪 into 𝒫, he supplied the plural *s*.

Usage elsewhere in the text strongly supports this emendation. First of all, the text otherwise uses the plural *synagogues* in general references to houses of worship, especially when referring to being cast out of synagogues (as here in Alma 23:2):

Alma 32:2	for behold they were **cast** out of the **synagogues**
Alma 32:5	for they have **cast** us out of our **synagogues**
Alma 32:9	for we are **cast** out of our **synagogues**
Alma 32:12	it is well that ye are **cast** out of your **synagogues**
Alma 33:2	because ye are **cast** out of your **synagogues**
3 Nephi 18:32	nevertheless ye shall not **cast** him out of your **synagogues** or your **places** of worship

The last example also shows *synagogues* being conjoined with another plural noun phrase, "your **places** of worship". We find the same here in Alma 23:2, which in the current text refers to having "free access to their **houses** and also their **temples** and their **sanctuaries**". Elsewhere, the text has quite a few examples where *synagogues* collocates with other plural references to places where people can gather, usually places of worship:

> 2 Nephi 26:26
>> behold hath he commanded any
>> that they should depart out of the **synagogues** or out of the **houses** of worship

> Alma 16:13
>> and Alma and Amulek went forth preaching repentance unto the people
>> in their **temples** and in their **sanctuaries**
>> and also in their **synagogues** which was built after the manner of the Jews

> Alma 26:29
>> and we have entered into their **houses** and taught them
>> and we have taught them in their **streets**
>> yea and we have taught them upon their **hills**
>> and we have also entered into their **temples** and their **synagogues** and taught them
>> and we have been cast out

> Alma 32:1
>> they did go forth and began to preach the word of God unto the people
>> entering into their **synagogues** and into their **houses**
>> yea and even they did preach the word in their **streets**

> Helaman 3:9
>> and they did suffer whatsoever tree should spring up
>> upon the face of the land that it should grow up
>> that in time they might have timber to build their **houses**
>> yea their **cities** and their **temples** and their **synagogues** and their **sanctuaries**
>> and all manner of their **buildings**

> Helaman 3:14
>> yea the account of the Lamanites and of the Nephites . . .
>> and their building of **temples** and of **synagogues** and their **sanctuaries**

> 3 Nephi 13:2 (Matthew 6:2, King James Bible)
>> therefore when ye shall do your alms
>> do not sound a trumpet before you
>> as will hypocrites do in the **synagogues** and in the **streets**
>> that they may have glory of men

> 3 Nephi 13:5 (Matthew 6:5, King James Bible)
>> and when thou prayest
>> thou shalt not do as the hypocrites
>> for they love to pray standing in the **synagogues** and in the **corners of the streets**
>> that they may be seen of men

In one instance, the form is singular but the semantics is plural:

> Alma 21:16
>> preaching the word of God in **every synagogue** of the Amlicites
>> or in **every assembly** of the Lamanites where they could be admitted

The only other time we get the singular *synagogue* is when there is a specific reference to a particular synagogue:

Alma 21:11	he departed out of the **synagogue**
Alma 31:13	for they had a place built up in the center of their **synagogue**
Moroni 7:1	as he taught them in the **synagogue** which they had built

In all remaining instances, all general, we get only the plural:

Alma 21:4	and he began to preach to them in their **synagogues**
Alma 21:4	for they had built **synagogues** after the order of the Nehors
Alma 21:5	as Aaron entered into one of their **synagogues**
Alma 21:20	that there should be **synagogues** built in the land of Ishmael
Alma 31:12	they found that the Zoramites had built **synagogues**
Alma 32:3	therefore they were not permitted to enter into their **synagogues**
Alma 32:10	save it be in your **synagogues** only

The last of these general examples is especially interesting since there Oliver initially wrote this plural as a singular in 𝓞:

> Alma 32:10
>> do ye suppose that ye cannot worship God
>> save it be in your [*Synagogue > Synagogues* 0 | *Synagogues* 1 |
>>   *synagogues* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] only

Thus all the other textual evidence supports Oliver Cowdery's emendation in Alma 23:2 to the plural *synagogues,* made when he copied the text from 𝓞 into 𝓟. Oliver may have written the singular *Synagogue* in 𝓞 because of the preceding occurrence of the singular *prison* in "or to cast them into prison"; note that both this clause and the following one, "nor cast them out of their synagogue(s)", use the verb *cast,* thus facilitating the mistake in 𝓞 of writing *Synagogue* instead of the correct *Synagogues.*

Summary: Accept in Alma 23:2 Oliver Cowdery's emendation in 𝓟 of *synagogue* to *synagogues;* usage elsewhere in the text supports the plural *synagogues* in all cases of general reference.

- **Alma 23:3**

and thus they might go forth
and [*preach* 01ABCDEFGHIKLMNOPQRST | *teach* J] *the word according to their desires*

As discussed under Alma 8:4, *preach* and *teach* are used rather interchangeably (and sometimes together) in the Book of Mormon text, so in each case we follow the earliest textual sources. Here we have an instance where the original *preach* was accidentally replaced by *teach* in the 1888 LDS

edition. No subsequent LDS edition used the 1888 edition as copytext; thus the error here was never perpetuated.

Summary: Maintain in Alma 23:3 the verb *preach* rather than *teach,* a typo in the 1888 LDS edition.

■ **Alma 23:3**

therefore he sent [*this* 01ABCDGHKPS|*his* EFIJLMNOQRT] *proclamation throughout the land unto* **his** *people*

The 1849 LDS edition accidentally replaced "**this** proclamation" with "**his** proclamation", probably because of the visual similarity between *this* and *his* coupled with the following use of *his* in "unto **his** people". The LDS text has retained this typo. In the following verse, the text has one more instance of "**this** proclamation", one that has never been changed to "**his** proclamation":

> Alma 23:4
>> and now it came to pass that
>> when the king had sent forth **this** proclamation
>> that Aaron and his brethren went forth from city to city

Elsewhere the text has only instances of "a proclamation" (12 times) and "the proclamation" (3 times), but never "his proclamation".

Summary: Restore in Alma 23:3 the determiner *this* in "he sent this proclamation", the reading of the original manuscript.

■ **Alma 23:3**

therefore he sent this proclamation throughout the land unto his people
that the [*words >% word* 0|*word* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *of God might have no obstruction*
but that it might go forth throughout all [*his > the* 1|*the* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *land*
that his people might be convinced concerning the wicked traditions of their fathers

Here we have two minor manuscript corrections. The first one is found in ℗, where Oliver Cowdery initially wrote "the words of God". He immediately deleted the plural *s,* apparently by erasure (the *s* is smeared). Oliver then wrote inline the following *of,* with the *o* overwriting the last part of the erased *s.* The following singular pronoun *it* supports the singular usage ("but that **it** might go forth throughout all the land"). As explained under Alma 5:11, either reading (with *word* or *words*) is theoretically possible here, so we follow the earliest textual evidence, in this case the corrected reading in ℗.

The second scribal error occurred as Oliver Cowdery copied the text from ℗ into 𝓟, where he initially wrote "throughout all **his** land". Virtually immediately Oliver crossed out the initial *his* and supralinearly inserted *the* without any change in the level of ink flow. ℗ is not extant for this word, but it probably read *the.* Most likely, Oliver's initial error in 𝓟 was the result of the following occurrence of *his:* "that **his** people might be convinced". Theoretically, either *the* or *his* is possible in this construction. Normally the text has "through(out) (all) **the** land"—that is, the determiner

is *the*. In two cases, the determiner is *this* (Mosiah 1:10 and Alma 5:5); but in one case, the determiner is *his:*

> Alma 47:1
>> the king of the Lamanites sent a proclamation
>> throughout all **his** land among all **his** people

The correction of *his* to *the* in Alma 23:3 suggests that in Alma 47:1 the use of the *his* in "throughout all **his** land" could be an error for *the,* with the *his* coming from the following "among all **his** people". But since other determiners are always possible for this construction involving *throughout* and *land,* the critical text will follow the earliest textual sources in selecting the determiner for *land.* Since in Alma 23:3 the correction of *his* to *the* is virtually immediate in 𝓟, the critical text will accept the *the*. On the other hand, in Alma 47:1 the *his* in "throughout all his land" will be maintained since 𝓟 reads that way (in this instance, 𝓞 is not extant for the determiner of *land*).

Summary: Accept in Alma 23:3 two corrections in the manuscripts: "the **word** of God" in 𝓞 and "throughout all **the** land" in 𝓟; usage elsewhere in the text supports these two corrections.

■ **Alma 23:5**

and thousands were brought to [*the* 01ABCDEFGIJLMNOPQRST | *a* HK] *knowledge of the Lord*

Here the 1874 RLDS edition replaced the determiner *the* with *a* in the phrase "**the** knowledge of the Lord", thus giving "**a** knowledge of the Lord"; the original *the* was restored to the RLDS text in 1908. Usage elsewhere in the text supports both *the* and *a* in the phrase "to bring someone to the/a knowledge of X", with 20 occurrences with *the* and 4 with *a*. When X refers to the Lord, we have 7 other occurrences with *the:*

Mosiah 27:36	**bringing** many . . . to **the** knowledge of their Redeemer
Mosiah 28:2	they might **bring** them to **the** knowledge of the Lord their God
Alma 37:8	and **brought** them to **the** knowledge of their God
Alma 37:9	they **brought** them to **the** knowledge of the Lord their God
Alma 37:10	**bringing** many thousands of them . . . to **the** knowledge of their Redeemer
3 Nephi 5:23	and surely shall he again **bring** a remnant of the seed of Joseph to **the** knowledge of the Lord their God
3 Nephi 20:13	and they shall be **brought** to **the** knowledge of the Lord their God

But in one case, *a* is found in the earliest text:

3 Nephi 16:4	or may be **brought** to **a** knowledge of me their Redeemer

In each case of "to bring someone to the/a knowledge of X", we let the earliest textual sources determine the reading for the determiner of *knowledge*.

Summary: Accept in Alma 23:5 the earliest reading, "and thousands were brought to **the** knowledge of the Lord"; the use of *the* before *knowledge* is supported by the clear majority of examples elsewhere in the text.

■ **Alma 23:5**

and they were taught the records
and [the 01ABCDEFGHIJKLNPS | moqrt] prophecies
which were handed down even to the present time

In this passage, the 1905 LDS edition accidentally dropped the repeated *the* before *prophecies;* the LDS text has continued with this reading. The repeated determiner is a Hebraistic characteristic of the Book of Mormon text and should be maintained wherever there is evidence for it, as here. For further discussion, see under CONJUNCTIVE REPETITION in volume 3. The critical text will restore the repeated *the* here.

Summary: Restore in Alma 23:5 the repeated *the* in the conjunctive noun phrase "the records and **the** prophecies".

■ **Alma 23:5**

and they were taught the records and the prophecies
[which were 0ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST | which were >js NULL 1] handed down
even to the present time

In his editing of 𝓟 for the 1837 edition, Joseph Smith deleted *which were* here in Alma 23:5, thus creating a postmodifying past-participial phrase ("the records and the prophecies handed down even to the present time"). The resulting construction, it turns out, is not characteristic of the Book of Mormon text; thus it is appropriate that this emendation was not implemented in the 1837 edition.

Elsewhere in the text there are other cases where nouns (namely, *records, prophecies, tradition,* and *oaths*) are followed by *handed down,* and in each instance *handed down* is found in a relative clause rather than as a postmodifying past-participial phrase. In each case (listed below), the part in bold could be lacking but is not:

> The Words of Mormon 1:10
>> he took them and put them with the other plates which contained records
>> **which had been** handed down by the kings from generation to generation
>> until the days of king Benjamin

> Alma 30:14
>> behold these things which ye call prophecies
>> **which ye say are** handed down by holy prophets
>> behold they are foolish traditions of your fathers

> Alma 31:16
>> and we do not believe in the tradition of our brethren
>> **which was** handed down to them by the childishness of their fathers

> Helaman 16:20
>> but behold we know that this is a wicked tradition
>> **which has been** handed down unto us by our fathers

4 Nephi 1:48

> Ammaron being constrained by the Holy Ghost
> did hide up the records which were sacred
> yea even all the sacred records
> **which had been** handed down from generation to generation

Mormon 6:6

> and having been commanded of the Lord
> that I should not suffer that the records
> **which had been** handed down by our fathers which were sacred
> to fall into the hands of the Lamanites . . .

Ether 8:15

> and Akish did administer unto them the oaths
> —which was given by them of old who also sought power—
> **which had been** handed down even from Cain
> who was a murderer from the beginning

(Of course, in the last example, it would be difficult to omit the "which had been" given the preceding parenthetical relative clause, "which was given by them of old who also sought power".) Clearly, the original text in Alma 23:5 is the expected expression and will be retained in the critical text.

Summary: In Alma 23:5 Joseph Smith's crossout in 𝓟 of *which were* was never implemented in the 1837 edition; the original reading is definitely correct since the Book of Mormon text consistently prefers the relative clause form over the past-participial form for the postmodifying passive phrase *handed down*.

■ **Alma 23:6**

or as many as were brought to the knowledge of the truth
through the preaching of [*Aaron > Ammon* 01 | *Ammon* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
  and his brethren
according to the spirit of revelation and of prophecy

We have part of the original manuscript here, but unfortunately we cannot be sure whether Oliver Cowdery wrote *Ammon* or *Aaron*. The first two letters of the name were at the end of a line, but that portion of the manuscript leaf is no longer extant. At the beginning of the next line, the last three letters of the name have some overwriting and are difficult to read. The *n* at the end of the name is fairly clear, but the *o* is very vague; worst of all, the first letter in this line can be either a defective *m* (with the second arch lower than the first) or a strange-looking *re* (with excessive rounding of the *r*). Oliver seems to have initially written the name in 𝓞 as *Aaron*, then corrected it to *Ammon*. If so, when he came to copying from 𝓞 into 𝓟, he almost made the same initial mistake of writing *Aaron* instead of *Ammon*. Oliver's correction in 𝓟, unlike the one in 𝓞, is clear: he started to write *Aaron* by writing the first three letters, *Aar;* at that point he overwrote the second and third letters, *ar,* with an *m* and then finished producing the correct name, *Ammon,* by writing inline the rest of that name (the last three letters, *mon*). Thus ultimately Oliver interpreted the corrected name in 𝓞 as *Ammon* rather than *Aaron*.

Elsewhere in the text we have ten examples of "Ammon and his brethren" and seven of "Aaron and his brethren". Here I exclude five instances of "Ammon and his brethren" where *Ammon* refers

to the descendant of Zarahemla who found the people of Limhi (as described in Mosiah 7:3). I also exclude one unclear case involving both *Ammon* and *Aaron:*

> Alma 27:25
> and Alma also related unto them
> his conversion with **Ammon and Aaron and his brethren**

In Alma 22–23, there is a division of missionary labor, with Ammon continuing to work with king Lamoni's people and Aaron and his brethren working within the larger kingdom that was ruled by king Lamoni's father. In this portion of the narrative, we have the following passage, just a couple of verses before Alma 23:6, where the narrative refers to "Aaron and his brethren":

> Alma 23:4
> and now it came to pass that
> when the king had sent forth this proclamation
> that Aaron and his brethren went forth from city to city . . .

(The reading here is largely based on 𝒫; in this case, the name *Aaron* is not extant in 𝒪.) The passage then moves on to discuss (in Alma 23:6) the tremendous success of these missionaries. One may wonder whether the passage is referring to the missionary work of just Aaron and his brethren or whether Ammon should be included. By the time we get to Alma 23:9, the text makes it clear that Ammon's converts are also being included:

> Alma 23:8–10
> now these are they which were converted unto the Lord :
> the people of the Lamanites **which were in the land of Ishmael**
> and also of the people of the Lamanites which were in the land of Middoni . . .

In other words, the listing of converts here includes Ammon's converts in the land of Ishmael (who were under king Lamoni's rule). The entire listing (covering verses 9–12) is therefore consistent with the corrected reading earlier in verse 6, "Ammon and his brethren".

Thus the narrative supports the corrected reading in 𝒫 for "Ammon and his brethren". In Alma 23:6, Oliver Cowdery initially wrote "Aaron and his brethren" in both 𝒪 and 𝒫 because this phrase had just occurred a short time earlier in Alma 23:4, but there the text properly refers to the newly permitted freedom of Aaron and his brethren to travel throughout the entire kingdom of king Lamoni's father.

Summary: Accept in Alma 23:6 the corrected reading in 𝒫, "Ammon and his brethren", apparently also the corrected reading in 𝒪; the narrative here moves from referring to the freedom to preach given to "Aaron and his brethren" to discussing the missionary success of "Ammon and his brethren".

■ **Alma 23:7**

they did lay down [*their > the* 1 | *the* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *weapons of* **their** *rebellion*

Here in the printer's manuscript, Oliver Cowdery initially wrote *their* instead of the correct *the* before *weapons,* probably under the influence of the prepositional phrase postmodifying *weapons,* "of **their** rebellion". Oliver virtually immediately caught his error here in 𝒫 and crossed out the

final *ir.* Although we cannot be sure that the crossout is Oliver's, it seems to be; in addition, there is no observable change in the level of ink flow for the crossout. The original manuscript is not extant for the phrase "the weapons of their", but spacing between extant fragments supports the shorter *the weapons* rather than the longer *their weapons.* Further support for "the weapons of their rebellion" comes a few verses later when the text virtually repeats the language of Alma 23:7:

> Alma 23:13
> and these are they that laid down **the weapons of their rebellion**

There is considerable evidence in the manuscripts that Oliver Cowdery tended to anticipate a following *their* and allow it, if only momentarily, to replace a correct *the* (for a list of examples and some discussion, see under Alma 1:26). We have another example close by where *the* before *weapons* was accidentally changed to *their;* in this case, the error was made in the 1849 LDS edition:

> Alma 24:19
> and thus we see that they buried
> [*the* 01ABCDGHKPS | *their* EFIJLMNOQRT] weapons of peace
> or they buried **the** weapons of war for peace

In this instance there was no following *their* to trigger the change, but there are two surrounding occurrences of *they:* "they **buried** . . . or they **buried**". Moreover, "**their** weapons of war" is very common in the text (occurring 24 times). In any event, the critical text will restore the *the* before *weapons* in both Alma 23:7 and Alma 24:19.

Summary: Maintain in Alma 23:7 the definite article *the* before *weapons,* the virtually immediate correction in 𝓟 (here the earliest extant textual source).

■ **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* 1ABCDEGHKPRT | *Shimnilon* FIJLMNOQS]

This is the only place in the Book of Mormon where the name *Shimnilom* appears. According to the earliest textual source, the printer's manuscript (the original manuscript is not extant for this part of the sentence), the name ends in *m.* The 1852 LDS edition accidentally replaced the final *m* with an *n;* the same error occurred in the 1953 RLDS edition. The 1920 LDS edition, following the earlier editions, restored the correct spelling, *Shimnilom,* to the LDS text.

The most likely source for the incorrect *Shimnilon* is the preceding name *Shemlon* (which ends in *n*), although before that we have the name *Shilom,* which supports the correct spelling ending in *m.* Interestingly, the name *Shemlon* was accidentally replaced with *Shemlom* in the 1841 British edition in Mosiah 10:7. (The correct *Shemlon* was restored in the subsequent LDS edition, in 1849; see the discussion under Mosiah 10:7.) For mix-ups regarding the names *Shiblom* and *Shiblon,* see the discussion under Ether 1:11–12.

Summary: Maintain in Alma 23:12 the name *Shimnilom,* the spelling found in the earliest textual sources.

■ **Alma 23:13**

and these are the names of the cities of the Lamanites
[*which* >js *who* 1 | *which* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *were converted unto the Lord*

The question here in this summarizing statement is whether *which* refers to *the cities* or *the Lamanites*. In his editing of 𝓟 for the 1837 edition, Joseph Smith emended the *which* to *who,* which means that at that time he interpreted the *which* as referring to *the Lamanites*. The previous listing of the converted peoples in this chapter supports this interpretation, namely, that the text is referring to the peoples who have been converted rather than to the cities:

> Alma 23:8–13 (original text)
>> now these are they which were converted unto the Lord :
>> the people of the Lamanites which were in the land of Ishmael
>> and also of the people of the Lamanites which were in the land of Middoni
>> and also of the people of the Lamanites which were in the city of Nephi
>> 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
>> and these are the names of the cities of the Lamanites
>>> which were converted unto the Lord

But Joseph's emendation in verse 13, changing *which* to *who,* never showed up in the 1837 edition; instead, the original *which* was retained.

The question, then, is whether the Book of Mormon text allows cities to be converted. Or can only people be converted? Elsewhere in the text, there are no references to the conversion of cities, although such language would be unremarkable in today's English. In the Book of Mormon, only people are converted. In fact, two verses later in this chapter the text makes it clear that it was the people in the cities who were converted:

> Alma 23:15
>> therefore we have named all the cities of the Lamanites
>> **in which they** did repent and come to the knowledge of the truth
>> and were converted

Here *in which* refers to *the cities* while *they* refers to *the Lamanites*.

All of these examples in verses 8–12 and 15, plus all the others in the Book of Mormon, argue that Joseph Smith's interpretation of *which* here in Alma 23:13 was indeed correct; that is, *which* refers to *the Lamanites,* not to *the cities*. Of course, in the critical text, we do not need to determine the referent for *which;* here the critical text will simply maintain the *which* of the original text. For further discussion, see under WHICH in volume 3.

Summary: Retain the original relative pronoun *which* in Alma 23:13: "and these are the names of the cities of the Lamanites **which** were converted unto the Lord"; internal evidence argues that *which* here refers to *the Lamanites,* not to *the cities*.

■ **Alma 23:13**

and these are they
that [*lay* >+ *layed* 0 | *laid* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *down the weapons of their rebellion*

Here in the original manuscript, Oliver Cowdery initially wrote down "and these are they that **lay** down the weapons of their rebellion". Later, perhaps when the text was read back to Joseph Smith and thus checked, Oliver corrected the *lay* to *layed* (that is, *laid*) by supralinearly inserting the *ed* with somewhat heavier ink flow. Don Brugger suggests (personal communication, 7 July 2006) that in this instance Oliver Cowdery probably misinterpreted *laid* as *lay* because the following word, *down,* began with a *d;* that is, it would have been difficult to hear the difference between *laid down* and *lay down.* Also note that Oliver's misinterpretation could have been primed by the occurrence of *lay down* earlier in this account:

> Alma 23:7
> they did **lay down** the weapons of their rebellion

Of course, the base form of the transitive verb *lay* is correct in verse 7 since it occurs with the auxiliary verb form *did.*

Summary: Maintain in Alma 23:13 the past-tense verb form *laid,* not the *lay* that Oliver Cowdery accidentally wrote when he first took down Joseph Smith's dictation for this passage.

■ **Alma 23:14**

and the Amlicites were not converted save only one
neither was any of [1 | *the* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *Amulonites*

Here in the printer's manuscript, *Amulonites* is missing its determiner, the definite article *the.* The 1830 compositor supplied it when he set the type. Clearly, the definite article seems required in this context; elsewhere in the text, in noun phrases of the form "any of X", either the X is a pronoun (*those, you,* or *them*) or a noun preceded by a determiner (such as *the, these,* or a possessive pronoun like *my, his, our,* or *their*). The original manuscript is not extant here for the noun phrase "(the) Amulonites", but there is space for the *the* between extant fragments of ☉. The critical text will therefore accept the 1830 compositor's addition of the determiner *the* in this passage.

Summary: Accept in Alma 23:14 the definite article *the* that the 1830 compositor provided before *Amulonites* in "neither was any of **the** Amulonites"; there is definitely room between extant fragments in ☉ for the *the.*

■ **Alma 23:14**

but they did harden their hearts and also the hearts of the Lamanites in that part of the land
[*whitheersoever* 0 | *whithersoever* >js *wheresoever* 1 | *whithersoever* A |
   wheresoever BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *they dwelt*

In this passage, the original text apparently read "whithersoever they dwelt", which Joseph Smith edited for the 1837 edition to "wheresoever they dwelt". Joseph's editing here replaced the archaic

whithersoever with the more modern *wheresoever.* And this change has continued in all subse-
quent editions. But in making this change, Joseph introduced the only occurrence of *wheresoever*
in the entire Book of Mormon.

There are 12 remaining occurrences of *whithersoever* in the Book of Mormon text. All of these
examples occur in contexts involving movement. Similarly, *whithersoever* in the King James Bible
always occurs with verbs of motion, either expressly or implied. But this one example originally
in Alma 23:14 does not overtly involve motion, which is probably the reason why Joseph Smith
decided to change it to *wheresoever.*

Historically, the adverbials *whither, hither,* and *thither* are used with verbs of motion (see the
examples in the Oxford English Dictionary under these words). The corresponding nonmotion
adverbs are *where, here,* and *there.* But today *whither* (including *whithersoever*), *hither,* and *thither*
are definitely archaic, yet except for this one instance of *whithersoever* here in Alma 23:14, all
instances of these archaic motion adverbs have been left unchanged in the Book of Mormon text.

When we consider *whither* itself, we find that the Book of Mormon text has three examples
where *whither* occurs with a nonmotion verb:

> 1 Nephi 22:4
>
> > yea the more part of all the tribes have been led away
> > and they are scattered to and fro upon the isles of the sea
> > and **whither** they **are** none of us knoweth

> 3 Nephi 16:1
>
> > I have other sheep which are not of this land
> > neither of the land of Jerusalem
> > neither in any parts of that land round about
> > **whither** I **have been** to minister

> Ether 14:1
>
> > and now there began to be a great curse upon the land
> > because of the iniquity of the people
> > in the which if a man should lay his tool or his sword upon the shelf
> > or upon the place **whither** he **would keep** it
> > and behold upon the morrow he could not find it
> > so great was the curse upon the land

In these three cases, the verb itself does not involve motion (either *be* or *keep*), although we should
note that in each case the larger passage involves some kind of movement, whether of peoples or
the Savior in his ministry after his resurrection or in placing tools and weapons on a shelf.

In all other cases in the current Book of Mormon text (as well as for every example in the
King James Bible), *whither* occurs only with verbs of motion. Generally speaking, the same basic
results hold for *hither* and *thither* in the Book of Mormon, although there are a few problematic
cases where the motion is only implied. For *hither,* we always have verbs of motion except for
three cases in Jacob 5 where the text has "look hither" (verses 23, 24, and 25). But one could argue
that looking involves moving the head or looking in a direction. (Jacob 5 also has one case of
"look here", in verse 16.) The King James Bible uses *hither* only with verbs of motion. Similarly,
the adverb *thither* is always used in the Book of Mormon with verbs of motion. But there is one

example of *thither* in the King James Bible where the verb itself, *labor,* does not involve motion (although the larger context does):

> Joshua 7:3
>> but let about two or three thousand men go up and smite Ai
>> *and* make not all the people to labor **thither** for they *are but* few

This last example shows that even the King James Bible will allow one of these motion adverbials to occur with a nonmotion verb, but still in the context of motion.

All in all, these examples suggest that we can grammatically permit *whither, hither,* and *thither* to occur with nonmotion verbs providing the context implies motion. Therefore, there is no strong motivation to edit the adverbial *whither* in 1 Nephi 22:4, 3 Nephi 16:1, and Ether 14:1 or the three occurrences of the adverbial *hither* in Jacob 5:23–25. Perhaps one could interpret the one remaining case, here in Alma 23:14, as involving motion in the sense that dwelling somewhere first requires people to move there, a very prominent aspect in accounts of settlement in the Book of Mormon.

The critical text will maintain the *whithersoever* in Alma 23:14 since it is the earliest reading (it is extant in 𝓞) and appears to be intentional. We should also note that the historical distinction between *whither* and *where* has been blurred from the earliest times in English. For instance, there are examples of *where* being used with verbs of motion from Old English up to Early Modern English, at which time *whither* began to become archaic. Note, for instance, William Shakespeare's 1590 use of *where* for *whither* in the speech of the four fairies in *A Midsummer Night's Dream:* "Where shall we go?" (act 3, scene 1, line 166). For other examples, see definition 3 under section I for the word *where* in the OED. Of course, here in Alma 23:14, we have the opposite situation, with *whithersoever* in the original text instead of *wheresoever.*

Summary: Restore the original *whithersoever* in Alma 23:14, the reading of the earliest textual sources (𝓞, 𝓟, and the 1830 edition), even though the verb *dwell* ("whithersoever they dwelt"), as well as the larger context, makes no direct reference to movement.

■ **Alma 23:14**

but they did harden their hearts and also the hearts of the Lamanites in that part of the land whithersoever they [dweld > dwelt 0 | dwel > dwelt 1 | dwelt ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]

Oliver Cowdery initially wrote *dwelt* as *dweld* in 𝓞, with perhaps the initial intent to write *dwelled,* the alternative past-tense form for *dwelt.* Virtually immediately Oliver corrected the final *d* by overwriting it with a *t.* Elsewhere the Book of Mormon text has only *dwelt* (or *did dwell*) for the past tense of the verb *dwell,* never *dwelled* (except as an initial error here in Alma 23:14); similarly, the past participle is always *dwelt,* never *dwelled.* The King James Bible overwhelmingly prefers *dwelt* (with 226 occurrences), but even so there are 6 occurrences of *dwelled* (as in Ruth 1:4: "and they *dwelled* there about ten years"). The critical text will, of course, maintain the expected form *dwelt* here in Alma 23:14.

Summary: Maintain in Alma 23:14 the corrected *dwelt* rather than the *dwelled* (spelled as *dweld*) that Oliver Cowdery initially wrote in 𝓞.

■ **Alma 23:15**

therefore we have named all the cities of the Lamanites
[*in the > in Which* 1 | *in which* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
they did repent and come to the knowledge of the truth and were converted

We do not have the original manuscript here, but it appears that Oliver Cowdery wrote (at least initially) "in the which" in 𝓞 since spacing considerations between extant fragments give ample room for the article *the*. However, it is quite possible that in the original manuscript Oliver corrected this example of "in the which" to "in which" by crossing out the *the*. While copying this passage from 𝓞 into 𝓟, Oliver had completed only the beginning strokes for the *the* when he caught himself and turned the uncrossed *t* and the beginning stroke for the *h* into a capital *W*. He then continued writing the rest of the word *which* inline. The immediacy of this correction suggests that Oliver himself tended to write "in the which", even when "in which" was the correct reading.

Elsewhere in the text, there were originally 56 occurrences of "in the which", although exactly half of these were edited out by Joseph Smith for the 1837 edition. On the other hand, the original text (judging from the earliest textual sources) had at least four other occurrences of "in which". See the discussion regarding "in (the) which" under 1 Nephi 3:2 as well as more generally under IN THE WHICH in volume 3. The important point here is that Oliver Cowdery himself did not show any inclination to remove the definite article *the* in this phrase in any of the 56 original occurrences of "in the which" in the text; in fact, the printer's manuscript here in Alma 23:15 suggests that Oliver preferred or was quite used to "in the which"—and that he quite probably wrote "in the which" initially in the original manuscript for this passage as well but then corrected it to "in which". The shorter form "in which" is apparently correct here in Alma 23:15, although elsewhere in the original Book of Mormon text the clear majority of cases have the *the*. The critical text, for each case of "in (the) which", will follow the earliest textual evidence in determining whether the *the* was there or not.

Summary: Maintain Oliver Cowdery's corrected "in which" in Alma 23:15; although the text usually reads "in the which", there is evidence in a handful of cases that the original text read "in which".

■ **Alma 23:16**

and now it came to pass that the king
and those [*People* 0 | *people* 1A | BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
[*which* 1A | *who* BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *were converted*
were desirous that they might have a name

The 1837 edition omitted the word *people* from the phrase "those people which were converted"; in addition, the archaic use of *which* was replaced by *who* since the reference here is to persons. Joseph Smith did not mark this deletion (or the change to *who*) in his editing for the 1837 edition. Elsewhere, the text has seven occurrences of "those people" followed by a relative clause (*which* originally, edited to *who* in the 1837 edition):

Mosiah 28:12	those people which had been destroyed
Alma 37:21	those people which have been destroyed

Alma 46:4	those people which were wroth
Alma 51:21	those people which professed the blood of nobility
Alma 63:10	those people which had gone forth into that land
Helaman 1:9	those people which were desirous that he should be their governor
Helaman 8:10	those people which sought to destroy Nephi

So there is nothing wrong with this phraseology. Since *people* has never been removed from any of the other instances of this construction, the 1837 omission of *people* in Alma 23:16 was probably accidental.

Summary: Restore *people* in Alma 23:16, as well as the original relative pronoun *which,* giving "those people which were converted".

■ **Alma 23:17**

and it came to pass that
they called their [*name* 01ABCDEGHKPS | *names* FIJLMNOQRT] *Anti-Nephi-Lehies*

The 1852 LDS edition changed the singular *name* to the plural *names,* probably because the name itself, *Anti-Nephi-Lehies,* is in the plural. This change to the plural may be due to conscious editing, but it is nonetheless inappropriate given that elsewhere in this narrative the text refers to *Anti-Nephi-Lehi* as "their name", not "their names":

Alma 23:16
and now it came to pass that
the king and those people which were converted
were desirous that they might have **a name**
that thereby they might be distinguished from their brethren
therefore the king consulted with Aaron and many of their priests
concerning **the name** that they should take upon them
that they might be distinguished

Alma 23:17
and they were called by **this name** and were no more called Lamanites

Alma 24:1
and it came to pass that the Amlicites and the Amulonites
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 the Amulonites
to anger against their brethren

Thus the critical text will restore the singular *name* here in Alma 23:17.

Summary: Restore in Alma 23:17 the singular *name* in "they called their name Anti-Nephi-Lehies"; usage elsewhere consistently supports the use of the singular *name* in referring to the Anti-Nephi-Lehies.

■ **Alma 23:17**

they called their name
[*AntiNephiLehies* 01 | *Anti-Nephi-Lehies* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRT |
   Anti-Nephi-Lehis > Anti-Nephi-Lehies S]

There are several questions here that need to be considered:

(1) Should the name *Anti-Nephi-Lehi* be in the plural?

(2) If so, should the plural be *Anti-Nephi-Lehies* or *Anti-Nephi-Lehites?*

(3) If the plural is *Anti-Nephi-Lehies,* should it be spelled as initially in the 1953 RLDS edition, as *Anti-Nephi-Lehis?*

(4) Should the first morpheme in the name be *Anti* or *Ante?*

I shall deal with these questions in order.

(1) *Anti-Nephi-Lehies* or *Anti-Nephi-Lehi?*

Elsewhere in the text, *Anti-Nephi-Lehi* occurs only in a singular form. This name is also the adopted name of the brother of king Lamoni who becomes king over all the Lamanites at the death of his father (Alma 24:3). We expect, of course, this personal name to always be in the singular. When the name refers to the people of Ammon, we get "the people of Anti-Nephi-Lehi" (eight times), of which seven of these could be interpreted (probably incorrectly) as 'the people **of the king** named Anti-Nephi-Lehi'. But there is one clear case where the singular *Anti-Nephi-Lehi* occurs with the word *name:*

Alma 24:1
and it came to pass that the Amlicites and the Amulonites
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 the Amulonites
to anger against their brethren

In this passage, we get the singular *Anti-Nephi-Lehi,* not the plural *Anti-Nephi-Lehies.* In other words, the original manuscript has the plural *Anti-Nephi-Lehies* in Alma 23:17 but the singular *Anti-Nephi-Lehi* in Alma 24:1. Thus the plural *Anti-Nephi-Lehies* occurs only once. Nonetheless, the critical text will maintain this unique occurrence of the plural since that is how it reads in ℗. Moreover, there is really nothing wrong with the plural form.

(2) *Anti-Nephi-Lehies* or *Anti-Nephi-Lehites?*

The plural reading for *Anti-Nephi-Lehies* is very clear in the original manuscript; the name definitely ends with *Lehies,* and there is no overwriting. The name does appear at the end of a line, but there appears to be no attempt at crowding the text and thus no indication of a potential error.

Given other names in the Book of Mormon, we might expect *Anti-Nephi-Lehites.* One could argue that the reading in the original manuscript was indeed an error—that the *t* was accidentally dropped out, especially since Oliver Cowdery was writing the name at the end of a line. There are at least 13 Book of Mormon names ending in *-ite* that are derived from proper nouns:

Amalickiah	Amalickiahite
Amlici	Amlicite
Ammon	Ammonite
Ammonihah	Ammonihahite
Amulon	Amulonite
Ishmael	Ishmaelite
Jacob	Jacobite
Jared	Jaredite
Joseph	Josephite
Laman	Lamanite
Lemuel	Lemuelite
Nephi	Nephite
Zoram	Zoramite

But each of these *-ite* names is based on a personal name, whereas *Anti-Nephi-Lehi* is not originally a personal name. (Only later does the brother of king Lamoni take this as his personal name, in Alma 24:3.) Of course, *Lehi* is a personal name, but *Lehite* is not found as an independent name in the text (though it is sometimes used by modern commentators to refer to Lehi's descendants).

The tendency to write *Anti-Nephi-Lehites* is very natural. In fact, for one of the noncanonical headings in Ⓞ, Oliver Cowdery appears to have written the plural *Anti-Nephi-Lehites* (that is, *Lehites* rather than *Lehies*):

heading for page 338′ of Ⓞ

```
(                          h)i(t)es take up arms in defence [ f    ]
(                     t)es &C
```

In other words, Oliver wrote something equivalent to "the Anti-Nephi-**Lehites** take up arms in defense of the Nephites etc." This heading covers the text for Alma 53:10–22, although the text itself uses the term "the people of Ammon" to refer to this people (Alma 53:10). We have to go all the way back to Alma 43:11 to find the last use in the text of the name *Anti-Nephi-Lehi*. And we have to go even further back to Alma 23:17 to find the only occurrence in the text of the plural *Anti-Nephi-Lehies*. So it is not surprising that Oliver substituted *Anti-Nephi-Lehites* for the correct plural *Anti-Nephi-Lehies* when he composed the heading for this much later page in Ⓞ.

There is one example of a name for a group of Book of Mormon people using a name derived from a personal name, but without the *-ite* ending, namely *Nehors*:

Alma 21:4
for they had built synagogues after the order of **the Nehors**
for many of the Amlicites and the Amulonites were after the order of **the Nehors**

Alma 24:28
now the greatest number of those of the Lamanites
which slew so many of their brethren were Amlicites and Amulonites
the greatest number of whom were after the order of **the Nehors**

So *s* can be directly added to a personal name to form the plural name for a group of people. Thus *Anti-Nephi-Lehies* (or *Anti-Nephi-Lehis*) is possible. And since *Anti-Nephi-Lehi* itself was not in

the beginning a personal name, the dominance of the *-ite* ending should not play a significant factor in determining whether *Anti-Nephi-Lehies* is a mistake for *Anti-Nephi-Lehites.*

(3) *Anti-Nephi-Lehies* or *Anti-Nephi-Lehis?*

Since there is no overwhelming evidence to reject *Anti-Nephi-Lehies,* we should consider whether *Lehies* is spelled correctly—that is, should the plural ending be *-es* rather than *-s?* As far as spelling in the Book of Mormon is concerned, we have some evidence for the *-es* plural after a final *i*— namely, the plural spelling for *onti,* for which the manuscripts consistently give the plural spelling *onties,* or mistakenly as *anties* but still ending in *-es* (in Alma 11:22, 25). Of course, since the singular *onti* already occurred in the immediately preceding text (in Alma 11:6, 13), the plural ending *-es* may simply be Oliver Cowdery's own plural spelling for *onties*. On the other hand, the plural *Anti-Nephi-Lehies* is the very first occurrence of that name in the text, so it is possible that its plural ending *-es* was spelled out by Joseph Smith as part of the dictation. Yet *Lehi* is already known to the scribe, so it is also possible that Joseph left it to Oliver to spell the plural as *Lehies.*

Current English definitely prefers the *-s* plural ending for words ending in *i.* For instance, in two statistical samplings of material written in the 1960s (the Brown corpus and the American Heritage corpus), there are nine different words ending in *i* for which the plural ending had been added, and in a total of 82 instances the plural ending was always *-s:*

> alibis (1), alkalis (2), bikinis (1), martinis (2), Nazis (27), rabbis (3), safaris (3), skis (19), taxis (24)

For the Brown corpus, see W. Nelson Francis and Henry Kučera, *Frequency Analysis of English Usage: Lexicon and Grammar* (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1982); for the American Heritage corpus, see John B. Carroll, Peter Davies, and Barry Richman, *Word Frequency Book* (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1971).

But in earlier centuries, according to spellings cited in the Oxford English Dictionary under the appropriate lexical item, the ending *-es* seems to have been preferred. The 1800s and early 1900s was a period of transition from *-es* to *-s.* For each of the following words, I list the dates for the plural spellings as cited in the OED under the respective lexical item; instances taking *-s* that postdate the latest *-es* spelling are given in bold while instances taking *-es* that predate the earliest *-s* spelling are in italics:

WORD	dates for *-es* spellings	dates for *-s* spellings
alkali	*1813*	**1863, 1875**
effendi	1732	1716, **1814**
macaroni	*1778, 1783, 1876, 1901, 1974*	1885, 1942, 1946, **1985, 1997**
mufti	*1630, 1654, 1829*	1813, **1852, 1988**
rabbi	*1553, 1611, 1629, 1641, 1647, 1688, 1691, 1855*	1788, 1838, **1897**
taxi	*1908, 1911, 1923*	1914, **1925, 1923, 1979**

Thus the *-es* spellings in *Anti-Nephi-Lehies* and *onties* appear to be fully acceptable 19th-century spellings. They could be respelled as *Anti-Nephi-Lehis* and *ontis,* but since today's Book of Mormon readers are familiar with these archaic spellings, it is probably best to retain the original *-es* ending for these two Book of Mormon words.

(4) *Anti-Nephi-Lehi* or *Ante-Nephi-Lehi?*

Jared Weaver (personal communication, 29 September 2003) wonders whether the first morpheme, *Anti*, might be an error for *Ante*. He suggests that the *Anti* should not be interpreted as the Greek prefix *anti-* (with its meaning 'against') but instead *Anti* should be revised to read *Ante-*, based on the Latin prefix *ante-* (with its meaning 'before').

I myself think that the *Anti* of *Anti-Nephi-Lehies* should not be interpreted as either the Greek prefix *anti-* 'against' or the Latin prefix *ante-* 'before'. Instead, *Anti* appears to be a proper noun in the Nephite-Lamanite language. Consider how many uses there are in the text of the morpheme *Anti* in Nephite and Lamanite proper nouns: *Ani-Anti, Antiomno, Antionah, Antionum, Antiparah, Antipas,* and *Antipus;* perhaps the Nephite monetary unit *antion* could also be added to this list. Further, the only other combinations of *Nephi* and *Lehi* in the text refer to the land (and city) of *Lehi-Nephi* in Mosiah 7–9, which is the place that Nephi fled to after leaving his brothers, the Lamanites, behind. I would suggest that whatever *Anti* means, it has something to do either with that part of their territory or with the righteous heritage of Nephi and Lehi. I don't think it should be interpreted as meaning 'neither Nephi nor Lehi' (*Anti-Nephi-Lehi,* interpreted according to the Greek *anti-*) or as 'before Nephi and Lehi' (*Ante-Nephi-Lehi,* interpreted according to the Latin *ante-*). Other interpretations for *Anti* in *Anti-Nephi-Lehi* have been proposed, but ultimately the text itself provides no explicit evidence for what *Anti* means.

Summary: Retain the plural form *Anti-Nephi-Lehies* in Alma 23:17; the initial morpheme *Anti* appears to be an independent morpheme whose original meaning is not recoverable from the text of the Book of Mormon (at least as we have it); *Anti* is probably not an error for *Ante*.

■ **Alma 23:18**

and the [*cures* 0 | *curse* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *of God did no more follow them*

The original manuscript reads "the cures of God", which Oliver Cowdery interpreted as "the curse of God" when he later copied the text from 𝒪 into 𝒫—that is, he interpreted the *es* as a metathesis in letter order, and so he switched the order of the *e* and *s* to give *curse*. But another possibility is that the original reading was *curses* and that in the original manuscript Oliver accidentally dropped the *s* after the *r*.

When we look at the rest of the Book of Mormon text, we find 29 other occurrences of the singular *curse,* but none of the plural *curses.* This fact strongly argues that Oliver Cowdery correctly interpreted *cures* as a mix-up in letter ordering and not as the omission of an *s.* Also note that there is one other occurrence of "the curse of God", nearby in Alma 17:15: "and the curse of God had fell upon them".

Summary: Accept in Alma 23:18 Oliver Cowdery's interpretation of *cures* as *curse* since the singular *curse* occurs many times elsewhere in the text but the plural *curses* is never found.

Alma 24

■ **Alma 24:1**

and it came to pass [NULL >– *that* 0 | *that* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
the Amlicites and the Amulonites and the Lamanites . . .

> Here in the original manuscript, we have a momentary loss of *that* after "it came to pass". Some-
> what later, with narrower ink flow, Oliver Cowdery supralinearly supplied the *that,* probably when
> he read the text back to Joseph Smith during the dictation process. The subordinate conjunction
> *that* usually follows "it came to pass", but not always. Since either reading is possible, there would
> have been little motivation here for Oliver to emend the text on his own. The critical text will
> therefore accept the occurrence of *that* after "it came to pass" in Alma 24:1. For discussion of this
> variation, see under 1 Nephi 7:7; also see the more general discussion under THAT in volume 3.

Summary: Accept in Alma 24:1 the occurrence of *that* (the corrected reading in ◯) after "it came to pass".

■ **Alma 24:1**

(1) *and the Lamanites* [*which* >js *who* 1 | *which* A | BCDEF | *who* GHIJKLMNOPQRST] *were*
in the land of Amulon and also in the land of Helam
(2) *and* [*which* >js *who* 1 | *which* A | *who* BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *was in the land of Jerusalem*
and in fine in all the land round about
(3) [*which* 0A | *which* >js *who* 1 | *who* BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *had not been converted*
and had not taken upon them the name of Anti-Nephi-Lehi
were stirred up by the Amlicites and by the Amulonites

> Here in the printer's manuscript, Joseph Smith grammatically emended three instances of *which*
> to *who* in his editing for the 1837 edition, but the first of these *who*'s ended up being omitted by
> the 1837 typesetter. The *who* was restored in the 1858 Wright edition (and thus in the RLDS tex-
> tual tradition) while the 1879 LDS edition restored it to the LDS text. The critical text will, of
> course, restore the original use of *which* in all three of these cases. The original text, in accord
> with the biblical style, uses both *which* and *who* as relative pronouns to refer to people; in each
> case, the critical text will follow the earliest textual sources in determining which relative pro-
> noun was the original. For further discussion, see under WHICH in volume 3.

Summary: Restore all three original occurrences of *which* here in Alma 24:1 (and elsewhere in the
text, whenever *which* is supported by the earliest textual sources).

■ **Alma 24:1**

and it came to pass that the Amlicites and the Amulonites 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 [NULL > *by* 1 | *by* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *the Amulonites*

While copying 𝓞 into 𝓟, Oliver Cowdery initially omitted the repeated preposition *by*. Almost immediately, Oliver supralinearly inserted the *by*—and without any change in the level of ink flow (the insert mark itself is in heavier ink flow and was perhaps written after Oliver redipped his quill). The repeated *by* is not extant in 𝓞, but there is room for it between surviving fragments of 𝓞. The Hebraistic repetition of the preposition is clearly the more difficult reading for speakers of modern English, yet such repetition is characteristic of the original Book of Mormon text. Undoubtedly, the original manuscript had the repeated *by* here in Alma 24:1. For further discussion, see under Alma 2:38; also see under CONJUNCTIVE REPETITION in volume 3.

Summary: Accept in Alma 24:1 Oliver Cowdery's corrected text with the repeated *by* ("by the Amlicites and **by** the Amulonites"); such Hebraistic structures are very common in the Book of Mormon text.

■ **Alma 24:2**

and their hatred became exceeding sore against them
even [*somuch* >+ *insomuch* 0 | *insomuch* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *that*
    they began to rebel against their king
insomuch that they would not that he should be their king

Here in the original manuscript, Oliver Cowdery initially wrote *even somuch,* which he soon corrected to *even insomuch* by supralinearly inserting the *in.* The ink level for the correcting *in* is only slightly heavier, which suggests that Oliver's correction occurred after he redipped his quill. Elsewhere the text has four examples of *even so much* and one more of *even insomuch:*

1 Nephi 17:6	yea even **so much** that we cannot write them all
Mosiah 7:25	even **so much** that they did shed blood among themselves
Alma 2:2	even **so much** that they began to be very powerful
Alma 38:5	even **so much** ye shall be delivered out of your trials
Helaman 5:23	even **insomuch** that they durst not lay their hands upon them

Since either reading is possible, the critical text will accept the corrected reading in Alma 24:2 ("even **insomuch** that they began to rebel against their king").

The original spelling of *so much* here in Alma 24:2 as *somuch* (that is, as one word) should not be interpreted as evidence for *insomuch* and against *so much* as the original reading, mainly because Oliver Cowdery sometimes spelled legitimate occurrences of *so much* as one word (1 time in 𝓞, 3 times in 𝓟). In fact, *insomuch* is also often written by Oliver with spaces: *in somuch* (2 times in 𝓟), *inso much* (1 time in 𝓞, 9 times in 𝓟), and *in so much* (2 times in 𝓟). Thus the spelling *somuch* (with no space between *so* and *much*) plays no role whatsoever in Alma 24:2 (or anywhere else) in determining whether the text should read *insomuch* or *so much.*

Summary: Accept in Alma 24:2 Oliver Cowdery's corrected reading in 𝒪: "even **insomuch** that they began to rebel against their king".

■ **Alma 24:4**

and the king died in that selfsame year that the Lamanites began
to make [*preperations* 1 | *preparation* A | *preparations* bcdefghijklmnopqrst]
for war against the people of God

The 1830 compositor set "preparation for war"; the printer's manuscript has the plural *preparations* (spelled as *preperations*). The 1837 edition restored the plural *preparations*. The word is partially extant in the original manuscript, but not the end of the word.

This plural reading is consistent with the use of the plural *preparations* in the next two verses:

> Alma 24:5
> now when Ammon and his brethren and all those which had come up with them
> saw the **preparations** of the Lamanites to destroy their brethren . . .

> Alma 24:6
> nay they would not even make any **preparations** for war

More generally in the text, when the verb is *make,* there are 17 examples where the direct object is the plural *preparations* (including here in Alma 24:4), but there are none that have the singular *preparation,* although occasionally the plural has been replaced by the singular (see under Jarom 1:8, Mormon 2:4, and Mormon 4:6). The plural use in "to make preparations" is quite correct in Alma 24:4.

Summary: Retain the plural *preparations* in Alma 24:4, a reading that is consistent with 16 other examples of "to make preparations" in the text.

■ **Alma 24:5**

now when [*Ammen* 0 | *Ammon* 1abcdefghijklmnopqrst] *and his brethren . . .*

Here the original manuscript incorrectly spells *Ammon* as *Ammen*. The name *Ammon* occurs 53 times in the extant text of 𝒪, at least for the last vowel of the name. (Included in this number are four extant occurrences of the name in the headings that the scribe wrote at the top of each page of 𝒪.) In 51 of these cases, from Alma 19:11 through Alma 58:39, 𝒪 reads *Ammon* without variation for the *o* vowel. Thus the spelling *Ammen* here in Alma 24:5 is undoubtedly an error. The same error in 𝒪 occurred later in the book of Alma, but in this instance, Oliver caught his error and corrected it virtually immediately, overwriting the *e* with the correct *o* (there is no difference in the level of ink flow):

> Alma 31:32
> yea [*Ammen > Ammon* 0 | *Ammon* 1abcdefghijklmnopqrst]
> and Aaron and Omner and also Amulek and Zeezrom and also my two sons

On the other hand, *Ammon* is never misspelled in 𝒫. The critical text will maintain the spelling *Ammon.*

Summary: The name *Ammon* was misspelled as *Ammen* two times in 𝒪 (and one of these was a momentary error); the earliest extant spelling of the name is *Ammon.*

■ **Alma 24:5**

now when Ammon and his brethren
[NULL > & 0 | & 1 | *and* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *all those which had come up with* **him**
saw the preparations of the Lamanites to destroy their brethren . . .

Here in the original manuscript, Oliver Cowdery initially omitted the *and* between *brethren* and *all those*. Virtually immediately he supralinearly inserted an ampersand (there is no change in the level of ink flow for his correction). Thus the corrected text distinguishes between "his brethren" and "all those which had come up" as fellow missionaries. Without the *and,* one could interpret "all those which had come up with him" (or, as we shall see, "all those which had come up with them") as an appositive to *his brethren.* As pointed out by David Calabro (personal communication), there is evidence in the text for the general term *brethren* modified nonrestrictively by an appositive of the form "all those <restrictive relative clause>":

> Mosiah 25:16
> and he did exhort the people of Limhi and his brethren
> —all those that had been delivered out of bondage—
> that they should remember that it was the Lord that did deliver them

Since the appositive construction is possible, there is no motivation for Oliver to have added the *and* here in Alma 24:5 except that Joseph Smith must have dictated an *and.* Thus the critical text will assume that Oliver initially omitted the conjunction *and* in this passage as he took down Joseph's dictation.

A more substantive question here deals with the use of *him* in "all those which had come up with **him**". As explained under 1 Nephi 10:18–19, there is evidence that Oliver Cowdery sometimes mixed up *him* and *them* in 𝒪 since both are typically pronounced in unstressed contexts as /əm/. In other words, it is possible that the original text here in Alma 24:5 read "Ammon and his brethren and all those which had come up with **them**" and that Oliver mistakenly interpreted Joseph Smith's dictated /əm/ as *him* rather than as *them.* In fact, the use of *his* in the immediately preceding "Ammon and **his** brethren" would have facilitated this interpretation. (This emendation was first suggested in 1998 by Dale Caswell, one of my student researchers in the critical text project.)

One wonders if there is any particular reason to associate the other missionaries with Ammon alone rather than with all four of the sons of king Mosiah. Support for the *them* is found earlier in the text; there the narrative consistently refers to these missionary companions as the companions of all four sons, not Ammon alone:

Mosiah 28:1

> Now it came to pass that after the sons of Mosiah had done all these things
> **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 whom **they** had selected go up to the land of Nephi
> that they might preach the things which they had heard
> and that they might impart the word of God to their brethren the Lamanites

Alma 17:6, 8

> now these were their journeyings
> having taken leave of their father Mosiah . . .
> 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 unto the Lamanites

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 of God

Of course, in all of these cases, the sons are collectively referred to as the "sons of Mosiah", not conjunctively as "Ammon and his brethren". On the other hand, when we have a full conjunctive listing of all the sons of king Mosiah, we always get the plural possessive pronoun *their,* never *his,* in referring to the missionary companions:

Alma 22:35

> and now I—after having said this—return again to the account
> of Ammon and Aaron Omner and Himni and **their** brethren

Alma 23:1

> Behold now it came to pass that
> the king of the Lamanites sent a proclamation among all his people
> that they should not lay their hands
> on Ammon or Aaron or Omner or Himni
> nor neither of **their** brethren
> which should go forth preaching the word of God
> in whatsoever place they should be in
> in any part of their land

Alma 25:17

> and now behold Ammon and Aaron and Omner and Himni
> and **their** brethren did rejoice exceedingly

Of course, in these three passages the names of all four sons are listed, not just one of them; thus *their,* not *his,* is expected. (As discussed under Alma 22:35, the *their* in that instance may actually refer to just Aaron, Omner, and Himni.)

Here in Alma 24:5, it seems rather odd to refer to the missionary companions as coming up "with Ammon" rather than with "Ammon and his brethren", especially since Ammon worked alone as a missionary. Alma 24:5 is the only passage that refers to the other missionary brethren as being Ammon's brethren rather than the brethren of all the sons of king Mosiah. Thus all of the

relevant passages elsewhere in the text support emending Alma 24:5 to read "and all those which had come up with **them**". The critical text will accept the emendation of *him* to *them* in this passage.

Summary: Emend Alma 24:5 to read "and all those which had come up with **them**" since elsewhere the text consistently refers to the missionary companions as the companions of all the sons of king Mosiah; the original *them,* probably pronounced as /əm/ by Joseph Smith, was apparently misinterpreted as *him* by Oliver Cowdery as he took down Joseph's dictation; Oliver was probably influenced by the immediately preceding *his* in "Ammon and **his** brethren".

■ **Alma 24:5**

now when Ammon and his brethren and all those which had come up with them
saw the preparations of the Lamanites to destroy their brethren
they came forth to the land of [*Medeon >+ Midian* 0 | *Midion >+ Midian* 1 |
     Midian ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
and there Ammon met all his brethren
and from thence they came to the land of Ishmael
that they might hold a council with Lamoni and also with his brother Anti-Nephi-Lehi

Heather Hardy (personal communication, 5 January 2006) has suggested that the reference here to "the land of **Midian**" is an error for "the land of **Middoni**". Elsewhere in this part of the book of Alma, from Alma 20:2 through Alma 23:10, there are 15 references to "the land of **Middoni**" but no other references to "the land of Midian". There are also two references to *Middoni* alone (Alma 20:3 and Alma 22:3), apparently with the meaning 'the land of Middoni'. Moreover, there are five passages that simultaneously refer to "the land of Middoni" and "the land of Ishmael":

Alma 20:14
     and he also commanded him that he should not go to **the land of Middoni**
     but that he should return with him to **the land of Ishmael**

Alma 20:15
     I will not slay Ammon
     neither will I return to **the land of Ishmael**
     but I go to **the land of Middoni**
     that I may release the brethren of Ammon

Alma 21:18
     and it came to pass that Ammon and Lamoni returned
     from **the land of Middoni** to **the land of Ishmael**
     which was the land of their inheritance

Alma 22:1
     now as Ammon was thus teaching the people of Lamoni continually
     we will return to the account of Aaron and his other brethren
     for after he departed from **the land of Middoni**
     he was led by the Spirit to the land of Nephi
     even to the house of the king which was over all the land
     save it were **the land of Ishmael**
     and he was the father of Lamoni

Alma 23:8−12
> now these are they which were converted unto the Lord :
> the people of the Lamanites which were in **the land of Ishmael**
> and also of the people of the Lamanites which were in **the land of Middoni**
> and also of the people of the Lamanites which were in the city of Nephi
> 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

The last passage lists the lands and cities where Ammon and his brethren converted the Lamanites: namely, the land of Ishmael (where Ammon was the missionary) and the land of Middoni (where Aaron and the others were the missionaries). The city of Nephi was where the chief king of the Lamanites ruled from; and as explained in Mosiah 11:12, the lands of Shilom and Shemlon were near the city of Nephi. The list in Alma 23 also includes two other cities where the Lamanites were converted (namely, Lemuel and Shimnilom), which are not otherwise mentioned in the text.

Here in Alma 24:5, the reference (in the current text) is to "the land of Midian" and "the land of Ishmael". Lamoni ruled over the land of Ishmael, and Ammon was the only missionary that went there; the others had been laboring in the land of Middoni. After initial difficulties in the land of Middoni, these other missionaries met with success there and elsewhere (as implied in Alma 21:12−17). So it makes perfectly good sense for Ammon to later meet all his brethren in the land of Middoni and from there go together to the land of Ishmael to discuss with Lamoni (the king over the land of Ishmael) and with Anti-Nephi-Lehi (the chief king who ruled from the land of Nephi) the increasing difficulty with the unconverted Lamanites.

In the original manuscript, this name was initially spelled as *Medeon.* One possibility is that the original text actually read *Midian,* but that Joseph Smith pronounced it with stress on the second syllable, as /mədi′ən/, which Oliver Cowdery wrote down in 𝓞 as *Medeon.* Later, the three vowels were all corrected, giving *Midian,* the biblical name. If Joseph spelled out the name for Oliver, then we can be quite sure that the original text read *Midian.* However, the three vowels were corrected using distinctly heavier ink flow, which is unusual since Book of Mormon names, if they are corrected when they first appear in the text, are immediately corrected without any change in the level of ink flow. For some reason, the correction of *Medeon* to *Midian* was done later.

Another possibility here in Alma 24:5 is that Joseph Smith misread the name *Middoni* as if it read *Middion* (with the *i* moved forward). Note that *Middion* could be pronounced, depending on the placement of the stress, as either /mədi′ən/ or /mɪ′diən/. The first leads to the spelling *Medeon,* the second to *Midian.* In the printer's manuscript, the name was initially spelled as *Midion.* The *o* vowel in 𝓟 suggests that when Oliver Cowdery first copied the name into 𝓟, the original manuscript may have still read as *Medeon.* Later, *Midion* was corrected in 𝓟 to *Midian;* the change of the *o* vowel to *a* was done with somewhat heavier ink flow. Perhaps the vowels in *Medeon* (the original spelling in 𝓞) were corrected at the same time the vowel in *Midion* was corrected in 𝓟; that is, when Oliver copied the name from 𝓞 into 𝓟 (in the fall of 1829), he did not recognize *Medeon,* the reading in 𝓞, and decided that it was an error for *Midian,* but spelling it initially in 𝓟 as *Midion* and then correcting both 𝓞 and 𝓟 to read *Midian.*

In a subsequent communication (12 May 2006), Hardy proposed a reason for why Oliver Cowdery might have replaced the unrecognizable *Medeon* with the biblical name *Midian:* namely,

Oliver's familiarity with the Bible. Earlier in Alma 21:2, when he could not figure out the name spelled as *Amelicite* in 𝒪, Oliver apparently decided to replace it with the biblical name *Amalekite,* not the correct *Amlicite* (found considerably earlier in Alma 2–3). Here at the beginning of Alma 24, just before writing *Midion* in 𝒫 (and then correcting it to *Midian*), Oliver twice more made this substitution of the biblical *Amalekite* for the Book of Mormon *Amlicite* (which is extant in 𝒪 for the first occurrence of the name in Alma 24:1 and is there spelled as *Amelicite*):

> Alma 24:1
>> and it came to pass that
> (1) the [*Amelicites* 0 | *Amalekites* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] and the Amulonites
>> and the Lamanites . . . which had not been converted
>>> and had not taken upon them the name of Anti-Nephi-Lehi
>> were stirred up
> (2) by the [*Amalekites* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] and by the Amulonites

Similarly, one could argue that when Oliver came to Alma 24:5, he made the same kind of replacement of an unrecognizable Book of Mormon name, *Medeon*, with a recognizable biblical name, *Midian.* Interestingly, the biblical names *Amalekites* and *Midianites* actually occur together in the book of Judges:

> Judges 6:3
>> the **Midianites** came up
>> and the **Amalekites** and the children of the east

> Judges 6:33
>> then all the **Midianites** and the **Amalekites** and the children of the east
>> were gathered together

> Judges 7:12
>> and the **Midianites** and the **Amalekites** and all the children of the east
>> lay along in the valley like grasshoppers for multitude

Also the book of Genesis, in its description of Joseph being sold into slavery, refers to the same people as either Midianites or Ishmaelites (spelled as *Ishmeelites* in the King James text):

> Genesis 37:25
>> and they lifted up their eyes and looked
>> and behold a company of **Ishmaelites** came from Gilead
>> with their camels bearing spicery and balm and myrrh
>> going to carry *it* down to Egypt

> Genesis 37:27
>> come and let us sell him to the **Ishmaelites**

> Genesis 37:28
>> then there passed by **Midianites** merchantmen
>> and they drew and lifted up Joseph out of the pit
>> and sold Joseph to the **Ishmaelites** for twenty *pieces* of silver
>> and they brought Joseph into Egypt

Genesis 37:36
and the **Midianites** sold him into Egypt unto Potiphar

Genesis 39:1
and Joseph was brought down to Egypt
and Potiphar . . . bought him of the hands of the **Ishmaelites**
which had brought him down thither

(For another example, see Judges 8:22–26.) Thus another factor that may have allowed *Middoni* to be replaced by *Midian* is the fact that there are five passages in Alma 20–23 (listed above) that refer to "the land of Ishmael" along with "the land of Middoni". But probably the most significant factor in causing this substitution would have been more general: namely, Oliver Cowdery's familiarity with the biblical name *Midian*. In any event, the two biblical name replacements— of *Amalekite* for *Amelicite* (beginning in Alma 21 as an error in 𝓞 for *Amlicite*) and *Midian* for *Medeon* (here in Alma 24:5)—imply a strong familiarity with the Bible on the part of Oliver.

Summary: Accept in Alma 24:5 the emendation of *Midian* to *Middoni;* all other geographical references to the land of Middoni argue that this unique reference in the Book of Mormon to "the land of Midian" is an error due to Oliver Cowdery's familiarity with biblical names, just like his earlier decision in Alma 21 to interpret *Amelicite* in 𝓞 as the biblical name *Amalekite* (rather than the correct *Amlicite*).

■ **Alma 24:10**

and I also thank my God yea my great God
that he hath granted unto us that we might repent of **these** *things*
and also that he hath forgiven us
of [*these* 1 | *those* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *our many sins and murders*
which we have committed

Here the earliest extant source, the printer's manuscript, reads "**these** our many sins and murders"; the 1830 typesetter replaced *these* with *those*. Although either reading is theoretically possible, the original *these* makes sense since the king has just mentioned (in the previous verse) their sins and murders:

Alma 24:9
we have been convinced of our sins and of the many murders
which we have committed

Also note the use of *these* earlier in verse 10: "that we might repent of these things". Thus the repeated use of *these* in verse 10 helps hold the discourse together.

There is considerable evidence in the history of the text of mix-ups between *these* and *those*. See under Mosiah 28:1 for a list of instances where the 1830 typesetter accidentally mixed up the demonstrative determiners. In each instance, the critical text will restore the reading of the earliest textual sources (namely, *these* here in Alma 24:10).

Summary: Restore in Alma 24:10 the reading of the printer's manuscript, "**these** our many sins and murders which we have committed".

■ **Alma 24:10**

and also that he hath forgiven us of these our many sins and murders which we have committed
and [took 01ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQS | *taken* RT] *away the guilt from our hearts*

Here the original text conjoins "and took away the guilt from our hearts" with "he hath forgiven us of these our many sins and murders which we have committed". The question here is whether *took* should be interpreted as the simple past-tense form of the verb *take* or as the past participial form, equivalent to the standard *taken*. The 1920 LDS edition changed the original *took* to *taken,* thus showing that the editors for that edition interpreted the original *took* as equivalent to *taken* (the change was intentional since it was marked in the copy of the 1911 LDS Book of Mormon used by the committee). As explained under Alma 8:26, the original text allowed for such instances of "and took" conjoined with predicates in the perfect; the critical text will restore all such instances of *took* even though it is being used as a past participle. The earliest text definitely allows *took* as the past participle for *take:*

> Alma 47:1
>> for behold he had [*took* >+ *taken* ○ | *taken* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] those which were with him
>
> Alma 55:8
>> and behold we have [*took* 01ABCDEFGHIJKLMP | *taken* NOQRST] of their wine
>
> Alma 62:16
>> after they had [*took* 1ABDEP | *taken* CGHIJKLMNOQRST | *took* > *taken* F] them

(For the first example, Alma 47:1, the change from *took* to *taken* in ○ may be due to editing on the part of Oliver Cowdery; see the discussion under that passage.) For further discussion of *took* as the past participle of *take,* see under PAST PARTICIPLE in volume 3.

Summary: Restore in Alma 24:10 the original *took* in the conjoined predicate "and took away the guilt from our hearts"; here *took* is the past participle for the verb *take*.

■ **Alma 24:11**

and now behold my brethren
since it has been all that we could do
as we were the most lost of all mankind
*to repent of all [*NULL >? *our sins* ○ | *our sins* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]*
*[*NULL >? & ○ | §1 NULL >+ §2 & 1 | *and* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *the many murders*
which we have committed

In the original manuscript, spacing between extant fragments shows that in all probability Oliver Cowdery initially wrote "to repent of all the many murders which we have committed". Later he probably inserted *our sins &* supralinearly at the end of the line in ○:

Alma 24:11 (lines 22–23, page 265′ of 𝒪)

```
                                              (                              )
                                                        OUR SINS &
    we could do as we were the most lost of all (m            ) o(f      )
                                               ANKIND TO REPENT     ALL ^

    the many murders which we have committe(d &    get G)o(d t)o take (t      )
                                            TO                         HEM AW
```

None of the supralinearly insertion is actually extant in 𝒪, but it was probably there when Oliver copied the text from 𝒪 into 𝒫. Interestingly, in that copying process, Oliver accidentally omitted the *and* that would have been written as an ampersand at the end of the supralinear insertion in 𝒪. Scribe 2 of 𝒫 later supplied the ampersand when he proofed 𝒫 against 𝒪.

Two similar versions of this conjunctive expression are found in the preceding text:

> Alma 24:9–10
> we have been convinced of **our sins and of the many murders**
> which we have committed . . .
> and also that he hath forgiven us of **these our many sins and murders**
> which we have committed

These references to sins and murders are found six and three lines earlier in 𝒪, so it is theoretically possible that in verse 11 Oliver added the extra *our sins,* either accidentally or intentionally, as he copied the text from 𝒪 into 𝒫. If so, this would imply that scribe 2's insertion of the ampersand was based on editing rather than on correcting to 𝒪. Nonetheless, there is no evidence elsewhere in the text for such interference from a specific expression unless that expression is common or is found within a line, rarely two lines, in the manuscript. Ultimately, the safest solution here is to assume that the original text in verse 11 read "to repent of all our many sins and murders", the corrected reading in 𝒫 (and the earliest extant full text for Alma 24:11).

Summary: Maintain in Alma 24:11 the conjunctive expression "of all our sins and the many murders which we have committed", the corrected reading in 𝒫.

■ **Alma 24:11**

for it was all we could do to repent sufficiently before God
that he would take away our [*stains* 0 | *stain* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]

The original manuscript has the plural *stains,* which Oliver Cowdery miscopied as the singular *stain* when producing the printer's manuscript. The plural *s* is especially clear in the original manuscript since it was overwritten (but the preceding *n* is quite weak).

When the word *stain* is preceded by a possessive pronoun (like *our*), the Book of Mormon text uses the plural *stains;* there are two more instances of *our stains,* both occurring nearby:

> Alma 24:12
> now my best beloved brethren
> since God hath taken away **our stains**
> and our swords have become bright
> then let us stain our swords no more with the blood of our brethren

Alma 24:15

 and now behold since it has been as much as we could do
 to get **our stains** taken away from us and our swords are made bright
 let us hide them away

The plural *stains* is extant in 𝓞 for the first of these two other examples. The original use of the plural *stains* in Alma 24:11 is undoubtedly correct and will be restored in the critical text. Of course, the singular *stain* is also possible, as in the text for Alma 5:21: "yea his garments must be purified until it is cleansed from all **stain**".

Summary: Restore in Alma 24:11 *our stains,* the reading of the original manuscript; the plural *our stains* also occurs nearby in Alma 24:12 and Alma 24:15.

■ **Alma 24:12**

now my [*best* 01ABCDEFGHIJLMNOPQRST | κ] *beloved brethren*

The original usage here, "my best beloved brethren", is unique for the text. Otherwise, we have only "my beloved brethren" (59 times in the original text), which probably explains why the 1892 RLDS edition omitted the adjective *best* here (although unintentionally). The 1908 RLDS edition restored the correct "my best beloved brethren" to the RLDS text. Obviously, the use of *best* here is a difficult reading but appears to be intended. The critical text will maintain it.

 The expectedness of the phrase "my beloved brethren" once led the 1830 typesetter to replace "my brethren" with "my beloved brethren", namely in Alma 34:28 (for discussion, see under that passage). In another instance, Oliver Cowdery initially wrote "my beloved brethren" in 𝓟 instead of "my beloved people", the reading in 𝓞:

 Alma 24:7
 I thank my God
 my beloved [*People* 0 | *brethren > People* 1 | *people* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
 that our great God has in goodness sent these our **brethren** the Nephites . . .

In Alma 24:7 Oliver may have been influenced by the subsequent use of *brethren* in "these our brethren the Nephites".

Summary: Maintain the unique phraseology "my **best** beloved brethren" in Alma 24:12; this reading is found in the original manuscript and appears to be fully intended.

■ **Alma 24:13**

for perhaps if we should stain our swords again
they can no more be washed bright through the blood of the Son of our great God
[*which* 0ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST | *which >js who >js whih* 1] *shall be shed*
for the atonement of our sins

In his editing for the 1837 edition, Joseph Smith first thought that the relative pronoun *which* referred to "the Son of our great God"; thus he initially changed the *which* to *who* in 𝓟 (a supralinear insertion). But then he realized the *which* refers to "the **blood** of the Son of our great God",

so he restored the original *which* by crossing out the supralinear *who* and sublinearly inserting *which* (written as *whih,* a scribal slip). Elsewhere the text refers to blood being shed at least 45 times, including three other instances referring to the shedding of Christ's blood:

3 Nephi 18:11	in remembrance of my blood which I have shed for you
Moroni 5:2	in remembrance of the blood of thy Son which was shed for them
Moroni 10:33	through the shedding of the blood of Christ

Of course, the critical text will maintain the original *which* here in Alma 24:13 no matter whether its reference is to a person or not. For further discussion of the editing of *which* when it refers to persons, see under WHICH in volume 3.

It should be pointed out here that there are three instances in the current text of *bloodshed* that could be interpreted as *blood shed* (that is, as a noun postmodified by a past participle). For discussion of this possibility, see under Mormon 1:12 (there the earliest textual sources read "there was no **blood shed**" rather than the current LDS reading "there was no **bloodshed**").

Summary: Maintain in Alma 24:13 the *which* that refers to "the blood of the Son of our great God".

■ **Alma 24:15**

that we have not stained our swords in the blood of our brethren
since he imparted his [*word* 01ABCDEFGHIJKLNOPRST | *words* MQ] *unto us*

The 1905 LDS edition replaced the singular "his word" with the plural "his word", probably accidentally. The 1920 LDS edition restored the original "his word" to the LDS text. As explained under 1 Nephi 16:24, either singular *word* or plural *words* is possible when referring to one's word(s). But it should be pointed out that when the verb is *impart,* we always get the singular *word;* and as here in Alma 24:15, all of the other examples refer to the word of God:

Mosiah 28:1	that they might impart **the word of God** to their brethren the Lamanites
Alma 1:20	because they did impart **the word of God** one with another
Alma 1:26	to impart **the word of God** unto the people
Alma 1:26	and when the priest had imparted unto them **the word of God**
Alma 12:9	that they shall not impart / only according to the portion of **his word** which he doth grant unto the children of men
Alma 16:14	unto them they did impart **the word of God**
Alma 17:18	having imparted **the word of God** unto them
Alma 32:23	and now he imparteth **his word** by angels unto men
Alma 36:26	for because of **the word** which he hath imparted unto me

Note that in two cases (Alma 12:9 and Alma 32:23) we have "his word", the same as originally here in Alma 24:15.

Summary: Accept in Alma 24:15 the singular *word,* the original reading; all other occurrences in the text of "impart . . . word(s)" take the singular *word.*

■ **Alma 24:17**

and now it came to pass that
when the king had made an end
of [*the* >+ *these* 0 | *these* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *sayings . . .*

Here in Alma 24:17, Oliver Cowdery initially wrote "made an end of **the** sayings". Somewhat later he corrected the *the* to *these* by inserting the *se* a little above the line at the end of *the* (the correction is written with somewhat heavier ink flow). Oliver may have made this correction after reading the text back to Joseph Smith. Clearly, *these sayings* works much better than *the sayings.* Only once do we get *the sayings* in the text, and in that case there is a postmodifying prepositional phrase: "the sayings of our fathers" (Mosiah 1:6). On the other hand, elsewhere in the text there are 14 instances of *these sayings* without any postmodification (just like here in Alma 24:17).

Summary: Maintain in Alma 24:17 the use of *these* before *sayings,* the corrected reading in 𝒪; the initial reading, "made an end of **the** sayings", is undoubtedly a scribal error.

■ **Alma 24:17–18**

they took their swords and all the weapons
which were used for the shedding of man's blood
and they did bury them up deep in the earth
(1) *and* [*this* >+ *thus* 0 | *this* >js *thus* >js *this* 1 | *this* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *they did*
it being in their view a testimony to God and also to men
that they never would use weapons again for the shedding of man's blood
(2) *and* **this** *they did*
vouching and covenanting with God
that rather than to shed the blood of their brethren they would give up their own lives

Here in the current text we twice have the clause "and this they did". But in the first case, Oliver Cowdery initially wrote *this* in the original manuscript, then he corrected the *this* to *thus* by overwriting the original *is* with a heavily written *u,* which he then followed by writing the *s* inline, also with heavier ink flow but not quite as heavy as the ink flow for the *u.* Spacing between the finally written *s* and the following word, *they,* indicates that the change from *this* to *thus* took place before Oliver wrote the *they.* In other words, the correcting part of *thus,* despite being written with heavier ink flow, appears to be an immediate correction, not one done later. But when Oliver came to copy this part of the text from 𝒪 into 𝒫, he reverted to the *this,* which is what the 1830 compositor typeset. Joseph Smith, however, while editing the printer's manuscript for the 1837 edition, initially changed the *this* to *thus* by overwriting the *i* with a *u;* then he changed his mind and restored the *this* (but only minimally, by adding just the dot of an *i*). So there definitely appears to be some confusion here. But ultimately the text has settled on "and **this** they did" at the beginning of verse 18, in agreement with the second occurrence of "and **this** they did" in the middle of that verse (this second *this* is extant in 𝒪 and reads without correction).

It is possible that this second case of *this* later on in the passage may have influenced Oliver Cowdery in the first case to revert to *this* when he copied the text from 𝒪 into 𝒫; this second *this* may have also influenced Joseph Smith as he edited 𝒫 for the 1837 edition to restore the first *this*

after he had initially replaced it with *thus*. On the other hand, it seems less likely that the second occurrence caused Oliver to initially write *this* for the first occurrence in 𝒪 since that correction seems immediate (despite the use of heavier ink flow for the correction). Moreover, there is some distance (almost two manuscript lines in 𝒪) between the two occurrences of "and thus/this they did", so it is less likely that the first occurrence of "and this they did" in 𝒪 was an error in anticipation of the second "and this they did".

Another possibility worth considering is that the second occurrence of "and **this** they did" could be an error for "and **thus** they did". In other words, both times Oliver Cowdery incorrectly wrote "and **this** they did" but only in the first case did he catch the error and change it to "and **thus** they did". To be sure, there is considerable evidence that Oliver and the other scribes had difficulty with *this* and *thus,* especially after *and* at the beginning of sentences. For a list of instances where the scribes incorrectly replaced *thus* with *this,* if only momentarily, see under Alma 11:21. Particularly relevant here is the fact that there are two clear examples in 𝒫 where Oliver Cowdery initially wrote "and **this** they did" instead of the correct "and **thus** they did" (although in these two cases the *did* is a helping verb rather than a main verb):

> Alma 1:28
> > and [*this* > *thus* 1 | *thus* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] they did establish
> > the affairs of the church

> Ether 2:3
> > and they did also carry with them deseret
> > which by interpretation is a honey bee
> > and [*this* > *thus* 1 | *thus* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] they did carry with them
> > swarms of bees

We therefore have some support for the tendency to replace *thus* with *this* in the phrase "and thus they did".

Both readings, "and **thus** they did" and "and **this** they did", occur elsewhere in the text, as exemplified by the following contrasting pair:

> Alma 52:24–25
> > behold Moroni commanded that a part of his army which were with him
> > should march forth into the city and take possession of it
> > 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

> 3 Nephi 11:15
> > and it came to pass that the multitude went forth
> > and thrust their hands into his side
> > and did feel the prints of the nails in his hands and in his feet
> > and **this** they did do
> > going forth one by one 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 of whom it was written by the prophets that should come

Note that in Alma 52:25, one could replace *thus* with *this* ("and **this** they did and slew all those"), or that in 3 Nephi 11:15 one could replace *this* with *thus* ("and **thus** they did do / going forth one by one"). In both instances, the critical text will follow the reading of the earliest textual sources, *thus* in Alma 52:25 and *this* in 3 Nephi 11:15. In the same way, the critical text will follow the earliest textual sources for determining *thus* and *this* in Alma 24:18: namely, *thus* for the first occurrence and *this* for the second:

> Alma 24:18
>> and **thus** they did / it being in their view a testimony . . .
>> and **this** they did / vouching and covenanting with God . . .

There would have been no motivation for Oliver Cowdery to have emended his initial *this* to *thus* in ○ (at the beginning of verse 18) except that the text read this way (that is, this was the text that Joseph Smith dictated to him).

Summary: Restore in Alma 24:18 the *thus* (the immediately corrected reading in ○) at the beginning of the verse ("and **thus** they did / it being in their view a testimony"); later on in the verse, the use of *this* (the reading without correction in ○) will be maintained ("and **this** they did / vouching and covenanting with God").

■ **Alma 24:18**

and thus they did
it being in their view a testimony to God and also to men
that they never [*would* 0BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST | NULL >js *would* 1 | A] *use weapons again*
for the shedding of man's blood

○ is extant here and reads "that they never **would** use weapons again". When Oliver Cowdery copied from ○ into 𝒫, he omitted the *would,* producing the awkward "that they never use weapons again". Despite this difficulty, the 1830 typesetter copied the text as such, without the *would.* In his editing for the 1837 edition, Joseph Smith supplied this modal verb since it seemed necessary. Although it is theoretically possible that Joseph consulted ○ here, the evidence elsewhere shows that he consulted 𝒫 but not ○ in his editing for the 1837 edition. The critical text will, of course, maintain the reading of the original manuscript with its *would.*

Summary: Maintain the occurrence of the modal verb *would* in Alma 24:18, the reading of the original manuscript ("that they never would use weapons again").

■ **Alma 24:18 – 19**

and this they did | vouching and covenanting with God
that rather than [*to* >js NULL 1 | *to* A | BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *shed the blood of their brethren*
they would give up their own lives
and rather than [*to* 0A | *to* >js NULL 1 | BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *take away from a brother*
they would give unto him
and rather than [*to* 0A | *to* >js NULL 1 | BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *spend their days in idleness*
they would labor abundantly with their hands
and thus we see that when these Lamanites were brought to believe and to know the truth
that they were firm and would suffer even unto death
rather than [*to* 0A | *to* >js NULL 1 | BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *commit sin*

In this passage there are four occurrences of "rather than to" that Joseph Smith changed to "rather than" in his editing for the 1837 edition. But this passage was apparently the only place where Joseph did this kind of editing. In three other places he left the expression "rather than to":

> Alma 13:10
>
> they choosing to repent and work righteousness **rather than to** perish

> Alma 26:32
>
> for behold they had **rather** sacrifice their lives
> **than** even **to** take the life of their enemy

> Alma 51:20
>
> and the remainder of those dissenters
> **rather than** [*to* 01ABCDEPS | FGHIJKLMNOQRT] be smote down to the earth
>   by the sword
> yielded to the standard of liberty

In the first example (Alma 13:10), the infinitival *to* is supported by the preceding parallel use of *to* in "they choosing **to** repent and work righteousness". In the two other examples, there is no parallel support for the infinitival *to*. Interestingly, in the third case, the 1852 LDS edition dropped the *to,* in accord with current English usage (although this change may have actually been unintentional rather than due to conscious editing). It should also be noted that in the printer's manuscript for the Alma 51:20 example, Oliver Cowdery initially skipped the *to* by first writing the *b* of *be* (see the middle line in the following manuscript citation); Oliver immediately corrected what he had started by overwriting the *b* with a *t* and then continuing inline with the *o:*

> Alma 51:19 – 20 (lines 2 – 4, page 299 of 𝒫)
>
> ```
> into prison for there was no time for their trials at this period & the rema
> -inder of those dissenters rather than {b|to} be smote down to the earth by the
> sword yielded to the standard of liberty & were compelled to hoist the title of
> ```

This scribal error shows that "rather than to" was the reading in the text yet did not represent Oliver's language (since he seems to have preferred "rather than be smote down"). The critical text will, of course, restore all of these deleted *to*'s in Alma 24:18 – 19 and Alma 51:20.

As might be expected, there is evidence for "rather than to" in Middle and Early Modern English, including these examples (with spelling regularized) from the online Oxford English Dictionary:

Robert of Gloucester (1297)
> **Rather than to** lose her land,
> her life there to lose.

The Beauty and Good Properties of Women (about 1536)
> **Rather than to** be made in nature's forge
> an angel thou wouldest judge him, I make avow.

Nicolas Udall and others (1549)
> Getting their living with their own hands,
> **rather than to** be grievous unto other
> with shameless cravings and unseemliness.

(I wish to thank Don Chapman for help in determining the substantives for these citations.) There is also this example from the King James Bible:

Psalm 52:3
> thou lovest evil more than good
> *and* lying **rather than to** speak righteousness

The use of "rather than to" in the original Book of Mormon text is clearly intended and will be followed in the critical text wherever it is supported by the earliest textual sources.

Summary: Restore the archaic use of *to* in "rather than to" that was removed from four occurrences in Alma 24:18–19 (the result of Joseph Smith's editing for the 1837 edition) as well as from one other occurrence, in Alma 51:20 (in the 1852 LDS edition).

■ **Alma 24:19**

and thus we see that
they buried [*the* 01ABCDGHKPS | *their* EFIJLMNOQRT] *weapons of peace*
or they buried **the** *weapons of war for peace*

Here the 1849 LDS edition introduced the reading "they buried **their** weapons of peace", which has continued in the LDS text. This change from *the* to *their* appears to be a typo since the *the* in the subsequent "or they buried **the** weapons of war for peace" was not changed to *their*.

The reading "**their** weapons of war" is quite frequent elsewhere in the text (occurring 24 times) and probably contributed to the 1849 change from "**the** weapons of peace" to "**their** weapons of peace". (There are also four occurrences of "**your** weapons of war" and two of "**our** weapons of war".) Nonetheless, there are four other places where the original text has "**the** weapons of war":

Alma 3:1
> the Nephites which were not slain by **the** weapons of war
> after having buried those which had been slain . . .

Alma 44:10
> Moroni returned the sword and **the** weapons of war which he had received
> unto Zerahemnah

Alma 44:20

> he took **the** weapons of war from the Lamanites

Alma 55:16

> and cast in **the** weapons of war
> in unto the prisoners

(In the last example, the 1920 LDS edition removed the definite article *the;* for discussion, see under Alma 55:16.) These examples show that in Alma 24:19 the use of *the* in the original "the weapons of peace" and "the weapons of war for peace" is perfectly acceptable.

Summary: Restore in Alma 24:19 the original definite article *the* in "the weapons of peace", which is consistent with the definite article usage in the subsequent clause ("or they buried **the** weapons of war for peace").

■ **Alma 24:20**

and it came to pass that
their brethren the Lamanites made preparations for war
and came up to the land of Nephi
for the purpose of [*dethroaning* 0|*destroying* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *the king*
and to place another in his stead
and also of **destroying** *the people of Anti-Nephi-Lehi out of the land*

When copying the printer's manuscript from the original manuscript, Oliver Cowdery accidentally replaced *dethroning* with *destroying,* perhaps because of the occurrence of *destroying* within the same line of ℗. In addition, there is the visual similarity between *dethroning* and *destroying* (as well as the semantic compatibility in this instance) that would have facilitated the copying error.

To be sure, *dethrone* and *destroy* are not synonymous, yet in many passages either word would work. For example, we have six other occurrences in the text where a ruler (a king or a judge) is "dethroned"; and except for the example in Alma 51:5, the verb *destroy* would also work in place of *dethrone:*

Mosiah 29:21	ye cannot **dethrone** an iniquitous king
Alma 47:4	he laid the plan in his heart to **dethrone** the king of the Lamanites
Alma 47:8	that he might place himself at their head and **dethrone** the king
Alma 47:16	that he might accomplish his designs in **dethroning** the king
Alma 51:5	that Parhoron should be **dethroned** from the judgment seat
Ether 9:27	he did **dethrone** his father

On the other hand, there are at least two clear cases where a ruler (a governor or a king) is "destroyed"; in these two cases, *destroy* could be replaced by *dethrone:*

| 3 Nephi 6:30 | they did covenant one with another to **destroy** the governor and to establish a king over the land |
| Ether 9:26 | and Heth began to embrace the secret plans again of old to **destroy** his father |

With respect to the last example, note that we have a single passage where both *destroy* and *dethrone* are used to refer to the same act:

> Ether 9:26–27
>> and Heth began to embrace the secret plans again of old to **destroy** his father
>> and it came to pass that he did **dethrone** his father
>> for he slew him with his own sword

Since either *dethrone* or *destroy* is possible in Alma 24:20, we let the earliest textual sources determine the reading.

Summary: Restore the original occurrence of the verb *dethrone* in Alma 24:20: "for the purpose of **dethroning** the king".

■ **Alma 24:21**

[*&* 0 | *and* >js *now* 1 | *And* A | *Now* BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
[*it came to pass that* 0A | *it came to pass that* >js NULL 1 | BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
when the people saw that they were coming against them
they went out to meet them

When Joseph Smith removed the clausal "it came to pass that" from this passage, he also changed the preceding conjunction *and* to *now*. For another example where Joseph deleted "it came to pass that" and also edited a preceding *and* to *now* (or perhaps to *and now*), see the discussion under Alma 14:5–6. The critical text will, of course, restore the original "and it came to pass that" here in Alma 24:21. For further discussion of the occasional removal of "it came to pass" from the text, see under COME TO PASS in volume 3.

Summary: In Alma 24:21 replace Joseph Smith's *now* with the original sentence-initial conjunction *and;* also restore the original "it came to pass that" clause.

■ **Alma 24:23**

but that they would [*lay* >js *lie* 1 | *lay* A | *lie* BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *down and perish*
and praised God even in the very act of perishing under the sword

In the original text, this passage uses the verb *lay* where prescriptive grammar mandates *lie.* Joseph Smith, in his editing for the 1837 edition, substituted *lie* for *lay,* but the critical text will restore the original *lay.* As discussed under 2 Nephi 9:7, modern English speakers frequently use the historically transitive *lay* in place of the intransitive *lie.* Another instance of this is found in the original text for Omni 1:30: "and I am about to **lay** down in my grave". Also see the discussion under LAY in volume 3.

Summary: Restore the original *lay* in Alma 24:23; such usage is common in English.

■ **Alma 24:23**

now when the Lamanites saw that their brethren would not flee from the sword
neither would they turn aside to the right hand or to the left
but that they would lay down and perish
[01|, ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
and **praised** *God even in the very act of perishing under the sword*

One may wonder here if there isn't some error involving the conjoined predicate "and praised God". What we expect is something like "but that they would lay down and perish and **praise** God even in the very act of perishing under the sword". The original manuscript is extant here for "and praised God", but one could conjecture that Oliver Cowdery, the scribe here in 𝓞, might have misinterpreted "and praise God" as "and praised God" since it would be hard to distinguish between the two given the tendency in normal speech to omit the voiced /d/ between the two voiced sounds /z/ and /g/; that is, *praised God* would tend to be pronounced as if it were *praise God,* thus leading the scribe to misinterpret *praise God* /preiz gɑd/ as *praised God* /preizd gɑd/.

Another possibility is that there was a missing subject pronoun *they* here in Alma 24:23; that is, the original text may have read "and **they** praised God even in the very act of perishing under the sword". For evidence that the scribes occasionally deleted the subject pronoun *they,* see the list of examples under 2 Nephi 27:6.

Of course, if "and they praised God" is a possible reading, then "and praised God", the earliest reading, is also possible. Basically what we have is the conjoining of two full predicates after the subject *they:* "would lay down and perish" and "praised God". In fact, the 1830 typesetter interpreted the text in this way since he placed a comma after *perish* but not after *lay down,* thus separating "would lay down and perish" from "and praised God":

> Alma 24:23 (1830 accidentals)
> but that they would lay down and perish,
> and praised God even in the very act of perishing under the sword;

All subsequent editions have continued with this distinguishing use of the comma.

There appear to be no other examples in the text of this kind of conjunctive structure. Even so, since this ellipted reading will work, the critical text will maintain it, although the possibility remains that there is some primitive error here (perhaps the subject pronoun *they* was lost or an extra *d* was added to the verb *praise*).

Summary: Retain in Alma 24:23 the earliest reading (in 𝓞) of "but that they would lay down and perish and **praised** God even in the very act of perishing under the sword"; this reading will work but may nonetheless be the result of a primitive error in the text.

■ **Alma 24:24**

for they repented of the [*thing* 1|*things* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
which they had done

The original manuscript is not extant here. The printer's manuscript reads *thing* at the end of the line. Oliver Cowdery ended the final *g* with a downward swirl that could mistakenly be interpreted

as an *s,* which is apparently what the 1830 compositor did when he set the type from 𝓟 and replaced the singular *thing* with the plural *things.* The use of the singular is perfectly correct here: the text is referring to how the Lamanites had been killing their defenseless fellow Lamanites.

Elsewhere in the text we have two occurrences of the same basic phraseology, with the singular *thing* in "the thing which X has/had done":

> 1 Nephi 18:20
>> wherefore when they saw that
>> they were about to be swallowed up in the depths of the sea
>> they repented of **the thing which they had done**
>> insomuch that they loosed me

> Mosiah 4:22
>> and if ye judge the man
>> who putteth up his petition to you for your substance that he perish not
>> and condemn him
>> how much more just will be your condemnation
>> for withholding your substance
>> which doth not belong to you but to God
>> to whom also your life belongeth
>> and yet ye put up no petition
>> or repenteth not of **the thing which thou hast done**

And in both these cases a single continuous act is involved: in the first case, the rebellion of Laman and Lemuel and others on the open sea; and in the second, refusing to help the poor petitioner.

These examples do not mean that there are no examples of "the **things** which X has/had done". In contrast to the three original examples with the singular *thing,* there are two with the plural *things:*

> 1 Nephi 3:14
>> but Laman fled out of his presence
>> and told **the things which Laban had done** unto us

> Alma 17:39
>> and they were carried in unto the king
>> for a testimony of **the things which they had done**

These contrasting examples simply mean that in each case we follow the earliest textual sources in determining whether the text should read *thing* or *things.* The critical text will therefore restore the original *thing* in Alma 24:24.

There is one more example that shows the 1830 typesetter replacing *thing* with the plural *things:*

> 1 Nephi 15:11 (also as an initial error by Oliver Cowdery in 𝓟)
>> do ye not remember
>> the [*thing* 0 | *things* >% *thing* 1 | *things* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
>> which the Lord hath said

Summary: Restore the singular *thing* in Alma 24:24 since the Lamanites are repenting of their single collective act of murdering the defenseless converted Lamanites.

■ **Alma 24:25**

for they were [*sorrow* >− *stung* 0 | *stung* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
for the murders which they had committed

The usage with *stung* seems rather odd in modern English, which led Oliver Cowdery to start to write the word *sorrowful* in ⊙. He caught his error as he was writing the *w* of *sorrowful,* crossed out the part he had written *(sorrow),* and supralinearly inserted *stung.* The supralinear *stung* is written with weaker ink flow; perhaps as Oliver wrote the insertion, he held the quill at a different angle, which restricted the flow of ink. In any event, his correction is immediate. The original text undoubtedly read *stung* here.

There are no other examples of the past participle *stung* in the Book of Mormon, nor are there any in the King James Bible. Nonetheless, this metaphorical use of the verb *sting* can be found in English, including the following semantically relevant example (with spelling regularized) listed under *stung* in the Oxford English Dictionary (here the past participial form is *stunged* rather than *stung*):

> Gervase Markham (1609)
> My **well-stunged** conscience urged me to repent.

The OED definition reads "wounded or hurt by a sting, literally and figuratively". Obviously, the use is figurative here in Alma 24:25.

Summary: Accept in Alma 24:25 the unique occurrence of the past participle *stung:* "for they were stung for the murders which they had committed".

■ **Alma 24:26**

and it came to pass that the people of God were joined
[NULL > *that day* 0 | *that day* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *by more than the number*
which had been slain

The adverbial phrase *that day* was initially omitted by Oliver Cowdery as he took down Joseph Smith's dictation. His correction in ⊙ appears to have been virtually immediate since there is no change in the level of ink flow for the supralinear *that day.* There would have been no motivation for Oliver to have emended the text here since the sentence reads perfectly well without specifying *that day* (from the larger context it is obvious that the conversion of these Lamanites took place on the same day).

Summary: Maintain in Alma 24:26 the adverbial phrase *that day,* the corrected reading in ⊙.

■ **Alma 24:26–27**

and those which had been slain **were** *righteous people*
therefore we **have** *no reason to doubt*
but what they [*are* 01ABCDEGHKPS | *were* FIJLMNOQRT] *saved*
and there **was** *not a wicked man slain among them*
but there **were** *more than a thousand brought to the knowledge of the truth*

Although the surrounding passage is in the past tense, there is one sentence in the present tense ("therefore we **have** no reason to doubt but what they **are** saved", at least originally). Since salvation is an eternal state, there is nothing wrong with the present-tense *are* in this passage. In fact, the change in the 1852 LDS edition of *are* to *were* may not have involved conscious editing: the following past-tense forms, *was* and *were,* may have led the 1852 compositor to accidentally replace the *are* in "but what they **are** saved" with *were.*

A similar case where the present tense "are saved" is used to refer to converted souls that have since died is found in Alma 5:9–10. In this case, Alma is talking about the people that his father had converted among the people of king Noah. Since at the time of this discourse Alma's father is dead, as well as presumably a good many, if not all, of the people he converted, Alma is speaking about the souls of the deceased and yet he refers to the salvation of their souls in the present tense:

Alma 5:9–10
and again I ask :
was the bands of death broken
and the chains of hell which encircled them about
were they loosed
I say unto you :
yea they **were** loosed
and their souls **did** expand
and they **did** sing redeeming love
and I say unto you that they **are** saved
and now I ask of you :
on what conditions **are** they saved

Thus the present-tense usage referring to the saved souls of the deceased is perfectly acceptable; the critical text will restore the original present-tense *are* in Alma 24:26.

Summary: Restore the original present-tense *are* in Alma 24:26: "therefore we have no reason to doubt but what they **are** saved".

■ **Alma 24:28**

now the [*largest* >% *greatest* 0 | *greatest* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *number*
of those of the Lamanites which slew so many of their brethren
were Amlicites and Amulonites
the **greatest** *number of whom were after the order of the Nehors*

In this passage there are two instances of "the greatest number". In the first case, Oliver Cowdery initially wrote "the largest" in ℧; then he erased *largest,* overwrote it with *great,* and continued

inline with the superlative ending *est*. Clearly, the correction was immediate. Since either reading is possible, the corrected reading is undoubtedly the original reading.

In general, the text allows for *number* to be modified by the adjective *large* but only in its uninflected form; on the other hand, *number* can be modified by the adjective *great* in its comparative and superlative forms as well as in its uninflected base form:

"a great number"	5 times
"an exceeding great number"	1 time
"the greater number"	2 times
"the greatest number"	3 times
"a large number"	3 times
"the larger number"	0 times
"the largest number"	0 times

The critical text will therefore maintain the two occurrences of "the greatest number" in Alma 24:28.

Summary: Accept in Alma 24:28 Oliver Cowdery's immediately corrected reading in 𝓞 of "the greatest number"; here Oliver initially wrote "the largest number", a reading that is unsupported by usage elsewhere in the text.

■ **Alma 24:29**

there were none which were Amlicites or Amulonites
or which were [after 0 | of 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] the order of Nehor

Here Oliver Cowdery accidentally replaced the *after* (the reading in the original manuscript) with *of* as he copied from 𝓞 into 𝓟. Elsewhere in the text, we have the phraseology "to be **after** the order of X", never "to be **of** the order of X":

Alma 2:1	he being **after** the order of the man that slew Gideon by the sword
Alma 13:1	which was **after** the order of his Son
Alma 13:7	this high priesthood being **after** the order of his Son
Alma 14:16	now this judge was **after** the order and faith of Nehor
Alma 21:4	for many of the Amlicites and the Amulonites were **after** the order of the Nehors
Alma 24:28	the greatest number of whom were **after** the order of the Nehors

Moreover, the expression "to be after the order of X" is prominent in the epistle to the Hebrews in the King James Bible, especially in the phrase "after the order of Melchizedek" (which occurs six times). The critical text will restore the correct *after* here in Alma 24:29.

Summary: Restore the original preposition *after* in Alma 24:29: "or which were **after** the order of Nehor"; this usage is consistent with all other occurrences in the Book of Mormon text of the phraseology "to be **after** the order of X".

■ **Alma 24:30**

and thus we can plainly discern that
after **a people** [*has* >js *have* 1 | *has* A | *have* BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *been once enlightened*
     by the Spirit of God
and [*hath* >js *have* 1 | *hath* A | *have* BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *had great knowledge of things*
     pertaining to righteousness
and then **have** *fallen away into sin and transgression*
they become more hardened

Here the original text starts out treating *a people* as a singular since its associated verb form is the third person singular *has* ("after a people **has** been once enlightened"), while the following con-joined predicate begins with *hath* ("and **hath** had great knowledge"). Historically the third person singular form *hath* is equivalent to *has;* but in the Book of Mormon text, *hath* can be used in the plural as well as in the singular (as for instance in the original text for 1 Nephi 16:38: "and also that angels **hath** ministered unto him"). And here in Alma 24:30, the third conjoined predicate has *have*, the third person plural form in standard English. So in this passage, the earliest text starts out with *has* (the modern third person singular form), followed by the biblically styled *hath* (which can be interpreted as either singular or plural), and then ends with *have* (the third person plural form). In his editing for the 1837 edition, Joseph Smith made the passage read consistently and unambiguously in the plural by editing the *has* and the *hath* to *have*. The critical text will, of course, restore the original verb forms, despite the variety.

Elsewhere the text can treat *people* as either a singular or a plural, as in the following two contrastive passages involving *this people:*

> Alma 30:24–25 (singular *is*)
> ye say that this people **is** a free people . . .
> ye say that this people **is** a guilty and a fallen people
>
> Helaman 15:3 (plural *are*)
> yea woe unto this people which **are** called the people of Nephi

Unlike these passages, the passage in Alma 24:30 is mixed in its usage since it allows both singular and plural verb forms for *a people*. For further discussion of this issue, see under INFLECTIONAL ENDINGS in volume 3.

Summary: Restore in Alma 24:30 the original mixed use of the verb forms *has, hath,* and *have* for the subject noun phrase *a people* ("after a people **has** been once enlightened . . . and **hath** had great knowledge . . . and then **have** fallen away").

■ **Alma 24:30**

and thus their [*state* 1BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST | *estate* A] *becometh worse*
than as though they had never known these things

The 1830 typesetter accidentally misplaced *state* with *estate*, the historical equivalent of *state* with the meaning 'condition'. The word *estate* has had a long history in the English language, being

borrowed into English from Old French in the 1200s (see the citations under *estate* in the Oxford English Dictionary). There are no instances of *estate* in the actual Book of Mormon text, although it occurs fairly frequently in the King James Bible with the meaning 'state or condition', as in Luke 1:48: "for he hath regarded the low **estate** of his handmaiden". (The New International Version, dating from 1978, translates this sentence as "for he has been mindful of the humble **state** of his servant".) Here in Alma 24:30, the 1837 edition restored the original *state*.

Summary: Maintain in Alma 24:30 the noun *state*, which was mistakenly set as *estate* in the 1830 edition.

■ **Alma 24:30**

and thus their state becometh worse
than [*as tho* 0 | *as tho* >js *if* 1 | *as though* A | *though* BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
they had never known these things

In his editing for the 1837 edition, marked in the printer's manuscript, Joseph Smith changed the original conjunctive phrase *than as though* to *than if*. Ultimately, the 1837 edition and all subsequent editions read *than though*—that is, the *as* has been deleted.

It is quite possible that the use of *than though* in the current LDS and RLDS texts is simply an error that originated in the 1837 edition. Elsewhere in the text there are examples of *as though* without any preceding *than* (17 times). In addition, there are 51 occurrences of *as if,* but none of these have a preceding *than.* There are no occurrences of *than if* (Joseph Smith's manuscript emendation in Alma 24:30), although there is an occurrence of this usage in a revelation that Joseph received near the end of the printing of the first edition of the Book of Mormon (in March 1830):

> Book of Commandments 16:41–42 (Doctrine and Covenants 19:38)
> pray always and I will pour out my Spirit upon you
> and great shall be your blessing
> yea even more **than if** you should obtain treasures of earth
>   and corruptibleness to the extent thereof

Finally, we should note that there is nothing really wrong with the original *than as though* here in Alma 24:30, the extant reading in 𝒪 and copied as such into 𝒫 and into the 1830 edition. According to *Literature Online* <lion.chadwyck.com>, there is evidence for this usage in the 1800s (at least):

> Paul Creyton (1849)
> without appearing to notice Gordon or Gustavus,
> more **than as though** they had not been there, he advanced

> Alice Cary (1867)
> to make her less satisfied and at ease with herself
> **than as though** no confidence existed at all

Summary: Restore in Alma 24:30 *than as though,* the reading of the earliest textual sources (the two manuscripts and the 1830 edition); examples of this complex conjunctive phrase can be found in the English of the 1800s (at least).

Alma 25

■ **Alma 25:1**

and behold now it came to pass that
[*these* 0 | *those* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *Lamanites were more angry*
because they had slain their brethren

Here Oliver Cowdery accidentally replaced *these* with *those* as he copied from 𝒪 into 𝒫. Either reading is, of course, possible. The critical text will restore the original *these*. For a nearby example of this same error, but by the 1830 typesetter, see under Alma 24:10; there "**these** our many sins and murders" was replaced with "**those** our many sins and murders". For a more general discussion of the tendency to mix up *these* and *those,* see under Alma 3:25.

Summary: Restore the perfectly acceptable "these Lamanites" in Alma 25:1, the reading of the original manuscript.

■ **Alma 25:1**

therefore they [*sware* 0 | *swore* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *vengeance upon the Nephites*

Here the original manuscript reads *sware,* but in copying from 𝒪 to 𝒫 Oliver Cowdery replaced the archaic, biblically styled *sware* with the modern English *swore.* In this case, the printed editions have maintained the modern *swore,* but the critical text will restore the original *sware.* For a complete discussion of the tendency in the history of the text to replace *sware* with *swore,* see under Enos 1:14.

Summary: Restore the original *sware* in Alma 25:1 since this is the reading of the original manuscript.

■ **Alma 25:2–4**

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
and after that [01 |, ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
they had many battles with the Nephites
in the which they were driven and slain
and among the Lamanites which were slain were almost all the seed of Amulon and his brethren

The question here is whether *after that* is a prepositional phrase or the archaic conjunctive construction *after that* (which is equivalent to simply *after* in modern English). The 1830 typesetter

interpreted the *that* here as a pronoun since he placed a comma after it. In this instance, if we delete the *that,* we get a sentence fragment, which means that the 1830 typesetter's decision was very likely correct.

The intended meaning of this passage is that the Lamanite armies first destroyed the people in the land of Ammonihah; then there were many battles with the Nephites, the result of which was a major defeat for the Lamanites, which included the destruction of almost all the Amulonites (who had joined the Lamanites). The pronominal *that* and its accompanying comma should therefore be retained here in the standard text for Alma 25:3. For further discussion of the possible ambiguity of *after that* in the text, see under Alma 5:5.

Summary: Maintain in the standard text the comma after the prepositional phrase *after that* in Alma 25:3; here the *that* is a pronoun, not the conjunctive *that* which typically follows the subordinate conjunction *after* in the Book of Mormon text.

■ **Alma 25:4**

and among the Lamanites which were slain were
[*amost* 01 | *almost* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *all the seed of Amulon and his brethren*

Here the word form *amost* occurs in both the original and printer's manuscripts. This form may not be simply a scribal error for *almost,* but rather the dialectal *a'most,* which (according to the Oxford English Dictionary) has occurred since the 1700s. The OED, under *almost,* gives a citation from Samuel Palmer in 1710: "They had **a'most** as live be call'd anything, as to be thought too old for an agreeable conversation" (original spelling); there is also one from Walter Scott in 1816 but as *amaist,* a Scottish dialectal form: "As sair vexed **amaist** for you as for me" (equivalent to "As sore vexed almost for you as for me").

Of course, there is no reason for the standard text to use a dialectal form for *almost,* even though the two manuscripts consistently give *amost* here in Alma 25:4. Perhaps the *amost* in ○ is simply a scribal slip that Oliver Cowdery unthinkingly copied into ℗. Don Brugger suggests (personal communication) that Oliver's *amost* might have been influenced by the preceding occurrence of *among* in this verse ("and among the Lamanites which were slain"). It's also possible that in his own dialect Oliver actually pronounced *almost* as *amost.* Whatever explanation we might consider for *amost,* it should be emphasized that nowhere else in the text is there any evidence for *amost.* In all, there are 11 occurrences of *almost* in the text, of which Oliver misspells two as *allmost* (in Jacob 5:47 and the Words of Mormon 1:1). There is also one instance of *almost* spelled as *alsmost* (in Alma 26:20), a scribal slip influenced by the word *also* or by the *s* later on in *almost.*

There is evidence that Oliver Cowdery occasionally omitted the letter *l* in other words, especially when there was an adjacent consonant, as in the following examples in ℗:

PASSAGE	SPELLING SLIP IN ℗	CORRECT SPELLING
Jacob 5:20	behe**d**	behe**ld**
Alma 16:18	adu**t**ery	adu**lt**ery
Alma 43:50	**f**ed	**fl**ed
3 Nephi 8:12	whi**rw**inds	whi**rlw**inds

Most likely, the spelling *amost* in 𝒪 for Alma 25:4 was simply a scribal slip on Oliver's part. The critical text will accept the 1830 compositor's decision to set *amost* as *almost*.

Another possibility should be noted: here *amost* could be an error for the colloquial *most(ly)*. Elsewhere in the text, however, there are five occurrences of "almost all" (as here in the standard text for Alma 25:4) but none of "most all" and "mostly all".

Summary: Accept the 1830 edition's emendation of *almost* in place of *amost* (probably a scribal slip in 𝒪 for *almost*).

■ **Alma 25:6**

after having suffered [0ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST | *to* > NULL 1] *much loss and so many afflictions*

The original manuscript is extant for the relevant part here, and it reads without any *to* (or *too*) before *much* in "after having suffered much loss". But Oliver Cowdery, as he copied from 𝒪 into 𝒫, initially wrote "**too** much loss", where *too* (meaning 'also') was spelled as *to*, Oliver's consistent spelling for *too* in both manuscripts (four times in extant portions of 𝒪 and seven times in 𝒫). But here in Alma 25:6 Oliver caught his error and crossed out the intrusive *too* (spelled as *to*).

Summary: Maintain in Alma 25:6 the original reading without *too* before "much loss".

■ **Alma 25:6**

for many of them
after having suffered much loss and so many afflictions
[*they* 0A | *they* >js NULL 1 | BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *began to be stirred up in remembrance of the words which Aaron and his brethren had preached to them in their land*

Here in Alma 25:6, Joseph Smith removed the redundant *they* in his editing for the 1837 edition. The original text allowed for the pronominal repetition of an earlier subject, especially after an intervening subordinate or parenthetical clause, as in the following example:

> The Words of Mormon 1:18 (original text)
> **wherefore** with the help of these
> king Benjamin by laboring with all the might of his body
>   and the faculty of his whole soul
> and also the prophets
> **wherefore they** did once more establish peace in the land

In this case, Joseph deleted the repetitious *wherefore* as well as the redundant subject pronoun *they*. For further examples of this kind of editing, see under Jacob 1:14. In each instance, the critical text will restore the redundancy of the original text.

Summary: Restore the redundant subject pronoun *they* in Alma 25:6, thus "for many of them—after having suffered much loss and so many afflictions—**they** began to be stirred up".

■ **Alma 25:8**

now this martyrdom caused that many of their brethren should be stirred up to anger
and there began to be **contention** *in the wilderness*

One wonders here if the indefinite article *a* might be missing from before *contention*—that is, perhaps the original text read "and there began to be **a** contention in the wilderness". Elsewhere in the text, we get 11 equivalent examples of "there was **a** contention" but none of "there was contention"; in fact, in six examples (each marked below with an asterisk), the text says that "there **began** to be **a** contention":

Omni 1:28	wherefore he caused **a** contention among them
* Mosiah 19:3	and there **began** to be **a** great contention among them
* Alma 2:1	there **began** to be **a** contention among the people
Alma 22:22	and there should be **a** great contention and a disturbance among them
Alma 50:25	had it not been for **a** contention which took place among them
* Alma 50:26	therefore there **began** to be **a** warm contention between them
* Alma 51:2	for there **began** to be **a** contention among the people
* Helaman 1:2	therefore there **began** to be **a** serious contention
* Helaman 2:1	therefore there **began** to be **a** contention again among the people
Helaman 4:1	and there was also **a** contention among the people
3 Nephi 7:7	and they did cause **a** great contention in the land

For the example in Helaman 1:2, there is evidence for the omission of the *a:* namely, the 1874 RLDS edition omitted the *a,* giving "there began to be serious contention" (the 1908 RLDS edition restored the *a* to the RLDS text).

In the case of Alma 25:8, the original manuscript is not extant for "and there began to be (a) contention", but the transcript in volume 1 of the critical text shows that there must have been some supralinear correction:

Alma 25:8 (line 10, page 268′ of 𝒪)

```
(                                          )
              BEGAN  TO  BE
(                              in) the wilderness & the<%se%> Lamanites began to hunt
   & THERE <        >^ CONTENTION
```

Based on the spacing between extant fragments, it is quite possible that Oliver Cowdery, the scribe in 𝒪, initially wrote "and there **was a** contention in the wilderness", which he then corrected to "and there **began to be** contention in the wilderness". He may have intended to correct the text to "and there began to be **a** contention in the wilderness", but when he crossed out his original *was,* he may have also crossed out the *a* accidentally. It is also possible that he didn't cross out the *a* but nonetheless omitted it when he copied the text from 𝒪 into 𝒫. Obviously, we are unable to determine whether the *a* was there or not in 𝒪. But clearly, there was some scribal correction or difference that could have led to the *a* being accidentally omitted.

Ultimately, the question comes down to whether the reading without the *a* is possible in Alma 25:8. When we consider the larger context here, we find that the text is referring to a general and continuing contention in the wilderness, not a specific or limited contention:

Alma 25:7–9 (earliest extant text)
>   and it came to pass that those rulers
>   which were the remnant of the children of Amulon
>   caused that they should be put to death
>   yea all those that believed in these things
>   now this martyrdom caused that
>   many of their brethren should be stirred up to anger
>   and **there began to be contention** in the wilderness
>   and the Lamanites began to hunt the seed of Amulon and his brethren
>   and began to slay them
>   and they fled into the east wilderness
>   and behold they are hunted at this day by the Lamanites

Thus the context suggests that *contention* alone, without any indefinite article *a,* is possible in Alma 25:8. For this reason, the critical text will retain the earliest extant reading for Alma 25:8: "and there began to be contention in the wilderness". But the possibility remains that an original indefinite article *a* was accidentally omitted here in the early transmission of the text.

Summary: Maintain in Alma 25:8 the earliest extant reading: "and there began to be contention in the wilderness"; nonetheless, there is a possibility that the original text read "and there began to be **a** contention in the wilderness".

■ **Alma 25:8**

and [*these >% the* 0|*the* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *Lamanites began to hunt the seed of Amulon and his brethren*

Here in the original manuscript, Oliver Cowdery initially wrote "and **these** Lamanites began to hunt the seed of Amulon". This reading is possible since the immediately preceding text states that not all the Lamanites were involved, only many of them:

Alma 25:8 (initial text in 𝓞)
>   now this martyrdom caused that
>   **many of their brethren** should be stirred up to anger
>   and there began to be contention in the wilderness
>   and **these Lamanites** began to hunt the seed of Amulon and his brethren
>   and began to slay them

Nonetheless, *the* rather than *these* is undoubtedly correct since Oliver immediately corrected the *these* in 𝓞 to *the* by erasing the final *se*.

Summary: Maintain in Alma 25:8 the use of *the* in "and **the** Lamanites began to hunt the seed of Amulon and his brethren".

■ **Alma 25:9**

thus the [*word >+ words* 1 | *words* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *of Abinadi*
[*was* 0A | *was >*js *were* 1 | *were* BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *brought to pass . . .*

In the printer's manuscript, Oliver Cowdery initially wrote the singular *word;* then later (with somewhat heavier ink flow) he inserted the plural *s* at the end of *word*. The original manuscript is not extant here, but Oliver was probably correcting to the reading of the original manuscript. He may have initially written the singular *word* because of the following singular *was* ("the **word** of Abinadi **was** brought to pass"). Even so, it should be emphasized here that one cannot use the occurrence of the singular verb *was* in the original manuscript as evidence for the singular subject *word* since the plural noun *words* frequently took a singular verb in the original Book of Mormon text; in fact, in two cases (each marked below with an asterisk) there is a postmodifying prepositional phrase "of X", just like here in Alma 25:9:

*	1 Nephi 19:24	the **words** of the prophet which **was** written . . .
	Alma 5:11	the **words** which **was** delivered by the mouth of Abinadi
*	Alma 9 preface	The **words** of Alma and also the **words** of Amulek which **was** declared unto the people . . .
	Alma 12:2	now the **words** that Alma spake unto Zeezrom **was** heard by the people round about
	Helaman 8:13	and also the **words** which **was** spoken by this man Moses
	3 Nephi 1:5	the time was past for the **words** to be fulfilled which **was** spoken by Samuel the Lamanite
	3 Nephi 1:15	the **words** which came unto Nephi **was** fulfilled
	Ether 5:1	the **words** which **was** commanded me
	Moroni 10:27	did I not declare my **words** unto you which **was** written by this man

And in one of these cases, Oliver Cowdery made the same initial mistake that he apparently made here in Alma 25:9:

> 3 Nephi 1:15
>
> and it came to pass that
> the [*word > words* 1 | *words* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] which came unto Nephi
> [*was* 1A | *were* BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] fulfilled

𝒪 is not extant in this case either. But for this part of the text (from Helaman 13 through the end of Mormon), both 𝒫 and the 1830 edition are firsthand copies of 𝒪; and in this case, the 1830 edition reads "words . . . was", while in the printer's manuscript Oliver initially wrote "word . . . was" but then virtually immediately inserted the plural *s* at the end of *word* (there is no change in the level of ink flow), giving "words . . . was" (the same as the 1830 reading).

In virtually every instance the Book of Mormon text refers to Abinadi's word(s) in the plural (25 times, including here in Alma 25:9). Only in one passage is the singular *word* used to refer to Abinadi's message:

> Mosiah 17:11
>
> and now king Noah was about to release him for he feared his **word**

The original manuscript is not extant for any of the book of Mosiah, so we cannot be sure if the singular is correct in Mosiah 17:11. In fact, the preceding verse uses the plural:

Mosiah 17:10
yea and I will suffer even unto death
and I will not recall my **words**
and **they** shall stand as a testimony against you

The critical text nonetheless accepts the singular *word* in Mosiah 17:11 since either *word* or *words* can be used in such contexts. Consider, for instance, the following variation with respect to Alma's word(s):

Mosiah 18:3   and as many as would hear his **word** he did teach
Mosiah 18:3   and many did believe his **words**
Mosiah 18:6   as many as believed him went thither to hear his **words**
Mosiah 18:7   there were a goodly number gathered together
                      to the place of Mormon to hear the **words** of Alma
Mosiah 18:7   all were gathered together that believed on his **word** to hear him

Thus the singular or plural usage is quite possible; so in each instance we let the earliest textual sources determine which number, singular or plural, is correct for *word*. Here in Alma 25:9, we accept the plural *words* and the singular *was*.

Summary: Accept in Alma 25:9 Oliver Cowdery's corrected reading in the printer's manuscript (namely, the plural *words*); also restore the original singular verb form *was*, despite its ungrammaticality in standard English ("thus the **words** of Abinadi **was** brought to pass").

■ **Alma 25:11–12**

now this is what he meant
that many should suffer death by fire
according as he had suffered
and he said unto the priests of Noah
that their seed should cause many
to [suffer >+ be put to 0 | be put to 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] death
in the like manner as he was

Here in verse 12, Oliver Cowdery initially wrote "to suffer death" in 𝒪, but he soon corrected the text by crossing out *suffer* and supralinearly inserting *be put to* (the correction is written with slightly heavier ink flow, probably the result of Oliver redipping his quill). Oliver's error here was very likely the result of him having just written down four instances of the verb *suffer*—and all in reference to death:

Alma 25:9–11
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
for he said unto them
what ye shall do unto me shall be a type of things to come

> 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**

Thus Oliver's initial error in verse 12 of writing "their seed should cause many to **suffer death**" is virtually expected. Moreover, there would have been no motivation for either Oliver or Joseph to have consciously emended the text here to read "their seed should cause many to **be put to** death". Either reading is theoretically possible since elsewhere in the text there are 13 occurrences of "to suffer death" and 21 of "to put to death". The critical text will therefore accept the corrected reading in 𝕆: "their seed should cause many to **be put to** death".

Stan Larson, on page 246 of his master's thesis, *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, 1974), argues that the correction here in Alma 25:12 represents Joseph Smith deliberating "over how to express an idea" and that since both phrases "convey essentially the same thought", Joseph decided to emend his original reading. In actuality, there is very little if any evidence in the original manuscript for stylistic emendation on Joseph's part, although there is some evidence that in the original manuscript Oliver Cowdery occasionally emended the text, especially in places where other scribes had taken down Joseph's original dictation. Yet Oliver always edited towards expected phraseology (see, for instance, the discussion and examples under 1 Nephi 20:11); there is no evidence that Oliver ever attempted to create variety with his editing. Overall, the evidence argues that Joseph read off a fully prepared English-language text to his scribes and that he did not emend it as he dictated the text. Nor is there any independent evidence that scribes and editors consciously emended the text simply to avoid overuse of the same word.

Summary: Accept in Alma 25:12 the corrected reading in 𝕆: "that their seed should cause many to **be put to** death"; Oliver Cowdery initially wrote "that their seed should cause many to **suffer** death", mainly because the preceding text in verses 9–11 uses the verb *suffer* four times in referring to death.

■ **Alma 25:13**

> *and it came to pass that when the Lamanites saw*
> *that they could not overpower the Nephites*
> *they [returneth > returned 0 | returned 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] again to their own land*

Here in the original manuscript, Oliver Cowdery initially wrote the present-tense *returneth* ("they returneth again to their own land"), but he immediately caught his error and overwrote the *th* with a *d* (the original crossing for the *t* in the *-eth* ending is incomplete, which seems to indicate that the correction to the *d* was immediate). In any event, we end up with the obviously correct past-tense reading "they **returned** again to their own land".

Summary: Accept in Alma 25:13 the past-tense *returned* (the immediately corrected reading in 𝕆) instead of the present-tense *returneth*.

■ **Alma 25:14**

and they did also bury their weapons of war
according as their brethren [NULL >+ *had* 0 | *had* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]

Here Oliver Cowdery initially wrote "according as their brethren", a clausal fragment. Later, with somewhat heavier ink flow, Oliver supralinearly inserted the auxiliary verb *had.* This correction may have occurred when Oliver read the text back to Joseph Smith. There is clearly a need for some verbal element here. Another possibility would have been to insert *did* rather than *had*.

Elsewhere there are 20 examples of "according as" in the text, and each instance is followed by a subject and a predicate. Seven of these examples take the past-tense perfect auxiliary *had:*

Omni 1:13	according as the Lord **had commanded** him
Alma 8:1	according as he **had** before **done** in the land of Zarahemla
Alma 19:7	according as the queen **had desired** him
Alma 25:11	according as he **had suffered**
Helaman 9:37	even according as Nephi **had said** unto them
3 Nephi 1:15	according as they **had been spoken**
Ether 2:21	according as the Lord **had commanded**

There are no examples of "according as" where the auxiliary verb is *do,* so odds are the inserted *had* here in Alma 25:14 is correct. Note by the way that the ellipsis after the auxiliary verb seems appropriate; it would seem odd, although not impossible, for the text to repeat the language of the immediately preceding text:

> Alma 25:14 (with ellipted words supplied)
>   and they did also bury their weapons of war
>   according as their brethren had **buried their weapons of war**

The corrected reading in 𝙊 probably represents the original text. Some kind of auxiliary verb is needed here, while ellipsis of the rest of the predicate is expected. Of the possible auxiliary verbs, *had* seems to be the most plausible.

Summary: Accept in Alma 25:14 Oliver Cowdery's corrected reading in 𝙊: "and they did also bury their weapons of war according as their brethren **had**".

■ **Alma 25:15**

for it was expedient that they should keep the law of Moses as yet
for it [*were* >+ *was* 0 | *was* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *not all fulfilled*

Here in the original manuscript, Oliver Cowdery initially wrote "for it **were** not all fulfilled". Virtually immediately he supralinearly inserted *was* (there is no difference in the level of ink flow for the *was*); then he seems to have redipped his quill just before crossing out the *were* and writing the insert mark (both the crossout and the insert mark were written with heavier ink flow).

Normally, the text prefers "for it was", with 17 occurrences elsewhere. On the other hand, "for it were" does occur twice; and in each case, *were* is immediately followed by *not* (just like here in Alma 25:15):

Mosiah 1:4

for it **were not** possible

that our father Lehi could have remembered all these things

3 Nephi 7:18

for it **were not** possible that they could disbelieve his words

Nonetheless, these two instances read "for it were not **possible** that . . .”; the reference to possibility allows for the subjunctive *were*, while in Alma 25:15 the indicative is appropriate for the factual "for it was not all fulfilled". In any case, the use of the correcting *was* seems to be fully intended, especially since it appears to be a virtually immediate correction. The critical text will follow the corrected text here in ℗, "for it **was** not all fulfilled".

Summary: Accept in Alma 25:15 the corrected reading in ℗ ("for it **was** not all fulfilled"); in this instance, Oliver Cowdery replaced his initial *were* with *was*.

■ **Alma 25:15–16**

(1) *yea and they did keep the law of* **Moses**
(2) *for it was expedient that they should keep the law of* **Moses** *as yet*
    for it was not all fulfilled
(3) *but notwithstanding the law of* **Moses**
    they did look forward to the coming of Christ
(4) *considering that the law of* [*Mose >– Moses* 0 | *Moses* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
    was a type of his coming
    and believing that they must keep those outward performances
    until the time that he should be revealed unto them
(5) *now they did not suppose that salvation came by the law of* **Moses**
(6) *but the law of* [*Mose >– Moses* 0 | *Moses* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *did serve*
    to strengthen their faith in Christ

We see in this passage that the name *Moses* occurs six times, of which three are extant in ℗ (numbers 3, 4, and 6). Two of those extant instances were initially spelled *Mose* in ℗, then corrected to *Moses* by inserting the *s* at the end of *Mose;* in both cases the *s* is inserted inline with weak ink flow. In several other passages, Oliver Cowdery wrote *Moses* as *Mose;* in all cases but one, Oliver eventually inserted the final *s* in the manuscript:

Jacob 7:7

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 [*Mose > Moses* 1 | *Moses* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]

into the worship of a being

which ye say shall come many hundred years hence

[initial *Mose* in ℘, with the *s* immediately supplied inline without
any change in ink flow]

Alma 30:3

> 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 [*Mose >+ Moses* 0 | *Moses* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
> until it should be fulfilled

> > [initial *Mose* in 𝓞, with the *s* inserted inline with slightly heavier ink]

Alma 34:7

> and also he hath appealed
> unto [*Mese > Mose > Moses* 0 | *Mose > Moses* 1 | *Moses* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
> to prove that these things are true

> > [initial *Mose* in both 𝓞 and 𝓟, with the *s* inserted inline in 𝓞
> > and inserted supralinearly above *Mose* at the end of the line in 𝓟,
> > both times without any change in ink flow]

3 Nephi 9:17

> and in me is the law
> of [*Mose* 1 | *Moses* ABCEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST | *Moscs* D] fulfilled

> > [*Mose* in 𝓟, left uncorrected]

The obvious explanation here is that Oliver Cowdery had a problem with the name *Moses:* he tended to omit the final *s.* Overall in the text, there are 75 occurrences of *Moses,* of which 43 are in the phrase "the law of Moses". We get the following statistics for how many times each scribe omitted the final *s* in *Moses:*

	EXTANT IN 𝓞	IN 𝓟
Oliver Cowdery	4 out of 21	3 out of 69
scribe 2 of 𝓞	0 out of 1	\<not applicable\>
scribe 3 of 𝓞	0 out of 1	\<not applicable\>
scribe 2 of 𝓟	\<not applicable\>	0 out of 6

Oliver seems to be the only one with this problem: he miswrote *Moses* as *Mose* in 7 out of 90 extant instances. The other scribes never made this error; in 8 instances they consistently wrote *Moses.* This difference, however, is not statistically significant since 8 is such a low number; if the other scribes miswrote *Mose* as frequently as Oliver did, we would have the following probabilities of getting *Mose* x times out of 8 cases:

x = 0	0.523
x = 1	0.353
x = 2	0.104
x = 3 or more	0.020

So actually zero would be the most probable number of times that the other scribes would have misspelled *Moses* as *Mose,* providing their error rate was the same as Oliver Cowdery's estimated error rate (here based on 𝓟 plus all the extant examples from 𝓞).

A less plausible explanation is that the spelling *Mose* actually represents the Hebrew name for *Moses:* namely, /moše/, which is how the name reads in the Hebrew. One could argue that the original plates actually read *Mose* instead of *Moses* for some, if not all, of the 75 cases and that Joseph Smith dictated *Mose* rather than the expected *Moses* (at least sometimes), with Oliver Cowdery then occasionally writing down *Mose*. One problem with this explanation for the spelling *Mose* is that there is no evidence of such Hebraistic literalism for other biblical names in the Book of Mormon text. In general, we get the standard English spelling for biblical names—never *Hava* for *Eve* or *Shalomo* for *Solomon*. In fact, one could argue that *Mose* should actually be *Moshe* if the Hebrew were really being followed. It is true, however, that in some cases biblical names are misspelled in the Book of Mormon manuscripts, but all of these appear to be the result of scribal error. There are two cases where the original spelling could be interpreted as an archaic pre-biblical spelling: *Nathareth* instead of *Nazareth* (twice in 1 Nephi 11:13) and *Ramath* instead of *Ramah* (in 2 Nephi 20:29). Yet the discussion under those passages shows that both *Nathareth* and *Ramath* are very likely scribal errors and do not represent the original Book of Mormon spellings for the names for *Nazareth* and *Ramah*.

Finally, there is one other specific word for which Oliver Cowdery tended to omit the final consonant—namely, the final *r* in *year*, giving *yea* (see the discussion under Alma 48:21 and Helaman 3:3). Apparently *Moses* was a specific word for which Oliver tended to omit the final *s*. The critical text will assume as much and will therefore accept in every case *Moses* as the intended spelling of the name, not *Mose*.

Summary: Maintain the spelling *Moses* everywhere in the text, despite Oliver Cowdery's occasional miswriting of the name as *Mose*.

■ **Alma 25:16**

and thus they did [*obtain > retain* 0 | *retain* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *a hope through faith unto eternal salvation*

Here in the original manuscript, it appears that Oliver Cowdery initially wrote something like "and thus they did **obtain** a hope through faith unto eternal salvation", although we cannot be sure that the word was *obtain* since only the end of the word is extant in 𝓞:

Alma 25:16 (lines 2–3, page 269′ of 𝓞)

```
law of Moses did serve to strengthen their (f                          )
                           AITH IN CHRIST & THUS THEY DID <   >
    retain
-<ain>^ a hope through <faath> faith unto Ete(r                         )
                           NAL SALVATION RELYING UPON THE SPIRIT
```

There is support for *obtain* as the initially written word in 𝓞 since it is found with the noun *hope* elsewhere in the text:

Jacob 2:19	and after that ye have **obtained a hope** in Christ
Jacob 4:6	and having all these witnesses we **obtain a hope**
Jacob 4:11	and having **obtained a good hope** of glory in him

Moroni 7:3   and that have **obtained a sufficient hope** by which ye can enter
                    into the rest of the Lord

Moreover, there is independent manuscript evidence that Oliver sometimes wrote *obtain* in place of *retain:*

Alma 60:24 (Oliver Cowdery's initial error in 𝔓)
    that he may support those parts of our country
    which he hath [*obtained >+ retained* 1 | *retained* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQS |
        regained RT]

There are two other possibilities for the initial error in Alma 25:16: *maintain* and *attain.* In the footnote to my transcript of 𝔒 for this passage (see volume 1 of the critical text), I suggested that Oliver initially wrote *maintain* in this passage. Ultimately, of course, the reading of the original text is *retain,* the corrected reading in 𝔒, not whatever Oliver initially wrote in 𝔒.

Summary: Maintain in Alma 25:16 the corrected reading in 𝔒: "and thus they did **retain** a hope through faith unto eternal salvation".

Alma 26

■ **Alma 26:1**

and now [NULL >+ *these are* 0 | *these are* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *the words of Ammon*
   to his brethren
which saith thus : my brothers and my brethren behold I say unto you . . .

Here in the original manuscript, Oliver Cowdery initially wrote "and now the words of Ammon";
later, with somewhat heavier ink flow, he supralinearly inserted *these are,* giving "and now these
are the words of Ammon". Oliver may have corrected the text here when he read it back to Joseph
Smith. There are three other examples where the text uses "and now these are the words" to intro-
duce an immediately following quotation:

> 2 Nephi 6:6
>   and now these are the words :
>   thus saith the Lord God
>   behold I will lift up mine hand to the Gentiles . . .

> Alma 57:30
>   and now these are the words which Gid said unto me :
>   behold we did start to go down to the land of Zarahemla with our prisoners . . .

> 3 Nephi 11:24−25
>   and now behold these are the words which ye shall say
>   calling them by name saying :
>   having authority given me of Jesus Christ I baptize you . . .

Although there are two instances of "and now the words", neither one introduces an immediately
following quotation:

> 2 Nephi 6:5   and now the words which I shall read are they which Isaiah spake
> Alma 9:34   and now the words of Amulek are not all written

The use of *these are* in Alma 26:1 is undoubtedly correct.

Summary: Accept in Alma 26:1 the corrected reading in ℴ, "and now **these are** the words of Ammon
to his brethren".

■ **Alma 26:1**

and now these are the words of Ammon to his brethren
[*which* 0ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST | *which* >js *which* 1] *saith thus . . .*

Here, as Joseph Smith was editing 𝒫 for the 1837 edition, he initially thought to grammatically emend *which* to *who*. He first crossed out the *which* but then realized that the *which* refers to *the words* rather than to the closer nouns *Ammon* or *his brethren*. Since the *which* does not refer to persons, Joseph restored the original *which* in 𝒫, thus effecting no change at all. The critical text will, of course, maintain the *which* here—even if it referred to persons. For another example of Joseph's false starts in editing *which*'s to *who*'s, see under Alma 24:13. For a complete discussion of the editing of *which* to *who* (or the lack of it), see under WHICH in volume 3.

Summary: Maintain *which* in Alma 26:1 and elsewhere in the text whenever the earliest textual sources read *which*.

■ **Alma 26:5**

behold the field [*was* 0ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST | *is* >+ *was* 1] *ripe*
and blessed are ye
for ye did thrust in the sickle and did reap with your mights
yea all the day long did ye labor

The original manuscript is extant here and reads in the past tense for the clause "behold the field **was** ripe". When copying from 𝒪 into 𝒫, Oliver Cowdery initially replaced the past-tense *was* with the present-tense *is,* but later (perhaps when proofing 𝒫 against 𝒪) he corrected the *is* to *was* (the level of ink flow is heavier for the supralinearly inserted *was*). Clearly, *was* is correct: 𝒪 reads that way. Moreover, the rest of passage refers to the missionary harvest in the past tense ("for ye **did** thrust in the sickle and **did** reap with your mights / yea all the day long **did** ye labor"); thus "the field **was** ripe" is wholly appropriate.

Oliver Cowdery's error may have been influenced by the immediately following present-tense verb form *are* in "and blessed are ye". Another possible influence is the present-tense use of *is* in the sentence "(for) behold the field **is** white already to harvest". This sentence appears in a number of revelations that Joseph Smith received for various individuals, including Oliver Cowdery, during the translation period (in the first half of 1829):

DATE	RECIPIENT	BOOK OF COMMANDMENTS (DOCTRINE & COVENANTS)
February 1829	Joseph Smith Senior	3:1 (4:4)
April 1829	Oliver Cowdery	5:2 (6:3)
May 1829	Hyrum Smith	10:2 (11:3)
May 1829	Joseph Knight Senior	11:2 (12:3)
June 1829	David Whitmer	12:2 (14:3)

The book of Alma was copied from 𝒪 into 𝒫 during the fall of 1829. Oliver was undoubtedly quite familiar with the language of his own personal revelation, which may therefore explain why he

initially wrote "behold the field **is** ripe" in 𝒫 rather than the correct "behold the field **was** ripe". David Calabro also points out (personal communication) that the present tense is also found in the parallel language of John 4:35: "and look on the fields / for they **are** white already to harvest", although here the present-tense form is the plural *are* rather than the singular *is*.

Summary: Accept in Alma 26:5 the past-tense *was* in "behold the field **was** ripe", the extant reading in 𝒪 and the corrected reading in 𝒫.

■ **Alma 26:5**

for ye did thrust in the sickle
and did reap with your [*mights* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQS | *might* RT]

As discussed under Jacob 1:19, the critical text will restore all original instances of the plural *mights*.

■ **Alma 26:11**

I do not boast
in my own strength [*or* 01ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQS | *nor* RT] *in my own wisdom*

Here the 1920 LDS edition edited the connective *or* to *nor*. Such editing is not required since either reading is possible in standard English. Note, in particular, the following similar instances of "not . . . or" elsewhere in the text, instances that have never been edited to "not . . . nor"; in each case, the *or* conjoins two phrases that are both within the scope of negation of the earlier *not:*

> Mosiah 2:10 (conjunction of two *that*-clauses)
> I have **not** commanded you to come up hither
> that ye should fear me **or** that ye should think that I of myself am more
>   than a mortal man

> Mosiah 12:15 (conjunction of two nonfinite predicates)
> we shall **not**
> come into bondage **or** be taken captive by our enemies

> Alma 19:24 (conjunction of two noun phrases)
> and they durst **not** put forth their hands to touch
> him **or** any of those which had fallen

> Alma 55:19 (conjunction of two nouns)
> he did **not** delight
> in murder **or** bloodshed

In Alma 26:11, two prepositional phrases are conjoined by the *or* and are both within the scope of negation of the *not:* "I do **not** boast in my own strength **or** in my own wisdom". The critical text will restore the original *or* here.

With regard to this change, Merriam Webster's Dictionary of English Usage notes (under the second item listed for *nor*) that "*nor* frequently replaces *or* in negative statements", which implies

that from a prescriptive point of view the 1920 editing is optional, not required. For further discussion of the editing of *or* to *nor* in the Book of Mormon text, see under Mosiah 2:12–13. For an overall discussion, see under NEGATION in volume 3.

Summary: Restore in Alma 26:11 the original *or* ("I do not boast in my own strength **or** in my own wisdom"); there is nothing grammatically inappropriate about the original text for this construction.

■ **Alma 26:12**

yea behold [*how* > NULL 0| 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *many mighty miracles*
we have wrought in this land

Here in the original manuscript, at the end of a line, Oliver Cowdery initially wrote *how* after *behold*. Almost immediately he caught his error and crossed out the intrusive *how* (there seems to be no change in the level of ink flow for the crossout). It appears that Oliver started to write "yea behold **how** many mighty miracles **have we** wrought in this land", where the normally expected word order would have been *have we*, not *we have*. The original manuscript is not extant for that portion of this sentence, but the printer's manuscript reads "yea behold many mighty miracles **we have** wrought in this land". The critical text will accept the reading without the *how* and with the word order *we have*.

There is a possibility that the initial occurrence of *how* here in verse 12 was in anticipation of the *how* that occurs 18 words later in the text (in verse 13); note, in particular, that the words *behold* and *many* are repeated:

Alma 26:12–13
yea **behold many** mighty miracles we have wrought in this land
for which we will praise his name forever
behold how many thousands of our brethren hath he loosed from the pains of hell

Here in this passage, Joseph Smith may have dictated too much of the text at one time, thus leading Oliver to write the *how* in anticipation of the following "behold **how** many thousands". It is also possible that Joseph himself anticipated the following *how* as he read off the text. For an example of anticipation that seems to indicate Joseph either viewing or dictating at least 20 words at a time, see under Alma 56:41.

Summary: Accept in Alma 26:12 the corrected reading in 𝓞 without the exclamatory *how* ("yea behold many mighty miracles we have wrought in this land"); the initial *how* after *behold* may be the result of anticipating the exclamatory *how* that does occur in the following sentence: "behold **how** many thousands of our brethren hath he loosed from the pains of hell" (Alma 26:13).

■ **Alma 26:13**

behold how many [*thousands* 01ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRT|*thousand* s] *of our brethren*
hath he loosed from the pains of hell

As explained under the Words of Mormon 1:14, we get *many thousand* only when it premodifies a semantically plural noun, as in Alma 28:10: "many thousand lives". When there is a postmodifying

prepositional phrase, the text always has *many thousands,* as in Alma 28:12: "many thousands of others". In a few instances, there has been a tendency to replace "many thousands of X" with "many thousand of X". Such an error initially occurred in the Words of Mormon 1:14 when Oliver Cowdery copied the text from 𝕆 into 𝔓. Here in Alma 26:13, the 1953 RLDS edition made the same error. The 1953 change was probably not intentional since for all other instances of "many thousands of X" (six of them) the 1953 edition retained the original *thousands.* One further example of this error occurred in the 1830 edition:

> 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* 01BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST | *thousand* A] of the Lamanites
>> of the incorrect tradition of their fathers

In this instance, the 1837 edition restored the correct *thousands;* see the discussion under Alma 37:9.

Summary: Maintain the correct plural expression "many **thousands** of X" in Alma 26:13 and elsewhere in the text.

■ **Alma 26:13–14**

*behold how many thousands of our brethren hath he loosed from the **pains** of hell . . .*
*for he is the Most High God and has loosed these our brethren from the **chains** of hell*

One wonders here if one of these two occurrences of "the pains/chains of hell" might be in error, especially since both *pains* and *chains* rhyme and are found in the same context ("loosed from the _____ of hell"). For both cases, the extant portions of the original manuscript barely miss giving us the specific word (whether *chains* or *pains*), so in each case the current reading is based on the printer's manuscript. Oliver Cowdery could have mixed up one of these words in his copying—or he might have misheard one for the other while taking down Joseph Smith's dictation. The use of *chains* with the verb *loose* seems more appropriate; nonetheless, *pains* is possible but is not as vivid.

Elsewhere in the text, this same competition between *chains* and *pains* continues. For instance, in the context of the verb *loose,* we have one other example (in Jacob 3) with *pains* and two more (in Alma 5) with *chains:*

> Jacob 3:11   and loose yourselves from the **pains** of hell
> Alma 5:9   and the **chains** of hell which encircled them about / were they loosed
> Alma 5:10   what is the cause of their being loosed from the bands of death
>>   yea and also the **chains** of hell

The example in Alma 5:9 also uses the verb *encircle* in reference to the chains of hell. We find the same competition between *chains* and *pains* for that verb as well, with one example (in Alma 14:6) where we get *pains* rather than the more expected *chains:*

> Alma 5:7   yea they were encircled about by the bands of death
>>   and the **chains** of hell
> Alma 12:6   that he might encircle you about with his **chains**

Alma 14:6   yea he began to be encircled about by the **pains** of hell

Alma 36:18   and art encircled about by the everlasting **chains** of death

So in all, there are three cases where we get *pains* rather than *chains* (Jacob 3:11, Alma 14:6, and Alma 26:13). David Calabro also points out (personal communication) that the King James Bible has instances of *pains* and *chains* that refer to death and hell:

Psalm 116:3   the sorrows of death compassed me
                          and the **pains** of hell gat hold upon me

Acts 2:24   whom God hath raised up / having loosed the **pains** of death

2 Peter 2:4   but cast *them* down to hell and delivered *them* into **chains** of darkness

Now, if there was evidence in the textual transmission of the Book of Mormon for mix-ups between the words *chain* and *pain,* then perhaps we could argue that *pains* might be an error for *chains* in one or more, perhaps all three, of these instances of *pains* in the Book of Mormon text. But no such evidence exists: the word *chain* occurs 17 times in the text while the word *pain* occurs 31 times, yet in no case has any instance of these two words ever been mixed up, even momentarily in the manuscripts. Thus the use of *pains* rather than *chains* seems to be intended in Jacob 3:11, Alma 14:6, and Alma 26:13.

It is especially worthwhile to examine the larger passage for the case of "encircled about by the pains of hell" in Alma 14:6. This passage refers to Zeezrom and the agony he is feeling for his guilt ("and his soul began to be **harrowed up** under a consciousness of his own guilt"). Note later that when Zeezrom is suffering in Sidom, he has "**a burning fever** which was caused by the great tribulations of his mind" (Alma 15:3); the verse continues with the explanation that "this great sin and his many other sins did **harrow up** his mind until it did become **exceeding sore** . . . therefore he began to be **scorched with a burning heat**". These passages thus match the reference in Alma 14:6 to Zeezrom being "encircled about with the **pains** of hell".

Summary: In accord with the earliest textual sources, maintain the less concrete use of *pains* instead of *chains* in Jacob 3:11, Alma 14:6, and Alma 26:13; in each of these three cases, *pains* will work and appears to be intended.

■ **Alma 26:14**

for he is the Most High God and has loosed
[*these* 0| 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *our brethren from the chains of hell*

Here in Alma 26:14, while copying from 𝒪 into 𝒫, Oliver Cowdery accidentally omitted the demonstrative *these* from "these our brethren". This kind of construction, "these our X", is fairly frequent in the original text, occurring seven times; in fact, in four of these cases (each marked below with an asterisk), the following noun is *brethren,* just like originally here in Alma 26:14:

* Alma 24:7   our great God has in goodness sent **these our** brethren

Alma 24:10   he hath forgiven us of **these our** many sins and murders

* Alma 26:9   **these our** dearly beloved brethren . . . would still have been racked
                          with hatred against us

* Alma 26:22	to bring **these our** brethren to repentance
* Alma 31:35	that we may bring **these our** brethren again unto thee
Alma 58:9	and now the cause of **these our** embarrassments . . . we knew not
Helaman 8:5	**these our** great cities shall be taken from us

Clearly, there is nothing inappropriate about the original reading "these our brethren" in Alma 26:14.

Summary: Restore in Alma 26:14 the demonstrative *these* in "these our brethren", the reading of the original manuscript.

■ **Alma 26:16**

yea we will praise our God **forever**
behold who can glory too much in the Lord

The original manuscript is not extant here, but there is definitely room for *& ever* after *forever:*

Alma 26:16 (lines 14–15, page 270′ of 𝒪)

```
(                              f)or our joy is full yea we will praise our God for
  THE LORD YEA WE WILL REJOICE

(                    n g)lory to much in the Lord yea who can say to much
  -EVER <        > BEHOLD WHO CA
```

The question here is whether the conjunctive phrase *& ever* (if it was in 𝒪) was crossed out in the original manuscript. It is possible that Oliver Cowdery, when copying from 𝒪 into 𝒫, simply missed the extra *& ever*. Of course, he may have accidentally added it in 𝒪, at least initially, since the expression "forever and ever" seems expected.

What is surprising is that everywhere else in the Book of Mormon text, when the context refers to the praising of God, we never have "forever and ever", only "forever":

2 Nephi 4:30	O Lord I will praise thee forever
Mosiah 18:30	for they shall sing to his praise forever
Alma 26:12	for which we will praise his name forever
Alma 26:14	yea we have reason to praise him forever
Alma 29:17	but that they may praise him forever
Alma 36:28	yea and I will praise him forever

Also note that two of these occur nearby in verses 12 and 14 of Alma 26. The critical text will therefore retain the reading of the earliest extant source, in this case 𝒫, for verse 16: "we will praise our God **forever**".

As David Calabro points out (personal communication), there are other possibilities for what Oliver Cowdery might have written between extant fragments of 𝒪. For instance, here in Alma 26:16 Oliver might have written *& now behold* instead of simply *behold.* In general, one cannot be sure what might have been written in the lacuna; normally the critical text will accept the earliest extant reading (usually the reading in 𝒫) unless there is clear evidence that that reading is in error.

Summary: Maintain in Alma 26:16 the reading "we will praise our God forever"; in accord with the consistency elsewhere in the Book of Mormon, the original text probably read without *and ever* after *forever* in this reference to praising God; if Oliver Cowdery initially wrote *forever & ever* in 𝒪, he probably crossed out the extra *& ever*.

■ **Alma 26:19–20**

O then why did he not consign us to an awful destruction
yea why did he not let the sword of his justice fall upon us and doom us to eternal despair
O my soul almost as it were fleeth [*at* 01ABCDEFIJLMNOPQRST | *from* GHK] *the thought*

In this passage, the 1858 Wright edition replaced the preposition *at* with *from;* the RLDS text followed this reading until the 1908 RLDS edition restored the original *at,* probably by reference to 𝒫. Here Ammon is saying that the thought that God could have condemned them to eternal destruction almost makes his soul flee. This reference to his soul fleeing seems to mean that this thought made him feel almost like dying or fainting. Ammon is definitely not saying that his soul was trying to flee away from the thought. A similar expression of this idea is found in Alma 29:16: "my soul is carried away even to the separation of it from the body as it were".

Summary: Maintain in Alma 26:20 the original preposition *at* in "O my soul almost as it were fleeth **at** the thought".

■ **Alma 26:21**

what natural man is there
that [*Knoweth* 0 | *knoweth* 1ABDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST | *knowest* C] *these things*

Here the 1840 typesetter accidentally replaced *knoweth* with *knowest,* an obvious typo. No subsequent edition has continued or reintroduced this error. For further discussion of mix-ups between the archaic inflectional endings *-eth* and *-est,* see under 1 Nephi 11:2.

Summary: Maintain in Alma 26:21 *knoweth* with its original inflectional ending *-eth* ("what natural man is there that **knoweth** these things").

■ **Alma 26:22**

yea unto such it shall be given to reveal things
which [0ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST | *have* > NULL 1] *never have been revealed*

𝒪 is extant here and reads "things which **never have** been revealed"—that is, the negative adverb *never* precedes the entire verb phrase, "have been revealed". When copying from 𝒪 into 𝒫, Oliver Cowdery started to write "things which **have never** been revealed", but he caught his error after writing *which have* (and perhaps the word *never*). Virtually immediately he crossed out the *have* and then continued inline after *never* with the full verb phrase, "have been revealed". Either order is possible:

□ *never have*

Alma 10:5 I **never have** known much of the ways of the Lord

Helaman 14:5 such an one as ye **never have** beheld

□ *have never*

Alma 24:16 as a testimony that we **have never** used them

Alma 30:33 I **have never** received so much as even one senine for my labor

Summary: Accept in Alma 26:22 the word order in 𝒪 (also the immediately corrected word order in 𝒫): "which **never have** been revealed" (that is, with *never* preceding the entire verb phrase).

■ **Alma 26:24**

do ye suppose that ye can convince the Lamanites
of the [NULL >+ *incorrectness of the* 0 | *incorrectness of the* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
traditions of their fathers

Here in the original manuscript, Oliver Cowdery initially wrote "do ye suppose that ye can convince the Lamanites of the traditions of their fathers". Later, with distinctly heavier ink flow, Oliver supralinearly inserted *incorrectness of the* in 𝒪, giving what appears to be a much more reasonable reading: "do ye suppose that ye can convince the Lamanites **of the incorrectness** of the traditions of their fathers". Oliver's correction here may have been made after he read the text back to Joseph Smith and it was discovered that Oliver (or maybe Joseph) had skipped the phrase "of the incorrectness". We might suppose that Oliver redipped his quill before making the correction; this would explain the distinct change in the level of ink flow for the correction. In other words, Oliver may have made this supralinear correction when he redipped his quill before taking down Joseph's dictation later on in the next line of 𝒪, beginning with the relative clause "whose days have been spent in the grossest iniquity". The level of ink flow is heavier for the inline text there, at least for the extant text beginning with *spent* (the second half of the relative clause). In other words, Oliver's supralinear insertion of *incorrectness of the* in heavier ink flow could have come when he paused to reread the text back to Joseph. When the missing words were discovered, Oliver redipped his quill, made the correction, and then continued taking down Joseph's dictation (also with the heavier ink flow resulting from the redipped quill).

But there is an alternative explanation for the corrected reading in Alma 26:24: namely, the supralinear insertion was the result of later editing on Oliver's part. The initial reading in 𝒪 ("do ye suppose that ye can convince the Lamanites of the traditions of their fathers") seems rather odd since one would think that the Lamanites, prior to their conversion, already believed in the traditions of their fathers and didn't need to be convinced of those traditions. Thus one could argue that the corrected text ("do ye suppose that ye can convince the Lamanites **of the incorrectness** of the traditions of their fathers") was the result of a later, conscious decision to emend the text.

There is one passage elsewhere in the text where the verb *convince* means 'to prove or demonstrate as incorrect' but without explicitly stating the incorrectness:

Alma 24:7

> I thank my God my beloved people
> that our great God has in goodness sent these our brethren the Nephites unto us
> to preach unto us and to **convince** us of the **traditions** of our wicked fathers

Of course, this passage does not mean that Ammon and his brethren convinced these Lamanites that their wicked fathers' traditions were correct! To the contrary, they convinced the Lamanites that these traditions were incorrect. Yet this passage has never been emended so that it would directly mention the incorrectness of those traditions (although the adjective *wicked* in "the traditions of our **wicked** fathers" implies as much). In three other passages, the reference to incorrectness or wickedness is there but it is stated obliquely (that is, the Lamanites are convinced concerning their traditions, which are nonrestrictively characterized as incorrect or wicked):

Alma 21:17

> yea they did **convince** many of their sins
> and of the **tradition** of their fathers which were not **correct**

Alma 23:3

> that his people might be **convinced**
> concerning the **wicked traditions** of their fathers

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

In one place, the Lamanites are convinced of their sins and murders, with the implication that they are convinced of the evilness of those acts:

Alma 24:9

> we have been convinced of our sins
> and of the many murders which we have committed

To be sure, there are passages where people are convinced of the incorrectness or wickedness of something—that is, in these passages the incorrectness or evilness is directly stated (as in the corrected reading for Alma 26:24):

Mosiah 28:2	and **convince** them of the **iniquity** of their fathers
Alma 30:58	they were all **convinced** of the **wickedness** of Korihor
Alma 37:8	yea and **convinced** many of the **error** of their ways
Alma 62:45	unto the **convincing** of many people of their **wickedness**
Helaman 5:19	and were **convinced** of the **wickedness** of the traditions of their fathers
3 Nephi 1:25	and were **convinced** of the **error** which they were in

Note that Helaman 5:19 and the corrected reading in Alma 26:24 are very similar except that one of them refers to the wickedness, the other to the incorrectness, of "the traditions of their fathers". And there is also independent support for the phraseology "the incorrectness of the traditions of their fathers":

Alma 9:17

and at some period of time they will be brought to believe in his word
and to know **of the incorrectness** of the traditions of their fathers

Thus the corrected reading in 𝓞 for Alma 26:24 is quite reasonable.

The main problem with the initial reading in 𝓞 for Alma 26:24 is that there is no word at all that refers either directly or indirectly to the incorrectness or wickedness of the traditions of the Lamanite fathers. This special difficulty may have led Oliver to emend the text here at some later time. If so, the change was made, it would appear, before the text was actually copied from 𝓞 into 𝓟 since in 𝓟 the reading shows no sign of emendation (it simply reads without correction as "do ye suppose that ye can convince the Lamanites **of the incorrectness** of the traditions of their fathers").

Ultimately, the decision here in Alma 26:24 is difficult. Probably the safest solution is to follow the corrected reading in 𝓞, which is also the reading in 𝓟, but with the understanding that the initial reading in 𝓞 may actually be the original reading.

Summary: Accept in Alma 26:24 Oliver Cowdery's corrected reading in 𝓞 as the original reading ("do ye suppose that ye can convince the Lamanites **of the incorrectness** of the traditions of their fathers"), although there is some possibility that the supralinearly inserted words *incorrectness of the,* written in distinctly heavier ink flow, may be due to conscious editing on Oliver's part.

■ **Alma 26:24**

do ye suppose that ye can convince the Lamanites
of the incorrectness of the traditions of their fathers
as stiff-necked a people as they are
(1) *whose hearts delighteth in the shedding of blood*
(2) *whose days have been spent in the grossest iniquity*
(3) [*& >% whose* 0 | *whose* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *ways have been the ways*
of a transgressor from the beginning

Here in the original text we apparently have a sequence of three relative clauses without any connectives. Before the last relative clause, Oliver Cowdery initially wrote an *and* in 𝓞 (as an ampersand), then immediately erased it and wrote *whose* inline, with the *w* overwriting the original *&*. Elsewhere in the text, we can find other asyndetic conjuncts of relative clauses, as in the following examples from the original text where two relative clauses are joined:

2 Nephi 9:9 (*who* refers to *that being*)

yea to that being
who beguiled our first parents
who transformeth himself nigh unto an angel of light

Alma 7:14 (*which* refers to *the Lamb of God*)

that ye may have faith on the Lamb of God
which taketh away the sins of the world
which is mighty to save and to cleanse from all unrighteousness

Alma 10:3 (*who* refers to *Lehi*)

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 . . .

To get asyndetic cases involving more than two relative clauses, we turn to examples from the King James Bible that are quoted or paraphrased in the Book of Mormon:

Mosiah 12:21 (quoting Isaiah 52:7), similarly 3 Nephi 20:40

how beautiful upon the mountains are the feet of him

that bringeth good tidings

that publisheth peace

that bringeth good tidings of good

that publisheth salvation

that saith unto Zion : thy God reigneth

Mosiah 15:14 (closely paraphrasing Isaiah 52:7)

and these are they

which hath published peace

that hath brought good tidings of good

that hath published salvation

that saith unto Zion : thy God reigneth

Thus the correcting *and* is not necessary in Alma 26:24. The critical text will follow the immediately corrected reading in ○, which removed the *and*.

Summary: Maintain in Alma 26:24 the corrected reading in ○ without the *and* before the final relative clause, "whose ways have been the ways of a transgressor from the beginning".

■ **Alma 26:27**

now when our hearts were depressed and we were about to turn back
behold the Lord comforted us and said :
go amongst **thy** *brethren the Lamanites*
and bear with patience **thine** *afflictions*
and I will give [*unto* 1ABCDEFGIJLMNOPQRST | HK]
[*thee* >js *you* 1 | *the* A | *you* BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *success*

In this passage, we have two substantive changes. In the 1874 RLDS edition, the preposition *unto* was omitted, probably accidentally. The 1908 RLDS edition restored the original preposition to the RLDS text. For a similar example, see under Alma 11:22; in that instance, the 1830 typesetter accidentally omitted the *unto* from "and all these will I give **unto** thee".

The second substantive change here in Alma 26:27 is more significant. In his editing for the 1837 edition, Joseph Smith emended the singular *thee* to the plural *you*. (I ignore the 1830 compositor's mis-setting of *thee* as *the,* a nonsubstantive change in the text.) Note, however, that Joseph did not change the preceding *thy* and *thine* to *your*. In this passage, the Lord is speaking to the sons of king Mosiah, a plurality. But as explained under 1 Nephi 3:29, the original text of the Book of Mormon sometimes allowed the historically singular pronoun *thou* to be used in the

plural. The critical text will therefore restore the *thee* to this passage in Alma 26:27. For a complete list of passages that originally used the second person singular pronoun for plurals, see under THOU in volume 3.

Summary: Restore in Alma 26:27 the historically singular *thee* since this is the reading of the earliest textual source, the printer's manuscript; also maintain the preposition *unto* before *thee*.

■ **Alma 26:28–30**

and now behold **we have** *come and been forth amongst them*
and **we have** *been patient in our sufferings*
and **we have** *suffered every privation*
(1) *yea we* [*have* 1ABCDEFGHIJLMNOQRT | KPS] *traveled from house to house . . .*
and **we have** *entered into their houses and taught them*
and **we have** *taught them in their streets*
(2) *yea and* **we** [*have* 01ABCDEFGIJLMNOQRT | HKPS] *taught them upon their hills*
and **we have** *also entered into their temples and their synagogues and taught them*
and **we have** *been cast out and mocked and spit upon and smote upon our cheeks*
and **we have** *been stoned and taken and bound with strong cords and cast into prison*
and through the power and wisdom of God **we have** *been delivered again*
and **we have** *suffered all manner of afflictions*

In this passage, the RLDS text has twice removed the *have,* once in verse 28 and once more in verse 29 (the first in the 1892 edition, the second in the 1874 edition). In each of these two cases, the original *we have* was preceded by a *yea* (although it is difficult to believe that the *yea* had much to do with loss of the perfect *have*). It appears that these two omissions were unintended, at least when they first entered the RLDS text. Surprisingly, the 1908 RLDS edition did not restore either of these *have*'s, even though they are in 𝓟. Neither *have* is fully extant in 𝓞, but in each case there is clearly room for the *have* between extant fragments of 𝓞. The critical text will, of course, maintain the persistent occurrence of the perfective *we have* throughout this passage.

Summary: Maintain in Alma 26:28–30 the continuous use of the perfect auxiliary *have*.

■ **Alma 26:29**

and we have been cast out and mocked and spit upon and **smote** *upon our cheeks*

Here the entire textual tradition has maintained the earliest use of the simple past-tense form *smote* (𝓞 is not extant here but very probably read *smote* rather than the standard *smitten*). Under 1 Nephi 4:19, I refer to four cases in the text where an original past-participial *smote* was grammatically emended to *smitten;* in each of those cases, *smote* occurs with the past perfect auxiliary *had:*

> 1 Nephi 4:19 (editing by Joseph Smith for the 1837 edition)
> and after that I had [*smote* 0 | *smote* >js *smiten* 1 |
>   *smitten* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] off his head with his own sword . . .

Alma 17:39 (1920 LDS editing)
and then went in unto the king bearing the arms
which had been [*smote* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQS | *smitten* RT] off
by the sword of Ammon
of those who sought to slay him

Alma 20:30 (editing by Joseph Smith for the 1837 edition)
and they had cast them out
and had [*smote* >js *smitten* 1 | *smote* A | *smitten* BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] them

Ether 15:31 (1920 LDS editing)
after he had [*smote* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQS | *smitten* RT] off the head
of Shiz . . .

Besides the instance here in Alma 26:29 of "have been . . . smote", there is one more instance in the original text of the past-participial *smote* (in this case, in the passive but without *had*):

Alma 51:20 (1906 LDS editing)
rather than to be [*smote* 01ABCDEFGHIJKLOPS | *smote* > *smitten* M | *smitten* NQRT]
down to the earth by the sword . . .

The critical text will restore all these original instances of past-participial *smote*. For a complete discussion of the use of the simple past-tense form as the past participle, see under PAST PARTICIPLE in volume 3.

Summary: Maintain in Alma 26:29 the original past-participial *smote;* restore *smote* wherever there is evidence for this form in the earliest extant textual sources.

■ **Alma 26:30**

and we have suffered all manner of afflictions
and all this that perhaps we might be the means
of saving some [*Soul* >% *soul* 0 | *soul* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]

Sirkku Skousen (personal communication) has raised the possibility that the text here should read in the plural, as "some souls". Later on in the verse we have a use of the single word *some* where the meaning is plural:

Alma 26:30
and we supposed that our joy would be full
if perhaps we could be the means of saving **some**

In English, the determiner *some* can occur with the plural *souls,* but the only example in the Book of Mormon reads "some few of their souls":

Alma 26:26
but behold my beloved brethren we came into the wilderness
not with the intent to destroy our brethren
but with the intent that perhaps we might save **some** few of their **souls**

Of course, this is not *some souls.*

Elsewhere there is evidence that the singular *some soul* is possible. Later on, Alma refers to his own desire to save his fellow beings (just like Ammon does in Alma 26:30):

> Alma 29:9
>> yea and this is my glory
>> that perhaps I may be an instrument in the hands of God
>> to bring **some soul** to repentance

Both Alma 26:30 and Alma 29:9 are extant in ᕮ for the phrase *some soul,* so the singular usage appears to be fully intended. The critical text will accept the use of *some soul* in the Book of Mormon text.

Summary: Retain the singular usage *some soul* in Alma 26:30 and Alma 29:9, the reading of ᕮ in both instances.

■ **Alma 26:31**

and we can witness of their sincerity
because of their love towards their brethren
and [*also* 1ABCDEFGIJLMNOPQRST | HK] *towards us*

Although ᕮ is not extant here, there is clearly room in a rather small lacuna in ᕮ for the adverb *also*. The 1874 RLDS edition accidentally omitted the *also* here; the 1908 RLDS edition restored it. A similar example of this usage is found in Alma 27:27: "and they were also distinguished for their zeal towards God and **also** towards men".

Summary: Retain in Alma 26:31 the occurrence of *also* in the conjoined structure "towards their brethren and **also** towards us".

■ **Alma 26:32**

for behold they had rather sacrifice their lives
than [*ever > even* 0 | *even* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *to take the life of their enemy*

Here Oliver Cowdery initially wrote *ever* in ᕮ, then virtually immediately corrected it to *even* by overwriting the final *r* with an *n* (there is no change in the level of ink flow). Since either word will work here, the critical text will accept the corrected reading in ᕮ, "than **even** to take the life of their enemy". There are no other instances in the text of either "than even to" or "than ever to", so no precise comparison with other passages is possible. But it should be noted that elsewhere in the text there are five examples of "even to", where *to* is the infinitival marker:

1 Nephi 18:18	they were brought near **even to** be carried out of this time
Alma 4:9	**even to** exceed the pride of those who did not belong to the church of God
Alma 34:4	yea even that ye would have so much faith as **even to** plant the word in your hearts
Alma 49:14	yea **even to** exceed the strength of the city Ammonihah
Mormon 1:11	**even to** exceed the number of thirty thousand

On the other hand, there are no instances of "ever to" in the text. There is no reason then to reject the corrected reading in 𝒪 for Alma 26:32 ("than **even** to take the life of their enemy").

Summary: Accept in Alma 26:32 the use of *even* in "than **even** to take the life of their enemy", the corrected reading in 𝒪.

■ **Alma 26:34**

and we know that they have gone to their God
because of their love and of their hatred **to** *sin*

One wonders here if the word after *hatred* is supposed to be *to*. There are no other instances of "hatred **to** X" in the Book of Mormon text. Here in Alma 26:34, the original manuscript is extant for all of this text except for the word *to,* which would have occurred at the very end of a line. Unfortunately, the edge of the paper for this leaf of 𝒪 has been worn off so that the last one or two letters (at least) at the end of almost every line are no longer extant. We do know that Oliver Cowdery sometimes miscopied a word at the end of a line in his copying from 𝒪 into 𝒫 (see the list under Alma 11:21); one relevant example involves a short preposition:

> 1 Nephi 8:27
>> and they were in the attitude of mocking and pointing their fingers
>> towards those which had came [*up* 0 | *at* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
>> and were partaking of the fruit

So if the original preposition for Alma 26:34 was not *to* at the end of the line in 𝒪, what could it have been? Elsewhere in the text, we have seven occurrences of "hatred **towards** X". However, *towards* will not fit at the end of the line in the original manuscript, although it is possible that Oliver Cowdery accidentally miswrote *to* instead of *towards* in the original manuscript. Don Brugger (personal communication) points out that the *to* at the end of the line could have facilitated the accidental omission of the *-wards* that should have been written at the beginning of the next line.

Another possibility for Alma 26:34 is "hatred **against** X", which occurs four times in the text, including once where the X includes *sin:* "but teach them an everlasting hatred **against** sin and iniquity" (Alma 37:32). Of course, *against* will not fit in the lacuna at the end of the line in 𝒪.

Yet another possibility is that the word could have been the preposition *of:* "because of their love and of their hatred **of** sin". This reading works well for modern English readers. And *of* would fit just as well as *to* in the lacuna at the end of the line. There is also one use of "hatred of X" in the text:

> 3 Nephi 7:11
>> yet they were united in the hatred **of** those
>> who had entered into a covenant to destroy the government

So *of* is definitely possible in Alma 26:34.

Alison Coutts (personal communication) suggests one more possibility, the preposition *for* (thus "hatred **for** sin"). As with *of,* there would be room in 𝒪 for that preposition, but there are no instances of "hatred **for** X" elsewhere in the text.

In defense of *to,* one could argue that the *to* in "their hatred **to** sin" is not a preposition but the adverbial infinitive marker; that is, "their hatred to sin" is related to "they hated to sin". This infinitival reading for "to sin" seems considerably more acceptable than the prepositional *to* (which seems more like a mistake for *towards, against,* or *of*). Given that this infinitival interpretation is possible, the phrase "their hatred **to** sin" should probably be left unchanged, although the possibility remains that *to* is an early error in the transmission of the text.

Summary: Maintain in Alma 26:34 the *to* in "their hatred **to** sin" since it can be interpreted as semantically equivalent to "they hated to sin"; nonetheless, it is quite possible that the original manuscript read *of* at the end of the line and that Oliver Cowdery accidentally misread this *of* as *to* when he copied the text from 𝓞 into 𝓟; another possibility is that the original text read *towards* but that Oliver accidentally changed it to *to* as he took down Joseph Smith's dictation.

■ **Alma 26:35**

yea and my joy is carried away
even unto [1APRST | *the* BCDEFGHIJKLMNOQ] *boasting in my God*

𝓞 is not extant here but probably read "even unto boasting in my God"; there is no room between extant fragments of 𝓞 for the definite article *the* before *boasting* except by supralinear insertion. In the 1837 edition, this standard gerundive form was changed to the mixed gerundive form "even unto **the** boasting in my God". The original text had quite a few examples of this mixed gerundive form, as explained under 1 Nephi 17:32. For another example where the 1837 edition added *the* to create an example of the mixed form, see under Alma 12:22. For a general discussion of this kind of nominal construction, see under GERUNDIVES in volume 3.

The 1908 RLDS edition removed the intrusive *the* here in Alma 26:35, probably by reference to 𝓟; the 1920 LDS edition made the same change but apparently by reference to the 1830 edition. The critical text will also follow the earliest textual sources by avoiding in this instance the intrusive *the*.

Summary: Maintain in Alma 26:35 the earliest attested gerundive form *boasting* without the preceding definite article *the* (thus "even unto boasting in my God").

■ **Alma 26:36**

yea blessed is the name of my God
who *hath been mindful of this people*
[*who is* >%+ *which are* 0 | *which are* >js *who are* 1 | *which are* A |
    who are BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *a branch of the tree of Israel*
and [*hath* >js *have* 1 | *hath* A | *has* BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *been lost from its body*
    in a strange land

Here in the original manuscript, Oliver Cowdery initially wrote *who is:* "this people who is a branch of the tree of Israel". He probably wrote the *who* because of the preceding *who* in "my God **who** hath been mindful of this people". In this case, either *who* or *which* is theoretically possible in the original Book of Mormon text since the biblical style allows the relative pronoun *which* to

refer to persons (see the discussion under WHICH in volume 3). For this relative clause in Alma 26:36, Oliver also initially wrote the verb as the singular *is*. As explained under Alma 24:30, the noun *people* can be treated as either a singular or a plural in the Book of Mormon text.

Here in Alma 26:36, the original reading is in the plural: "this people **which are** a branch of the tree of Israel". Oliver Cowdery's correction of his mistake in ℗ is an immediate one: he erased the *i* of the *is,* then overwrote the *o* of *who* and the word *is* with the *ich* of the *which* (the *ich* ended up being written with somewhat heavier ink flow, perhaps because of the erasure); Oliver also supralinearly inserted the correct *are,* but that correction has the same level of ink flow as the original inline text.

Interestingly, here in the original text the conjoined predicate in the second relative clause began with *hath:* "this people which are a branch of the tree of Israel and **hath** been lost from its body in a strange land". In the original text of the Book of Mormon, the inflectional ending *-(e)th* (as in *hath*) can take either a singular or a plural subject. Here in Alma 26:36, in his editing of ℗ for the 1837 edition, Joseph Smith replaced the historically singular *hath* with the plural *have,* in agreement with the preceding *are:* "this people who **are** a branch of the tree of Israel" (Joseph's edited text in ℗). For some reason, the 1837 edition ended up replacing *have* (originally *hath*) with *has,* thus conjoining a singular verb form with a plural one: "who **are** a branch of the tree of Israel and **has** been lost". (As explained under Alma 24:30, this kind of mixture in number for the noun *people* does occur elsewhere in the text.) The critical text will, of course, restore the original *hath* here. For further discussion, see under SUBJECT-VERB AGREEMENT in volume 3.

Summary: Maintain in Alma 26:36 the corrected reading in ℗: "this people **which are** a branch of the tree of Israel"; also restore the original *hath* in the following conjoined predicate: "and **hath** been lost from its body in a strange land".

■ **Alma 26:37**

now my brethren we see that God is mindful of every people
[*in* 01ABDEFIJLMNOPQS| CGHKRT] *whatsoever land they may be* **in**

℗ is extant here and has the preposition *in* at both the beginning and ending of the relative clause: namely, "**in** whatsoever land they may be **in**". The 1840 edition removed the beginning *in,* perhaps accidentally. The 1908 RLDS edition restored the original beginning *in,* apparently by reference to ℗. On the other hand, the 1920 LDS edition removed that *in,* possibly by reference to the 1840 edition but also perhaps independently since the repeated *in* is ungrammatical in standard English. The 1920 removal of the *in* was intentional since its deletion was marked in the committee copy.

The critical text will restore the original beginning *in,* especially since elsewhere in the original text relative clauses of this form seem to have consistently had both the beginning and ending *in.* For discussion and examples, see under Alma 23:1; also see the discussion under 2 Nephi 2:22.

Summary: Restore in Alma 26:37 the preposition *in* at the beginning of the relative clause; the original text had *in* at both the beginning and ending of this relative clause ("**in** whatsoever land they may be **in**").

Alma 27

■ **Alma 27:1**

that it [*were > was* O | *was* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *in vain to seek their destruction*

> Oliver Cowdery initially wrote "that it were in vain" in O; then virtually immediately he corrected the *were* to *was,* crossing out the *were* and supralinearly inserting the *was* (there is no change in the level of ink flow). Elsewhere the text has examples of only "it **was** (all) in vain":

Alma 47:32	that he had pursued them with his army but it **was** in vain
Mormon 3:3	and I did cry unto this people but it **was** in vain
Mormon 5:6	and we did stand against them boldly but it **was** all in vain

> The critical text will maintain the singular *was* here in Alma 27:1.

Summary: Accept in Alma 27:1 the correction of *were* to *was* in O: "that it **was** in vain to seek their destruction".

■ **Alma 27:2**

and when they saw
[O | *that* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *they could not seek revenge from the Nephites they began to stir up the people in anger against their brethren*

> The original manuscript does not have the subordinate conjunction *that.* There is no sign of any insertion at this place in the original manuscript. Oliver Cowdery added the *that* while producing the printer's manuscript. The conjunction *that* is, of course, expected here. For instance, in nearly all cases of "X saw (that) they", the earliest text has the *that* (19 times). There is one more case without the *that;* in this instance, the 1830 typesetter added the *that,* probably because there was a following conjoined clause that began with *that:*

> > Helaman 4:24
> > and they saw [1 | *that* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] they had become weak
> > > like unto their brethren the Lamanites
> > and **that** the Spirit of the Lord did no more preserve them

> (For further discussion of this case, see under Helaman 4:24.) In one of those original cases with the *that,* the 1840 edition accidentally omitted it:

> > Alma 47:15
> > and it came to pass that
> > when they saw [*that* 01ABDEFIJLMNOQRT | CGHKPS] they were surrounded
> > they pled with Amalickiah that he would suffer them to fall in with their brethren

In this case, the RLDS text has retained the reading without the *that*. Generally in the Book of Mormon, the subordinate conjunction *that* is optional after the verb *see,* although in most instances the earliest text has the *that*. In each case, the critical text will follow the earliest textual sources in determining whether the *that* should be there or not. Thus the critical text will accept the reading of 𝓞 without the *that* here in Alma 27:2. For a general discussion of the optionality of the subordinate conjunction *that,* see under THAT in volume 3.

Summary: Remove the intrusive *that* after *saw* in Alma 27:2 (thus "and when they saw they could not seek revenge . . .").

■ **Alma 27:3**

now this people again refused to **take their arms**

Although 𝓞 is not extant here, there is clearly room within a small lacuna at the beginning of a line in 𝓞 for the adverbial *up* before *their arms,* as conjectured in the transcript of 𝓞 in volume 1 of the critical text:

Alma 27:2–4 (lines 17–19, page 272′ of 𝓞)

```
(               r)efore they began again to destroy them now this people again refused to take
  -NEPHILEHI THE

(           ) & they suffered themselves to be slain according to the desires of their enemy
  UP THEIR ARMS

                                                                    they
(         m)on & his Brethren saw this work of destruction among those who <he^> so dearly
  NOW WHEN AM
```

Elsewhere the text always has "to take **up** arms" (21 times), never "to take arms", including these examples that refer to the Anti-Nephi-Lehies refusing to take up arms:

Alma 24:6	now there was not one soul . . . that would take **up** arms against their brethren
Alma 27:23	on account of their fear to take **up** arms against their brethren
Alma 27:28	and they never could be prevailed upon to take **up** arms against their brethren
Alma 43:11	and they would not take **up** arms
Alma 53:11	they had been kept from taking **up** arms against their brethren
Alma 53:13	and were desirous to take **up** arms in the defense of their country

In one of those 21 cases, the 1840 edition accidentally omitted the *up:*

Alma 50:26

insomuch that the people of Morionton
took [*up* 1ABDEFIJLMNOPQRST| CGHK] arms against their brethren

In this case, the 1908 RLDS edition restored the *up* to the RLDS text. In Alma 27:3, it appears that Oliver Cowdery may have accidentally omitted the line-initial *up* in 𝓞 when he copied the text from 𝓞 into 𝓟. The consistency of the text for the phrase "to take up arms" as well as the spacing between extant fragments of 𝓞 argues for including the *up* in Alma 27:3 (thus "now this people again refused to take **up** their arms").

One problem with this analysis is that in the 21 other cases, there is no determiner for the noun *arms;* that is, they all read "to take up arms" rather than "to take up **their** arms", the proposed reading for 𝒪 (or more generally, "to take up one's arms"). Here in Alma 27:3, the earliest extant reading, in 𝒫, has the *their* but is missing the *up:* "to take their arms"; there is clearly room in 𝒪 for the *their.* So one could propose that the *up* was lacking in the original text for Alma 27:3 and the reason for this was that the text read *their arms* rather than simply *arms.* In support of this argument, one could cite the six instances in the text of "to take **their** weapons of war" for which there is no *up:*

Alma 24:25	they threw down their weapons of war
	and they would not take them again
Alma 53:14	as they were about to take their weapons of war
Alma 53:16	that they would not take their weapons of war to defend themselves
	against their enemies
Alma 53:18	and took their weapons of war to defend their country
Alma 53:19	for they took their weapons of war
Alma 56:5	two thousand of these young men hath taken their weapons of war

Based on the synonymy of *arms* and *weapons of war,* one could argue from these six examples that *up* is not expected in "to take their arms". Yet it should also be pointed out that there are four examples in the text of "to take **up** their weapons of war", two of which immediately follow the last instance listed above (Alma 56:5):

Alma 56:6	that they would not take **up** their weapons of war
	against their brethren
Alma 56:7	and take **up** their weapons of war in our defense
Alma 62:16	that they would no more take **up** their weapons of war
	against the Nephites
Helaman 15:9	they have buried their weapons of war and they fear to take them **up**

So the choice of *up* is optional for "to take (up) their weapons of war". One could therefore argue that *up* is also optional for "to take (up) their arms", which occurs only once in the text (here in Alma 27:3); and in that case the *up* is lacking in 𝒫, the earliest extant source. Thus the argument based on the consistency of "to take **up** arms" is not as strong as one might have hoped for determining the text in Alma 27:3.

As far as the spacing between extant fragments for Alma 27:3 is concerned, one could argue that Oliver Cowdery initially wrote "to take **up** their arms" in 𝒪 but that he crossed out the *up,* thus giving the reading in 𝒫 ("to take their arms"). Ultimately, it is difficult to decide whether the *up* was in the original text for Alma 27:3. One potential factor to consider is the frequency with which Oliver accidentally dropped or added the adverbial *up.* We find that he tended to omit *up* about twice as frequently as he added it in the manuscripts; moreover, there are three cases where he failed to copy the *up* when he transmitted the text from 𝒪 into 𝒫 (each marked below with an asterisk):

□ omissions of *up:*

　　* title page (omitted when copied from 𝒪 into 𝒫)

　　　　sealed [*up* 2345│ 1A678BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] by the hand of Moroni
　　　　and hid up unto the Lord

2 Nephi 23:14 (initially omitted in 𝔓; Isaiah 13:14 has the *up*)
   and it shall be as the chased roe and as a sheep
   that no man taketh [NULL > *up* 1 | *up* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]

Alma 36:8 (initially omitted in 𝒪)
   and I arose and stood [NULL > *up* 0 | *up* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]

Alma 45:24 (initially omitted in 𝒪)
   but they grew proud
   being lifted [NULL > *up* 0 | *up* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] in their hearts

   * Helaman 1:32 (omitted when copied from 𝒪 into 𝔓)
   and the Lamanites did yield themselves
   [*up* 0 | 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] into the hands of the Nephites

   * 3 Nephi 4:16 (omitted when copied from 𝒪 into 𝔓; here the 1830 edition was set
        from 𝒪, not 𝔓)
   and if they should cut them off from all their outward privileges
   that they could cause them
   to yield themselves [1 | *up* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
   according to their wishes

   □ additions of *up:*

   title page (added when copied from 𝒪 into 𝔓)
   written and sealed [2345 | *up* 16A78BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
   and hid up unto the Lord

2 Nephi 8:10 (initially added in 𝒪; Isaiah 51:10 lacks the *up*)
   art thou not it
   which hath dried [*up* >% NULL 0 | 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] the sea

Alma 47:1 (initially added in 𝔓)
   to go [*up* >+ NULL 1 | ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] to battle
      against the Nephites

There is only one case where Oliver momentarily added the *up* in 𝒪 (namely, in 2 Nephi 8:10, listed above). Thus the more likely possibility is the omission of the *up* when copying from 𝒪 into 𝔓.

Ultimately, the critical text will accept for Alma 27:3 the earliest extant reading (in 𝔓) of "to take their arms"—that is, without the *up*. Although unique when compared with 21 instances of "to take up arms" elsewhere in the text, the corresponding phrase "to take one's weapons of wars" (that is, without the *up*) occurs six times in the text. Thus "to take their arms" is definitely possible. The spacing between extant fragments of 𝒪—as well as Oliver's tendency to omit *up* when copying from 𝒪 into 𝔓—supports the possibility of an original *up* in 𝒪. But there is also the possibility that Oliver initially wrote *up* in 𝒪, then corrected the text by crossing out the *up*.

Summary: In Alma 27:3 the critical text will accept the earliest extant reading, "now this people again refused to **take their arms**" (that is, without *up* before *their arms*); the possibility remains that *up* occurred in the original text (and in the original manuscript) and that it was accidentally omitted in copying from 𝒪 into 𝔓.

■ **Alma 27:3**

and they suffered themselves to be slain
according to the desires of their [*enemy* 0 | *enemies* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]

The original manuscript here has the singular *enemy,* which Oliver Cowdery copied into the printer's manuscript as *enemies.* In the Book of Mormon text, the plural *enemies* occurs almost four times more frequently than the singular *enemy.* In general, either singular or plural is possible, as in Alma 58:8, where both occur: "to defend ourselves and our country from falling into the hands of our **enemies** / yea to contend with **an enemy** which was innumerable".

Elsewhere, when referring to the enemy/enemies of the Anti-Nephi-Lehies, the text generally prefers the plural:

Alma 27:5   and flee out of the hands of our **enemies**
Alma 27:24   and we will guard them from their **enemies**
Alma 53:16   to defend themselves against their **enemies** by our armies

Even so, there is one other case of the singular *enemy* that involves the Anti-Nephi-Lehies:

Alma 26:32   they had rather sacrifice their lives
                 than even to take the life of their **enemy**

Yet in this case the context seems to imply the life of an individual enemy, which is somewhat different from what is implied in Alma 27:3 (namely, the whole opposing Lamanite army is referred to as "their enemy").

In general, the text has examples of the singular *enemy* and the plural *enemies,* although the plural is considerably more frequent. The critical text will in each case of *enemy/enemies* follow the reading of the earliest textual sources, thus *enemy* here in Alma 27:3. For two other examples involving variation in the number for *enemy,* see under Alma 49:28 and 3 Nephi 3:26.

Summary: In accord with the reading of the original manuscript, restore the singular *enemy* in Alma 27:3.

■ **Alma 27:4**

now when Ammon and his brethren saw this work of destruction
among those [*who* 01ABDEFIJLMNOPQS | *whom* CGHKRT]
[*he > they* 0 | *they* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *so dearly beloved*
and among those **who** *had so dearly beloved them*

Here in the original manuscript, Oliver Cowdery initially wrote "who **he** so dearly beloved". Virtually immediately Oliver corrected the *he* by crossing it out and supralinearly inserting the correct *they* (there is no change in the level of ink flow). Oliver was probably influenced by the preceding use of the singular *Ammon* and the *his* of the conjoined "and **his** brethren", but the following conjoined prepositional phrase shows that the plural is correct: "and among those who had so dearly beloved **them**".

The relative pronoun *who* occurs twice in this passage, although in the first instance the *who* serves as the direct object in the relative clause. Thus the *who* was edited to *whom* in the 1840 edition (presumably by Joseph Smith). But the original *who* was restored to the RLDS text in the

1908 RLDS edition since 𝒫 reads *who* (there is no correction to *whom* in 𝒫); in his editing for the 1837 edition, Joseph did not make the change to *whom.* The 1920 LDS edition made the grammatical correction to *whom* for the LDS text. The original *who* is obviously intended, given the parallelism between the two relative clauses:

> among those **who** they so dearly beloved
> and among those **who** had so dearly beloved them

For further discussion of *who* versus *whom,* see under PRONOUNS in volume 3.

Summary: Maintain in Alma 27:4 the plural pronoun *they,* the corrected reading in 𝒪 ("among those who **they** so dearly beloved"); also restore *who,* the original form for the direct object relative pronoun in this passage.

■ **Alma 27:4**

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

Here Oliver Cowdery omitted the *an* from before *everlasting destruction* as he copied the text from 𝒪 into 𝒫. All the printed editions have maintained this secondary reading. Elsewhere in the text, there are four occurrences of "an everlasting destruction":

Alma 5:7	and **an** everlasting destruction did await them
Alma 12:17	they shall be chained down to **an** everlasting destruction
Helaman 6:40	they were in an awful state and ripening for **an** everlasting destruction
3 Nephi 4:33	they had been delivered from **an** everlasting destruction

There are also two examples of *everlasting destruction* preceded by a different determiner:

Alma 12:36	to **the** everlasting destruction of your souls
Ether 14:25	and their wickedness and abominations had prepared a way for **their** everlasting destruction

But in two instances, there is no indefinite article (based on the earliest textual sources):

Alma 12:6	that he might chain you down to everlasting destruction
Helaman 8:26	yea even at this time ye are ripening . . . for everlasting destruction

It therefore appears that *everlasting destruction* does not have to be preceded by a determiner in the Book of Mormon text. The critical text will in each case follow the earliest textual sources, thus "**an** everlasting destruction" here in Alma 27:4.

Summary: Restore in Alma 27:4 the indefinite article *an* before *everlasting destruction,* the reading of the original manuscript.

■ **Alma 27:4**

therefore when Ammon and his brethren saw this great work of destruction
they were moved with compassion
and [*they* 01ABCEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST | d] *said unto the king . . .*

The 1841 British edition omitted the subject pronoun *they* in the conjoined clause "and **they** said unto the king". The 1849 LDS edition restored the *they* to the LDS text. Either reading is, of course, possible; as explained under Mosiah 11:27, the subject pronoun can be repeated in constructions involving *say,* as in "they received him with joy and **they** said unto him . . ." (Alma 55:9). The critical text will, of course, maintain the *they* here in Alma 27:4.

Summary: Retain in Alma 27:4 the repeated subject pronoun *they* in the conjoined clause "and **they** said unto the king" (the reading of the original text).

■ **Alma 27:7**

and Ammon [*sayeth* 01 | *saith* A | *said* BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *:*
I will go and inquire of the Lord
and if he [*sayeth* >js *say* 1 | *saith* A | *say* BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRT | *said* S] *unto us :*
go down unto our brethren
will ye go

In this passage, the original text has two instances of *saith* (spelled as *sayeth* in the manuscripts). The first, "and Ammon saith", is an instance of the historical present tense; this *saith* was edited to the past-tense *said* in the 1837 edition, in accord with Joseph Smith's general editing for that edition (see the discussion under 1 Nephi 2:1 as well as more extensively under HISTORICAL PRESENT in volume 3).

In addition, Joseph Smith edited the second *saith* from the indicative to the subjunctive (giving "and if he **say** unto us" in the 1837 edition). This subjunctive reading has been retained in all subsequent editions except for the 1953 RLDS edition. That edition accidentally changed the subjunctive *say* to the past-tense indicative *said,* undoubtedly under the influence of the preceding occurrence of the edited *said* in this passage ("and Ammon said").

Joseph Smith marked the change of the second *saith* to *say* in 𝔓, so that change was clearly intended. And in one other long passage, Joseph repeatedly edited the indicative "if he saith" to the subjunctive "if he say":

> Helaman 12:13−14, 16−17
>
> (1) yea and if he [*say* > *saieth* 1 | *saith* A | *say* BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
>   unto the earth . . .
> (2) yea if he [*say* 1BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST | *saith* A]
>   unto the earth . . .
> (3) and behold also if he [*saieth* 1 | *saith* A | *say* BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
>   unto the waters of the great deep . . .
> (4) behold if he [*saieth* 1 | *saith* A | *say* BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
>   unto this mountain . . .

In fact, in the second instance (in Helaman 12:14), the earliest text reads in the subjunctive ("yea if he **say** unto the earth"). In that case, the 1830 compositor set *saith,* probably because in 𝒫 the three other cases read *saith* (although in the first instance, in Helaman 12:13, Oliver initially wrote *say* in 𝒫 rather than *saith*). For further discussion of these four instances of *saith/say,* see under that passage in Helaman 12.

There are, however, two verses where Joseph Smith did not grammatically emend the indicative "if X saith" to the subjunctive "if X say"; in fact, these two examples occur right after the one here in Alma 27:7. In each of the two cases, there is first an historical present-tense *saith,* which Joseph changed to the past-tense *said* (as expected). But in each case he left unchanged a following indicative "if X saith" (each case of "if X saith" is marked below with an arrow):

> Alma 27:8
>> and the king [*sayeth* 0 | *sayeth* >js *said* 1 | *saith* A | *said* BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
>>> unto him :
>> → yea if the Lord [*sayeth* 0K | *sayeth* >js *sayth* 1 | *saith* ABCDEFGHIJLMNOPQRST]
>>> unto us : go
>> we will go down unto our brethren

> Alma 27:10
>> but the king [*saith* 0A | *saith* >js *said* 1 | *said* BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] unto him :
>> inquire of the Lord
>> → and if he [*sayeth* 01 | *saith* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] unto us : go
>> we will go

In general, the text has examples of both the indicative and subjunctive in *if*-clauses. One interesting example conjoins both subjunctive and indicative verb forms, neither of which have ever been edited:

> Mosiah 26:29
>> and if he **confess** his sins before thee and me
>> and **repenteth** in the sincerity of his heart
>> him shall ye forgive

In two other Book of Mormon examples, a King James passage (Micah 5:8) is quoted, first in the indicative, then in the subjunctive:

> 3 Nephi 20:16
>> and as a young lion among the flocks of sheep
>> who if he **goeth** through
>> both treadeth down and teareth in pieces

> 3 Nephi 21:12
>> as a young lion among the flocks of sheep
>> who if he **go** through
>> both treadeth down and teareth in pieces

Micah 5:8 has the subjunctive *go;* it is possible that the *goeth* in the first Book of Mormon quotation is due to the following *treadeth* and *teareth.*

In general, the text allows for either the indicative or subjunctive in *if*-clauses. For each *if*-clause, the critical text will follow the reading of the earliest textual sources in determining whether the verb should be in the indicative or in the subjunctive. Here in Alma 27:7, the original indicative *saith* will be restored in the critical text. For further discussion, see under SUBJUNCTIVE in volume 3.

Summary: Restore in Alma 27:7 the original indicative *saith* in the *if*-clause; the original historical present-tense *saith* will also be restored.

■ **Alma 27:10 – 12**

but the king saith unto him
inquire of the Lord
and if he saith unto us : go
we will go
otherwise we will perish in **the** *land*
and it came to pass that Ammon went and inquired of the Lord
and the Lord said unto him
get this people out of **this** *land that they perish not*

In the first part of this passage, we have "otherwise we will perish in **the** land", but in the second part, which parallels in part the language of the first, we have "get this people out of **this** land that they perish not". The question here is whether the phrase *the land* might be a mistake for *this land*. It is true that the original manuscript clearly reads *the land* in Alma 27:10, but nonetheless there is definite evidence that Oliver Cowdery had difficulty with writing down *this land* in the manuscripts, as in the following cases where he miscopied *this land* as *the land*:

> 2 Nephi 1:8 (error in copying from 𝒪 into 𝒫)
>
> and behold it is wisdom
> that this land should be kept as yet from the knowledge of other nations
> for behold many nations would overrun
> [*this* 0 | *the* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] land

> Helaman 3:12 (initial error in 𝒪)
>
> and it came to pass that
> there were many of the people of Ammon which were Lamanites by birth
> did also go forth into [*the* > *this* 0 | *this* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] land

> Helaman 14:20 (possible error in copying from 𝒪 into 𝒫)
>
> and there shall be no light
> upon the face of [*the* 1 | *this* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] land

> 3 Nephi 3:24 (initial error in 𝒫)
>
> and there were a great many thousand people which were called Nephites
> which did gather themselves together
> in [*the* > *this* 1 | *this* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] land

For the last two passages, both 𝒫 and the 1830 edition are firsthand copies of 𝒪 (and 𝒪 is not extant in either instance). In the last case, Oliver corrected his error virtually immediately. In the preceding case, the variation in Helaman 14:20 is probably the result of Oliver miscopying an

original *this* as *the,* especially since we have no independent evidence for the 1830 compositor
ever setting *this land* for an original *the land*. In fact, there is only one example of this kind of
error in the entire text (that is, one in the opposite direction, from *the land* to *this land*):

> Alma 52:10
>> and Moroni also sent unto him
>> desiring him that he would be faithful in maintaining
>> that quarter of [*this* >% *the* ᴏ | *the* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] land

In this case, the scribe in 𝕆 was Oliver, and he initially wrote *this land* but immediately corrected
it to *the land*. On the other hand, there is one place where the 1830 compositor set *the land* instead
of the correct *this land:*

> Mosiah 1:10
>> I would that ye should make a proclamation throughout all this land
>> among all this people or the people of Zarahemla and the people of Mosiah
>> which dwell in [*this* 1PS | *the* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOQRT] land

Overall, scribal evidence indicates a persistent tendency to replace *this land* with *the land;* thus
there may be a primitive error in Alma 27:10 that entered the text as Oliver Cowdery took down
Joseph Smith's dictation. Oliver could have miswritten "we will perish in **this** land" as "we will
perish in **the** land" (or perhaps Joseph accidentally dictated "we will perish in **the** land" instead of
"we will perish in **this** land").

Despite this evidence for an early transmission error in Alma 27:10, it should be noted that in
the original text the general phrase *the land* does occur in specific contexts, as in this striking set
of examples for which the original manuscript is fully extant:

> 1 Nephi 3:18
>> wherefore if my father should dwell in **the** land
>> after that he hath been commanded to flee out of **the** land
>> behold he would also perish
>> wherefore it must needs be that he flee out of **the** land

Besides "dwelling in **the** land" and "fleeing out of **the** land", the Book of Mormon text also refers
to people succeeding or failing "in **the** land", as in the following examples:

1 Nephi 13:20	I Nephi beheld that they did prosper in **the** land
Mosiah 2:2	for they had multiplied exceedingly and waxed great in **the** land
Mosiah 10:18	and we have suffered this many years in **the** land
Alma 9:16	therefore the Lord will . . . prolong their existence in **the** land
Alma 46:37	and thus they did maintain peace in **the** land

Thus there is nothing inherently wrong in Alma 27:10 with "we will perish in **the** land". The criti-
cal text will therefore retain that phraseology, although the possibility remains that "we will perish
in **the** land" is an error for "we will perish in **this** land".

It should also be noted that the term "in the land" is often used in the King James Bible (and
in the original Hebrew) to mean 'in this land', as in these examples from the first two books in
the Hebrew Bible:

Genesis 26:22   and we shall be fruitful in **the** land

Genesis 42:34   and ye shall traffic in **the** land

Exodus 8:25   go ye / sacrifice to your God in **the** land

Exodus 12:19   whether he be a stranger or born in **the** land

Summary: Maintain in Alma 27:10 the reading of the original manuscript with its use of *the* in "we will perish in **the** land", even though nearby in verse 12 the text reads "get this people out of **this** land that they perish not"; although there is considerable manuscript evidence for accidentally replacing *this land* with *the land,* there are also many examples in the Book of Mormon text (as well as in the Bible) where the general phrase "in the land" means 'in this land'.

■ **Alma 27:12**

and blessed [*are / art* 0 | *art* >js *are* 1 | *art* A | *are* BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *this people in this generation*

As described under Mosiah 2:24, there are a few places in the manuscripts where Oliver Cowdery intended to write *are* but accidentally crossed the *e,* giving *art.* In each case, as here in Alma 27:12, the *t* looks as much like a crossed *e* as an actual *t.* In this instance, the incorrect *art* was copied into 𝓟 and then into the 1830 edition. In his editing for the 1837 edition, Joseph Smith grammatically emended the *art* to *are.*

Elsewhere in the text there are 40 examples of "blessed are" followed by a plural subject; not surprisingly, the manuscripts consistently read *are* rather than *art* for each of these other examples. (Here in Alma 27:12, *are* is possible since *this people* is a semantic plural; see the discussion under Alma 24:30 regarding the singular or plural number for the word *people.*) There are also 14 examples of "blessed art" in the text; all of these are followed, as expected, by *thou.*

Summary: Maintain in Alma 27:12 the correctly interpreted "and blessed **are** this people", even though what Oliver Cowdery actually wrote in 𝓞 was "and blessed **art** this people"; in a few instances, Oliver miswrote *are* as *art* by accidentally crossing the *e* as if it were a *t.*

■ **Alma 27:14**

and came into the wilderness [*that* >% NULL 0 | 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *which divided the land of Nephi from the land of Zarahemla*

Here in the original manuscript, Oliver Cowdery initially wrote the relative pronoun *that* instead of the correct *which.* He caught his error by erasing the *that* and then wrote *which* inline (he did not write over the erased *that*), thus showing that the correction was immediate. Occasionally in 𝓞 and 𝓟, Oliver mixed up the two restrictive relative pronouns *that* and *which.* For another example, see under Jacob 5:57; for a general discussion, see under WHICH in volume 3.

Summary: Accept the immediately corrected *which* in Alma 27:14 ("the wilderness which divided the land of Nephi from the land of Zarahemla").

■ **Alma 27:15**

behold I and my brethren **will** *go forth into the land of Zarahemla*
and ye **shall** *remain here until we return*
and we **will** *try the hearts of our brethren*
whether they will [NULL >‒ *that ye shall* 0 | NULL > *that ye shall* 1 |
that ye shall ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *come into their land*

Initially the original manuscript lacked the words "that ye shall", but later on Oliver Cowdery inserted these words supralinearly in 𝓞 and with a slightly weaker ink flow. The printer's manuscript also has the same words "that ye shall" inserted supralinearly, and there the correction seems to be virtually immediate (that is, there is no change in the level of ink flow in 𝓟). It is odd that both manuscripts have the insertion. One possible explanation is that only later Oliver decided to emend the text here as he was copying from 𝓞 into 𝓟; after adding "that ye shall" in 𝓟, he turned to 𝓞 and emended it as well (which would explain why the level of ink flow for the correction was slightly weaker in 𝓞 but the same in 𝓟). On the other hand, the correction seems so specific and the style so unlike current English, one is almost forced to think that Oliver simply made the same mistake twice: the original phraseology was difficult, and thus both times Oliver initially wrote the nonsensical but syntactically normal "whether they will come into their land". Ultimately, it seems doubtful that Oliver himself would have made up the correcting language.

One thing we can demonstrate is that the modal verb *shall* in the correcting "that ye shall" is fully appropriate. First of all, earlier in the verse the text has *ye shall:* "and ye shall remain here". Secondly, we get the following additional examples in the text where the main verb *will* (in the sense of 'to wish, want, or desire') is completed by a *that*-clause:

1 Nephi 18:10	we will not that our younger brother **shall** be a ruler over us
2 Nephi 5:3	for behold we will not that he **shall** be our ruler
Alma 18:14	what wilt thou that I **should** do for thee O king
Helaman 12:6	and they will not that he **should** be their guide
Helaman 13:19	for I will . . . that they **shall** hide up their treasures unto me
3 Nephi 27:2	what will ye that I **shall** give unto you
3 Nephi 27:3	we will that thou **wouldst** tell us the name . . .
3 Nephi 28:4	what will ye that I **should** do unto you
Mormon 8:15	for God will that it **shall** be done with an eye singled to his glory
Ether 2:23	what will ye that I **should** do that ye may have light in your vessels
Ether 2:25	therefore what will ye that I **should** prepare for you
Ether 8:19	neither doth he will that man **should** shed blood
Ether 15:34	whether the Lord will that I **be** translated or that I **suffer** the will of the Lord in the flesh . . .

Of these 13 examples, 12 take a modal verb (5 with *shall,* 6 with *should,* and 1 with *would*). Only Ether 15:34 omits the modal verb, and there the verb takes the subjunctive form *be:* "that I be translated". In fact, the verb *suffer* in the following conjoined *that*-clause can also be viewed as a subjunctive form.

In the King James Bible, *will* is used 20 times in this same way (namely, as a main verb completed by a *that*-clause). This construction is found only in the New Testament. In 16 of these

occurrences, the verb in the *that*-clause takes the subjunctive (that is, the infinitive form of a main verb), as in the following example that has the subjunctive *be* (like Ether 15:34):

> John 17:24   I will that they also . . . **be** with me where I am

In three cases the modal *shall* occurs:

> Matthew 20:32   what will ye that I **shall** do unto you
> Mark 15:12   what will ye then that I **shall** do *unto him*
> Luke 18:41   what wilt thou that I **shall** do unto thee

Only once does *should* occur:

> Mark 10:51   what wilt thou that I **should** do unto thee

The Book of Mormon and King James examples suggest the following theoretically possible alternatives for Alma 27:15:

□ a different modal verb:

(1) "that ye **should** come into their land"
(2) "that ye **will** come into their land"
(3) "that ye **would** come into their land"

□ no modal verb at all:

(4) "that ye come into their land"

The most reasonable possibility for Alma 27:15 seems to be the *shall* that is found in Oliver Cowdery's supralinear correction in both manuscripts since the larger passage otherwise uses the present-tense modals: "I and my brethren **will** go forth into the land of Zarahemla and ye **shall** remain here until we return and we **will** try the hearts of our brethren". The modal *will,* although theoretically possible, would sound odd if it were the original reading here in Alma 27:15 ("whether they will that ye **will** come into their land").

Summary: Accept in Alma 27:15 the corrected reading in 𝓞 and 𝓟: "whether they will **that ye shall** come into their land"; the initial reading in both manuscripts (without "that ye shall") is probably due to Oliver Cowdery's difficulty in dealing with the unusualness in modern English of the construction "to will that <clause>".

■ **Alma 27:19**

now the joy of Alma in meeting his brethren was truly great
*and also the joy **of** Aaron **of** Omner **and** Himni*

As discussed under Alma 22:35, the structure of "of Aaron of Omner and Himni" seems strange. One would think that there should be an *of* before *Himni* or an *and* before *of Omner,* thus allowing for these alternatives:

□ repetition of the *of:*

the joy of Aaron of Omner and **of** Himni

□ repetition of the *and:*

the joy of Aaron **and** of Omner and Himni

□ repetition of both the *of* and the *and:*

the joy of Aaron **and** of Omner and **of** Himni

The text of the Book of Mormon typically allows prepositional and conjunctive repetition in conjoined structures (see the general discussion under CONJUNCTIVE REPETITION in volume 3). However, there are definitely cases where the repetition is lacking, as in the following two examples that show the same patterning of the example here in Alma 27:19; in both examples, I provide the larger passage so the reader can see the prevalence of more fully repetitive conjunctive expressions like "of X and of Y and of Z":

3 Nephi 30:2
turn all ye Gentiles from your wicked ways
and repent **of your evil doings of your lyings and deceivings**
and [1 | *of* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] your whoredoms
and of your secret abominations and your idolatries
and of your murders and [1ABCDEFIJLMNOPQRST | *of* GHK] your priestcrafts
and your envyings and your strifes

Ether 9:16 –18
and in the space of sixty and two years they had become exceeding strong
insomuch that they became exceeding rich
having all manner of fruit and of grain
and of silks and of fine linen
and of gold and of silver and of precious things
and also all manner **of cattle of oxen and cows**
and of sheep and of swine and of goats
and also many other kind of animals which were useful for the food of man

The first of these passages shows some textual variation in the occurrence of the repetitive *of*. See under 3 Nephi 30:2 for a discussion of this variation.

The critical text will follow the earliest textual sources in determining which syntactic elements will be repeated in conjunctive structures. Thus the invariant reading "and also the joy of Aaron of Omner and Himni" in Alma 27:19 will be maintained, despite its relative unusualness.

Summary: Maintain in Alma 27:19 the phraseology "of Aaron of Omner and Himni"; although only marginally repetitive, such constructions can be found elsewhere in the text.

■ **Alma 27:20**

and now it came to pass **that** *Alma conducted his brethren back to the land of Zarahemla*

The original manuscript is not extant here in Alma 27:20, but spacing between extant fragments does not allow for the *that* except by supralinear insertion:

Alma 27:19–20 (lines 19–20, page 273′ of 𝒪)

```
                                                    (              )
                                                       THAT
    -hold their joy was not that to excede their strength & now it came (t         )
                                                       O PASS ^ Alma

    conducted his Brethren back to the land of Zarahemla even to (   ) ow(n       )
                                                       HIS      HOUSE &
```

The printer's manuscript has the *that,* as do all published editions. Of course, we expect *that* after "it came to pass". Yet elsewhere in the earliest text there are two examples where "it came to pass" is directly followed by the subject of the main clause without any intervening *that:*

> Alma 53:16
>> but behold it came to pass they had many sons which . . .

> Alma 55:14
>> and it came to pass [01ABCDEFIJLMNOQRT | *that* GHKPS]
>> they did drink and were merry

In both these cases, the original manuscript is extant and the *that* is not there. It is quite possible that Oliver Cowdery, the scribe for these two cases, accidentally skipped the *that* in 𝒪 when he took down Joseph Smith's dictation. But in copying these passages into the printer's manuscript, it should be noted, Oliver did not insert the *that.* So perhaps we can assume here in Alma 27:20 that the original manuscript had a supralinear *that* since otherwise there is no evidence that Oliver ever added the *that* after *it came to pass* as he copied from 𝒪 into 𝒫. Of course, in the overwhelming majority of cases, we have the conjunction *that* between "it came to pass" and the directly following subject of the main clause. And there is evidence that Oliver sometimes initially omitted the *that* as he took down Joseph's dictation:

> Alma 24:1
>> and it came to pass [NULL >– *that* 0 | *that* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
>> the Amlicites and the Amulonites and the Lamanites . . .

> Alma 44:13
>> and it came to pass [*the* > *that* 0 | *that* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
>> the soldier which stood by . . .

> Alma 51:7
>> and it came to pass [*the* >% *that* 0 | *that* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
>> the voice of the people came in the favor of the freemen

For a fourth possibility, see under Alma 57:7; in that case, spacing between extant fragments argues for a supralinearly inserted *that* (just like here in Alma 27:20).

There is also one case in the history of the printed editions where the *that* after "it came to pass" was accidentally omitted in the context of an immediately following subject of the main clause:

Alma 52:20

and it came to pass [*that* 01ABCGHKPS | DEFIJLMNOQRT]
they sent embassies to the army of the Lamanites

In this case, the 1841 British edition accidentally omitted the *that;* it will be restored in the critical text.

The possibility still remains, of course, that Oliver accidentally inserted the expected *that* in Alma 27:20 as he copied from 𝒪 into 𝒫. Note, by the way, that in Alma 55:14, listed earlier in this discussion, the 1858 Wright edition added the *that* and it has continued in the RLDS text. So the tendency to add the *that* after "it came to pass" does exist, but the stronger tendency is to omit the *that.* For a complete discussion, see under THAT in volume 3.

Summary: Maintain in Alma 27:20 the earliest (and current) reading with the expected *that* after "it came to pass" and before the main clause, "Alma conducted his brethren back to the land of Zarahemla".

■ **Alma 27:20**

and it came to pass that they went
and told the chief judge all the things
[*which* 0 | *which* >js *that* 1 | *that* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *had happened unto them*
in the land of Nephi

Here the 1830 typesetter accidentally replaced *which* with *that*. Joseph Smith, following the 1830 edition, changed the original *which* in the printer's manuscript to *that* as he was editing the text for the 1837 edition. There are a number of cases like this where Joseph, in his editing for the 1837 edition, made the printer's manuscript agree with a change that the 1830 typesetter had earlier introduced into the text. For some other examples, see the emendations of *partook* to *partake* (in 1 Nephi 8:11) and *murdereth* to *murdered* (in Alma 1:18).

Nonetheless, there was no need here in Alma 27:20 to follow the 1830 edition. Statistically, the phrase "all the things which" is more frequent in the Book of Mormon text than "all the things that" (10 to 3):

1 Nephi 14:30	all the things **which** I saw
2 Nephi 33:1	all the things **which** were taught among my people
Mosiah 4:9	all the things **which** the Lord can comprehend
Mosiah 27:35	all the things **which** they had seen
Mosiah 28:11	all the things **which** he had kept and preserved
Mosiah 28:20	all the things **which** he had kept
Alma 18:1	all the things **which** they had seen
Alma 27:20	all the things **which** had happened unto them
Alma 51:35	all the things **that** he had done
Alma 55:15	all the things **that** had happened
Helaman 2:9	all the things **which** he had seen and heard and done
Helaman 5:50	all the things **which** they had heard and seen
Mormon 1:4	all the things **that** ye have observed

Grammatically there is nothing wrong with using *which* in a restrictive sense, despite the prescriptive claim to the contrary. See the first section under *that* in Merriam Webster's Dictionary of English Usage.

Summary: Restore the original and fully grammatical "all the things which" in Alma 27:20.

■ **Alma 27:22**

and this land [*Jershur > Jershon* 0 | *Jershon* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *is the land which we will give unto our brethren for an inheritance*

Here in the original manuscript, Oliver Cowdery initially wrote *Jershon* as *Jershur,* then virtually immediately corrected *Jershur* to *Jershon* by overwriting the final *ur* with *on*. There is no change in the level of ink flow for this correction.

This is the only place in extant portions of ○ where the name *Jershon* was ever misspelled or miswritten. (In the printer's manuscript, Oliver Cowdery once miswrote it as *Jeshon,* in Alma 28:1.) The first occurrence of the name *Jershon* is extant in ○ and is found a little earlier here in Alma 27:22: "we will give up the land of **Jershon**". Perhaps for the second occurrence of the name, initially misspelled as *Jershur,* the final *ur* was influenced by the preceding *er* in the name (especially since the *er* was likely pronounced /ɚ/ rather than /ɛr/). It seems less likely that Oliver was affected by the biblical place-name *Geshur,* the land where Absalom lived in exile (referred to in 2 Samuel 3 and 2 Samuel 13–15 as well as in 1 Chronicles 2–3), although we cannot wholly discount such an influence since Oliver seems to have been influenced by biblical names elsewhere in this part of the text (see the discussion regarding *Amalekites* and *Midian* under Alma 24:5). In any event, *Jershon* is definitely correct.

Summary: Maintain the name *Jershon* in Alma 27:22 and elsewhere in the text; the first occurrence of the name is extant in ○ and reads *Jershon.*

■ **Alma 27:22–24**

(1) *behold we will give up the* **land of Jershon** . . .
(2) *and this* **land Jershon** *is the land which we will give unto our brethren for an inheritance*
(3) *and behold we will set our armies between the* **land Jershon** *and the land Nephi that we may protect our brethren*
(4) *in the* **land** [*of* 0 | NULL > *of* 1 | ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] **Jershon** . . .
    and now behold this will we do unto our brethren
(5) *that they may inherit the* **land Jershon**

In these first five references to the land Jershon, the earliest text varies between "land **of** Jershon" and "land Jershon" (2 to 3). In one case (the fourth one listed), the earliest text had the *of,* but the 1830 typesetter omitted it, perhaps accidentally. In fact, Oliver Cowdery also omitted, at least initially, this same *of* as he was producing the printer's manuscript, but there he caught his mistake almost immediately and inserted the *of* supralinearly (there is no change in the level of ink flow for the *of* in 𝒫).

After this initial variability in Alma 27:22−24, the remainder of the text basically settles on "land of Jershon" (16 times), although there is one more instance of "land Jershon" in the earliest text (namely, in Alma 31:3). In that case, the 1830 typesetter accidentally replaced "land Jershon" with "land of Jershon" (see the discussion under Alma 31:3). Clearly, either reading is possible; so for each case of "land (of) Jershon", the critical text will follow the earliest textual sources in determining whether the *of* is there or not. We have found similar variability elsewhere in the text for "land (of) X" and "city (of) X"; see under 1 Nephi 17:7 for "land (of) Bountiful" and under 1 Nephi 11:13 for "city (of) Jerusalem".

David Calabro (personal communication) points out that the phrase "land Nephi" here in Alma 27:23 is unique to the text. Everywhere else the text reads "land **of** Nephi". He suggests that this one instance of "the land Nephi" may be an error: perhaps the preceding "the land Jershon" led to the loss of an original *of* in a conjoined "the land **of** Nephi". There is, in fact, a similar loss of an original *of* in another instance of "between the land (of) X and the land (of) Y":

> 3 Nephi 3:23 (original text)
> and the land which was appointed was the land of Zarahemla
> and the land **which was between the land of Zarahemla and the land** Bountiful
> yea to the line which was between the land Bountiful and the land Desolation

The portion in bold was skipped in the typesetting of the 1837 edition. When restored to the 1981 LDS edition, the *of* in "the land of Zarahemla" was set as "the land Zarahemla", perhaps under the influence of the following conjunct "the land Bountiful".

Calabro also suggests that the Book of Mormon always places *of* in phrases of the form "land (of) X" whenever X is a personal name. This proposed consistency could be used, for instance, to explain why the text has examples of only "land of Zarahemla", but none of "land Zarahemla" (see the discussion under Alma 2:15). Similarly, one could argue that the one case of "land Nephi" in Alma 27:23 is an error for "land **of** Nephi". Another case where this proposed consistency could be used to emend the text deals with "land (of) Manti". The earliest text has nine occurrences of "land **of** Manti" but only one of "land Manti":

> Alma 43:32
> and so down into the borders of the land
> [01ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRT | *of* s] Manti

In this instance, the 1953 RLDS edition supplied the expected *of*. Yet in the case of *Manti*, one could permit the possibility of "land Manti" by noting that *Manti* is a place-name as well as a personal name:

> Alma 1:15   and they carried him upon the top of the hill **Manti**
> Alma 2:22   now those which he had sent out to watch the camp of the Amlicites
>   were called Zeram and Amnor and **Manti** and Limher

Ultimately, however, there is probably not much in the proposed consistency of "land **of** <personal name>" since that consistency does not hold for "city **of** <personal name>". In the earliest text, there are definitely a few instances involving *city* and a personal name where the *of* is lacking:

> Alma 47:31   he entered the **city Nephi** with his armies
> Alma 49:14   yea even to exceed the strength of the **city Ammonihah**

Alma 55:26	when he had fortified the **city Gid**
Alma 55:33	the Lamanites had by their labors fortified the **city Morionton**
Alma 62:18	when they had come to the **city Nephihah**

Thus there is little force in the argument from personal names that "the land Nephi" in Alma 27:23 is an error for "the land **of** Nephi". The critical text will therefore retain the earliest reading, "between the land Jershon and the land Nephi".

Summary: Maintain in Alma 27:23 the unique instance of "land Nephi", but restore the original instance of "land **of** Jershon" in the clause "that we may protect our brethren in the land **of** Jershon"; the earliest text has examples of both "land of Jershon" and "land Jershon", although the cases with the *of* considerably outnumber the cases without it (18 to 4).

■ **Alma 27:23**

and this we do for our brethren
on account of their fear to take up arms against their brethren
lest they should commit sin
and this [*their* 01ABDEFIJLMNOPQRST | CGHK] *great fear came*
because of their sore repentance . . .

Here we have an example of a demonstrative followed by a possessive pronoun (namely, "this their") that was removed from the text. In this instance, the 1840 edition omitted the *their,* probably accidentally. The *their* was restored to the RLDS text in 1908. Elsewhere in the text there are three other occurrences of "this their", none of which have been removed from the text:

Alma 55:31	in **this their** times of affliction
Helaman 4:13	because of **this their** great wickedness
Helaman 11:11	because of **this their** humility

The example from Helaman 4:13 is similar to this one in Alma 27:23 (both have the adjective *great* before the noun).

The critical text will maintain all original instances of the demonstrative followed by a possessive pronoun, such as "this their" here in Alma 27:23. For a nearby example involving "these our", see under Alma 26:14 (in that case, the possessive pronoun *our* was removed rather than the demonstrative *these*).

Summary: Maintain the combined demonstrative and possessive pronoun "this their" in Alma 27:23 (and elsewhere in the text).

■ **Alma 27:23**

and this their great fear came because of their sore repentance
which they had on account of [*the* 01 | *their* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *many murders*
and their awful wickedness

Here both the original and printer's manuscripts read "**the** many murders and **their** awful wickedness". The 1830 typesetter replaced the definite article *the* with the possessive pronoun

their. It is possible that Joseph Smith read off "their many murders" but that Oliver Cowdery, the scribe here in the original manuscript, wrote *the* instead of *their*. There is considerable evidence that Oliver tended to replace *their* with *the*. In the following, I list instances where he initially made the error in 𝒪 or in 𝒫 and then immediately—or virtually immediately—corrected it:

◻ initial errors in 𝒪

Alma 40:13

therefore the spirit of the devil did enter into them
and take possession of [*the* > *their* 0 | *their* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] house

Alma 43:22

therefore they departed out of the land of Antionum into the wilderness
and took [*the* >% *their* 0 | *their* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] journey
round about in the wilderness

Alma 58:18

the Lamanites did come out
with [*the* >% *their* 0 | *their* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] numerous army
against us

◻ initial errors in 𝒫

Mosiah 10:13

that they were wronged while in the land
of [*the* > *their* 1 | *their* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] first inheritance

Alma 55:13

and it was pleasant to [*their* 0ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST | *the* >+ *their* 1] taste

Alma 59:13

Moroni was angry with the government
because of [*the* > *their* 1 | *their* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] indifference
concerning the freedom of their country

Alma 60:32

behold can you suppose that the Lord will spare you
and come out in judgment against the Lamanites
when it is the tradition of their fathers that hath caused
[*the* > *their* 1 | *their* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] hatred

Helaman 4:11

now this great loss of the Nephites and the great slaughter which was among them
would not have happened had it not been
for [*the* > *their* 1 | *their* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] wickedness
and their abomination which was among them

There is also one instance where Oliver appears to have miscopied the *their* of 𝒪 into 𝒫 as *the:*

Alma 13:10

and it was on account of
[*their* 0BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST | *the* 1A] exceeding faith and repentance
and their righteousness before God

Although in Alma 13:10 the original manuscript is not extant for the *ir* at the end of *their,* there is room for it between extant fragments of ℺. The resulting conjunctive structure in Alma 13:10 is strikingly similar to that of the earliest reading for Alma 27:23 (both have the form "the X and their Y").

When we consider other instances of "the many X" in the text, we find that there are actually four instances of "the many X" without any postmodification, but these are all restricted to the phrase "the many waters" (meaning 'ocean') and are found only in 1 Nephi 13. For all remaining examples of "the many X" (24 of them), the X is restrictively postmodified by a relative clause, as in these nearby examples where the text refers to "the many murders" and the sins committed by the Anti-Nephi-Lehies:

> Alma 24:9
>
> > we have been convinced of our sins
> > and of the many murders **which we have committed**
>
> Alma 24:11
>
> > to repent of all our sins and the many murders **which we have committed**
>
> Alma 27:6
>
> > because of the many murders and sins **we have committed against them**
>
> Alma 27:8
>
> > until we repair unto them the many murders
> > and sins **which we have committed against them**

It could well be that these previous occurrences of "the many murders", especially the two in verses 6 and 8 of this chapter, led Oliver to accidentally write "the many murders" one more time in Alma 27:23, an error that he did not catch.

One could argue that "the many murders", the earliest text in Alma 27:23, involves ellipsis and presumes that the reader will recognize that "the many murders" refers to the ones committed by these repentant Lamanites (and referred to earlier in the chapter). The only evidence for this kind of ellipsis in the text is based on examples like the one listed earlier, "**the** exceeding faith and repentance" in Alma 13:10, which is apparently an error for "**their** exceeding faith and repentance" (see the discussion under that passage). Another possibility for emending Alma 27:23 would be to assume that there was a relative clause in the original text and that this clause was somehow omitted during the early transmission of the text; in other words, the original text may have read something like "on account of the many murders **which they had committed** and their awful wickedness". But the possibility of a relative clause being lost seems much less plausible than an original *their* being accidentally replaced by *the.* The most probable solution here is to assume that the strange reading "the many murders" in ℺ and 𝒫 is in error and that the *the* is a mistake for *their.* The critical text will accept the 1830 emendation as the probable reading of the original text.

Summary: Accept in Alma 27:23 the 1830 typesetter's emendation of "**the** many murders" to "**their** many murders"; this emendation is supported by Oliver Cowdery's tendency to write *the* in place of *their* and by the fact that the otherwise expected postmodifying relative clause is lacking.

■ **Alma 27:24**

and we will guard them from their enemies
[*by* 01|*with* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *our armies*

The 1830 typesetter here changed the preposition *by* to *with*. Perhaps he felt that *by* seemed strange or that it might be misinterpreted as meaning 'beside' rather than 'by means of'. Or maybe his change was simply a typo.

Elsewhere in the Book of Mormon text, the preposition *with* is typically the one used with the verb *guard:*

> Alma 18:21
>> and if it were needed
>> I would guard thee **with** my armies

> Alma 55:26
>> and he also guarded that city **with** an exceeding strong force

> Alma 58:8
>> but it came to pass that we did receive food which was guarded to us
>> [*with* 0|*by* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] an army of two thousand men

The last example shows Oliver Cowdery, in his copywork from 𝓞 into 𝓟, miscopying the preposition *with* as *by.* Unlike the case here of Alma 27:24, in Alma 58:8 the 1830 typesetter maintained the reading in 𝓟 with its *by.* Undoubtedly the occurrence of the passive form of the verb *guard* made the use of *by* sound right ("which was guarded to us **by** an army of two thousand men"), whereas in Alma 27:24 the verb was in the active, which made the original use of *by* sound strange ("we will guard them . . . **by** our armies").

The Oxford English Dictionary, under definition 30 for the preposition *by,* gives citations of *by* with the meaning 'by means of', as in these two examples (spelling regularized), one from Early Modern English, the other from the 19th century:

> Hugh Latimer (1548)
>> Christ . . . draweth souls unto him **by** his bloody sacrifice.

> Charles Kingsley (1855)
>> The bird's foot star . . . you may see crawling **by** its thousand sucking feet.

In theory, either *by* or *with* will work in Alma 27:24 as well as in Alma 58:8. The critical text will, in each case, follow the earliest extant reading, thus *by* in Alma 27:24 and *with* in Alma 58:8.

Summary: Restore the preposition *by* in Alma 27:24 ("and we will guard them from their enemies **by** our armies") and the preposition *with* in Alma 58:8 ("we did receive food which was guarded to us **with** an army of two thousand men").

■ **Alma 27:24**

and we will guard them from their enemies by our armies
on [*conditions* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQS | *condition* RT]
[*that* 1ART | BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQS] *they will give us a portion of their substance*

As discussed under Mosiah 19:15, the original text always refers to *conditions* (that is, in the plural), never to *condition.* Modern-day readers expect the singular in the phrase "on condition that", thus the 1920 LDS edition's change to the "on condition that". This 1920 change was intentional since it was marked in the copy of the 1911 edition used by the 1920 committee to emend the LDS text.

In the typesetting for the 1837 edition, the *that* which follows "on conditions" was omitted, probably accidentally. Elsewhere in the text, whenever *conditions* is followed by a clause, the subordinate *that* is present, although there are only two other examples:

> 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 even one half of all they possessed

> Alma 54:11
>> save it be on conditions **that** ye will deliver up a man and his wife and his children
>>> for one prisoner

Here in Alma 27:24, the 1920 LDS edition restored the original *that* to the LDS text; on the other hand, the RLDS text has never restored the *that,* even though it is extant in 𝓟 and was not crossed out by Joseph Smith when he edited 𝓟 for the 1837 edition.

One might wonder here whether this example in Alma 27:24 should actually read "on **the** conditions", as in the preceding example in Alma 17:15 ("on **the** conditions of repentance"). Spacing considerations for Alma 27:24 indicate that the last line on this page of 𝓞 ended with the word *on;* there is no room for a *the* except by sublinear or supralinear insertion. On the other hand, the word *conditions* appears to have begun the next page of 𝓞 (in accord with spacing between extant fragments). So it is possible that when copying from 𝓞 into 𝓟, Oliver Cowdery accidentally omitted the last word, a *the,* if it were indeed there in 𝓞.

Usually the word *conditions* takes some kind of determiner (such as *the, any, what,* and *these*). However, in two cases besides Alma 27:24, there is no determiner: "only on conditions of repentance" (in Alma 42:13) and "on conditions that . . ." (in Alma 54:11). In the first case, the original manuscript is extant and there is no *the.* In the second case, the original manuscript is not extant, but spacing considerations indicate that *the* could have been there only as a supralinear insertion; most probably, there was no *the* for this phrase in the original manuscript. Thus there is no strong evidence that "on conditions" in Alma 27:24 is a mistake for "on **the** conditions". The critical text will assume that the original manuscript page in 𝓞 for Alma 27:24 ended with *on* and not *on the.*

Summary: Restore the plural *conditions* in Alma 27:24; also maintain the subordinate conjunction *that* after "on conditions", but do not emend "on conditions" to "on **the** conditions".

■ **Alma 27:25**

now it came to pass that when Ammon had heard this
he returned to the people of Anti-Nephi-Lehi
and also Alma with him into the wilderness
[*where* 1APRST | *whence* BCDEFGHIJKLMNOQ] *they had pitched their tents*

In this passage, the 1837 edition changed *where* to *whence,* apparently a typo since *whence* means 'from where', which obviously will not work here (although this may not have been obvious when the 1837 change was made, since *whence* was by then archaic in English). The 1908 RLDS edition restored the original *where* to the RLDS text (probably by reference to 𝒫); the 1920 LDS text made the change in the LDS text (probably by reference to the 1830 edition or for grammatical reasons).

The Oxford English Dictionary points out that *from whence* is a redundancy (see under *whence*). Interestingly, the Book of Mormon text has 21 examples of *whence* and every one of them is preceded by *from.* On the other hand, the King James Bible has 72 occurrences of *whence,* of which only 27 of them are preceded by *from.* Thus we get variation in the King James Bible, as in the following contrastive pair of questions:

Genesis 42:7   and he said unto them : **whence** come ye
Joshua 9:8   and Joshua said unto them : who *are* ye and **from whence** come ye

But we never get this variation in the original Book of Mormon text; there is only *from whence.* Thus the secondary reading here in Alma 27:25, "whence they had pitched their tents", is inconsistent with Book of Mormon usage since there is no preceding *from.* Of course, if *from* had been added when the 1837 typesetter changed *where* to *whence,* the error would have been obvious: "he returned . . . into the wilderness **from whence** they had pitched their tents".

Summary: Maintain the original *where* in Alma 27:25 ("he returned . . . into the wilderness **where** they had pitched their tents").

■ **Alma 27:25–26**

now it came to pass that when Ammon had heard this
he returned to the people of Anti-Nephi-Lehi and also Alma with him
into the wilderness where they had pitched their tents
and made known unto them all these things
and Alma also related unto them
his [*conversion* 1ABCGHIJKLMNOPQRST | *conversation* D | *convertion* E |
    conversion > conversation F] *with Ammon and Aaron and his brethren*
and it came to pass that it did cause great joy among them

This passage refers to Alma telling the Anti-Nephi-Lehies the story of his conversion—namely, when the angel appeared to him and the four sons of Mosiah (as described in Mosiah 27). The earliest textual sources (𝒫 as well as the first three editions) read *conversion.* (𝒪 is not extant except for the final *n* in the word; the spacing between extant fragments is sufficiently large that either *conversion* or *conversation* would fit.) The 1841 British edition accidentally misread *conversion*

(the 1837 reading) as *conversation,* which will in some sense work since Alma and the four sons of Mosiah had undoubtedly been conversing with each other (and the chief judge of the Nephites) on what to do to protect these Lamanites. But the larger passage argues against the word *conversation.* When Ammon returns with Alma, they first "made known unto them **all these things**" — namely, what the Nephites had agreed to do; their explanation would have included, at least by implication, any conversation Alma might have had with Ammon and the other sons of Mosiah regarding that issue. Thus when the text says that "Alma also related unto them <some information>", that information should be something new, like Alma's conversion story (which was much more personal and harrowing than what the sons of king Mosiah, who were with Alma when the angel appeared, could have previously told the Anti-Nephi-Lehies about that experience).

The incorrect *conversation* was not easily removed from the LDS text. After its first appearance in the 1841 British edition, Orson Pratt restored the correct *conversion* in the 1849 edition. The word was, however, misspelled in the 1849 edition as *convertion,* perhaps because the copytext for the 1849 edition was a copy of the 1841 British edition in which Pratt, we can speculate, had corrected *conversation* to *conversion* by simply crossing out the *sa* in *conversation,* giving *convertion* (it would have been better to have crossed out the *at*). Another possibility is that the 1849 misspelling resulted from the fact that *conversion* is related to the verb *convert,* which ends in *t.* In any event, in the first printing of the 1852 edition, the word was spelled correctly as *conversion,* but for the second printing, the 1841 reading was intentionally restored to the LDS text. (The clear majority of the substantive changes for the second 1852 printing derive from the 1840 Cincinnati/Nauvoo edition, not from the 1841 British edition.) Finally, in the 1879 edition, Orson Pratt once more restored the correct *conversion* to the text.

As discussed under Mosiah 19:24 (with respect to the word *ceremony*), the Book of Mormon text never actually uses the term *conversation,* although there are eight examples of the verb *converse.* On the other hand, there are four other occurrences of the word *conversion* in the Book of Mormon text:

Helaman preface	an account of their **conversion**
Helaman 6:3	because of the **conversion** of the Lamanites
Helaman 6:4	and did declare . . . the manner of their **conversion**
3 Nephi 9:20	because of their faith in me at the time of their **conversion**

So the original use of *conversion* here in Alma 27:26 is perfectly acceptable.

Summary: Accept in Alma 27:25 the word *conversion,* the reading found in the earliest textual sources and the one that makes more sense contextually than *conversation.*

■ **Alma 27:27**

and they were [*numbered* 0| 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *among the people of Nephi*
and also **numbered** *among the people which were of the church of God*

Here in the original manuscript, there is an extant fragment which records the last part, *ered,* of a word. This word was omitted when Oliver Cowdery copied from 𝒪 into 𝒫. This word was undoubtedly *numbered,* especially when we consider that the following conjoined predicate uses

the adverb *also* with *numbered:* "and **also numbered** among the people which were of the church of God". The original text here states that the people of Anti-Nephi-Lehi were counted as Nephites and, in addition, as members of the church.

The current reading "and they were among the people of Nephi" seems trivial since in the previous verse the text explains that these people "went down into the land of Jershon and took possession of the land of Jershon" (Alma 27:26). The land of Jershon is in Nephite territory, so obviously one might conclude that these people would be "among the people of Nephi". Yet actually this does not work. The Anti-Nephi-Lehies are not "among the Nephites" (that is, living in the midst of the Nephites); instead, they have their own land, the land of Jershon.

Here in Alma 27:27, the word *numbered* seems to be precisely what is missing from the reading. People are numbered with other people (33 times); we include in this tally two cases where the verb *number* has been accidentally replaced by *remember* (see under 1 Nephi 15:16 and Alma 1:24). Other theoretical possibilities for Alma 27:27 in lieu of *numbered,* such as *considered, gathered, remembered,* and *scattered,* are unlikely.

Summary: Restore the apparent reading of the original manuscript in Alma 27:27: "and they were **numbered** among the people of Nephi"; this reading is consistent with all other examples in the text of people being numbered with other people, including one in the immediately following conjoined predicate: "and also **numbered** among the people which were of the church of God".

■ **Alma 27:27**

and they were also distinguished
for their [*zealous* > *zeal* 0 | *zeal* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *towards God*

Here in the original manuscript, Oliver Cowdery appears to have started to write "and they were also distinguished for their **zealousness** towards God". But after writing *zealous,* Oliver crossed out the *ous,* giving the correct *zeal.* There are a few examples of *zealous* and *zeal* in the text but none of *zealousness.*

Summary: Accept *zeal,* the corrected reading in 𝒪 for Alma 27:27 ("for their **zeal** towards God").

■ **Alma 27:29**

therefore they would suffer death in the most aggravating and distressing manner
    which could be inflicted by their brethren
before they would take the sword or [*the* 01ABCGHKPS | DEFIJLMNOQRT] *scimitar*
    to smite them

Here the 1841 British edition accidentally omitted the repeated definite article *the* in "the sword or **the** scimitar". This variant has been followed in all subsequent LDS editions. The use of the repeated determiner is a Hebraistic characteristic of the Book of Mormon text and should be restored wherever there is textual evidence to support such repetition. When we consider all other conjoined examples of *sword* and *scimitar,* we always get repetition of either (1) the determiner or (2) the preposition if there is no determiner:

Mosiah 9:16	**with** swords and **with** scimitars
Mosiah 10:8	**with** swords and **with** scimitars
Alma 2:12	**with** swords and **with** scimitars
Alma 43:18	**with** swords and **with** scimitars
Alma 43:20	**their** swords and **their** scimitars
Alma 43:37	with **their** swords and **their** scimitars
Alma 44:8	**his** sword and **his** scimitar
Alma 60:2	**with** swords and **with** scimitars
Helaman 1:14	**with** swords and **with** scimitars

Thus the text consistently prefers some repetition when *sword* and *scimitar* are conjoined. For another example of the repetitive *the,* see the discussion under 1 Nephi 17:22 (which deals with the conjoining of *statutes* and *judgments*); also see the general discussion under CONJUNCTIVE REPETITION in volume 3.

Summary: Restore the omitted *the* before *scimitar* in Alma 27:29, thus making the text consistent in its repetitive structure for all conjuncts of *sword* and *scimitar.*

Alma 28

■ **Alma 28:1**

and now it came to pass that
after the people of Ammon were established in the land of Jershon
and a church also established in the land [0 | *of Jershon* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
and the armies of the Nephites were set round about the land
    [*of* 01ABCDEFGIJLMNOPQRST | HK] *Jershon . . .*

There is no evidence in the original manuscript for a supralinearly inserted "of Jershon" after the second "in the land" in this verse. Here Oliver Cowdery added the "of Jershon" in 𝒫 as he copied from 𝒪. One possibility is that "of Jershon" should have been in the original manuscript but was accidentally skipped as Oliver was taking down Joseph Smith's dictation. The other possibility is that there was no need for Oliver to add the words in the printer's manuscript but that he did so because the fuller phrase "the land of Jershon" occurs in both the immediately preceding and following clauses ("after the people of Ammon were established in **the land of Jershon** . . . and the armies of the Nephites were set round about **the land of Jershon**").

There are a couple of other examples where the text first refers to "the land of X" and then immediately thereafter to the same land as simply "the land":

Alma 15:13
    and Alma established a church **in the land of Sidom**
    and consecrated priests and teachers **in the land**
    to baptize unto the Lord whosoever were desirous to be baptized

Alma 28:8
    and this is the account of Ammon and his brethren
    their journeyings **into the land of Nephi**
    their sufferings **in the land**
    their sorrows and their afflictions

Thus the original reading in Alma 28:1, "and a church also established in the land" (that is, without any "of Jershon" after *land*), is quite possible. The critical text will here restore the earliest text, the reading in 𝒪.

We also note that in the last instance of "the land of Jershon" the 1874 RLDS edition omitted the *of*; later the 1908 RLDS edition restored the *of* to the RLDS text. As discussed under Alma 27:22–24, either "land of Jershon" or "land Jershon" is possible; so in each instance we follow the earliest textual sources, thus "the armies of the Nephites were set round about the land **of** Jershon" here in Alma 28:1.

Summary: Follow the original manuscript in Alma 28:1, which has only the shorter "in the land" (not "in the land of Jershon") in reference to the establishment of a church among the people of Ammon; in addition, maintain the *of* in the later occurrence in the verse of "the land **of** Jershon".

■ **Alma 28:2–3**

and thus [0A | NULL >js *there was* 1 | *there was* BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *a tremendious battle*
yea even such an one as never had been known
among all the people in the land from the time Lehi left Jerusalem
yea and tens of thousands of the Lamanites were slain and scattered abroad
yea and also **there was** *a tremendious slaughter among the people of Nephi*

The original manuscript is extant here and reads "and thus a tremendious battle"—that is, without any verb. This expression may be a literalism carried over from the original language of the Book of Mormon, but it is quite unacceptable in English as a stand-alone sentence. (For *tremendious* rather than the standard *tremendous,* see below.) Of course, here the reading in 𝒪 may represent an accidental loss of some words, although this sentence fragment must have not been too objectionable since the printer's manuscript and the 1830 edition reproduced this reading without any emendation.

In his editing for the 1837 edition, Joseph Smith added the words "there was", giving us the current reading: "and thus **there was** a tremendous battle". This phraseology is definitely characteristic of the Book of Mormon since the existential "there was a(n) X" occurs 42 times in the earliest text. Moreover, in the very next verse we have precisely this kind of existential construction—and with the word *tremendious:*

> Alma 28:3
>> yea and also **there was** a tremendious slaughter among the people of Nephi

The parallelism between these two adjacent verses, plus the use of the word *also,* suggests that the original manuscript is defective here in verse 2 and that it should have read as Joseph edited it for the 1837 edition. He probably patterned his emendation in verse 2 on the reading in verse 3.

In the original (and current) text, there are no other examples of "(and) thus <noun phrase>" with the existential meaning 'and thus there is/was <noun phrase>'—that is, there are no examples of existential "(and) thus" without the *there* and a corresponding existential verb. As expected, there are other examples of "(and) thus there <existential verb phrase>":

> Alma 4:9   and thus . . . **there began to be** great contentions
>> among the people of the church
>
> Alma 25:6   and thus **there were** many of them converted in the wilderness
>
> 3 Nephi 6:14   and thus **there became** a great unequality in all the land
>
> Mormon 2:11   thus **there began to be** a mourning and a lamentation in all the land

In none of these instances have the *there* and the existential verb phrase ever been omitted. There are, however, a couple of cases where other instances of the existential *there* have been momentarily lost during the early transmission of the text:

> Helaman 11:1 (*there* momentarily omitted in 𝒫 by Oliver Cowdery)
>> insomuch that [NULL > *there* 1 | *there* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] were wars
>>> throughout all the land

3 Nephi 28:37 (*there must* omitted by scribe 2 of 𝒫, supplied by Oliver Cowdery)
>and he hath made it manifest unto me
>that [𝔰2 NULL > 𝔰1 *there must* 1 | *there must* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
>needs be a change wrought upon their bodies

The omission of *there was* in Alma 28:2 is possible, although there is no other omission precisely like it.

Summary: Accept Joseph Smith's emendation of the text in Alma 28:2 ("and thus **there was** a tremendious battle") since the reading in 𝒪 does seem to be quite defective and the most reasonable emendation is *there was,* the reading found in the next verse ("yea and also **there was** a tremendious slaughter").

■ **Alma 28:2–3**

and thus there was
a [*tremendeeous* 0 | *tremendious* 1 | *tremendous* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *battle . . .*
yea and also there was
a [*tremendeeos* 0 | *tremendious* 1 | *tremendous* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *slaughter*
>*among the people of Nephi*

The standard word *tremendous* reads as *tremendious* in the manuscripts (with various spellings). There is one other occurrence of this word in the text, and there too the manuscript reading has the extra /i/ vowel:

>Mormon 8:2
>and now it came to pass that after the great and
>[*tremendious* 1 | *tremendous* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] battle at Cumorah . . .

As explained under 1 Nephi 17:25, the earliest text of the Book of Mormon prefers *grievious* rather than the standard *grievous.* Similarly, we have *tremendious* rather than *tremendous* in the manuscripts. The critical text will restore this form of the word, perhaps the result of dialectal overlay but also quite possibly the original reading. This pronunciation was common in the 1800s, as exemplified by the following instances of *tremendious* from Meriwether Lewis and William Clark's journals (1803–1806); the spellings are regularized except for the word *tremendious:*

5 May 1805	it was a most **tremendious** looking animal
2 June 1805	the ferocity of those **tremendious** animals
13 June 1805	a roaring too **tremendious** to be mistaken
14 June 1805	but hearing a **tremendious** roaring above me
24 October 1805	a **tremendious** black rock
11 November 1805	with most **tremendious** waves breaking with great violence against the shores
18 November 1805	to break with **tremendious** force in every direction
28 November 1805	how **tremendious** is the day
30 June 1806	leaving these **tremendious** mountains behind us

The Oxford English Dictionary does not mention the form *tremendious* under *tremendous;* but under the word *stupendious,* the OED does refer to *tremendious,* identifying it as the "vulgar form of *tremendous*". There is evidence, however, for *tremendious* as a more or less standard form in

earlier English; *Literature Online* <lion.chadwyck.com> lists, for example, three formal uses of *tremendious* in poetry that date from the early 1700s (here given with original accidentals):

> Sarah Egerton (1703)
>> The ecchoing Trump of Fame his Glories will re-herse,
>> To all the wondering Universe,
>> Till it Joyn sound with the **Tremendious** last.

> Edward Ward (1708)
>> Thus the **tremendious** awful Troop . . .
>> Small Tenders did in Numbers wait
>> Upon the bold **tremendious** Fleet . . .

Thus the use of the word *tremendious* in the Book of Mormon is not necessarily dialectal but may represent a standard pronunciation of the word in Early Modern English. The critical text of the Book of Mormon will restore the original *tremendious* in all three instances.

Summary: Restore the original occurrences of *tremendious* in Alma 28:2–3 and Mormon 8:2, the consistent reading in the manuscripts for the standard *tremendous*.

■ **Alma 28:3**

yea and also there was a tremendious slaughter among the people of Nephi
nevertheless the Lamanites were driven and scattered
and the people of Nephi returned again to their [*lands* 0 | *land* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]

The original manuscript has the plural *their lands,* which Oliver Cowdery accidentally miscopied from ① into ② as a singular, *their land.* Elsewhere in the text, after wars and battles, the people typically "return to their lands":

> Alma 3:1
>> and after they had finished burying their dead
>> they all **returned** to their **lands** and to their houses
>>> and their wives and their children

> Alma 44:23
>> and the armies of the Nephites or of Moroni **returned**
>> and came to their houses and their **lands**

> 3 Nephi 6:1–2
>> and now it came to pass that the people of the Nephites
>> did all **return** to their own **lands** in the twenty and sixth year
>> every man with his family his flocks
>> and his herds his horses and his cattle
>> and all things whatsoever did belong unto them
>> and it came to pass that they had not eaten up all their provisions
>> therefore they did take with them all that they had not devoured
>>> of all their grain of every kind
>> and their gold and their silver and all their precious things
>> and they did **return** to their own **lands** and their possessions

In each of these cases, the text refers to people returning after war to what appears to be their individual plots of land that they farm.

Summary: Restore in Alma 28:3 the plural *their lands,* the reading in 𝒪; the text here refers to the individual lands that the people farmed, not the whole land in which they lived.

■ **Alma 28:5**

yea the cry of widows **mourning** *for their husbands*
and also of fathers [NULL > *a* >+ NULL 0| 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] **mourning** *for their sons*
and the daughter for the brother
yea and the brother for the father
and thus the cry of mourning was heard among every one of them
[*a* 0|NULL > *a* 1| ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] **mourning** *for their kindred which had been slain*

In this passage, the first instance of the prepositional *a* was edited out of the text. Initially in 𝒪, Oliver Cowdery missed the *a,* but then virtually immediately he supralinearly inserted it (there is no change in the level of ink flow for the supralinear *a*). Then some time later, this *a* was crossed out, apparently by Oliver Cowdery; the crossout is with somewhat heavier ink flow. Perhaps Oliver decided to emend the text here since the present-participial *mourning* in the preceding phrase lacks the prepositional *a* ("yea the cry of widows **mourning** for their husbands").

Later on in this verse, we have a second instance of *a mourning,* and in this case both 𝒪 and 𝒫 have the prepositional *a:* namely, "**a mourning** for their kindred which had been slain". Initially in 𝒫, Oliver Cowdery once more omitted the *a* and, as before, supralinearly inserted it. In this case, he had earlier written the *a* in 𝒪 and without any correction; nor did he remove this second instance of the prepositional *a* in either manuscript. Don Brugger (personal communication) suggests that this second instance of *a mourning* could be interpreted as a gerund in apposition to the preceding "the cry of mourning". This possible difference in grammatical interpretation could have led Oliver to leave this case of *a mourning* in the text. In any event, the 1830 compositor interpreted the *a* here as a case of the prepositional *a* and decided to remove it when he set the type. The most reasonable interpretation is that "a mourning for their kindred which had been slain" is a present participial clause that modifies the preceding noun phrase "every one of them", just like the two earlier instances of present participial "(a) mourning" modify their preceding nouns, *widows* and *fathers.*

David Calabro points out (personal communication) that in the original text the very first occurrence of the participial *mourning* ("yea the cry of widows mourning for their husbands") may have also read with the prepositional *a* (as "yea the cry of widows **a mourning** for their husbands"), even though 𝒪 is extant in this particular case and reads without the *a.* Further support for this possibility comes from two very similar occurrences of present-participial *mourning* earlier in the text where the printer's manuscript twice reads "a mourning for X":

Mosiah 21:9
and now there was a great mourning and lamentation among the people of Limhi
the widow [*a* 1| ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] mourning for her husband
the son and the daughter [*amourning* 1|*mourning* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
for their father
and the brothers for their brethren

Not surprisingly, the 1830 typesetter removed these two instances of the prepositional *a* from Mosiah 21:9. On the other hand, there is one other example of present-participial *mourning;* 𝄞 is extant in this case and lacks the *a:*

> Alma 28:11
>> yea and many thousands are **mourning** for the loss of their kindred

Typically, present participial verb forms lacked the prepositional *a* in the original Book of Mormon text. For instance, there are six instances of *going forth* in the text, of which only two originally had the prepositional *a* (each marked below with an asterisk):

*	1 Nephi 11:24	and I beheld the Son of God **a going forth** among the children of men
	1 Nephi 11:31	and I beheld the Lamb of God **going forth** among the children of men
*	Alma 17:26	as he was with the Lamanitish servants **a going forth** with their flocks
	Alma 27:16	as Ammon was **going forth** into the land
	Helaman 2:9	as they were **going forth** unto the judgment seat
	3 Nephi 11:15	and this they did do / **going forth** one by one

Thus the text allows for variation in the use of the prepositional *a*. In each instance, we rely on the earliest extant text to determine whether the *a* is there or not. The critical text will therefore restore both confirmed instances of the prepositional *a* in Alma 28:5. The deletion of the supra-linearly inserted *a* in the first instance appears to be due to editing. For additional discussion regarding the prepositional *a* in the Book of Mormon text, see under 1 Nephi 8:28. For a complete analysis, see under PREPOSITIONAL A in volume 3.

Summary: Restore both cases of the original prepositional *a* in Alma 28:5: "**a mourning** for their sons . . . **a mourning** for their kindred which had been slain"; on the other hand, the first instance of *mourning* in this passage will be retained without the prepositional *a:* "yea the cry of widows **mourning** for their husbands", as will the one in Alma 28:11: "yea and many thousands are **mourning** for the loss of their kindred".

■ **Alma 28:5**

yea the cry of widows mourning for their husbands
and also of fathers a mourning for their sons
and the daughter for the brother

(1) *yea* [& >? NULL 0| 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *the brother for the father*
(2) [& 01| *and* ABDEFIJLMNOQRT| CGHK| *And* PS] *thus the cry of mourning was heard*
among every one of them a mourning for their kindred which had been slain

In this passage, the original manuscript has an *and* after the second *yea* (listed above as 1). This *and* is written as an ampersand, but in addition there is a single slanted ink stroke just touching the ascender of the ampersand. Oliver Cowdery later interpreted this ink stroke as a crossout, and thus he did not include the *and* when he copied the text into the printer's manuscript. Even so, this ink stroke is highly unusual as a crossout: nowhere else do we find Oliver crossing out a word in such an indecisive way. Everywhere else, Oliver crossed out words with multiple strokes (usually

horizontally, occasionally vertically, but never with a slanting single stroke). Moreover, his cross-outs essentially cover the letter(s), except for ascenders and descenders, but this crossout is high up. In other words, all the evidence suggests that this is a stray ink stroke and not a crossout.

By putting the *and* back into the text, we end up with a list of conjuncts, each with an initial *and:*

> Alma 28:5 (original conjunctive structure)
> **and** also of fathers a mourning for their sons
> **and** the daughter for the brother
> **yea and** the brother for the father

A similar kind of conjoined structure is found earlier in the text:

> Mosiah 12:2
> **and** the vultures of the air
> **and** the dogs
> **yea and** the wild beasts shall devour their flesh

In addition, the 1840 edition deleted the *and* in the summarizing statement here in Alma 28:5 (listed above as 2), giving "thus the cry of mourning was heard among every one of them" without any preceding *and*. This deletion appears to be a typo rather than the result of Joseph Smith's editing for the 1840 edition, since there is definitely nothing ungrammatical about the original use of *and* here in "**and** thus the cry of mourning was heard among every one of them". The 1908 RLDS edition restored this original *and* to the RLDS text.

Summary: Restore in Alma 28:5 the *and* before "the brother for the father" that Oliver Cowdery failed to copy from 𝓞 into 𝓟 because he thought the ampersand was crossed out; also maintain the *and* later on in the verse ("**and** thus the cry of mourning was heard among every one of them") that the 1840 edition omitted, probably accidentally.

■ **Alma 28:5**

and thus the cry of mourning was heard
among [*every one* 01ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQS | *all* RT] *of them*

Here the 1920 LDS edition replaced *every one* with *all,* probably because the preposition *among* typically takes a plural count noun. Although *every one* is plural in meaning, its form is singular. The critical text will restore the original reading here, despite its oddity. There are no other examples of "among every one" in the text, although there are examples of *among* followed by *all,* including two cases earlier in this chapter:

> Alma 28:2   among all the people in the land
> Alma 28:4   among all the people of Nephi

There are no other cases in the text of the reading "among all of them". More generally, we have examples elsewhere of "all of them" (six times) and "every one of them" (three times).

Summary: Despite its singular form, restore in Alma 28:5 the semantically plural *every one* as the head noun for the preposition *among:* "among every one of them".

■ **Alma 28:7**

and thus [ended 01AJNPS | *endeth* BCDEFGHIKLMOQRT] *the fifteenth year of the reign*
of the judges over the people of Nephi

As discussed under Alma 3:27, there are six cases in the text where a narrative-based past-tense
ended has been accidentally replaced with the present-tense *endeth*. Here in Alma 28:7, the 1837
edition introduced the change into the text. The critical text will maintain the past-tense form in
all cases; there are no instances in the original text of "thus **endeth** the Xth year".

■ **Alma 28:7**

and thus ended the fifteenth year of the reign
[NULL >? *of the Judges* 0 | *of the Judges* 1AHJKMOPQS | *of the judges* BCDEFGILNRT]
[*over* 01ABCDEFGIJLMNOQRT | *of* HKPS] *the people of Nephi*

The scribes had difficulty with the long phrase "the Xth year of the reign of the judges". Although
𝒪 is not extant here in Alma 28:7, the lacuna between extant fragments is not long enough for the
whole expression. Oliver Cowdery, the scribe here in 𝒪, probably omitted "of the judges" initially,
although theoretically it is also possible that he omitted "of the reign". In either case, he probably
supplied the missing phrase supralinearly in 𝒪 since the whole phrase "of the reign of the judges" is
found in the printer's manuscript. A similar case where the missing phrase could be either "of the
reign" or "of the judges" is found nearby:

> Alma 30:2 (conjectured reading in 𝒪, not extant for "of the reign of the judges")
> and it was in the sixteenth year of the reign
> [NULL >? *of the Judges* 0 | *of the Judges* 1AEFHIJKLMNOPQS |
> *of the judges* BCDGRT] over the people of Nephi . . .

But there are four sufficiently extant instances in 𝒪 that clearly show Oliver Cowdery initially
omitting "of the judges":

> Alma 50:23 (fully extant in 𝒪)
> yea even at this time in the twenty and first year of the reign
> [NULL > *of the Judges* 0 | *of the Judges* 1AEFHIJKLMNOPQS | *of the judges* BCDGRT]

> Alma 50:24 (fully extant in 𝒪)
> and it came to pass that the twenty and second year of the reign
> [NULL >+ *of the Judges* 0 | *of the Judges* 1AEFHIJKLMNOPQS |
> *of the judges* BCDGRT] also ended in peace

> Alma 52:15 (fully extant in 𝒪)
> but behold it came to pass in the twentieth and seventh year of the reign
> [NULL >+ *of the Judges* 0 | *of the Judges* 1AEFHIJKLMNOPQS |
> *of the judges* BCDGRT] . . .

> Alma 54:1 ("of the reign" is not extant in 𝒪; supralinear "of the judges" is extant)
> And now it came to pass in the commencement of the twenty and ninth year
> [NULL >? *of the Reign* 0 | 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
> [NULL >+ *of the Judges* 0 | *of the Judges* 1AEFHIJKLMNOPQS |
> *of the judges* BCDGRT] . . .

In the last of these, Oliver seems to have also omitted "of the reign" in 𝒪 since 𝒫 (as well as all the printed editions) lacks "of the reign". Whether Oliver ever supplied "of the reign" supralinearly in 𝒪 is not determinable but is presumed in the transcription for 𝒪. For discussion of this complicated case, see under Alma 54:1.

Finally, in two cases in 𝒪, we can deduce that "of the judges" was initially omitted since "of the reign" is sufficiently extant in 𝒪 and is written inline, while there is insufficient room in the lacuna for "of the judges":

> Alma 59:1 ("of the judges" is not extant in 𝒪, but "of the reign" is)
> Now it came to pass in the thirtieth year of the reign
> [NULL >? *of the Judges* 0 | *of the Judges* 1AEFHIJKLMNOPQS |
>   *of the judges* BCDGRT] over the people of Nephi . . .

> Alma 62:52 ("of the judges" is not extant in 𝒪, but "of the reign" is partially extant)
> and it came to pass that all these things were done
> and Helaman died in the thirty and fifth year of the reign
> [NULL >? *of the Judges* 0 | *of the Judges* 1AEFHIJKLMNOPQS |
>   *of the judges* BCDGRT] over the people of Nephi

Thus all of the extant evidence in 𝒪 (a total of six cases) argues that Oliver Cowdery tended to initially omit "of the judges" as he took down Joseph Smith's dictation. The critical text will assume he made the same initial error here in Alma 28:7 as well as in Alma 30:2.

Also here in Alma 28:7, the 1874 RLDS edition introduced a simple textual error in the extended phrase "of the reign of the judges **over** the people of Nephi"—namely, that edition replaced the *over* with *of,* probably because the preposition *of* occurs so frequently in the extended phrase ("**of** the reign **of** the judges over the people **of** Nephi"). The RLDS text has never corrected this error in Alma 28:7, although 𝒫 reads *over.* Elsewhere in the original text, there are at least 45 occurrences of "of the reign of the judges **over** the people of Nephi", but there are none with *of* instead of *over.* There is one other place where *over* was replaced by *of,* but only momentarily:

> Alma 50:35 (Oliver Cowdery's initial error in 𝒪, immediately corrected)
> and thus ended the twenty and fourth year of the reign of the judges
> [*of* >% *over* 0 | *over* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] the people of Nephi

A similar initial error is found in the expression "the reign of the **kings** over the people of Nephi":

> Mosiah 29:47 (scribe 2's initial error in 𝒫, immediately corrected)
> and thus ended the reign of the kings
> [*of* >% *over* 1 | *over* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] the people of Nephi

The critical text will maintain the consistent use of *over* in the extended phrase "of the reign of the judges **over** the people of Nephi".

Summary: Maintain in Alma 28:7 the extended phrase "of the reign of the judges over the people of Nephi"; here Oliver Cowdery seems to have initially omitted "of the judges" in 𝒪 but then supralinearly supplied it; the 1874 RLDS edition accidentally replaced the *over* with *of.*

■ **Alma 28:8**

and this is the account of Ammon and his brethren
their journeyings [into 1|in ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] the land of Nephi
*their sufferings **in** the land*
their sorrows and their afflictions and their incomprehensible joy
and the reception and safety of the brethren in the land of Jershon

The original manuscript is not extant for the word *into* in the phrase "their journeyings into the land of Nephi", but spacing between existing fragments indicates a better fit if the original manuscript read *into*, though the shorter *in* is still possible. In any event, 𝓟 reads *into*, which the 1830 compositor set as *in*, perhaps because of the *in* in the immediately following "their sufferings **in** the land" (for discussion regarding accidental mix-ups of *into* and *in*, see under 1 Nephi 4:33). But here in Alma 28:8, the compositor may have also been influenced by the oddness of the phraseology "their journeyings", which sounds like a continuing action and more than one journey. In fact, the use of *into* would work better for modern readers if the text had read in the singular and as *journey* (thus "their **journey into** the land of Nephi").

The account of the missionary labors of the sons of king Mosiah includes both their journey into the land of Nephi as well as their journeys throughout that land. Moreover, there are clear examples in the Book of Mormon text where *journeyings* is actually used to refer to what modern-day English speakers would consider a single journey:

> 1 Nephi 17:2
> and they began to bear **their journeyings** without murmuring

> Alma 17:5
> now these are the circumstances
> which attended them in **their journeyings**
> for they had many afflictions
> they did suffer much both in body and in mind
> such as hunger thirst and fatigue
> and also much labor in the spirit

> Alma 17:6–9,13,18
> now these were **their journeyings** . . .
> nevertheless they departed out of the land of Zarahemla . . .
> and thus they departed into the wilderness . . .
> and it came to pass that they journeyed many days in the wilderness
> and they fasted much and prayed much . . .
> 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 . . .
> and thus they took **their several journeys** throughout the land

The first example deals with the journey of Lehi and his people. The second and third ones refer to the journey the sons of king Mosiah and their missionary companions made to the land of Nephi. The description in Alma 17:5–13 seems to restrict itself to the journey prior to arrival in the land of the Lamanites. There is no mention in this passage of Ammon and his brethren being

persecuted or suffering at the hands of the Lamanites and the Nephite dissenters (as there is in Alma 26:28–29); instead, the passage in Alma 17 mentions the difficulties of only the journey in the wilderness while traveling towards the land of Nephi. When these missionaries finally split up, the text does refer to "their several **journeys** throughout the land" (Alma 17:18), but note here that the word is *journeys* and not *journeyings.*

We should also recognize that this passage in Alma 28:8 gives a chronological listing of what Ammon and his brethren went through on their mission: first their journey to the land of Nephi, then their difficulties (sufferings, sorrows, and afflictions) in the land of Nephi followed by their great joy when the Anti-Nephi-Lehies converted, and finally the Nephites' acceptance of these Lamanite converts. The journey into the land of Nephi was a very difficult one for the sons of Mosiah; in fact, they almost turned back: "now when our hearts were depressed and we were about to turn back / behold the Lord comforted us" (Alma 26:27). So it is not surprising that the first stage of their missionary work was included in the listing in Alma 28:8. And thus the use of the preposition *into* is perfectly correct in Alma 28:8 and will be restored in the critical text.

Summary: Restore in Alma 28:8 the preposition *into,* the reading in 𝓟 ("their journeyings **into** the land of Nephi"); the plural *journeyings* is used elsewhere to refer to this difficult first stage in their mission (Alma 17:5–6); because Alma 28:8 is a chronological listing of the different stages of this mission to the Lamanites, "their **journeyings into** the land of Nephi" is appropriate.

■ **Alma 28:8**

and this is the account of Ammon and his brethren
their journeyings into the land of Nephi
their sufferings in the land
their sorrows and [NULL >+ *their* 1 | *their* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *afflictions*
and their incomprehensible joy

Here in the printer's manuscript, Oliver Cowdery initially wrote "their sorrows and afflictions"; then he supralinearly inserted a repeated *their* before *afflictions* with a slightly sharper yet heavier ink flow. Perhaps Oliver made this correction sometime later when he proofed 𝓟 against 𝓞, but after sharpening his quill. The original manuscript is not extant here, but there is definitely room for *their* between surviving fragments of 𝓞. Moreover, the use of repeated *their*'s in conjoined noun phrases is characteristic of the Book of Mormon text, so the correction in the printer's manuscript is most probably the reading of the original manuscript. See under CONJUNCTIVE REPETITION for further discussion of the repeated *their.*

Summary: Accept Oliver Cowdery's supralinearly inserted *their* in 𝓟 as the reading of the original text, especially since there is room for it between extant fragments of 𝓞.

■ **Alma 28:8**

and this is the account of Ammon and his brethren
their journeyings into the land of Nephi
their sufferings in the land
their sorrows and their afflictions and their incomprehensible joy
and the reception and safety of **the** *brethren in the land of Jershon*

Joanne Case suggests (personal communication, 14 September 2004) that "the brethren" here might be an error for "their brethren". In support of this emendation, there are a considerable number of cases where *their* and *the* were mixed up during the transmission of the text in the manuscripts. See, for instance, the nearby discussion under Alma 27:23 where many examples are listed of Oliver Cowdery's tendency in the manuscripts to write *the* instead of *their*. ⊙ is not extant here in Alma 28:8, but the lacuna is large enough here that either *their* or *the* will fit.

The reference to "the brethren" here in Alma 28:8 is, of course, to the people of Ammon, earlier known as the Anti-Nephi-Lehies (see Alma 27:26). In previous passages, the text uses the word *brethren* to refer to these Lamanite converts, but always with a possessive pronoun modifying *brethren:*

Alma 26:3	for **our** brethren the Lamanites were in darkness
Alma 26:9	these **our** dearly beloved brethren . . . would still have been racked with hatred against us
Alma 26:13	how many thousands of **our** brethren hath he loosed from the pains of hell
Alma 26:14	for he . . . has loosed these **our** brethren from the chains of hell
Alma 26:22	to bring these **our** brethren to repentance
Alma 27:21	concerning the admitting **their** brethren which were the people of Anti-Nephi-Lehi

Thus the emendation of "the brethren" to "their brethren" has considerable merit.

The text also refers to these people as "the people of Ammon" (19 times, beginning at Alma 27:26), but never as "the brethren of Ammon", so we should probably not assume that "the brethren" in Alma 28:8 is an error for "the brethren of Ammon". (Under this hypothesis, "of Ammon" would have been accidentally omitted or supralinearly inserted in ⊙.)

There are two other instances of the unmodified phrase "the brethren" elsewhere in the text:

Mosiah 26:5	because of the dissensions among the brethren
Alma 35:2	the rest of the brethren . . . also came over into the land of Jershon

The first case of "the brethren" refers to the brethren of the church; the second refers to missionaries. But "the brethren" here in Alma 28:8 does not have to be analyzed as an unmodified noun phrase. Instead, "the brethren" can be interpreted as a noun phrase postmodified by "in the land of Jershon"; that is, the text is not referring to these people's "reception and safety . . . in the land of Jershon", but to the "reception and safety of the brethren [who now live] in the land of Jershon". Since this interpretation is possible, the critical text will maintain the use of "the brethren" in Alma 28:8. Even so, there may be a primitive error in the text, with an original "their brethren" being replaced by "the brethren".

Summary: Maintain in Alma 28:8 the current reading, "and the reception and safety of **the** brethren in the land of Jershon" since "in the land of Jershon" can be interpreted as postmodifying "the brethren"; nonetheless, the definite article *the* may be an error for *their*.

■ **Alma 28:12**

yet they rejoice and exult in the hope
[*yea* 01PS | ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOQRT] *and even know*
according to the promises of the Lord
that they are raised to dwell at the right hand of God

Both the original and printer's manuscripts have the word *yea* here in Alma 28:12. The 1830 type-setter accidentally omitted the *yea*. The 1908 RLDS edition restored the *yea* to the RLDS text. There is nothing wrong with "yea and even" followed directly by the finite verb (the subject being ellipted). This kind of transition is found, for instance, earlier in the text:

Alma 1:6
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

Summary: Restore the earlier *yea* in Alma 28:12 since both manuscripts have it; the construction "yea and even" immediately followed by the finite verb occurs elsewhere in the text.

■ **Alma 28:13**

and thus we see how great
the [*unequality* 01 | *inequality* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *of man is*
because of sin and transgression

As explained under Mosiah 29:32, the original text read *unequality* rather than *inequality;* as also explained under that passage, the occurrence of *unequality/inequality* here in Alma 28:13 is not an error for *iniquity.*

■ **Alma 28:13**

and thus we see how great the unequality of man is
because of sin and transgression and the power of the devil
which comes **by** *the cunning plans*
[1ABCDEFGIJLMNOPQRST | *by* HK] *which he hath devised to ensnare the hearts of men*

The 1874 RLDS edition accidentally added the preposition *by* before the relative clause "which he hath devised to ensnare the hearts of men". The typesetter was probably influenced by the preceding *by* in "which comes **by** the cunning plans". The 1908 RLDS edition restored the correct reading that lacks the *by* at the head of the second relative clause.

Summary: Maintain the current text in Alma 28:13 without the preposition *by* before the relative clause "which he hath devised to ensnare the hearts of men".

■ **Alma 28:14**

and thus we see the great **call** *of the diligence of men*
to labor in the vineyards of the Lord
and thus we see the great reason of sorrow
and also of rejoicing

Ross Geddes (personal communication, 12 July 2004) suggests that the noun *call* may be a mistake here. He points out that this use of *call* is the only example of the word *call* being used as a noun in the entire Book of Mormon text. Consequently, he considers a number of possible emendations, including *call* as a mishearing for *all,* but ultimately he rejects this possibility and others. Nothing seems to work. He recognizes that the intended meaning here seems to be 'need' (as if the text read "and thus we see the great **need** of the diligence of men to labor in the vineyards of the Lord"). The word *call* is extant in the original manuscript.

It turns out that the Oxford English Dictionary lists under definition 8a for the noun *call* the meaning 'need' (as in "there was no call for that behavior" or "he had no call to do that", more or less idiomatic uses of *call* that prevail in modern English). The OED gives the following citations (accidentals unchanged) from Early Modern English where *call* is used much like it is in Alma 28:14:

> Edward Hyde (about 1674)
> He assured them . . . 'that they had a very lawful Call
> to take upon them the supreme Authority of the Nation'.

> Daniel Defoe (1719)
> What call, what occasion, much less what necessity I was in, to go.

So the meaning for *call* as 'need' will definitely work in Alma 28:14.

Summary: Maintain the noun *call* in Alma 28:14 ("and thus we see the great **call** of the diligence of men"); although its use in this passage seems strange to English speakers today, it has the meaning 'need' (a general meaning that dates back to Early Modern English).

■ **Alma 28:14**

and thus we see the great call
of [*the* 1PS | ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOQRT] *diligence of men*
to labor in the vineyards of the Lord

Here the 1830 typesetter dropped a small word, the definite article *the*. Although the original manuscript is not extant here, there is clearly room between the surviving fragments for a *the.* Elsewhere in the text, there are examples where *diligence* is preceded by various kinds of determiners, including none at all (listed as NULL here):

all diligence	12
NULL diligence	6
the diligence	5
their diligence	4
your diligence	2
his diligence	1
thy diligence	1
so much diligence	1

In this particular case of Alma 28:14, we actually expect the definite article *the* because *diligence* has a postmodifier (namely, "of men to labor in the vineyards of the Lord"). A similar example is found earlier in the text:

> Alma 7:26
>> and my soul doth exceedingly rejoice
>> because of **the** exceeding diligence and heed which ye have given unto my word

In this second case, *diligence and heed* is postmodified by the relative clause "which ye have given unto my word". Thus the definite article is expected.

One might also ask here if the preposition *of* that follows *call* in Alma 28:14 is in fact correct. The original manuscript is not extant for this word. One possible emendation would be to replace *of* with *for,* which would undoubtedly alleviate the awkwardness of this passage:

> Alma 28:14 (possible emendation)
>> and thus we see the great call **for** the diligence of men
>> to labor in the vineyards of the Lord

The *for* could fit in the lacuna of 𝒪. On the other hand, there is independent evidence for the selection of the preposition *of* since later on in this verse we have one more example of *great* followed by a noun; and there we get the preposition *of* just as before (in fact, the *of* is conjunctively repeated):

> Alma 28:14
>> and thus we see the great reason **of** sorrow and also **of** rejoicing

Summary: Restore the definite article *the* before *diligence* in Alma 28:14 ("the great call of **the** diligence of men to labor in the vineyards of the Lord"); also retain the preposition *of* after *call* since it is consistent with the use of *of* in a similar expression later in the verse.

■ **Alma 28:14**

and thus we see the great call of the diligence
of [*man > men >* NULL 0| 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *men to labor in the vineyards*
    of the Lord

In the original manuscript, Oliver Cowdery initially wrote *man,* then immediately corrected the *a* to an *e* by overwriting the *a* with an *e* (there is no change in the level of ink flow). But then to make the word perfectly clear, Oliver crossed out his corrected *men* and rewrote the plural *men* inline.

The use of the plural *men* here is supported by occurrences of the plural *men* in surrounding clauses:

Alma 28:13   the cunning plans which he hath devised to ensnare the hearts of **men**

Alma 28:14   sorrow because of death and destruction among **men**

The corrected *men* in ↺ is undoubtedly the original reading for the phrase "the great call of the diligence of men". For a list of cases involving the mix-up of *man* and *men*, see under 1 Nephi 15:35.

Summary: Accept the corrected *men* in Alma 28:14 since the correction of *man* to *men* was immediate; both preceding and following clauses also have the plural *men*.

Alma 29

■ **Alma 29:2**

yea I would declare unto every soul as with the voice of thunder
   repentance and the plan of redemption
that they should repent and come unto our God
that there might [*be no* 1PS | *not be no* A | *not be* BCDEFGHIJKLMNOQRT] *more sorrow*
   upon all the face of the earth

The 1830 typesetter added an extra *not* here in Alma 29:2, thus creating a multiple negative. The 1837 edition removed the multiple negative by deleting the original *no* rather than the intrusive *not*. The printer's manuscript reads "that there might **be no more** sorrow", and Joseph Smith made no change in 𝓟 in his editing for the 1837 edition (𝓞 is not extant here). The LDS text has maintained the 1837 reading, while the RLDS text has restored the original reading (beginning with the 1908 RLDS edition).

Moreover, the 1837 change made a difference in meaning. The original reading says that there will not be any sorrow anymore, while the secondary reading literally means that there won't be any increase in sorrow. Clearly, the original reading is what is intended here. In addition, the 1837 reading created a unique reading for the Book of Mormon text. Elsewhere in the text, there are no occurrences of "not be more <noun>", but there are three more of "be no more <noun>":

2 Nephi 32:6	and there will **be no more** doctrine given
Mosiah 16:9	that there can **be no more** death
Mosiah 28:2	and that there should **be no more** contentions in all the land

For further discussion, see under 2 Nephi 26:32 as well as more generally under NEGATION in volume 3.

Summary: Restore in Alma 29:2 the original use of the negative: "that there might **be no more** sorrow" (which is consistent with other usage in the text).

■ **Alma 29:3**

for I had ought to be content **with** *the things*
[*with which > which* 0 | *which* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMOPQRST | *with* N] *the Lord hath allotted unto me*

Here in 𝓞 and in the 1906 LDS edition, we see the accidental influence of the *with* that occurs in the immediately preceding prepositional phrase, "with the things". Oliver Cowdery initially

wrote the relative clause as "**with which** the Lord hath allotted unto me", which doesn't sound impossible, but it is wrong; virtually immediately Oliver crossed out the intrusive *with* (there is no apparent difference in the level of ink flow for the crossout). In the 1906 edition, the compositor accidentally misread *which* as *with,* thus setting "with the things **with** the Lord hath allotted unto me", an impossible reading. Obviously, the corrected reading in 𝒪 is the original reading here.

Summary: Maintain in Alma 29:3 the relative clause as "**which** the Lord hath allotted unto me" (that is, without any *with*).

■ **Alma 29:4**

I had not ought to harrow up in my desires the firm decree of a just God
for I know [*that* 01ABCDEFGIJLMNOPQRST | HK] *he granteth unto men according to their desires*

Here the 1874 RLDS edition omitted the subordinate conjunction *that* after the verb *know,* giving "for I know he granteth unto men according to their desires". The 1908 RLDS edition restored the original *that.* Either reading is theoretically possible. For another example where the 1874 RLDS edition omitted the *that* after the verb *know,* see under Alma 5:45. Also see the general discussion under THAT in volume 3.

Summary: Maintain in Alma 29:4 the original subordinate conjunction *that* after the verb *know* ("for I know that . . .").

■ **Alma 29:4**

[*whether > whither* 0 | *whither >*jg *whether* 1 | *whether* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *it be*
unto death or unto life

As discussed under 1 Nephi 22:4, Oliver Cowdery frequently mixed up *whether* and *whither.* Here in Alma 29:4, he initially wrote the correct *whether* in 𝒪, but then he emended it to the incorrect *whither.* Almost immediately he overwrote the *e* with an *i* (there is no change in the level of ink flow for the overwriting). Oliver copied the word as *whither* into 𝒫, but John Gilbert (the 1830 typesetter) emended it in 𝒫 to the correct *whether.*

For this instance of *whether,* there has been no variation in the printed history of the text since *whether* is obviously correct. It is also supported by the invariant use of *whether* later on in this verse ("whether it be unto salvation or unto destruction") and in the next verse ("whether he desireth good or evil").

Summary: Maintain in Alma 29:4 the first instance of *whether* rather than the *whither* that Oliver Cowdery substituted for it in the manuscripts.

■ **Alma 29:4**

for I know that he granteth unto men
according to their [*desires desires* >? *desires* 0 | *desires* >js *desire* 1 | *desires* A |
    desire BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
whether it be unto death or unto life
yea I know that he allotteth unto [*man* 0D | *man* > *men* 1 | *men* ABCEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
yea decreeth unto them decrees which are unalterable
according to their [*wills* 01ABCDEFGHIJKLNPRST | *will* MOQ]
whether [*it* 0A | *it* >js *they* 1 | *they* BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *be unto salvation or unto destruction*

In this passage we have four cases where there has been some editing of the grammatical number. As we shall see, the critical text will restore the earliest reading in all four cases, the plural *desires,* the singular *man,* the plural *wills,* and the singular *it.*

The earliest, fully extant source for the phrase "according to their desire(s)" is the printer's manuscript, and it reads in the plural. In his editing for the 1837 edition, Joseph Smith emended the plural *desires* to the singular *desire,* probably because the following clause uses the singular pronoun *it* to refer to *desires:* "according to their **desires** / whether **it** be unto death or unto life" (original text). But as explained under Mosiah 18:10,11, the use of singular pronouns to refer to *desires* is quite common in the original text. Thus the critical text will accept the plural *desires* here in Alma 29:4.

It should be pointed out here that the reading in 𝒪 for this phrase is complicated. It appears that Oliver Cowdery originally wrote the plural *desires* twice in 𝒪, then crossed out the first one. But we cannot be sure that he initially created a dittography in this instance since the second *desires* is only partially extant:

    Alma 29:4 (line 31, page 275′ of 𝒪)

        just God for I Kno that he granteth unto men according to their <desires> desir( )
                                                                               ES

It is theoretically possible that Oliver initially wrote the plural *desires,* then corrected it to the singular *desire* by rewriting the whole word inline (but in the singular). This kind of correction, however, would be contrary to Oliver's practice: if he had wanted to correct *desires* to the singular *desire,* he would have crossed out or erased the plural *s.* In the manuscripts, we find that Oliver never corrected a plural *s* by rewriting the whole word, either supralinearly or inline. Sometimes he caught his error before finishing the *s;* such aborted *s*'s were not crossed out. Usually he erased the plural *s,* but sometimes he simply crossed it out. We get the following statistics for the two manuscripts (the count for 𝒪 is limited since most of 𝒪 is not extant):

	𝒪	𝒫
aborted *s*	4	2
erased *s*	22	25
crossed-out *s*	9	6
TOTAL	35	33

Thus it is extremely doubtful that in 𝒪 for Alma 29:4 Oliver corrected *desires* by crossing it out and then writing *desire* inline.

There is considerable evidence, on the other hand, that Oliver frequently wrote single-word dittographies. In the original manuscript, for instance, there are 34 extant cases where Oliver mis-wrote two instances of the same word inline. Most of these repetitions involve function words (pronouns, determiners, auxiliary verbs, conjunctions, and the like). And of these 34 examples, 27 of them are corrected by crossing out or erasing the first instance, not the second. In five cases, Oliver repeated a fully lexical noun or verb (namely, *come, slaves, Lord, caused,* and *world*), and in each case he crossed out the first instance of the repeated word. The case of *slaves* is very much like what apparently happened in Alma 29:4 with the word *desires,* also a plural noun:

Alma 27:8 (line 29, page 272′ of 𝒪)

```
Brethren & we will be their <slav>es s(la          ) we repair unto them the many mur
                                 VES UNTILL
```

Even though the plural ending for the second instance of *slaves* is not extant in 𝒪, it would be unreasonable to argue that this second *slaves* was actually the singular *slave*. Correcting *slaves* to *slave* is not really an option in Alma 27:8 since the plural is required ("and we will be their slaves"). In the case of Alma 29:4, the plural is not required since in theory *desires* could have been corrected to *desire* by crossing out the plural and writing the singular *desire* inline. Yet all of the specific manuscript evidence argues that Oliver never did correct the plural *s* by rewriting the entire word as a singular. The critical text will therefore assume that the original word in 𝒪 for Alma 29:4 was the plural *desires* and that Oliver initially wrote the plural *desires* twice in 𝒪.

Elsewhere in the text, when we have the verb *grant,* we always get the plural *desires,* never the singular *desire*—and this is irrespective of whether we are dealing with just one person or several people:

Enos 1:12	I will grant unto thee according to thy **desires**
Mosiah 21:6	he granted unto them that they should do according to their **desires**
Alma 20:24	but grant that he may do according to his own **desires**
Alma 62:28	unto them it was granted according to their **desires**

Thus the plural *desires* is expected in Alma 29:4.

At the end of the verse in Alma 29:4, we have the same kind of problem in number agreement with respect to the plural *wills* and the singular pronoun *it.* In this case, Joseph Smith left the plural *wills* unchanged in his editing of 𝒫 for the 1837 edition but changed the singular *it* to *they* (giving "according to their **wills** whether **they** be unto salvation or unto destruction"). Interestingly, the 1905 LDS edition changed the plural *wills* to the singular *will,* even though the following pronoun was still the plural *they* that Joseph had earlier introduced into the text. This use of the singular *will* continued in the LDS text (in two subsequent editions, the 1907 and the 1911) until the 1920 LDS edition restored the plural *wills*.

Clearly, the original plural *wills* and the singular *it* are fully intended, especially since there is the following striking parallelism with the original language earlier in the verse:

Alma 29:4
according to their **desires** whether **it** be unto **death** or unto **life** . . .
according to their **wills** whether **it** be unto **salvation** or unto **destruction**

Moreover, there are other instances in the original text where the plural *wills* occurs:

Mosiah 16:12	having gone according to their own carnal **wills** and **desires**
Alma 4:8	those that did not believe according to their own **wills** and pleasure
Alma 12:31	to act according to their **wills** and **pleasures**
Helaman 7:5	and to do according to their **wills**
Helaman 7:5	and do according to their own **wills**

Notice that in two of these examples, a conjoined noun is also in the plural: "wills and desires" in Mosiah 16:12 and "wills and pleasures" in Alma 12:31 (but Alma 4:8 has "wills and pleasure"). For the two instances of "wills and pleasure(s)" in the book of Alma, there has also been a tendency to replace the plural *wills* with the singular *will*. For discussion regarding that tendency, see under Alma 4:8 and Alma 12:31.

Finally, we have the case of *man* here in Alma 29:4. The word *man* occurs at the end of the line in 𝒪, and the word is extant except for the final *n*. In the printer's manuscript, Oliver Cowdery initially copied the singular *man,* then corrected it to the plural *men* by crossing out *man* and supralinearly inserting *men.* There is no change in the level of ink flow, which implies that there was little delay in Oliver's decision to emend *man* to *men* in 𝒫. He was probably influenced by the following plural pronouns (*them* and *their*) that have *man* as their antecedent ("he allotteth unto **man** yea decreeth unto **them** decrees which are unalterable according to **their** wills"). In addition, the text earlier on in this verse uses the plural *men* in a parallel clause: "he granteth unto **men** according to their desires".

There is considerable evidence for mixing up *man* and *men* in the manuscripts (see the list under 1 Nephi 15:35). In fact, here in Alma 29:4, the 1841 British edition unintentionally restored the singular *man*. On the other hand, there is evidence that the text allows plural pronouns to refer to singular *man* since *man* sometimes takes the plural interpretation of 'mankind':

2 Nephi 9:6	and because **man** became fallen **they** were cut off
Alma 12:27	but it was appointed unto **man** that **they** must die
Moroni 7:38	and awful is the state of **man** for **they** are as though there had been no redemption made

The second example of *man* was changed to *men* in the 1920 LDS edition—but the two others have been left unchanged. Clearly, the earliest use of *man* rather than *men* is possible in Alma 29:4. The critical text will restore the singular *man* even though theoretically it could be an error for *men.*

Summary: Follow in Alma 29:4 the earliest reading with respect to the grammatical number of the nouns and pronouns: "he granteth unto **men** according to their **desires** whether **it** be unto death or unto life / 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 29:4**

yea I know that he allotteth unto man

□ *yea decreeth unto them decrees which are unalterable*   01APST

□ NULL   BCDEFGHIJKLMNOQR

according to their wills

The 1837 edition accidentally omitted the parenthetical *yea*-clause, "yea decreeth unto them decrees which are unalterable". This clause was restored in the 1908 RLDS edition and in the 1981 LDS edition. Perhaps the 1837 typesetter was influenced by the phraseology earlier in this verse: "he granteth unto men according to their desires", thus leading him to set "he allotteth unto men according to their wills" (as noted in the previous discussion, the 1830 edition read *men* rather than the original *man*). The placement of the text in the 1830 edition (the copytext for the 1837 typesetter) facilitated the omission since the word *according* occurs at the end of the line and right below *unto men* in the preceding line:

> Alma 29:4 (1830 typesetting, line for line; bolding added)
> death or unto life ; yea, I know that he allotteth **unto men,** yea,
> decreeth unto them decrees which are unalterable, **according**
> to their wills ; whether it be unto salvation or unto destruc-

Summary: Maintain in Alma 29:4 the expansive reading of the original text: "he allotteth unto men— yea decreeth unto them decrees which are unalterable—according to their wills".

■ **Alma 29:5**

yea and I **know** *that good and evil*
[*hath* 0A | *hath* >js *has* >js *have* 1 | *have* BCDEFGIJLMNOPQRST | HK] *come before all men or he that* **knoweth** *not good from evil* **is** *blameless*

Here the 1874 RLDS edition omitted the perfective auxiliary *have* (originally *hath*). The surrounding clauses lack the perfect auxiliary, which may be the reason the *have* was omitted (but probably unintentionally). The 1908 RLDS edition restored the *have* to the RLDS text. The original *hath* was emended to *have* by Joseph Smith in his editing for the 1837 edition. At first Joseph thought to emend *hath* to *has,* but then he decided to treat the subject "good and evil" as a plural; so he changed the *has* to the plural *have.* In the original text, *hath* frequently occurred with plural subjects. For a complete discussion of the *-(e)th* ending and how it has been edited in the text, see under INFLECTIONAL ENDINGS in volume 3.

Summary: Maintain in Alma 29:5 the use of the perfective auxiliary; the original *hath* will be restored in place of the grammatically correct *have.*

■ **Alma 29:5**

yea and I know that good and evil hath come before all men
[0 | NULL >jg ; 1 | ; ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
[*or* 01ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQS | RT] *he that knoweth not good from evil is blameless*
[0 | NULL >jg ; 1 | ; ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
but he that knoweth good and evil
to him it is given according to his desires . . .

Here in the larger passage, Alma is arguing that men will be judged according to their desires and their wills:

Alma 29:4
I had not ought to harrow up in my desires the firm decree of a just God
for I know that he granteth unto men according to their desires
whether it be unto death or unto life
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

But when Alma follows this statement with "yea and I know that good and evil hath come before **all** men", he suddenly realizes that he has overstated his argument—good and evil have not come before everyone—so Alma immediately adds a clarifying *or*-statement to deal with those who have not known good or evil (and therefore have not had desires of good or evil): "**or** he that knoweth not good from evil is blameless". After this clarification, Alma returns to his original topic—those who do know good and evil:

Alma 29:5
but he that knoweth good and evil
to him it is given according to his desires
whether he desireth good or evil / life or death / joy or remorse of conscience

Alma thus corrects his original statement by using the conjunction *or,* which is one common way that the original Book of Mormon writers used in making corrections in the text, as for instance in Alma 24:19: "and thus we see that they buried the weapons of peace **or** they buried the weapons of war for peace" (see the discussion under Alma 22:22–23). The use of *or* here in Alma 29:5 is crucial in distinguishing between those who do not know good from evil and those who do.

The 1920 LDS edition removed the *or;* this change was a conscious one since it is marked in the copy of the 1911 large-print Chicago edition that the 1920 committee used to mark the 1920 textual changes. The 1830 printer's punctuation in this passage (two semicolons, which divided up the passage into three separate sentences) may have led the 1920 committee to consider the *or* as superfluous. The *or* should definitely be restored since this was Alma's way of indicating that what he had just written was not totally accurate and could be misleading. In addition, the punctuation should be changed to show that the text that follows the *or* is Alma's way of correcting his initial statement:

Alma 29:5 (with emended punctuation)

>yea, and I know that good and evil hath come before all men—
>or he that knoweth not good from evil is blameless—
>but he that knoweth good and evil,
>to him it is given according to his desires,
>whether he desireth good or evil, life or death, joy or remorse of conscience.

Summary: Restore the corrective *or* in Alma 29:5 since it shows that Alma realized that his initial statement ("good and evil hath come before all men") was not fully accurate; the punctuation should also be altered to show that the clause that comes after the *or* serves to correct the initial statement.

■ **Alma 29:5**

but he that knoweth good and evil
to him [*it* 01ABCDEFGHIJLMNOPQRST | K] *is given according to his desires*

The 1892 RLDS edition omitted the expletive *it* here. Although an accident, the resulting reading is not impossible. Elsewhere in the text there are examples of "to X is given", although in each of these cases there is an explicit subject following *is given:*

>Alma 12:10   to him is given the greater portion of the word
>Alma 12:11   to him is given the lesser portion of the word
>Moroni 10:9   to one is given by the Spirit of God that he may teach
>   the word of wisdom

(In the last case, the *that*-clause appears to serve as the postponed subject for *is given.*) The major problem with the 1892 reading for Alma 29:5 is that there is no explicit subject following *is given.* Obviously, the original reading with the *it* will be maintained here in Alma 29:5.

Summary: Maintain the expletive *it* in Alma 29:5: "to him **it** is given according to his desires".

■ **Alma 29:5**

whether he desireth good or evil
life or death
joy or [*remorse* 0ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST | *sorrow > remorse* 1] *of conscience*

Here in the printer's manuscript, Oliver Cowdery initially wrote "joy or sorrow"; but then virtually immediately he corrected *sorrow* to *remorse,* the extant reading in 𝓞. (There is no change in the level of ink flow for the supralinearly inserted *remorse* in 𝓟.) Oliver was perhaps influenced by the conjoining of *joy* and *sorrow* only a few verses earlier (at the end of the previous chapter):

>Alma 28:14
>   **sorrow** because of death and destruction among men
>   and **joy** because of the light of Christ unto life

One other example conjoining *joy* and *sorrow* is found in Jacob 4:3: "that they may learn with **joy** and not with **sorrow**—neither with contempt—concerning their first parents". There are, on the other hand, no other examples in the text of conjoined *joy* and *remorse.*

Summary: Maintain the conjoined "joy or remorse" in Alma 29:5, the extant reading of the original manuscript.

■ **Alma 29:7**

why should I desire
that I [*were > was* 0 | *was* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQS | *were* RT] *an angel*

In standard English, we expect the subjunctive *were* here in Alma 29:7 since the *that*-clause is contrary to fact. Of course, in colloquial English, *was* occurs in such clauses. In this instance, it appears that Oliver Cowdery initially wrote "that I **were** an angel" in ○, but then he corrected the *were* to *was* by crossing out the *were* and supralinearly inserting the nonstandard *was*. The crossed-out *were* is not extant in ○, but the last half of the supralinear *was* is extant. There is no change in the level of ink flow for the extant *as* of *was,* so the correction appears to be virtually immediate. It is clear that the intended reading in the original manuscript is "that I **was** an angel". The 1920 LDS edition changed the *was* to *were,* but the RLDS text has retained the original *was*. The critical text will restore the nonstandard *was*. For further discussion of *was* versus *were* in the original text, see under SUBJUNCTIVE and under MOOD in volume 3.

Summary: Restore the indicative *was* in Alma 29:7, the corrected reading in ○ ("why should I desire that I **was** an angel").

■ **Alma 29:8**

for behold the Lord doth grant unto all nations of their own nation and tongue to teach his word
yea **in wisdom** *all that he seeth fit that they should have*
therefore we see that the Lord doth counsel
in [NULL >+ *his* 1 | ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOQRST | *his* P] *wisdom*
according to that which is just and true

The original manuscript is not extant for the phrase "in his wisdom", but there is definitely space for the determiner *his* between surviving portions of the original manuscript. In the printer's manuscript, Oliver Cowdery initially wrote the text without the *his,* but later he inserted the *his* supralinearly. The level of ink flow for the correction is somewhat heavier, which suggests that here Oliver redipped his quill before correcting ℗ or that the correction was done later when proofing ℗ against ○. Despite Oliver's correction in ℗, the 1830 compositor set simply "in wisdom", without the *his*. The 1908 RLDS edition, based on the correction in the printer's manuscript, restored the *his;* but in the subsequent 1953 RLDS edition, the *his* once more dropped out. This difficulty in keeping the *his* is undoubtedly due to the phrase "in wisdom" that occurs in the preceding sentence ("yea **in wisdom** all that he seeth fit that they should have").

Elsewhere in the text there are two occurrences of the verb *counsel* with *wisdom,* and they both take the form "in wisdom"—that is, without a determiner:

Jacob 4:10   he counseleth **in wisdom** and in justice and in great mercy
over all his works

Alma 37:12   for he doth counsel **in wisdom** over all his works

Nonetheless, there are a number of cases involving other verbs where the text has "in <possessive pronoun> wisdom" and the reference is to the Lord's wisdom:

2 Nephi 3:19	which is expedient **in my wisdom** should go forth
2 Nephi 27:22	until I shall see fit **in mine own wisdom** to reveal all things
3 Nephi 28:29	when the Lord seeth fit **in his wisdom** that . . .
3 Nephi 29:1	when the Lord shall see fit **in his wisdom** that . . .
Mormon 5:13	they shall come forth according to the commandment of the Lord when he shall see fit **in his wisdom**

So the determiner *his* is definitely possible in Alma 29:8, and the earliest textual sources (the corrected reading in 𝓟 and the spacing between fragments of 𝓞) support the *his*. In addition, there would have been no motivation for adding the *his* except in an attempt to get 𝓟 to agree with 𝓞. The critical text will therefore restore the *his* here in Alma 29:8.

Summary: In accord with the earliest textual source (the printer's manuscript), restore the phrase "in **his** wisdom" in Alma 29:8 ("the Lord doth counsel in his wisdom").

■ **Alma 29:10**

then do I remember what the Lord [has 01ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPRST | hath Q] done for me
yea even that he **hath** *heard my prayer*

The change to *hath* in the 1911 LDS edition is unusual because the tendency in the history of the text has been to replace *hath* with *has,* not *has* with *hath.* In this instance, the change was probably influenced by the occurrence of *hath* in the following clause ("yea even that he **hath** heard my prayer"). The 1920 LDS edition restored the original *has* (which is extant in 𝓞). The original text has examples of both *hath* and *has,* although *hath* dominates. See the general discussion under INFLECTIONAL ENDINGS in volume 3.

Summary: Maintain the original occurrence of *has* in Alma 29:10.

■ **Alma 29:11**

yea and **I** *also remember the captivity of my fathers*
for **I** *surely do know that the Lord did deliver them out of bondage*
and [I then > by then 0 | by this 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] did establish his church

In the original manuscript, Oliver Cowdery initially wrote *I then,* which is an obvious error. Oliver corrected his mistake by crossing out both words and supralinearly inserting *by then.* The correction seems to be virtually immediate since the level of ink flow is unchanged. The fact that Oliver at first wrote *I* instead of *by* was probably due to the preceding occurrences of *I* in this passage (and facilitated by the phonetic similarity between *I* and *by*). Oliver also crossed out the word *then,* but in his supralinear insertion he simply repeated the *then.* It is possible that Oliver accidentally crossed out one too many words and thus restored the *then.*

Another possibility is that Oliver Cowdery misheard some other word as *then* but that in his correction he accidentally rewrote the incorrect *then.* By the time Oliver got around to producing

the printer's manuscript, he was unable to recall what *by then* originally represented. He obviously found *by then* impossible, so he freely edited the adverbial *then* to the determiner *this*. As a result, all editions (including the current text) have *by this*. I would conjecture that the original text actually read *by them*. Oliver initially misheard the dictated *by them* as *I then,* but this error was caught and partially corrected. Oliver intended, I would propose, to correct *I then* to *by them,* but he accidentally wrote *then* instead of *them*. There is considerable evidence elsewhere in the manuscripts that Oliver frequently miswrote *them* as *then;* in the following listing, I give only the readings in ℗ (where extant), ℗, and the 1830 edition (represented respectively as 0, 1, and A):

□ error uncorrected in ℗:

Alma 57:11   and send [*then* 0 | *them* 1A] to Judea

□ error corrected in ℗:

Alma 46:10   which God had granted unto [*then > them* 0 | *them* 1A]
Alma 47:15   he would suffer [*then > them* 0 | *them* 1A]
Alma 50:26   a warm contention between [*then > them* 0 | *them* 1A]

□ error uncorrected in ℗:

Alma 55:32   no poison should be administered among [*them* 0A | *then* 1]

□ error corrected in ℗:

2 Nephi 5:9   take it upon [*then > them* 1 | *them* A]
2 Nephi 5:24   which was upon [*then > them* 1 | *them* A]
Helaman 1:24   giving [*them* 0A | *then > them* 1] no time

Clearly, Oliver could have miswritten *them* as *then* in his supralinear correction in ℗ for Alma 29:11.

In the emended reading, *by them* seems to mean 'by means of them'. Alma the elder was the one responsible for establishing the church among his own converts as well as later among the Nephites in the land of Zarahemla. For some discussion of the use of *by* with the meaning 'by means of', see under Alma 27:24.

Summary: Emend Alma 29:11 to read "and **by them** did establish his church"; neither the initial reading in ℗ *(I then)* nor the corrected reading in ℗ *(by then)* is possible; Oliver Cowdery's conjectured reading in ℗ *(by this)* was purely speculative on his part and can hardly represent the original text.

■ **Alma 29:11**

yea the Lord God
    the God of Abraham
    [NULL >- & 0 | 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *the God of Isaac*
    and the God of Jacob
did deliver them out of bondage

Here in the original manuscript, Oliver Cowdery initially wrote the conjunctive appositive (which nonrestrictively postmodifies *the Lord God*) with only one *and:* "the God of Abraham / the God of Isaac / **and** the God of Jacob". Later, perhaps when he read the text back to Joseph Smith,

Oliver supralinearly inserted an ampersand before "the God of Isaac". This insertion is written with slightly weaker ink flow. But when Oliver came to copying this conjunctive expression into 𝓟, he once more omitted the first *and*. And this time he did not correct his error. The printed editions have followed the reading in 𝓟 without the first *and*.

The exact same sequence of errors and correction is found in 𝓞 for 1 Nephi 17:40; there Oliver Cowdery initially wrote "yea even Abraham Isaac and Jacob". Later he supralinearly inserted an ampersand before *Isaac,* but in this case with very weak ink flow. When copying from 𝓞 into 𝓟, Oliver once more omitted the *and;* and the printed editions have followed the 𝓟 reading. As discussed under 1 Nephi 17:40, the first *and* in conjuncts involving *Abraham, Isaac,* and *Jacob* is optional. Also see the extensive discussion under 1 Nephi 19:10 for the question of how much conjunctive repetition occurs with these three names. The evidence there shows that in each case the critical text should follow the earliest textual sources. Here in Alma 29:11, the critical text will restore the omitted *and.*

Summary: Restore in Alma 29:11 the corrected reading in 𝓞, which has an *and* between each instance of "the God of X" (thus "the God of Abraham **and** the God of Isaac **and** the God of Jacob").

■ **Alma 29:12**

yea I have [*also > always* o | *always* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *remembered the captivity of my fathers*

Here Oliver Cowdery initially started to write *also*. He almost finished writing the word when he aborted the final *o*, overwrote the *so* with *w,* and then continued inline with the *ays.* Thus his correction was immediate. Theoretically, either reading is possible, but *always* is definitely the correct reading here. The probable source for Oliver's initial error was the occurrence of *also* in a nearly identical clause in the preceding verse: "yea and I **also** remember the captivity of my fathers" (Alma 29:11). For a similar example where *always* was accidentally replaced by *also,* an error that entered the printed text, see nearby under Alma 30:52.

Summary: Maintain in Alma 29:12 the immediately corrected reading in 𝓞: "yea I have **always** remembered the captivity of my fathers".

■ **Alma 29:13**

yea and that same God hath called me by a holy calling to preach the word unto [*this* 01ABCDEGHIJKLMNOPQRST | *his > this* F] *people*

Here the compositor for the 1852 LDS edition accidentally set *his people* rather than the correct *this people*. In the second printing, the correct *this people* was restored. The 1852 compositor was prone to make this mistake:

> Alma 5:54
> wherewith they have been brought
> into [*this* 1ABCDEGHIJKLMNOPQRST | *his > this* F] church

Alma 9:19

    nay he would rather suffer that
    the Lamanites might destroy all [*this* 1ABCDEGHKPS | *his* FIJLMNOQRT] people

Alma 10:20

    well doth he cry unto [*this* 1ABCDEGHKPRST | *his* FIJLMNOQ] people

In each case, the critical text will retain the original *this*.

Summary: Maintain the occurrence of *this* in Alma 29:13 ("to preach the word unto this people").

■ **Alma 29:17**

yea and also all those which are the fruit
of their [*labour* o | *labours* 1DQ | *labors* ABCEFGHIJKLMNOPRST]

The original manuscript has the singular *labor* (spelled as *labour*) in the phrase "the fruit of their labor". In the printer's manuscript, Oliver Cowdery accidentally replaced the singular *labor* with the plural *labors* (spelled as *labours*), thus giving "the fruit of their labors". The plural *labors* (sometimes spelled as *labours*) has been retained in all the printed editions.

    The Book of Mormon text has three other examples of the phrase "the fruit(s) of one's labor(s)", and in each case the original text has both *fruit* and *labor* in the plural:

Alma 26:31

    now behold we can look forth
    and see the **fruits** of our **labors**
    and are they few

Alma 36:25

    the Lord doth give me exceeding great joy
    in the [*fruits* o | *fruit* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] of my **labors**

Alma 40:26

    but they are cast out
    and consigned to partake of the **fruits** of their **labors**
    or their works which have been evil

In Alma 36:25, Oliver Cowdery accidentally replaced the plural *fruits* with the singular *fruit* as he copied the text from 𝓞 into 𝓟. These four examples of "the fruit(s) of one's labor(s)" show that in the original text *fruit* and *labor* always agree in number: either both are singular (as here in Alma 29:17) or both are plural (in Alma 26:31, Alma 36:25, and Alma 40:26).

    The completely singular case in Alma 29:17, although unique in the Book of Mormon, is probably intended. In support of this reading with two singulars, we note that the only parallel example in the King James Bible has both *fruit* and *labor* in the singular: "this *is* the **fruit** of my **labor**" (Philippians 1:22). The critical text will restore the singular *labor* in Alma 29:17, the reading of the original manuscript.

Summary: Restore in Alma 29:17 the singular *labor,* the reading in 𝓞 (thus "the **fruit** of their **labor**"); similar usage is found in the King James Bible.

Alma 30

■ **Alma 30:1–2**

behold now it came to pass that
(1) **after** *the people of Ammon were established in the land of Jershon*
(2) *yea and also* **after** *the Lamanites were driven out of the land*
   [& 01 | *and* ABCDEFGHIJKLPRST | *and* > NULL M | NOQ] *their dead were buried*
      by the people of the land
   —*now their dead were not numbered because of the greatness of their numbers*
   neither were the dead of the Nephites numbered—
   but it came to pass that
(3) **after** *they had buried their dead*
(4) *and also* **after** *the days of fasting and mourning and prayer*
   —*and it was in the sixteenth year of the reign of the judges over the people of Nephi*—
   there began to be continual peace throughout all the land

The syntax of this whole passage is extremely complex. In the original text (as well as in the current), the initial pair of *after*-clauses in verse 1 (listed above as 1 and 2) are never completed. Instead, these conjoined *after*-clauses are interrupted by a long intervening parenthetical clause ("now their dead were not numbered because of the greatness of their numbers / neither were the dead of the Nephites numbered"). This parenthetical clause is then followed by a second pair of *after*-clauses in the middle of verse 2 (listed above as 3 and 4). This second pair of *after*-clauses is also followed by its own intervening parenthetical clause ("and it was in the sixteenth year of the reign of the judges over the people of Nephi"), which adds to the complexity. The entire sentence is finally completed with the independent clause at the end, "there began to be continual peace throughout all the land".

The 1906 LDS large-print edition attempted to deal with the incompleteness of the first pair of *after*-clauses in verse 1 by deleting the *and* before "their dead were buried by the people of the land". The third printing for the 1905 LDS Chicago edition (in 1907) followed the 1906 edition by deleting this *and* from the original plates used for the first Chicago printing (in 1905). And the 1911 LDS large-print Chicago edition followed the changed text. On the other hand, the 1920 LDS edition restored the *and,* probably because it was felt that this clause ("and their dead were buried by the people of the land") actually belonged with the preceding clause ("yea and also after the Lamanites were driven out of the land"). This decision restored the original text, despite the fact that it leaves verse 1 clausally incomplete. The critical text will follow the original reading, despite its complexity.

Summary: Ignore in Alma 30:1 the 1906 LDS emendation that removed the *and* before "their dead were buried by the people of the land"; the original text here is complex, but the incompleteness of the pair of conjoined *after*-clauses in verse 1 is intended.

■ **Alma 30:2**

now their dead were not numbered
because of the greatness of their [number >+ numbers 0 | numbers 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
neither were the dead of the Nephites numbered

Here Oliver Cowdery initially wrote the singular *number* in the original manuscript; then some-
what later he inserted the plural *s* with heavier ink flow. This change probably occurred when
Oliver read back the text to Joseph Smith. The correction does not appear to be due to editing
since either the singular or plural is possible here. Elsewhere in the text we have examples of both
singular *number* and plural *numbers* in reference to the greatness of a number; none of the fol-
lowing cases show any textual variation between *number* and *numbers*:

　□ singular *number* (7 times)

Mosiah 21:17	because of the greatness of their **number** that had been slain
Alma 3:1	because of the greatness of their **number**
Alma 44:21	because of the greatness of the **number**
Alma 48:4	because of the greatness of the **number** of his people
Helaman 1:25	notwithstanding the greatness of the **number** of the Nephites which were slain
Helaman 4:20	because of the greatness of the **number** of the Lamanites
Mormon 4:17	because of the greatness of their **number**

　□ plural *numbers* (4 times)

Alma 49:6	because of the greatness of their **numbers**
Alma 62:19	and beholding the greatness of their **numbers**
Helaman 11:31	because of the exceeding greatness of the **numbers** of those robbers
Mormon 6:8	because of the greatness of their **numbers**

For each case involving *greatness,* we allow the earliest textual sources to determine whether we
have *number* or *numbers*. The critical text will accept the plural *numbers* in Alma 30:2.

Summary: Accept in Alma 30:2 the plural *numbers,* the corrected reading in the original manuscript;
theoretically, either *number* or *numbers* is possible in this context.

■ **Alma 30:5**

and it came to pass
[1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRS | that T]
in [the commencement of 0T | 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRS] the seventeenth year
　of the reign of the judges
there was continual peace

The extant original manuscript here reads "the commencement of the seventeenth year". But
when Oliver Cowdery copied from 𝇋 into 𝄞, he accidentally omitted "the commencement of",
thus giving "in the seventeenth year". The 1981 LDS edition, in accord with the reading in 𝇋,

restored the missing phrase "the commencement of ". The tendency to omit "the commencement of " is relatively frequent in the text. Out of 17 original occurrences of "it came to pass (that) in the commencement of the Xth year", six involve the loss (sometimes only momentarily) of "the commencement of ". There is another example where Oliver omitted this phrase when he copied from 𝓞 into 𝓟 (and as with Alma 30:5, this phrase was restored in the 1981 edition):

> Alma 54:1
> And now it came to pass
> in [*the commencement of* 0T | 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRS] the twenty
> and ninth year . . .

In four cases, the phrase was initially omitted in 𝓞 (three times) or in 𝓟 (once, marked here with an asterisk):

> Alma 45:20
> and now it came to pass
> in [NULL > *the commencement of* 0 |
> *the commencement of* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
> the nineteenth year . . .

> Alma 50:25
> and it came to pass that
> in the [NULL > *commencement of the* 0 |
> *commencement of the* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
> twenty and fourth year . . .

> * Alma 51:1
> And now it came to pass
> in the [*commencement of the* 0ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST |
> NULL >+ *commencement of the* 1]
> twenty and fifth year . . .

> Alma 63:1
> And it came to pass in the [NULL > *commencement of the* 0 |
> *commencement of the* 1ABCEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST | *commencment of the* D]
> thirty and sixth year . . .

In Alma 30:5 the 1981 LDS edition also added the subordinate conjunction *that* before the *in*. Of the 16 other occurrences of "it came to pass (that) in the commencement of the Xth year", three have the *that* in the earliest text:

> Alma 50:25   and it came to pass **that** in the commencement
>   of the twenty and fourth year . . .
> Alma 57:6   and it came to pass **that** in the commencement
>   of the twenty and ninth year . . .
> 3 Nephi 1:4   and it came to pass **that** in the commencement
>   of the ninety and second year . . .

For the first two cases, the *that* is extant in 𝓞. In the third case, 𝓞 is not extant; but for that part of the text, 𝓟 and the 1830 edition are both firsthand copies of 𝓞, and each one has the *that*. So quite

clearly, *that* can occur in this construction. Of the 13 other occurrences without the *that* (that is, where the earliest text reads "it came to pass in the commencement of the Xth year"), 𝒪 is extant in five instances. Thus there is clear evidence that this phrase can lack the subordinate conjunction *that* before the preposition *in,* so in each case we follow the earliest textual sources in determining whether the *that* is there or not.

David Calabro wonders (personal communication) if there shouldn't always be a subordinate *that* either before or after the *commencement* phrase. In the 13 clear cases where there is no *that* before the *commencement* phrase, there are four instances where *that* follows (as in Alma 45:20: "and now it came to pass in the commencement of the nineteenth year of the reign of the judges over the people of Nephi **that** Helaman went forth among the people"). But in the remaining nine cases, there is no following *that* (as in Alma 62:12: "and it came to pass in the commencement of the thirty and first year of the reign of the judges over the people of Nephi / Moroni immediately caused that provisions should be sent"). It should also be pointed out that theoretically *that* could both precede and follow the *commencement* phrase, as can be found in the original text for other adverbial phrases (for instance, Jacob 7:17 originally read "and it came to pass **that** on the morrow **that** the multitude were gathered together"). However, in the three established cases where *that* precedes the *commencement* phrase (listed above), there is no repeated *that* (thus Alma 50:25 reads "and it came to pass **that** in the commencement of the twenty and fourth year of the reign of the judges / there would also have been peace").

As for the occurrence here in Alma 30:5, spacing between extant fragments of 𝒪 suggests that the subordinate conjunction *that* was there, at least initially. This possibility is represented as follows in the transcription of 𝒪 in volume 1 of the critical text:

Alma 30:4−5 (lines 6−7, page 277′ of 𝒪)

```
                      year
  the sixteenth ^ of the Reign of the Judges over the Peo(p                      )
                                        LE OF NEPHI & IT CAME TO PASS THAT IN

  the commencement of the seventeenth year of the (Reig                      )
                                        N OF THE JUDGES THERE WAS CONTINU
```

The possibility that the *that* in 𝒪 could have been crossed out is mentioned in a footnote to the transcription. Of course, it must be remembered that the *that* here is conjectured; there could have been some other correction for this missing part of 𝒪. Or perhaps the lacuna is not as long as postulated in the transcription; in other words, there may have been no *that* at all in 𝒪. Given this inconclusiveness regarding the *that* in Alma 30:5, the critical text will simply follow the earliest extant reading—namely, the reading in 𝒫, which lacks the *that:* "and it came to pass in the commencement of the seventeenth year".

Summary: Maintain in Alma 30:5 the phrase "the commencement of" that was originally omitted when Oliver Cowdery copied the text from 𝒪 into 𝒫; remove the *that* which the 1981 LDS edition added when restoring the phrase "the commencement of" to the text; in this instance, the earliest extant source for the words "and it came to pass (that) in" is 𝒫, which lacks the *that* (although it may have occurred in 𝒪).

■ **Alma 30:6**

there came a man into the land of Zarahemla
and he was [*Anti Christ* 01 | *Anti-Christ* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOQRT | *Anti-christ* P | *antichrist* S]

The phraseology of "he was anti-Christ" seems unusual. Possible interpretations include the following (I provide for each one a distinctive spelling):

(1) *anti Christ* as a prepositional phrase (that is, 'he was against Christ')
(2) *antichrist* as an adjective
(3) *Anti-Christ* as a proper noun (a name or title)
(4) *anti-Christ* as a common noun

The last possibility suggests that the text here in Alma 30:6 could be in error and that *anti-Christ* is a common noun with its determiner missing. The obvious candidate for such a missing determiner would be *an*. In other words, perhaps the original text here in Alma 30:6 read "and he was **an** anti-Christ". The repetition of the syllable *an* ("**an an**ti-Christ") could have caused difficulty for either Joseph Smith while dictating or Oliver Cowdery while writing down Joseph's dictation. There is an example earlier in the text of a similar difficulty when scribe 2 of 𝒫 wrote *an onti* as *anti* in Alma 11:13 (see the discussion under Alma 11:6).

The expression "he was an anti-Christ" seems perfectly reasonable in English; the use of *anti-Christ* as a noun is supported by the use of the determiner *this* later on in this chapter:

Alma 30:12
and **this anti-Christ** whose name was Korihor
—and the law could have no hold upon him—
and he began to preach unto the people that there should be no Christ

However, when we consult the usage in the King James Bible, we discover that the word *anti-Christ* (spelled as *antichrist* in the currently published text) most frequently occurs without any determiner (in three out of five cases, each marked below with an asterisk):

* 1 John 2:18   and as ye have heard that **antichrist** shall come
   1 John 2:18   even now are there **many antichrists**
* 1 John 2:22   he is **antichrist** / that denieth the Father and the Son
* 1 John 4:3   and this is that *spirit* of **antichrist**
   2 John 1:7   this is a deceiver and **an antichrist**

For the third case, the King James reading ("he is anti-Christ") parallels "he was anti-Christ", the reading in Alma 30:6.

When we compare the King James translation with the Greek original, we find that the Greek typically has the definite article equivalent of *the,* especially in the Textus Receptus, the Greek text that served as the basis for translating the King James Bible:

	KING JAMES BIBLE	TEXTUS RECEPTUS
1 John 2:18	antichrist	"**the** antichrist"
1 John 2:18	many antichrists	"antichrists many"
1 John 2:22	antichrist	"**the** antichrist"
1 John 4:3	of antichrist	"of **the** antichrist"
2 John 1:7	and an antichrist	"and **the** antichrist"

The translations given in quotation marks under the column *Textus Receptus* are very literal, even in one case to being ungrammatical in English ("antichrists many").

Examples quoted in the Oxford English Dictionary (under *Antichrist*) indicate the natural tendency to use a determiner with the common noun *anti-Christ,* although it does list one early example (dating about 1400) without any determiner (original spellings and capitalization given here):

about 1400	Ilk one contrary to Crist is anticrist
1579	and proued to bee an antichrist
1646	A Witch is an Anticrist
1860	The first Anti-Christ Simon Magus

We see from these examples that there is considerable variation in the spelling of *anti-Christ.* Current printings of the King James Bible have the lowercase *antichrist* (and without a space or hyphen). The 1611 first printing of the King James Bible had the spelling *Antichrist.* The OED and Merriam-Webster's Collegiate Dictionary give *Antichrist* as the standard spelling. The critical text will use *anti-Christ,* under the assumption that the word is a common noun. Other common nouns involving *anti* are typically spelled this way in today's English (such as *anti-American* and *anti-Catholic*).

Although the Book of Mormon clause "he was anti-Christ" (the reading of 𝇋) could be an error for "he was **an** anti-Christ", the critical text will retain the text without the indefinite article since there are three examples of *anti-Christ* in the King James Bible without any determiner.

Summary: Accept "he was anti-Christ" (the reading of the original manuscript) as the correct reading in Alma 30:6 since it parallels the most frequent usage in the King James Bible (that is, without any determiner for *anti-Christ*).

■ **Alma 30:7**

for it was strictly contrary
to the [commandments 0 | commands 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] of God
that there should be a law which should bring men onto unequal grounds

The extant portion of the original manuscript clearly reads *commandm.* The rest of the word is lost. But the *m* is clear and is definitely not deleted or erased. Further, spacing between extant fragments clearly has room for the final four letters of the word, *ents.*

Except in Jacob's writings, the rest of the Book of Mormon uniformly uses the precise phraseology "commandments of God" (69 times) instead of "commands of God". But Jacob uses two occurrences of "commands of God"; the choice of *commands* over *commandments* may represent the immediacy of Jacob's discourse style:

Jacob 2:10	I must do according to the strict commands of God
Jacob 4:5	to be obedient unto the commands of God

There is also a more convoluted occurrence of "command of God" in the text; in this instance, Mormon is the source for the usage: "the dust of the earth moveth hither and thither to the dividing asunder at the **command** of our great and everlasting God" (Helaman 12:8). Of course, this use of "command of God" is different in that it does not refer to the Lord giving commands to a person but instead to nature. For further discussion of the phrase "command(s) of God", see under Jacob 2:10.

There is considerable evidence that two scribes, Oliver Cowdery and scribe 2 of 𝔓, tended to replace *commandments* with *command(s):*

> 1 Nephi 4:17 (initial error in 𝔓 by Oliver Cowdery)
>
> according to his [*commandments* 0BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST |
>   *commands* > *commandments* 1 | *commmandments* A]

> Mosiah 29:36 (initial error in 𝔓 by scribe 2)
>
> that they was expressly repugnant to the [*command* > *commandments* 1 |
>   *commandments* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] of God

> Alma 8:15 (initial error in 𝔓 by scribe 2)
>
> for thou hast been faithful in keeping the [*commands* > *commandments* 1 |
>   *commandments* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] of God

> Alma 30:7 (Oliver Cowdery's error in copying from 𝒪 into 𝔓)
>
> for it was strictly contrary
> to the [*commandments* 0 | *commands* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] of God

> Helaman 7:4 (initial error in 𝔓 by Oliver Cowdery)
>
> laying aside the [*commands* > *commandments* 1 |
>   *commandments* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] of God

> 3 Nephi 6:14 (Oliver Cowdery's probable error in copying from 𝒪 into 𝔓)
>
> willing with all diligence to keep the [*commands* 1 |
>   *commandments* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] of the Lord

> 4 Nephi 1:12 (initial error in 𝔓 by scribe 2)
>
> but they did walk after the [*commands* > *commandments* 1 |
>   *commandments* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
> which they had received from their Lord and their God

The only complicated case is the one in 3 Nephi 6:14. In that instance, both 𝔓 and the 1830 edition are firsthand copies of 𝒪. Since elsewhere the 1830 typesetter never mixed up *command(s)* and *commandments(s),* the odds are that it was the scribe in 𝔓, Oliver Cowdery, who was responsible for the change in 3 Nephi 6:14, namely, of *commandments* to *commands* (which was Oliver's tendency elsewhere in the text). Moreover, no scribe ever made the opposite change, replacing *command(s)* with *commandment(s).* There is only one case where this error occurred in the printed editions, and that was in the 1841 British edition for Jacob 2:10 (see under that passage for discussion).

David Calabro points out (personal communication) that since the last part of *commandments* in Alma 30:7 is not extant in 𝒪, it is worth considering whether 𝒪 might have read in the singular as "contrary to the **commandment** of God". Of course, the replacement in 𝔓 by the plural *commands* supports the plural *commandments.* Moreover, other passages in the Book of Mormon have only the plural usage, "contrary to the **commandments** of God":

> Mosiah 27:10
>
> and to lead astray the people of the Lord contrary to the **commandments** of God

> Helaman 8:3
>
> and nothing did he speak which were contrary to the **commandments** of God

Helaman 16:12
and do more and more of that which was contrary to the **commandments** of God

In fact, there is no occurrence of the singular "commandment of God" anywhere in the Book of Mormon (although this phrase is found six times in the King James New Testament). Thus the odds are quite high that in Alma 30:7 the original manuscript read *commandments* rather than the singular *commandment.*

Summary: Restore in Alma 30:7 "the **commandments** of God", in accord with the reading of the original manuscript and usage elsewhere in the text.

■ **Alma 30:10**

but if he murdered / he was punished unto death
and if he robbed / he was also punished
and if he stole / he was also punished
and if he committed adultery / he was also punished
yea for all [*these > this* O | *this* 1ABCEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST | *his* D] *wickedness*
they were punished

Initially Oliver Cowdery wrote "all these wickedness" in O; he soon corrected the plural determiner *these* to *this* by supralinear insertion. It is possible to interpret "all these wickedness" as meaning 'all these wickednesses', especially since the preceding text implies a plurality in its reference to four types of wickedness: murder, robbery, stealing, and adultery. In Early Modern English, nouns ending in unstressed /əs/ could be either singular or plural. As discussed under 2 Nephi 31:18, Jacob 4:7, and Alma 34:26, there are instances in the original Book of Mormon text of the nouns *witness, weakness,* and *wilderness* that may actually be plurals even though the plural ending *-es* is lacking. In the same way, it is possible that here in Alma 30:10 the initial text, "all these wickedness", means 'all these wickednesses'. Given this interpretation, Oliver's correction of *these* to *this* could have been editing on his part: he just couldn't accept the apparent contradiction in grammatical number between *these* and *wickedness.*

On the other hand, there is no apparent change in the level of ink flow for the correction in O, which implies that the correction was virtually immediate. Perhaps Oliver Cowdery initially wrote *all these* simply because he expected a plural after *all.* But elsewhere in the text, *all these* is always followed by plural noun forms, including two cases of "all these witnesses" (in Jacob 4:6 and Alma 30:45), not "all these witness" (the parallel that we might expect if "all these wickedness" was the correct reading here in Alma 30:10).

It should also be noted that there is one other occurrence of *this wickedness* in the text. In that instance, as we might expect, the text refers to a single wickedness:

3 Nephi 1:9–10
now it came to pass that there was a day set apart by the unbelievers
that all those who believed in those traditions should be put to death
except the sign should come to pass which had been given by Samuel the prophet
now it came to pass that
when Nephi the son of Nephi saw **this wickedness** of his people
his heart was exceeding sorrowful

The critical text will therefore accept the standard reading in Alma 30:10, "all this wickedness", even though there is a small possibility that the initial reading "all these wickedness" is correct (but only with the meaning 'all these wickednesses').

We should also note here that in Alma 30:10 the 1841 British edition accidentally replaced "all **this** wickedness" with "all **his** wickedness", which gives the nonsensical "yea for all **his** wickedness **they** were punished". This use of the determiner *his* was undoubtedly motivated by the occurrence of the generic *he* in the preceding text: "and if **he** committed adultery / **he** was also punished". But if the *his* were adopted, then the following plural pronoun *they* would have to be emended to *he* (and the verb *were* to *was*), giving "yea for all **his** wickedness **he** was punished".

Summary: Maintain the corrected reading in ⊙ for Alma 30:10: "yea for all **this** wickedness they were punished".

■ **Alma 30:11**

for there was a law that men should be judged according to their **crimes**
nevertheless there was no law against a man's belief
therefore a man was punished only
for the [*crime* >− *crimes* o | *crimes* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *which he had done*

Near the end of this passage, Oliver Cowdery initially wrote *crime* in the original manuscript; then somewhat later he inserted the plural *s,* but the level of ink flow was not as heavy. The adding of the *s* could represent a later correction resulting from Oliver rereading the text to Joseph Smith after this part of the text has been initially dictated. Another possibility is that later Oliver consciously made the change to *crimes* since earlier in the passage there is an occurrence of the plural: "for there was a law that men should be judged according to their **crimes**".

Elsewhere in the text, the earliest sources give instances of both singular and plural for *crime,* with seven in the singular and ten in the plural. In one of these cases, an original singular *crime* was incorrectly replaced with the plural *crimes* (see under Alma 1:10). In another case, all the extant sources read *crime,* but the original may have been *crimes* (see under Alma 50:39 for discussion of this case of possible emendation). As far as Alma 30:11 is concerned, we note that when the associated verb is *punish,* we can have either singular *crime* or plural *crimes:*

> The Words of Mormon 1:15–16
>> and it came to pass that
>> after there had been false Christs
>> and their mouths had been shut
>> and they punished according to their **crimes**
>> and after there had been false prophets and false preachers and teachers
>>> among the people
>> and all these having been punished according to their **crimes** . . .
>
> Mosiah 29:15
>> and whosoever hath committed iniquity
>> him have I punished according to the **crime** which he hath committed

In the first passage, both instances of the plural *crimes* seem more appropriate than a singular *crime* would. But in the second passage, the text could read in either the singular or the plural: "him have I punished according to the crime(s) which he hath committed". In Mosiah 29:15, the critical text will follow the invariant textual reading for all the textual sources (including 𝔓, the earliest extant source), thus accepting the singular *crime*. Similarly, here in Alma 30:11 either singular *crime* or plural *crimes* will work, so we accept the corrected reading in 𝒪 as the reading of the original text. Nonetheless, the possibility remains that the *crime* that Oliver Cowdery initially wrote in Alma 30:11 could have been the original reading and that the correction to *crimes* was a conscious attempt to make both occurrences of *crime(s)* in the passage read in the plural.

Summary: Accept in Alma 30:11 the correction in 𝒪 from the singular *crime* to the plural *crimes* in "therefore a man was punished only for the **crimes** which he had done"; the possibility remains that the original text read in the singular and that Oliver Cowdery changed the singular to the plural since earlier in the passage the text reads in the plural ("for there was a law that men should be judged according to their **crimes**").

■ **Alma 30:12**

and this anti-Christ whose name was Korihor
—and the law could have no hold upon him—
[*& he* 0|*& he* >js *&* 1|*And he* A| BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *began to preach unto the people*
that there should be no Christ

In his editing for the 1837 edition, Joseph Smith here removed the occurrence of *and he* after the parenthetical clause "and the law could have no hold upon him". But in marking up 𝔓 for that edition, Joseph crossed out only the redundant *he*. He probably also intended to delete the Hebraistic-like *and* but just neglected to do so. The entire *and he* was omitted in the 1837 edition itself.

Similar uses of the connective *and* with a redundant subject pronoun can be found elsewhere in the original text, as in the following example that the 1830 typesetter removed from the text:

> Ether 9:8
> and now the brother of him that suffered death
> —and his name was Nimrah—
> [*& he* 0|*& he* >jg NULL 1| ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *was angry with his father*

The critical text will, of course, restore instances of pronominal redundancy and the Hebrew-like connective *and* in the original text. Such constructs provide narrative cohesion in the text. Also see under 2 Nephi 10:3 for another example where the 1830 typesetter removed a redundant *that he* (which also follows a parenthetical clause).

Summary: In accord with the reading of the manuscripts, restore in Alma 30:12 the redundant connective *and he;* there is evidence elsewhere in the text for such usage.

■ **Alma 30:13**

O ye that are bound down
under a foolish and [a ᴏ1ᴀʙᴄᴅᴇꜰɢɪᴊʟᴍɴᴏᴘǫʀsᴛ| ʜᴋ] vain hope

Here the 1874 RLDS edition accidentally omitted the repeated indefinite article *a* from "a foolish and **a** vain hope". The 1908 RLDS edition restored the repeated *a* to the RLDS text. The repetition is found in one other conjoining of *foolish* and *vain:* "to believe that the doctrine of Christ was a foolish and **a** vain thing" (3 Nephi 2:2). The critical text will maintain the repeated article here in Alma 30:13. For a complete discussion of such repetition, see under ᴄᴏɴᴊᴜɴᴄᴛɪᴠᴇ ʀᴇᴘᴇᴛɪᴛɪᴏɴ in volume 3.

Summary: Maintain the repeated *a* in Alma 30:13: "under a foolish and **a** vain hope".

■ **Alma 30:14**

behold these things which ye call prophecies
which ye say are handed down by holy prophets
*behold they are **foolish traditions** of your fathers*

One wonders here if the determiner *the* is missing before "foolish traditions of your fathers". If *traditions* were not postmodified by the prepositional phrase "of your fathers", then the current reading would be perfectly fine ("behold they are foolish traditions"). Elsewhere we consistently get *the* in expressions of the form "tradition(s) of X" (34 times), including these nearby examples in Alma 30–31:

Alma 30:16	because of **the** tradition **of** your fathers
Alma 30:23	**the** foolish traditions **of** your fathers
Alma 30:27	after **the** foolish traditions **of** your fathers
Alma 30:31	after **the** silly traditions **of** their fathers
Alma 31:16	in **the** tradition **of** our brethren
Alma 31:17	after **the** foolish traditions **of** our brethren
Alma 31:22	after **the** tradition **of** their brethren

The original manuscript is not extant here in Alma 30:14 for the first part of "foolish traditions of your fathers", but the short spacing between extant fragments does not allow for a *the* except by supralinear insertion.

The text here in Alma 30:14 ("behold they are foolish traditions of your fathers") is different from all other occurrences of "tradition(s) of X" in that it is the only instance where the noun phrase "tradition(s) of X" acts as a subject complement. The subject here is the pronoun *they,* which refers to the earlier noun phrase "these things which ye call prophecies". In other words, the sentence "these things which ye call prophecies . . . are foolish traditions of your fathers" works well enough without the *the* before *traditions*. Note that neither *traditions* nor *prophecies* takes the definite article. The critical text will therefore accept the unique occurrence here in Alma 30:14 of "tradition(s) of X" without the definite article.

Summary: Maintain in Alma 30:14 the unusual but apparently intended reading "behold they are foolish traditions of your fathers"—that is, without the normally expected definite article *the* before *traditions;* in this instance, the larger context allows for the indefinite use of "tradition(s) of X".

■ **Alma 30:16**

but behold it is the [*effects* 01A | *effect* BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *of a frenzied mind*

There were two original occurrences in the text of "the effects" that took the singular verb form *is* (here in Alma 30:16 and earlier in Mosiah 7:30). In both cases, the plural *effects* was eventually edited to singular *effect* in the printed editions (in the 1840 edition for Mosiah 7:30, in the 1837 edition for Alma 30:16). The critical text will, of course, restore the original plural *effects* (it will also maintain the singular verb *is*). Here in Alma 30:16, this unusual reading is extant in the original manuscript. See under Mosiah 7:30 for further discussion.

Summary: Restore the original plural *effects* in Alma 30:16 (as well as in Mosiah 7:30).

■ **Alma 30:16**

and this derangement of your minds comes
because of the [*traditions* >% *tradition* 0 | *tradition* 1ABDEPS | *traditions* CFGHIJKLMNOQRT]
  of your fathers
which [*leads* 0 | *lead* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *you away into a belief of things*
which [*is* > *are* 0 | *are* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *not so*

The text here, as corrected in 𝒪, is the original reading: namely, "because of the **tradition** of your fathers which **leads** you away into a belief of things which **are** not so". Oliver Cowdery initially wrote *traditions* in 𝒪, but then he erased the plural *s* (an immediate correction), thus giving "because of the tradition which leads you away" (which is perfectly grammatical). Oliver also initially wrote "into a belief of things which **is** not so", which he virtually immediately corrected to "into a belief of things which **are** not so" (his crossout of the *is* and supralinear insertion of the *are* show no change in the level of ink flow). The initial *is* may have been influenced by the preceding singular *belief;* the antecedent for the relative pronoun *which* is, of course, the immediately preceding plural *things*.

Subsequent history of this passage led to textual difficulties. When he copied from 𝒪 into 𝒫, Oliver Cowdery changed the verb *leads* to *lead,* probably because he was influenced by the immediately preceding plural noun *fathers,* even though the relative clause "which lead(s) you away" refers to the traditions, not the fathers. Yet such disagreement between subject and verb is frequently found in the original text. (See, for instance, the discussion under 1 Nephi 4:4; for general discussion, see under SUBJECT-VERB AGREEMENT in volume 3.) Finally, when Joseph Smith came to edit this passage for the 1840 edition, he removed the subject-verb disagreement by changing *tradition* into a plural. The 1852 LDS edition made the same change in the LDS text, perhaps independently or by reference to the 1840 edition. The 1908 RLDS edition, on the other hand, restored the original *tradition* since 𝒫 read that way (yet that edition maintained the plural

verb form *lead,* also the reading in 𝒫, even though the resulting reading led to subject-verb dis-agreement). The critical text will, of course, restore the corrected reading in 𝒪.

For further discussion regarding subject-verb agreement for the noun *tradition(s)* as well as other changes involving the grammatical number for *tradition(s),* see under Mosiah 1:5.

Summary: Restore in Alma 30:16 the corrected reading in 𝒪: "because of the **tradition** of your fathers which **leads** you away into a belief of things which **are** not so"; this reading, most likely the original reading, is grammatically correct according to the standard rules of subject-verb agreement.

■ **Alma 30:17**

telling them that there could be no atonement made
for the sins of [*men* 0ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST | *the world* >+ *men* 1]

𝒪 is extant here and reads "the sins of **men**", so in this instance there is no question about the original reading. When copying from 𝒪 into 𝒫, Oliver initially miswrote *men* as *the world*. Sometime later, perhaps when proofing 𝒫 against 𝒪, he crossed out *the world* and supralinearly inserted *men* (the level of ink flow is somewhat heavier). The phrase "the sins of men" is unique to the text here, although there is one instance of the related "the sins of every man" (Alma 5:48). But "the sins of the world" is very common in the Book of Mormon text, with 17 occurrences. Oliver was obviously influenced by the frequency of "the sins of the world" as he copied the text here from 𝒪 into 𝒫.

Summary: Follow in Alma 30:17 the reading of 𝒪, "the sins of men", instead of the much more common "the sins of the world", the initial reading in 𝒫.

■ **Alma 30:20**

for they took him and bound him
and carried him before Ammon which was **a high priest** *over that people*

Here in Alma 30:20, the original manuscript is not extant for "a high priest". Based on spacing between the extant fragments, the best fitting text in the lacuna would be "**the** high priest". Still, "**a** high priest" fits well enough. It is possible here that 𝒪 originally read "**the** high priest" and that Oliver Cowdery accidentally replaced it with "**a** high priest" as he copied from 𝒪 into 𝒫. There is at least one clear case involving a position of leadership where Oliver incorrectly replaced *the* with *a* in his copywork:

> Alma 47:13
> if he would make him Amalickiah
> [*the* 0 | *a* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] second leader over the whole army

For another possible example of the same error by Oliver Cowdery (namely, *a foundation* instead of *the foundation*), see under Alma 50:13–14.

Emending "**a** high priest" to "**the** high priest" here in Alma 30:20 could be based on the argument that each people or land or church would have had only one high priest. For instance, here in Alma 30 the very next verse implies a single high priest in the land of Gideon:

Alma 30:21
 and it came to pass that
 he caused that he should be carried out of the land
 and it came to pass that
 he came over into the land of Gideon
 and began to preach unto them also
 and here he did not have much success
 for he was taken and bound
 and carried before **the high priest**
 and also the chief judge over the land

The use of "**the** high priest" in this verse definitely implies that the immediately preceding verse 20 could also have originally read "and carried him before Ammon which was **the** high priest over that people".

When referring to the early days of the church (originally founded by Alma the elder), the text clearly refers to there being only one high priest over the entire church, originally Alma the elder and later his son, Alma the younger (ten times from Mosiah 23:16 through Alma 8:23), as in the following examples in Alma 4–5 that refer to Alma the younger:

Alma 4:4
 yea they were baptized by the hand of Alma
 who had been consecrated **the high priest** over the people of the church
 by the hand of his father Alma

Alma 4:18
 now Alma did not grant unto him **the office of being high priest** over the church
 but he retained **the office of high priest** unto himself
 but he delivered the judgment seat unto Nephihah

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

Yet despite this reference to Alma the younger as "the high priest", Alma himself in his address to the church in Zarahemla in Alma 5 refers to himself as "a high priest", perhaps because his father would have continued to have been a high priest after ordaining his son to the high priesthood:

Alma 5:3
 I Alma having been consecrated by my father Alma
 to be **a high priest** over the church of God . . .

On the other hand, there are references later in the book of Alma that mention a multiplicity of high priests:

Alma 46:6	for they were **high priests** over the church
Alma 46:38	and Helaman and **the high priests** did also maintain order in the church
Helaman 3:25	even **the high priests** and the teachers were themselves astonished
3 Nephi 6:21	and they which had been **high priests** and lawyers
3 Nephi 6:27	yea even almost all the lawyers and **the high priests** did gather themselves together

The two examples in 3 Nephi 6 refer to apostate high priests. Such high priests can be found much earlier in the Book of Mormon, under king Noah:

> Mosiah 11:11
>> and the seats which was sat apart for the **high priests**
>> which was above all the other seats
>> he did ornament with pure gold
>> and he caused a breastwork to be built before them
>> that they might rest their bodies and their arms upon
>> while they should speak lying and vain words to his people

Earlier the text refers only to *priests,* not *high priests* (see Mosiah 6:3 for king Benjamin and his son, king Mosiah; see Mosiah 11:4–7 for Zeniff and his son, king Noah). In any event, the references to *high priests* suggest that there could have been more than one high priest among the people of Ammon; one would think that Ammon's brothers (Aaron, Omner, and Himni) could have also been high priests in the land of Jershon (if they resided there).

The phrase "a high priest over that people" can also be interpreted as saying that Ammon was a high priest, namely, the one over the people of Ammon. In other words, Alma was the high priest over the whole church; and Ammon was also a high priest but only over the people of Ammon. We could treat "over that people" more as added information than as restrictively modifying *high priest.* Thus we can make sense of the reading "Ammon which was a high priest over that people". The critical text will retain the *a* here in Alma 30:20, although the *a* could be an error for *the.*

Summary: Maintain in Alma 30:20 the earliest extant reading (in 𝒫) of "**a** high priest over that people"; although this usage is unusual, it is possible that Ammon was not the only high priest among the people of Ammon (formerly the Anti-Nephi-Lehies); his brothers Aaron, Omner, and Himni could have also been high priests over the people of Ammon; another possibility is that the text is simply saying that Ammon was a high priest but only over his own people.

■ **Alma 30:22**

why do ye teach this people that there shall be no Christ
to interrupt their [*rejoiceing > rejoiceings* 1 | *rejoicings* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]

The original manuscript is not extant for *rejoicing(s),* but the correction in the printer's manuscript appears to be virtually immediate since there is no change in the level of ink flow. Elsewhere in the earliest text, there are examples of both the singular noun *rejoicing* and the plural *rejoicings* (six of the singular, three of the plural), including one other plural example in this chapter: "that we may have **rejoicings** in the joy of our brethren" (Alma 30:34). So either singular or plural is possible. Only one of these nine other examples involves variation in number: namely, in Helaman 3:31, where Oliver initially wrote *rejoiceings* in 𝒫 but then erased the plural *s.* Yet it is possible that the original text for Helaman 3:31 may have read in the plural (see the discussion under that passage).

Summary: Accept in Alma 30:22 the virtually immediate correction in the printer's manuscript of the singular *rejoicing* to the plural *rejoicings,* the probable reading of the original manuscript (which is not extant here).

■ **Alma 30:24**

ye say that this people is a free people
behold I say : [*there > these* 0 | *there > they* 1 | *they* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *are in bondage*
ye say that those ancient prophecies are true
behold I say that ye do not know that **they** *are true*

In this passage, the original manuscript is extant for Korihor's statement after the first occurrence of "behold I say". At this point in 𝓞, Oliver Cowdery initially wrote *there,* a possible contraction for *they are* (that is, *they're*). From a textual point of view, the contraction *they're* is highly unlikely since the Book of Mormon systematically avoids contractions of words. Yet Oliver did not correct his initial *there* in 𝓞 to *they are*. Instead, he overwrote the *r* of *there* with an *s,* giving "**these** are in bondage". The correction was virtually immediate since there was no change in the level of ink flow for the overwriting. Mix-ups between *there* and *these* are fairly common in the manuscripts; for a list of examples, see under Alma 13:16.

When Oliver Cowdery came to copy this passage from 𝓞 into 𝓟, he again initially wrote *there;* but this time he corrected the *there* to *they,* giving "**they** are in bondage". He was perhaps influenced by the use of *they* in the latter part of the verse: "behold I say that ye do not know that **they** are true". In any event, all the printed editions have followed the final manuscript change, the subject pronoun *they.*

Elsewhere in the text, there are numerous occurrences of *these are,* although the majority of them are followed by a predicate nominative noun phrase postmodified by a restrictive relative clause (as in Helaman 1:3: "now **these are** their names who did contend for the judgment seat"). But in a few cases, we have examples similar to the original usage here in Alma 30:24, where *these* refers to a recently identified plural noun phrase:

> 1 Nephi 12:11
>
> and I looked and beheld three generations did pass away in righteousness
> and their garments were white even like unto the Lamb of God
> and the angel said unto me : **these** are made white in the blood of the Lamb
> because of their faith in him

> 1 Nephi 13:2−3
>
> and I said : I behold many nations and kingdoms
> and he saith unto me : **these** are the nations and kingdoms of the Gentiles

> Mosiah 15:11
>
> 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

In these examples, each instance of *these* is immediately preceded by a reference to the speaker, just like here in Alma 30:24 ("behold I say : these are in bondage"):

> 1 Nephi 12:11   and the angel said unto me : these are made white
>
> 1 Nephi 13:3   and he saith unto me : these are the nations
>
> Mosiah 15:11   I say unto you that these are his seed

It is also worth noting that the use of the demonstrative *these* is appropriate in Alma 30:24 since the preceding text has the demonstrative *this* ("ye say that **this** people is a free people / but I say : **these** are in bondage"). The critical text will therefore restore the corrected reading in ◌.

Summary: Restore the original demonstrative *these* in Alma 30:24, the corrected reading of the original manuscript: "behold I say : **these** are in bondage".

■ **Alma 30:28**

a being which [*hath never > never hath* 0 | *never hath >js has never* 1 | *never hath* A | *never has* BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *been seen nor known*

There are two textual variants in this passage, one dealing with the order of the words *never* and *hath,* the other with the choice between *hath* and *has*. The second change (made by Joseph Smith in his editing for the 1837 edition) is, of course, secondary; the critical text will restore the original *hath* here (for a complete discussion, see under INFLECTIONAL ENDINGS in volume 3).

In the original manuscript, Oliver Cowdery originally wrote "hath never"; but then he crossed out the *hath* and wrote it inline after the *never* (which shows that the correction was an immediate one). Joseph Smith, in his editing of the printer's manuscript, crossed out the *hath* after the *never* and inserted *has* supralinearly before the *never*. Thus Joseph apparently intended to change the order so that the *have* verb would precede the *never*. But in the setting of the 1837 edition, the earlier word order (in 𝒫 and in the 1830 edition)—namely, with *never* first—was maintained.

Elsewhere there are considerably more examples where *never* precedes the perfective *have* verb instead of following it: 25 times versus 7 times. In one other case, there has been some word order variation in the manuscripts, namely in Alma 26:22 (see the discussion there). So in each case, we follow the early textual sources in determining the position of *never* with respect to the perfect auxiliary *have*. Here in Alma 30:28, we follow the corrected reading in ◌: "a being which **never hath** been seen nor known".

Summary: Maintain in Alma 30:28 the placement of *never* before the perfect auxiliary verb: "a being which **never hath** been seen nor known"; also restore the original form for the perfective *have* (namely, *hath*).

■ **Alma 30:28**

a being which never hath been seen [*nor* 01ABCDGPS | *or* EFHIJKLMNOQRT] *known which never was nor* [*vever* 0 | *never >js ever* 1 | *never* A | *ever* BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *will be*

Here the 1849 LDS edition replaced the first *nor* with *or*. This change is probably accidental since all other occurrences of "never X nor Y" have been retained in the text (including a second one in Alma 30:28):

> Alma 30:28
> a being which never hath been seen nor known
> which **never** was **nor** never will be

3 Nephi 20:8
> and their soul shall **never** hunger **nor** thirst but shall be filled

Mormon 4:12
> and there **never** had been so great wickedness
> among all the children of Lehi **nor** even among all the house of Israel

Joseph Smith also created an instance of "never X nor Y" in his editing for the 1837 edition, and this secondary instance has never been changed to "never X or Y":

Enos 1:8
> because of thy faith in Christ
> whom thou hast [*not* >js *never before* 1 | *not* A |
>   *never before* BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] heard **nor** seen

As we might suspect, there are no instances of "never X or Y" in the original text. This instance of "never X or Y" in Alma 30:28 is the only one that has been introduced into the text.

 This passage also has an original example of *nor never,* which Joseph Smith grammatically emended to *nor ever* in his editing for the 1837 edition, thus removing a multiple negative from the text. The critical text will restore this nonstandard usage since it is clearly intended. For another example, see under Jacob 7:9. For a general discussion of how negation has been edited in the text, see under NEGATION in volume 3.

Summary: Restore the correct negative construction "never X nor Y" in Alma 30:28, which agrees with three other examples in the original text (and one more in the current text); also restore the original instance of *nor never* in this passage.

■ **Alma 30:30**

yea he went on to
[*blasphemy* 1 | *blaspheme* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]

The original manuscript is not extant here, but the word *blasphemy*/*blaspheme* would have been at the end of the line; so it is possible that Oliver Cowdery's *blasphemy* in the printer's manuscript is a copying error. In any event, the 1830 typesetter replaced the noun *blasphemy* with the verb *blaspheme*. Although rare in the text, both the noun *blasphemy* and the verb *blaspheme* do occur elsewhere:

Jacob 7:7	this is blasphemy
Jarom 1:5	neither did they blaspheme

The verb expression "to go on to X" also occurs elsewhere in the text, but only once:

Alma 16:17
> that they might not be hardened against the word
> that they might not be unbelieving and **go on to destruction**

In this instance, *to* is followed by the noun *destruction,* not a verb (in theory the text could have read something like "and go on to destroy themselves"). This example provides support for

restoring in Alma 30:30 the noun reading ("he went on to **blasphemy**"). The critical text will follow the earliest extant reading, the noun *blasphemy,* instead of the verb *blaspheme.*

Summary: Restore in Alma 30:30 the noun *blasphemy* in place of the verb *blaspheme* that was introduced into the 1830 edition; there is only one other occurrence in the text of "to go on to X", and in that instance a noun follows the *to* ("and go on to destruction", in Alma 16:17).

■ **Alma 30:31**

for the sake of glutting
[*by* > *in* 0 | *in* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQS | *on* RT] *the labors of the people*

In the original manuscript, Oliver Cowdery initially wrote *glutting by;* then with the same level of ink flow, he crossed out the *by* and supralinearly inserted the preposition *in.* The preposition *in* was edited to *on* in the 1920 LDS edition. (This last change is not a typo since it is marked in the 1920 committee copy.) The preposition *on* is nearly the same as the preposition *upon* used with the verb *glut* in the next verse: "we do not glut ourselves **upon** the labors of this people" (Alma 30:32). This subsequent example of "to glut upon" suggests that the committee for the 1920 edition could have selected *upon* instead of *on* as the emendation for Alma 30:31.

Elsewhere in the text, the verb *glut* takes the preposition *with,* and the second of these occurs in Alma 30:

| Mosiah 9:12 | that they might glut themselves **with** the labors of our hands |
| Alma 30:27 | that ye may glut yourselves **with** the labors of their hands |

Examples from the Oxford English Dictionary under the verb *glut* show that this verb normally takes the preposition *with* (27 times), but there are examples (some archaic) of other prepositions:

on	4 times
in	2 times
upon	2 times
for	1 time

The two OED citations with the preposition *in* show that the preposition *in* was possible in Early Modern English (here I retain the original accidentals):

Jehan Palsgrave (1530)
There is no carnall pleasure but a man may be glutted **in** it.

Clodamas (1639)
Not content to glut himselfe **in** such sins as might have some excuse.

The critical text will restore the unexpected preposition *in* here in Alma 30:31.

Summary: Restore in Alma 30:31 the original preposition *in:* "for the sake of glutting **in** the labors of the people".

■ **Alma 30:33**

I have never received so much as
[*even* 01ABCDEFGIJLMNOPQRST | HK] *one senine for my labor*

The 1874 RLDS edition omitted the adverb *even* here, probably accidentally. The 1908 RLDS edition restored the original *even*. The critical text will, of course, retain the *even* here.

Summary: Maintain *even* in Alma 30:33: "I have never received so much as **even** one senine for my labor".

■ **Alma 30:33–34**

(1) *and notwithstanding the many* [*labours* 01DFNQ | *labors* ABCEGHIJKLMOPRST]
which I have performed in the church
I have never received so much as even one senine

(2) *for my* [*labour* 01DFN | *labor* ABCEGHIJKLMOPQRST]
neither hath any of my brethren save it were in the judgment seat . . .
and now if we do not receive any thing

(3) *for our* [*labours* 0DFNQ | *labour > labours* 1 | *labors* ABCEGHIJKLMOPRST] *in the church*
what doth it profit us to labor in the church save it were to declare the truth

In this passage we see differences in grammatical number for three instances of the noun *labor,* beginning with the plural *labors,* switching then to the singular *labor,* and ending up with the plural *labors* (labeled above as 1, 2, and 3). In the third instance, Oliver Cowdery initially wrote *labor* in 𝒫 (spelled as *labour*); sometime later he added the plural *s* (the level of ink flow for the inserted *s* is somewhat heavier).

In general, the text allows for either singular *labor* or plural *labors.* See, for instance, the discussion regarding the noun phrase "the fruit(s) of one's labor(s)" under Alma 29:17 or the verb phrase "to perform one's labor(s)" under Alma 53:1. In some cases, we get only one of the two possibilities, such as the plural in "labors of X" (see the discussion under Mosiah 7:16). Given the phrase "for one's labor(s)", we have here in Alma 30:33–34 both a singular and a plural; in Mosiah 18:26 there is one more instance of the singular: "for their **labor** they were to receive the grace of God". For each case of *labor(s),* we will let the earliest textual sources determine the grammatical number.

Summary: Accept the textual switching between the singular and plural forms of *labor* whenever they occur in the text, including the switch from *labors* to *labor* and then back to *labors* in Alma 30:33–34.

■ **Alma 30:35**

and now believest thou that we deceive this people
that *causeth such joy in their hearts*

One wonders if something isn't missing here at the beginning of the seemingly disconnected clause "that causeth such joy in their hearts". The text for this passage is wholly extant in 𝒪, so if there is an error, it would have occurred as Joseph Smith dictated the text to Oliver Cowdery.

At first glance, the *that* at the beginning of the clause seems to be a relative pronoun, but then the question is: what is the antecedent for this relative pronoun? When we consider other passages

where the verb *deceive* is followed by a clause beginning with *that,* we find three examples, and in each case the *that* is a subordinate conjunction, not a relative pronoun:

> Mosiah 10:18
>> for this very cause hath king Laman
>> by his cunning and lying craftiness and his fair promises
>> hath **deceived** me
>> **that** I have brought this my people up into this land
>> that they may destroy them

> 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 cast us out

> Alma 20:13
>> and now his children also are come amongst us
>> that they may by their cunning and their lyings **deceive** us
>> **that** they again may rob us of our property

In each of these three cases, the *that*-clause explains what resulted from the deception. In other words, the *that* means 'with the result that' or 'so that'. One possible emendation, then, for Alma 30:35 is that the earliest text, the reading in ⊙, is missing a subject pronoun after the *that,* where *that* is interpreted as a subordinate conjunction heading a resultive clause. Perhaps the text originally read "and now believest thou that we deceive this people **that it** causeth such joy in their hearts". In this instance, the small pronoun *it* could have been accidentally omitted as Joseph Smith dictated the text to Oliver Cowdery. Another possibility is that the original text here read "and now believest thou that we deceive this people **that that** causeth such joy in their hearts". Here the repetition of the *that* (the first as a subordinate conjunction, the second as the subject pronoun) could have easily been treated as a dittography and accidentally reduced to a single *that*. With both these possibilities, we detect irony in Alma's question. The scope of the question extends through the *that*-clause, which means that Alma is rhetorically asking: "Do you really believe that we deceive the people so that it will cause them to have such joy in their hearts?"

This interpretation suggests another possible emendation for this passage, namely, placing an *and* before the *that,* so that the *that* now becomes a subject pronoun: "and now believest thou that we deceive this people **and** that causeth such joy in their hearts". Once more, the scope of the question continues to the end of the entire sentence. Under this interpretation, the small word *and* (which would have been written as an ampersand by Oliver Cowdery) could have been lost during the early transmission of the text. In fact, we could even accept the earliest reading as a case of asyndetic conjunctiveness, where the *and* is simply understood and not stated.

Another possibility here would be to interpret the *that* as an error for a more complex connective, such as "concerning **that** which" or "in **that** which" (for example, "and now believest thou that we deceive this people **in that which** causeth such joy in their hearts"). Under this interpretation, the emended *that*-clause now simply states that the deception deals with what brings joy to these people. Examples of both "concerning that which" and "in that which" can be found in

the text (nine times and three times, respectively). But it does seem rather dubious that a three-word connective like *concerning that which* or *in that which* could have somehow been reduced to a single *that* during the dictation of the text, although the change of *in that which* to simply *that* seems more probable since *in* is so much shorter than *concerning*.

Taken altogether, these considerations argue for emending the text in Alma 30:35 by adding an *and* before "that causeth such joy in their hearts". In the standard text, it would be necessary to keep the question mark at the end of the whole sentence:

> Alma 30:35 (proposed emendation, with punctuation)
> And now, believest thou that we deceive this people
> **and** that causeth such joy in their hearts?

There is considerable evidence in the manuscripts for the occasional omission of the conjunctive *and,* including two instances in 𝓟 before a repeated *that* (although these are instances of the subordinate *that* rather than the relative pronoun *that*):

> 2 Nephi 8:14 (citing Isaiah 51:14, which in the King James Bible has the *and*)
> the captive exile hasteneth **that** he may be loosed
> [NULL > & 1 | *and* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] **that** he should not die in the pit

> Alma 60:24
> **that** he may support those parts of our country which he hath retained
> [NULL >+ & 1 | *and* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] **that** we may also recover
>   the remainder of our possessions in these parts

Thus the loss of an original *and* in Alma 30:35 is possible.

After having made this conjectural emendation, I decided to re-examine the ultraviolet photographs for pages 278′ and 279′ of 𝓞 and discovered that Oliver Cowdery had initially written the clause "that causeth such joy in their hearts" at the beginning of the line in 𝓞. Somewhat later, with weaker ink flow, Oliver inserted an ampersand in the left margin of page 279′ just before the *that* which originally began the line. Here I give the corrected transcript for the relevant lines of 𝓞:

Alma 30:35–37 (lines 24–25, page 279′ of 𝓞)

```
    -west that we receive no gain & now believest thou that we deceive this Peop(le)

 |&|  that causeth such joy in their he(a t  &) Korihor answered him yea then Al
                                         R S
```

In volume 1 of the critical text, the marginally inserted *&* is missing from the transcript. The ampersand is hard to see in the ultraviolet photograph for page 279′ of 𝓞 and was consequently interpreted by me (and independently by Marcello Hunter) as noise. But the *&* is clearly visible when viewed from across the gutter on the ultraviolet photograph for the preceding page of 𝓞 (namely, from page 278′, where pages 278′ and 279′ formed a spread when this gathering was originally photographed over fifty years ago). Nor is it particularly surprising here that the conjunction *and* was permanently lost from the text when Oliver Cowdery later copied this line of 𝓞 into 𝓟: the *&* was written with weaker ink flow and was partially hidden in the gutter of the tightly stitched gathering of 𝓞. The critical text will therefore accept my originally conjectured *and* as confirmed. This means that the textual citation for this verse should read as follows:

Alma 30:35

and now believest thou that we deceive this people
[NULL >– & 0| 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] that causeth such joy in their hearts

Summary: Restore in Alma 30:35 the conjunctive *and* between "that we deceive this people" and "that causeth such joy in their hearts"; written somewhat later with weaker ink flow in the left margin of 𝒪, the ampersand was hard to see in the gutter of the tightly stitched gathering and was therefore omitted when Oliver Cowdery copied this passage from 𝒪 into 𝒫 (it was also omitted in the transcript of 𝒪 in volume 1 of the critical text); internal evidence also supports the occurrence of *and* in this passage.

■ **Alma 30:35**

and that [*causes > causeth* 0| *causeth >*js *causes* 1| *causeth* A| *causes* CDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
such joy in their hearts

Here Oliver Cowdery initially wrote *causes* in 𝒪, but he immediately overwrote the *s* with a *t* and then wrote the *h* inline. So the correction of *causes* to *causeth* is immediate, and *causeth* is very likely the original reading. In his editing for the 1837 edition, Joseph Smith changed *causeth* to *causes,* but this simply represents his typical (but inconsistently applied) replacement of the archaic *-(e)th* ending with the more modern *-(e)s* ending. For general discussion, see under INFLEC-TIONAL ENDINGS in volume 3.

Summary: Restore in Alma 30:35 *causeth,* the immediately corrected reading in 𝒪.

■ **Alma 30:36–37**

and Korihor answered him : yea
[*then* 0| *& > then* 1| *And then* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *Alma saith unto him . . .*

The original manuscript is extant here and clearly shows the *then,* but there is no *&.* While copying into the printer's manuscript, Oliver Cowdery initially wrote an ampersand; then he immediately overwrote the *&* with a *t* and followed inline with the rest of the word *then.* But the 1830 typesetter set *And then,* which has continued throughout all subsequent printed editions.

The question here is whether *then* needs to have an immediately preceding *and.* Elsewhere in the text, there are 14 examples where *then* heads a sentence-initial clause containing the main verb *say,* as in the following example:

Alma 45:6–8

and Alma saith unto him again : will ye keep my commandments
and he said : yea I will keep thy commandments with all my heart
then Alma saith unto him : blessed art thou

And there are also five cases where the *and then* heads a sentence-initial clause containing *say,* as in this example:

Alma 18:26

and then Ammon saith : believest thou that there is a Great Spirit

So either transition is possible. Therefore, here in Alma 30:36–37, the transition without the *and* (as specified in the two manuscripts) will be followed.

Summary: Restore in Alma 30:37 the reading of the two manuscripts, namely, the *then* without a preceding *and*.

■ **Alma 30:37**

then Alma [*sayest* >+ *saith* 0 | *saith* >js *said* 1 | *saith* A | *said* BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *unto him* **believest** *thou that there is a God*

Here Oliver Cowdery initially wrote *Alma sayest* in 𝒪; somewhat later, probably after reading back the text to Joseph Smith, he crossed out *sayest* and supralinearly inserted the correct *saith* (the level of ink flow for the correction is somewhat heavier). Here Oliver's initial *sayest* was probably influenced by the use of the *-est* ending in the following clause: "**believest** thou that there is a God". An additional instance of this same error, but left uncorrected in 𝒪, is found later on in the text:

> Alma 45:2
> Alma came unto his son Helaman
> and [*sayest* 0 | *sayeth* >js *said* 1 | *saith* A | *said* BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] unto him
> **believest** thou the words which I spake unto thee

In this second instance, Oliver corrected *sayest* to *saith* (spelled as *sayeth*) when he copied from 𝒪 into 𝒫. For both these passages in the book of Alma, the historical present tense was changed by Joseph to *said* in his editing for the 1837 edition, but *saith* will be restored in the critical text. In a number of other cases, Oliver initially replaced the third person singular ending *-(e)th* with the second person singular *-(e)st*. For a list, see under 1 Nephi 11:2; also see the general discussion under INFLECTIONAL ENDINGS in volume 3.

Summary: Restore the historical present-tense *saith* in Alma 30:37, the corrected reading in 𝒪.

■ **Alma 30:39**

now Alma saith unto him
[*if* >js *will* 1 | *If* A | *will* BCDEFG | *Will* HIJKLMNOPQRST] *ye deny again*
that there is a God and also deny the Christ
[0 | NULL >js ? 1 | : A | ? BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
for behold I say unto you
I know there is a God and also that Christ shall come

The original text here ("if ye deny again that there is a God and also deny the Christ") is an example of a Hebrew-like conditional clause that has the force of an oath and is equivalent to a negative imperative. The construction here basically means 'do not deny again that there is a God and [do not] also deny the Christ!' (with the implied meaning 'otherwise something bad will happen'). As Sommer Greer points out (personal communication, September 2003), this kind of usage is found in English discourse when speakers use incomplete *if*-clauses without any drop in

intonation (as in "if you do that . . ."); such *if*-clauses are interpreted as negative imperatives (meaning 'don't do that!').

In his editing for the 1837 edition, Joseph Smith removed this literal Hebrew-like construction by changing the clause into an interrogative: "Will ye deny again that there is a God and also deny the Christ?" (he even added a question mark in 𝒫). Like the original *if*-clause, this yes-no question can also be given a threatening interpretation. The critical text will restore the original reading here. In a printed text, for punctuation one could perhaps use three dots of ellipsis at the end of the *if*-clause as a mark of incompleteness:

> Alma 30:39 (original text, with punctuation and capitalization added)
> Now Alma saith unto him :
> If ye deny again that there is a God and also deny the Christ . . .
> For behold, I say unto you :
> I know there is a God and also that Christ shall come.

For a complete discussion of this Hebrew-like usage, see under 1 Nephi 19:20−21. In that passage the original text provided an example of an incomplete conditional clause that in context functioned as an emphatic declarative. Also see the discussion under HEBRAISMS in volume 3.

Summary: Restore the original *if* in Alma 30:39: "**if** ye deny again that there is a God and also deny the Christ"; this Hebrew-like conditional clause acts as a negative imperative in this context.

■ **Alma 30:40**

and now what evidence have ye
[*that* 01ABCEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST | D] *there is no God*
or **that** *Christ cometh not*

The 1841 British edition omitted the first subordinate *that* in this passage, but the subsequent 1849 LDS edition restored it. Note here that we have a conjoining of two complete *that*-clauses ("**that** there is no God or **that** Christ cometh not"). It turns out that there are examples in the original text like the secondary 1841 conjoining, as in the previous verse where there is no *that* for the first conjunct: "I know there is a God and also **that** Christ shall come" (Alma 30:39). In fact, it is possible that here in verse 40 the 1841 compositor was influenced by the language of the previous verse. For further discussion on the optionality of the subordinate conjunction *that,* see under THAT in volume 3.

Summary: Maintain both occurrences of the subordinate *that* in Alma 30:40 ("and now what evidence have ye **that** there is no God or **that** Christ cometh not").

■ **Alma 30:41**

but behold I have all things as a testimony that these things are true
and ye [NULL > also 0 | also 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] have all things
   as a testimony unto you that they are true

In taking down Joseph Smith's dictation here, Oliver Cowdery initially omitted the *also,* but almost immediately he supralinearly inserted it (there is no change in the level of ink flow). Throughout this passage, Alma frequently uses *also* in his arguments against Korihor, especially in conjunctive pairs:

verse 39	if ye deny again that there is a God and **also** deny the Christ
verse 39	I know there is a God and **also** that Christ shall come
verse 44	ye have the testimony of all these thy brethren and **also** all the holy prophets
verse 44	yea and its motion / yea and **also** all the planets

The critical text will therefore maintain the *also* here in verse 41.

Summary: Maintain Alma's characteristic use of *also* in Alma 30:41 and elsewhere in his debate with Korihor.

■ **Alma 30:42**

that he may destroy
the [children 0ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST | people > children 1] of God

In the printer's manuscript, Oliver Cowdery originally wrote "the people of God"; then virtually immediately he replaced *people* with *children* (the level of ink flow for the supralinear correction is unchanged). In the original manuscript, only the final *n* (of *children,* presumably) is extant, but that one letter shows that 𝓞 did not read *people.* Nor would there have been any motivation for Oliver to have emended "the people of God" in 𝓟 to "the children of God". Elsewhere in the text there are nine occurrences of "the people of God" and four of "the children of God", so in each instance we follow the earliest textual sources.

Summary: Maintain in Alma 30:42 the occurrence of "the children of God", the apparent reading in 𝓞 and the corrected reading in 𝓟.

■ **Alma 30:45**

and yet will ye deny **against** *all these witnesses*

The syntax for this clause seems unusual and suggests the possibility that *against* is an error for *again.* The original manuscript is extant here, and the reading is clearly *against,* not *again.* The *against* is definitely intended since Oliver Cowdery initially wrote *again,* lifted his pen, and then wrote inline the *st* (with slightly weaker ink flow).
   Elsewhere in the text there are two other occurrences of *deny* occurring with *again* but never with *against.* These two occurrences, in fact, occur in this same narrative:

| Alma 30:39 | if ye deny again that there is a God and also deny the Christ |
| Alma 30:47 | therefore if thou shalt deny again / behold God shall smite thee |

Korihor had previously denied the existence of God (in verses 28 and 38) and that there would be a Christ (in verses 12–15 and 26), so the use of *again* in these two passages is perfectly expected. However, here in Alma 30:45, Korihor has not yet denied the evidence from God's creation that Alma has just mentioned:

Alma 30:44

yea and all things denote there is a God
yea even the earth and all things that is upon the face of it / yea and its motion
yea and also all the planets which move in their regular form
doth witness that there is a Supreme Creator

So contextually, an emendation to *again* in verse 45 appears to be inappropriate.

There are a total of 83 occurrences of the verb *deny* in the Book of Mormon. In 77 cases, *deny* either takes a direct object or is in the passive (where the subject is the semantic equivalent of the direct object). Besides this case in Alma 30:45, there are five cases where *deny* takes no direct object (although a general one is implied):

Alma 30:45	yea I will deny except ye shall shew me a sign
Alma 30:47	therefore if thou shalt deny again / behold God shall smite thee
Helaman 9:30	and behold he shall deny unto you
Helaman 9:37	for according to the words he did deny
Helaman 16:1	they confessed unto him their sins and denied not

Thus Alma 30:45 can be interpreted as one more of these cases where no direct object follows *deny*. But it does seem a little unusual (yet possible, of course) to use a prepositional phrase to complete the verb *deny* ("and yet will ye deny against all these witnesses"). However, since the *against* was written very deliberately in the original manuscript, the critical text will maintain this usage. Korihor has not yet denied these witnesses from nature, so *again* would not really be appropriate. For another example where the question arises of whether *again* and *against* have been mixed up in the text, see the discussion under Alma 14:20.

Summary: Maintain in Alma 30:45 the original *against* ("and yet will ye deny **against** all these witnesses"); the use of *against* here is probably not a mistake for *again,* although "deny again" occurs two times in this chapter and "deny against" occurs nowhere else in the Book of Mormon; *again* does not really work here since Korihor has not yet denied the evidence from God's creation that Alma has just mentioned in verse 44; moreover, the careful way that *against* was written in the original manuscript strongly argues that *against* was indeed intended.

■ **Alma 30:45**

yea I will deny **except** *ye shall shew me a sign*

The original manuscript is not extant here, but between the extant fragments there is definitely room for the subordinate conjunction *that* after *except*. It is quite possible that the *that* was deleted in the original manuscript, as suggested in the transcription of 𝒪 in volume 1 of the critical text:

Alma 30:45–46 (line 13, page 280′ of 𝒪)

```
(                                   e) a sign & now it came to pass that Alma said unto him
    EXCEPT <     > YE SHALL SHEW M
```

There is no *that* in the printer's manuscript.

Elsewhere in the text there are 124 occurrences of *except* followed by a clause. In only one case in the earliest (and the current) text do we have the subordinate conjunction *that* following *except*:

Alma 43:2
now we shall say no more concerning their preaching
except that they preached the word and the truth
according to the spirit of prophecy and revelation

But here the *that* may be more connected with the preceding verb *say* than with *except;* that is, the sentence could be thought of as involving ellipsis: "**we shall say** no more concerning their preaching except [we shall say] that they preached the word and the truth".

The usage *except that* followed by a clause was more common in earlier English, as in the following example from the Oxford English Dictionary under *except* (spelling regularized):

John Berners (1523)
he shall leave them entirely to us
except that if the French kings had them by exchange for other lands

There is one example in the King James Bible: "and **except that** the Lord had shortened those days / no flesh should be saved" (Mark 13:20). Otherwise, the Book of Mormon and the King James Bible have no examples of *except that.* On the other hand, the original Book of Mormon text had numerous examples of the archaic conjunctive forms *before that, after that,* and *because that* (which are also found in the King James text).

We should also keep in mind that some other word besides *that* could be the reason the lacuna in 𝒪 is longer than what the text in 𝒫 requires. For instance, the previous line ends with the verb *deny,* so perhaps the next line began with a direct object for *deny,* as suggested by the note for this line of 𝒪 in volume 1: *these* or *them* before *except* may have been deleted or lost when copying from 𝒪 into 𝒫. Thus the best solution is to assume that some word (such as *that* after *except* or perhaps *these* or *them* before *except*) was written in the original manuscript and then deleted. In other words, we should follow the earliest extant reading, the reading in 𝒫, for Alma 30:45: "except ye shall shew me a sign".

Summary: Accept for Alma 30:45 the reading in 𝒫: "except ye shall shew me a sign"; although there is room in the lacuna of 𝒪 for *except that* or some other textual expansion, we cannot be sure what the actual reading was there, so we will follow the earliest extant source, 𝒫.

■ **Alma 30:47**

but behold it is better that thy soul should be lost
than that thou [shouldst 01AIJLMNOPQRST | shouldest BCDEFGHK] be the means
of bringing many souls down to destruction

> The 1837 edition replaced the one-syllable *shouldst* with the two-syllable *shouldest,* but this form
> has not persisted in the text: the LDS text reverted to the original *shouldst* in 1879, the RLDS text
> in 1908. (For a nearby example where the 1837 edition made this same change but with *wouldst,*
> see under Alma 30:55.) As discussed under 1 Nephi 20:5, the critical text will maintain in each case
> of *should(e)st* the reading found in the earliest textual sources, thus *shouldst* here in Alma 30:47.

■ **Alma 30:47**

therefore if thou [shall > shalt 0 | shalt 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] deny again
behold God shall [smites > smite 0 | smites 1 | smite ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] thee

> Here we have two minor scribal errors in 𝓞. In the first case, Oliver Cowdery initially wrote *thou*
> *shall,* but then he virtually immediately overwrote the final *l* with a *t* (there is no change in the
> level of ink flow). As discussed under Mosiah 12:11, there has been a tendency in the textual his-
> tory to replace the archaic *shalt* with *shall.*
>
> In the second case, Oliver Cowdery started to write *smites* in 𝓞 instead of *smite.* He cut off
> writing before finishing the final *s.* However, when he came to copying this passage from 𝓞 into 𝓟,
> he misread his aborted *s* as a full *s* and thus wrote *smites* in 𝓟. Obviously, "God shall smites thee"
> is impossible. The 1830 compositor set the correct *smite.*

Summary: Maintain in Alma 30:47 the corrected reading in 𝓞: "therefore if thou **shalt** deny again /
behold God shall **smite** thee".

■ **Alma 30:49**

and I say
[that 0ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST | that >js NULL 1] in the name of God
[that 01A | BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] ye shall be struck dumb
that ye shall no more have utterance

> The original text had two *that*'s surrounding the phrase "in the name of God". In his editing for the
> 1837 edition, Joseph Smith deleted the first one, which therefore implies that the phrase "in the
> name of God" refers to the verb *say*—in other words, "I say in the name of God that . . .". The 1837
> edition deleted the wrong *that,* thus producing "I say that in the name of God ye shall be struck
> dumb". All subsequent printed editions have followed this reading, even the 1908 RLDS edition
> (which normally relies on 𝓟 for establishing the text).
>
> In this sentence the phrase "in the name of God" acts as part of the performative verb *say.*
> Performatives are verbal actions that perform an act by uttering some words (such as "I sentence
> you to ten years in prison"). In many instances, performatives also involve a statement of authority
> by the individual uttering the performative: "by the power vested in me / I pronounce you man
> and wife". In Alma 30:49, the performative verb is *say,* and therefore "in the name of God" is

semantically attached to *say* (in accord with how Joseph Smith edited the text for the 1837 edition). Similar examples of performatives in the Book of Mormon include the following:

> 1 Nephi 17:48
>> **in the name of the Almighty God** I command you that ye touch me not

> Alma 44:5–6
>> and now Zerahemnah I command you **in the name of that all-powerful God** who hath strengthened our arms . . .
>> I command you by all the desires which ye have for life
>> that ye deliver up your weapons of war unto us

> Moroni 3:3
>> **in the name of Jesus Christ** I ordain you to be a priest

The critical text will, of course, restore the repeated *that* here in Alma 30:49 since that is the earliest reading. For other examples of *that*'s surrounding prepositional phrases, see under 2 Nephi 1:17. For a more general discussion of the repeated conjunctive *that,* see under THAT in volume 3.

Summary: Restore the repeated *that* in Alma 30:49: "I say that in the name of God **that** ye shall be struck dumb"; the current reading, "I say that in the name of God ye shall be struck dumb" changes the nature of the original performative and is apparently the result of accidentally deleting the wrong *that* when setting the type for the 1837 edition.

■ **Alma 30:51**

art thou convinced of the power of [*gd* >% NULL 0 | *a* 1ABDE | CFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *God*

Here in the original manuscript, Oliver Cowdery initially miswrote *God* as *gd*, which he immediately corrected by erasing the *gd* (and then partially crossing it out). But when Oliver came to copying from 𝒪 into 𝒫 (about six months later), he misread the erased *gd* as the indefinite article *a*. Thus 𝒫 and most of the earliest editions read "art thou convinced of the power of **a** God". The 1840 edition emended the text here by removing the intrusive *a*, but very unlikely by reference to 𝒪; the reading with the extra *a* just seemed unacceptable. Similarly, the 1852 LDS edition removed the *a* from the LDS text, either independently or by reference to the 1840 edition. The current standard text correctly reads "art thou convinced of the power of God", as will the critical text.

Summary: Maintain in Alma 30:51 the original reading, "the power of God", rather than the incorrect "the power of **a** God" that was accidentally introduced into 𝒫 when Oliver Cowdery misread the erased *gd* in 𝒪 as *a*.

■ **Alma 30:51**

[*now behold* 0 | *would* >+ *behold* 1 | *Behold* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
he hath shewed unto you a sign

The original manuscript here reads "now behold". While copying from the original into the printer's manuscript, Oliver Cowdery initially wrote *would*. This error may have been the result of

misreading the *now* as the visually similar *wou* and then combining it with the end of *behold:* **now** beho**ld** > **would**. A little later Oliver caught this error and crossed out the *would* and supra-linearly inserted *behold* (with a slightly heavier ink flow, perhaps after redipping his quill). But here Oliver neglected to also insert the original *now*.

The phrase *now behold* is very common in the Book of Mormon text, occurring 149 times elsewhere in the text. Although 114 of these other occurrences also have an *and* ("and now behold"), there are 34 occurrences without any other preceding connector (that is, simply as "now behold"), as here originally in Alma 30:51. There is also an occurrence of "but now behold" (in Mormon 5:18). The critical text will, of course, restore the original instance of "now behold" here in Alma 30:51. For another example of the same loss of *now* (but from an instance of *and now behold*), see under Alma 32:5.

Summary: Restore the *now* in Alma 30:51: "**now** behold he hath shewed unto you a sign"; Oliver Cowdery accidentally omitted the *now* when he corrected the initial *would* that he had written in 𝒫 (*would* was probably a visual misreading of *now behold*).

■ **Alma 30:52**

*and I [*always* ᴏᴛ | *also* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRS] knew that there was a God*

The original manuscript here reads "and I **always** knew that there was a God". This reading emphasizes that Korihor always knew that he was lying. But Oliver Cowdery, when he copied the text into the printer's manuscript, misread *always* as the visually similar *also,* which changes the meaning. For another example of this same kind of misreading by Oliver Cowdery as he copied the text from 𝒪 into 𝒫, see nearby under Alma 29:12. In accord with the reading in 𝒪, the 1981 LDS edition restored the correct *always* here in Alma 30:52. The critical text will also follow this reading in 𝒪.

Summary: Maintain in Alma 30:52 the occurrence of *always* ("and I always knew that there was a God"), the reading in 𝒪.

■ **Alma 30:53**

and he saith unto me
*there [*was* >+ *is* ᴏ | *is* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] no God*

Here in the original manuscript, Oliver Cowdery initially wrote "there **was** no God". Later, prob-ably when he read back the text to Joseph Smith, he corrected the *was* to *is* (his supralinear *is* is written with somewhat heavier ink flow). Oliver's error here was probably influenced by the occurrence of "and I always knew that there **was** a God" in the immediately preceding verse. Here in verse 53, we have a direct quote, thus the present-tense *is*.

Summary: Maintain in Alma 30:53 the present-tense *is,* the corrected reading in 𝒪; here Korihor is directly quoting what the devil said to him.

■ **Alma 30:54**

*now when he had **said** this*
he besought that Alma should pray unto God
that the curse might be taken from him

Eric Skousen (personal communication, 19 August 2003) has noted that there seems to be a problem here with the use of the word *say*. We expect rather *write* (thus "when he had written this") since moments earlier Korihor had been struck dumb and was consequently writing to Alma and the chief judge:

> Alma 30:52
> and Korihor put forth his hand and **wrote** . . .

Over the years, various readers have noted a potential problem with having the chief judge write to Korihor in verse 51:

> Alma 30:51
> and now when the chief judge saw this
> he put forth his hand and **wrote** unto Korihor . . .

The chief judge, one might think, could have spoken to Korihor, given that later Alma seems to have spoken directly to Korihor:

> Alma 30:55
> but Alma **said** unto him . . .

Nonetheless, as we shall see, it is more likely that Alma actually wrote what he "said" to Korihor.

When we look at the larger context here in Alma 30, we find that the text uses the word *saying* to refer to what is specifically being written:

> Alma 30:51
> and now when the chief judge saw this
> he put forth his hand and **wrote** unto Korihor **saying** :
> art thou convinced of the power of God

> Alma 30:52
> and Korihor put forth his hand and **wrote saying** :
> I know that I am dumb for I cannot speak

These two examples clearly show that anything written can be thought of as being said. Thus the two subsequent examples that refer to Korihor and Alma as saying something does not necessarily mean that they actually spoke these words:

> Alma 30:54–55
> now when he had **said** this
> he besought that Alma should pray unto God
> that the curse might be taken from him
> but Alma **said** unto him
> if this curse should be taken from thee
> thou wouldst again lead away the hearts of this people

Here the verb *say* is more general and basically means 'to communicate'. Moreover, Korihor was probably also struck deaf, so that he would not have been able to hear if the chief judge and Alma had actually spoken to him. In fact, deafness might have been a contributing factor in Korihor's death in Antionum, the land of the Zoramites:

> Alma 30:59
>> and as he went forth amongst them
>> behold he was ran upon and trodden down
>> even until he was dead

There are at least eight other cases in the Book of Mormon where something written is referred to as saying something:

Mosiah 29:4	and these were the words that were **written saying**
Alma 54:4	now these are the words which he **wrote** unto Ammoron **saying**
Alma 54:15	and these are the words which he **wrote saying**
Alma 56:2	and these are the words which he **wrote saying**
Alma 60:1	and these are the words which he **wrote saying**
3 Nephi 3:1	and these were the words which were **written saying**
3 Nephi 30:1	for behold he commandeth me that I should **write saying**
Moroni 8:1	and on this wise did he **write** unto me **saying**

This usage is also in the King James Bible and reflects a literal translation of the Hebrew and the Greek:

2 Samuel 11:15	and he **wrote** in the letter **saying**
1 Kings 21:9	and she **wrote** in the letters **saying**
Luke 1:63	and he asked for a writing table and **wrote saying**

The last of these is particularly relevant since Zacharias, like Korihor, had been struck dumb and was forced to communicate by writing, yet the King James Bible literally translates the Greek as *wrote saying*. The form *legōn* 'saying' comes from the Greek verb *legein*, which means 'to speak'; *legein* is related to *logos* 'word', which generally refers to thought and conceptualization, especially communication and only more specifically to speaking. Thus the use of "wrote saying" means 'wrote thus communicating'. As pointed out by David Calabro (personal communication), Zacharias (like Korihor) was also deaf since in the previous verse the text explains that "they made signs to his father how he would have him called" (Luke 1:62). Undoubtedly, Zacharias's asking for a writing tablet was also done with signs.

Summary: The Book of Mormon text frequently uses the verb *say* when quoting what someone has written; similar examples can be found in the King James Bible; in Alma 30, Korihor wrote after he was struck dumb, as stated in verse 52 ("and Korihor put forth his hand and **wrote saying**") and by implication in verse 54 ("now when he had **said** this"); this same conclusion applies to Alma's reply to Korihor in verse 55 ("and Alma **said** unto him") since earlier in verse 51 the text refers to the chief judge as writing to Korihor ("he put forth his hand and **wrote** unto Korihor **saying**"), probably because Korihor had also been struck deaf.

■ **Alma 30:55**

if this curse should be taken from thee
thou [*wouldst* 01AFIJLMNOQRT | *wouldest* BCDEGHKPS] *again lead away*
    the hearts of this people

> Here the 1837 edition replaced *wouldst* with *wouldest*, just like it replaced *shouldst* with *shouldest* earlier in verse 47 of this chapter. Here in verse 55, the 1852 LDS edition reverted to the original *wouldst,* but the RLDS text has here retained the two-syllable *wouldest.* As explained under 1 Nephi 20:5, the critical text will in each case of *would(e)st* maintain the earliest reading, thus *wouldst* here in Alma 30:55.

■ **Alma 30:56**

but he was cast out
and went about from house to house
[*a* 1A | BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *begging for his food*

■ **Alma 30:58**

and Korihor did go about from house to house
[*a* 01A | BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *begging*
[*food* 0ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST | *food* >js NULL 1] *for his support*

> As discussed under 1 Nephi 8:28, the original text of the Book of Mormon had a number of instances of the historical, now dialectal, prepositional *a.* Here in Alma 30:56, 58, we have two instances of *a begging.* In both of these cases, the *a* was removed in the 1837 edition. For a complete list of such usage, see under PREPOSITIONAL A in volume 3. The critical text will restore all instances of this usage, whenever there is evidence for the *a* in the earliest textual sources.
>
> We also note here that Joseph Smith, in his editing of 𝓟 for the 1837 edition, deleted the word *food* in verse 58, perhaps because he wanted to suggest that Korihor might have also been begging for other things for his support (such as clothing). In any event, the 1837 edition and all subsequent editions have ignored this emendation, perhaps because of the previous reference to begging for food in verse 56 ("but he was cast out and went about from house to house a begging for his food"). The critical text, in agreement with all the printed editions, will retain the reference to begging for food in Alma 30:58.

Summary: Maintain in Alma 30:56, 58 the two uses of the prepositional *a* in *a begging;* also maintain the two specific references to Korihor begging for food.

Alma 31

■ **Alma 31:1**

now it came to pass that after the end of Korihor
Alma having received tidings that the Zoramites were perverting the ways of the Lord
and that Zoram which was their leader was leading the hearts of the people
to bow down to dumb idols [.&.C. 0|.&C. 1|&c. ABCDEFGHIKLMNOQ|*etc.* JPS| RT] . . .

This instance of *etc.* was deleted in the 1920 LDS edition. The *etc.* is actually necessary since there were other things besides idol worship that these apostate Zoramites had started to do. In fact, much of this chapter describes in great detail the worship practice of these Zoramites (which, it should be noted, has no specific reference to bowing down to idols). David Calabro points out (personal communication) that the tidings that Alma received may not have been fully accurate. On the other hand, we needn't presume that Mormon's abridged record included a complete account of the Zoramite apostasy. In any event, the critical text will restore the original occurrence of *etc.* here in Alma 31:1.

Summary: Restore the original *etc.* in Alma 31:1 since the text intends to say that Zoram was encouraging various apostate practices in addition to idol worship.

■ **Alma 31:3**

now the Zoramites had gathered themselves together in a land which they called Antionum
which was east of the land [NULL > *of* 0|*of* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *Zarahemla*
which lay nearly bordering upon the seashore
which was south of the land [01|*of* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *Jershon*

As discussed under Alma 2:15, the original text consistently has the *of* in the expression "the land of Zarahemla". Here in Alma 31:3, Oliver Cowdery initially wrote "the land Zarahemla" in 𝒪, but then almost immediately he inserted the *of* inline (there is no change in the level of ink flow). On the other hand, the earliest text read "the land Jershon" later in this verse, but the 1830 compositor set "the land **of** Jershon". As explained under Alma 27:22–24, there are instances of both "land Jershon" and "land **of** Jershon" in the original text. In each case, we follow the earliest reading; thus "the land Jershon" will be restored here in Alma 31:3.

Summary: Follow the earliest textual evidence regarding the *of* in phrases of the form "land (of) X"; thus in Alma 31:3, the original *of* in "the land **of** Zarahemla" will be maintained, but the intrusive *of* in "the land Jershon" will be removed.

■ **Alma 31:4–5**

now the Nephites greatly feared
that the Zoramites would enter into a correspondence with the Lamanites
and that it would be the means
of [*greater* > *a greater* >% *great* o | *great* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *loss*
    on the part of the Nephites
and now as the preaching of the word had had
a [*greater* 01PS | *great* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOQRT] *tendency*
to lead the people to do that which was just
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 . . .

In this passage there are two instances of textual variation between the adjective *great* and its comparative form *greater*. In verse 4, Oliver Cowdery initially wrote "it would be the means of **greater** loss" in 𝒪; then virtually immediately he corrected this clause by adding the indefinite article *a* (thus "it would be the means of **a greater** loss"). The *a* was inserted inline without any change in the level of ink flow. The initial text here in 𝒪 may have been influenced by the occurrence of "a greater tendency" in the following clause (near the beginning of verse 5). In any event, this error in verse 4 was immediately caught: Oliver erased the *a* and the comparative *-er,* giving "it would be the means of **great** loss". The original text undoubtedly read this way.

When he copied from 𝒪 into 𝒫, Oliver Cowdery correctly wrote "great loss" in verse 4 and "a greater tendency" in verse 5. But the 1830 compositor was influenced by the occurrence of "great loss" in verse 4 and ended up setting "a great tendency" in verse 5 rather than the correct "a greater tendency". The 1908 RLDS edition restored the original *greater* to the RLDS text, but the LDS text has maintained "a great tendency". The critical text will restore the original "a greater tendency" in verse 5, the reading of both 𝒪 and 𝒫. The use of the comparative *greater* is supported by the parallel occurrence of the comparative *more powerful* in the immediately following *yea*-clause:

> 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 . . .

Summary: Restore in Alma 31:5 the original comparative form in "a greater tendency"; also maintain in Alma 31:4 the corrected reading in 𝒪, the noncomparative *great* in "it would be the means of great loss on the part of the Nephites".

■ **Alma 31:5**

and now as the preaching of the word
[*had had* 01PS | *had* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOQRT] *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*

Here the 1830 typesetter accidentally omitted the past perfect auxiliary *had* near the beginning of verse 5 (thus replacing *had had* with *had*), but in the subsequent main clause he kept the *had had.*

This second example of *had had* parallels the first one (note, for instance, the use of the *yea*); thus the first *had had* should be restored.

Summary: Restore the original first *had had* in Alma 31:5 ("the preaching of the word **had had** a greater tendency to lead the people to do that which was just"); this change restores the parallelism with the second *had had* in the verse ("yea it **had had** more powerful effect upon the minds of the people than the sword").

■ **Alma 31:6–7**

(1) *therefore he took* [*with him* >? NULL 0| 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *Ammon*
 and Aaron and Omner
 and Himni he did leave in the church in Zarahemla
(2) *but the former three he took* **with him**
 and also Amulek and Zeezrom which were at Melek
(3) *and he also took two of his sons*
(4) *now the eldest of his sons he took not* **with him**
 and his name was Helaman
(5) *but the names of those which he took* **with him**
 were Shiblon and Corianton
 and these are the names of those which went with him among the Zoramites
 to preach unto them the word

The original manuscript is not extant for the words after *therefore he* and before *Omner,* but there is clearly room for a couple of extra words (which also could have been crossed out). A good candidate for the missing text is the phrase *with him.* Elsewhere in this passage, we have four other cases (listed above as 2–5) that refer to Alma's taking someone along with him, and in three of these cases the phrase *with him* occurs. But there is one case where *take* is not followed by *with him,* namely the third case: "and he also took two of his sons". So either reading, with or without *with him,* is theoretically possible in the first case.

We should note that, as far as the earliest extant text reads, the phrase *with him* occurs only when the direct object is fronted (cases 2, 4, and 5). One could take this relationship as support for the earliest extant reading in case 1, namely, "therefore he took Ammon and Aaron and Omner" without *with him* after *took.* Nonetheless, this relationship does not necessarily hold since elsewhere in the text we have examples of *with X* both preceding and following a nonfronted direct object:

□ *with X + direct object* (two times)

 1 Nephi 18:8   and had taken **with us** our provisions and things
      which had been commanded us
 3 Nephi 6:2   they did take **with them** all that they had not devoured

□ *direct object + with X* (seven times)

 1 Nephi 2:4   and took nothing **with him** save it were his family . . .
 Mosiah 21:19   unless he took his guards **with him**
 Mosiah 28:1   they took a small number **with them**
 Alma 55:9   that ye have thus taken wine **with you**

Mormon 4:22	taking all the inhabitants **with them**
Ether 2:23	neither shall ye take fire **with you**
Ether 14:15	and Coriantumr had taken all the people **with him**

In fact, there are no other cases of *with X* (besides the three in Alma 31:6–7) where the direct object is fronted. But at least the examples in 1 Nephi 18:8 and 3 Nephi 6:2 show that there is nothing wrong with having *with him* immediately following the verb *take,* especially when the direct object is long. Thus the original text in case 1 could have read "therefore he took **with him** Ammon and Aaron and Omner" (note that the direct object is long here). But if *with him* was originally in 𝒪, we cannot be sure whether Oliver crossed out this *with him* or omitted the phrase when he copied from 𝒪 into 𝒫.

Of course, there is always the possibility that some other reading or correction could explain the extra length between extant fragments of 𝒪 here in Alma 31:6. Ultimately, we cannot be sure what kind of error may have occurred here in the text. Since either reading, with or without the phrase *with him,* is possible, the critical text will follow 𝒫, the earliest extant reading for this part of the text.

Summary: Follow in Alma 31:6 the printer's manuscript with its reading "therefore he took Ammon and Aaron and Omner" (that is, without the phrase *with him*); although there is room in the original manuscript for this phrase, we cannot be sure that it was there.

■ **Alma 31:7**

and his name was [*called* >? NULL 0| 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *Helaman*

Spacing considerations between extant fragments of the original manuscript suggest some cross-out (or text now lost) here in Alma 31:7. In the transcript of 𝒪 for this passage, I suggested in a note the possibility that the word *called* might have been written in 𝒪 (as "and his name was **called** Helaman"). The verb *call* is sometimes used when someone's personal name is referred to the first time in the text, as in the following examples:

2 Nephi 3:15	and his name shall be called after me
2 Nephi 18:3	call his name Maher-shalal-hash-baz
Mosiah 24:3	and now the name of the king of the Lamanites was Laman
	being called after the name of his father
Alma 24:3	and he called his name Anti-Nephi-Lehi
Alma 63:11	being called after the name of his father
Ether 14:17	now the name of the brother of Lib was called Shiz

The last example parallels the proposed emendation here of "and his name was **called** Helaman".

Another possible explanation for the length of the lacuna in 𝒪 is that Oliver Cowdery misspelled the name *Helaman* on his first try and crossed out his error. One possibility could have been the name *Helem,* which could have been crossed out and followed inline by *Helaman.* (It is doubtful Oliver would have initially written *Helam* in 𝒪 since in that case he would probably have simply added inline the word-final *an.*) We have evidence that Oliver sometimes misspelled *Helam* as *Helem* and *Helaman* as *Heleman* (see the discussion under Mosiah 27:16).

Of course, we cannot be sure of the original reading for the text in this lacuna of 𝒪. Once more, we must resort to the reading of the printer's manuscript, the earliest extant reading and, in this case, one that makes perfectly good sense. Elsewhere in the text there are 46 examples of "name (of Y) was X" (that is, without *called*), including 11 with precisely the same syntax as in 𝒫 for Alma 31:7 ("and his name was X"):

Alma 1:15	and his name was Nehor
Alma 16:5	and his name was Zoram
Alma 17:21	and his name was Lamoni
Alma 43:16	and his name was Moroni
Alma 46:3	and his name was Amalickiah
Alma 52:3	and his name was Ammoron
3 Nephi 3:18	and his name was Gidgiddoni
Mormon 2:9	and his name was Aaron
Ether 6:25	and his name was Pagag
Ether 9:8	and his name was Nimrah
Ether 14:10	and his name was Lib

Thus the critical text will accept the reading in 𝒫.

Summary: Accept in Alma 31:7 the earliest extant reading, "and his name was Helaman" (the reading in 𝒫), even though there is room in the lacuna of 𝒪 for about one more word (which was probably crossed out).

■ **Alma 31:8–9**

now the Zoramites were dissenters from the Nephites
therefore they [*had* 01ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQS | *had had* RT] *the word of God preached unto them*
but they had fell into great errors

The original manuscript is fully extant for a single *had* in Alma 31:8. The word immediately preceding this *had* is not completely extant in the original manuscript. The last letter of that word is partially visible; it does not appear to be a *d,* but it could be a *y.* In other words, the evidence is consistent with the hypothesis that the immediately preceding word was *they.* There is no room between extant fragments of 𝒪 for another *had* except by supralinear insertion; so it seems reasonable to assume that 𝒪 read "they **had** the word of God preached unto them", not "they **had had** the word of God preached unto them".

The use of the past perfective *had* at the beginning of the next verse, "they had fell" (or "they had fallen" in the standard edited text), definitely suggests that the text in Alma 31:8 should read "they **had had** the word of God preached unto them" (see under Mosiah 4:1 for discussion of *fell* as the past participle for the verb *fall*). It is quite possible that one of the *had*'s was dropped during the dictation process. There is considerable evidence that Oliver Cowdery occasionally omitted the perfective *had* in the manuscripts, if only momentarily:

2 Nephi 4:10 (supralinear *had* inserted in 𝒫 with slightly weaker ink flow)
when my father [NULL >− *had* 1 | *had* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] made
an end of speaking unto them . . .

Omni 1:13 (supralinear *had* inserted in 𝒫 with no change in the level of ink flow)

    according as the Lord [NULL > *had* 1 | *had* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
      commanded him

Alma 44:8 (*had* lost in copying from 𝒪 into 𝒫; supplied by the 1830 typesetter
      after gathering 22 was proofed against 𝒪 rather than 𝒫)

    when Zerahemnah [*had* 0ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST | 1] heard these sayings . . .

Alma 46:21 (initial *rent* in 𝒪 immediately corrected by erasure to *had rent*)

    the Lord should rend them even as
    they [*rent* >% *had rents* >% *had rent* 0 | *had rent* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
      their garments

Helaman 16:1 (both 𝒫 and the 1830 edition set from 𝒪; probable loss of *had* when
      copying from 𝒪 into 𝒫)

    when they [*came* 1 | *had came* A | *had come* BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] forth
      and found him . . .

(Two of these cases, Alma 44:8 and Helaman 16:1, are complicated; for discussion see under those passages.) Thus it is possible that in 𝒪 for Alma 31:8, Oliver accidentally omitted the perfective *had* as he took down Joseph Smith's dictation (or possibly Joseph himself omitted it in his dictation). The 1920 LDS edition emended the text here by adding the extra *had*.

It should also be noted that there is considerable evidence that the perfective *had* has sometimes been accidentally added to the text, as in these examples from Oliver Cowdery (in some passages, there is at least one nearby perfective *had* that seems to have prompted the intrusive *had;* these passages are each marked below with an asterisk):

    * Jarom 1:5 (initial insertion of *had* in 𝒫 deleted almost immediately)

      and now behold two hundred years **had** passed away
      and the people of Nephi **had** waxed strong in the land
      they [*had* > NULL 1 | ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] observed to keep
        the law of Moses

    * Alma 14:8 (initial insertion of *had* in 𝒫 deleted almost immediately)

      and they brought their wives and children together
      and whosoever [*had* > NULL 1 | ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] believed
        or **had** been taught to believe in the word of God
      they caused that they should be cast into the fire

    Alma 47:1 (*had* accidentally added when copying from 𝒪 into 𝒫)

      now we will return in our record to Amalickiah
      and those which [*were* > *fled* 0 | *had fled* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
        with him into the wilderness

    * 3 Nephi 1:16 (*had* initially added in 𝒫, then virtually immediately crossed out)

      for they knew that the great plan of destruction
      which they **had** laid for those
      who [*had* > NULL 1 | ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] believed in the words
        of the prophets
      had been frustrated

Ether 13:28 (*had* initially added in 𝓟, then virtually immediately crossed out)
Coriantumr beat him and did pursue him
until he [0ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST | *had* > NULL 1] came
to the plains of Heshlon

* Ether 15:33 (*had* initially added in 𝓟, then virtually immediately crossed out)
and he went forth and beheld that the words of the Lord **had** all been fulfilled
and he finished his record—and the hundredth part I have not written—
and he [*had* > NULL 1 | ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] hid them in a manner
that the people of Limhi did find them

In these instances, the earliest textual evidence lacks the perfective *had* where readers might expect it.

One question here in Alma 31:8 is whether the word *therefore* in "therefore they (had) had the word of God preached unto them" refers to the Zoramites as dissenters or as Nephites. The verse as a whole, with its implication that despite earlier preaching the Zoramites "had fell into great errors", suggests that the *therefore* refers to the fact that the Zoramites were originally Nephites. Under this interpretation, the reader definitely expects "they **had had** the word of God preached unto them". This interpretation is, in fact, explicitly supported by Amulek's later language in Alma 34:2: "yea I know that these things were taught unto you bountifully before your dissension from among us".

Another example where the editors for the 1920 LDS edition supplied the past perfect *had* is found at the beginning of the book of Alma:

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 [1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQS | *had* RT] established laws
and they were acknowledged by the people
therefore they were obliged to abide by the laws which he **had** made

As explained under that passage, the Book of Mormon text sometimes allows the simple past tense when readers expect the past perfect, as in this example from the book of Mosiah:

Mosiah 27:8
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

Thus the critical text will accept the occasional use of the simple past tense (as in Mosiah 27:8, Alma 1:1, and Alma 31:8) instead of the past perfect that readers might expect.

Summary: Restore in Alma 31:8 the earliest reading without the perfective *had* (namely, only the main verb *had* in "they **had** the word of God preached unto them"); although this reading could be

an error for "they **had had** the word of God preached unto them", the simple past-tense form is sometimes used this way in the earliest text.

■ **Alma 31:9**

for they would not observe to keep the commandments
[NULL >+ *of God* O| *of God* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
and his statutes according to the law of Moses

Oliver Cowdery later inserted *of God* in ℗ (the level of ink flow for the supralinear correction is slightly heavier). It is possible that *of God* represents editing on Oliver's part: the occurrence of *his* in the conjoined structure "the commandments and his statutes" is a difficult reading since there is no immediate antecedent for the *his,* although *God* does appear in the preceding verse:

> Alma 21:8–9 (initial text in ℗)
> therefore they had the word of **God** preached unto them
> but they had fell into great errors
> for they would not observe to keep the commandments and **his** statutes
> according to the law of Moses

Of course, Oliver's addition of the phrase *of God* may have been virtually immediate; he could have simply redipped his pen before inserting the correct *of God.* It's also possible that Oliver discovered that the phrase *of God* was missing after reading back the text to Joseph Smith.

Elsewhere, whenever *his* modifies conjuncts of *commandments* and *statutes,* there is a nearby preceding occurrence of *Lord* or *God* that the *his* refers to:

> Mosiah 6:6
> and it came to pass that king Mosiah did walk in the ways of **the Lord**
> and did observe **his** judgments and **his** statutes
> and did keep **his** commandments in all things whatsoever he commanded him

> Alma 25:14
> and they began to be a righteous people
> and they did walk in the ways of **the Lord**
> and did observe to keep **his** commandments and **his** statutes

> 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

> Helaman 15:5
> and I would that ye should behold that
> the more part of them are in the path of their duty
> and they do walk circumspectly before **God**
> and they do observe to keep **his** commandments and **his** statutes and **his** judgments
> according to the law of Moses

The last example (from Helaman 15:5) suggests another possible emendation for Alma 31:9: namely, "for they would not observe to keep **his** commandments and his statutes according to the law of Moses." There is evidence elsewhere in the text for Oliver Cowdery accidentally replacing *his* with *the:*

Alma 46:25 (*the* immediately crossed out in 𝒫 and replaced with *his* inline)
that part of [0ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST | *the* > NULL 1] **his** seed
which shall be taken unto God

Alma 52:24 (*the* immediately crossed out in 𝒪 and replaced with *his* inline)
behold Moroni commanded that
a part of [*the* > NULL 0 | 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] **his** army
which were with him
should march forth into the city

Ether 9:6 (*the* immediately corrected to *his* in 𝒪)
and Akish reigned in [*the* >% *his* 0 | *his* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] stead

Ether 13:31 (*the* virtually immediately replaced by *his* in 𝒫)
and Shared wounded Coriantumr
in [*the* > *his* 1 | *his* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] thigh

Another possible emendation is that instead of the phrase *of God* the phrase *of the Lord* could have been inserted in Alma 31:9. Either "the commandments of the Lord" or "the commandments of God" is possible, as exemplified by an instance of each phrase in the previous chapter of Alma:

Alma 30:3
yea and the people did observe to keep
the commandments of [*the Lord* 0ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST | *God* > *the Lord* 1]

Alma 30:7
for it was strictly contrary
to the [*commandments* 0 | *commands* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] of God

Note that in the first example, Oliver Cowdery initially wrote "the commandments of God" in 𝒫, which suggests that he could have, on his own, chosen "the commandments of God" in Alma 31:9 rather than the alternative "the commandments of the Lord".

Given these various possibilities for Alma 31:9, it is probably safest to adopt the corrected reading in 𝒪, "the commandments of God"; this reading will work, and it is very possible that it is the result of Oliver Cowdery and Joseph Smith attempting to get the text copied down correctly.

Summary: Accept the corrected reading in 𝒪 for Alma 31:9: "they would not observe to keep the commandments **of God** and his statutes".

■ **Alma 31:13**

for they had a place built up in the center of their synagogue
a place [of 01A | for BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] standing which was high above the head

The earliest textual sources have "a place **of** standing"; the 1837 edition replaced the preposition *of* with *for.* Although the preposition *for* does improve the sense of the reading, still "a place of standing" is understandable and is, in fact, supported by usage in the King James Bible:

> Acts 25:23
> and on the morrow
> when Agrippa was come—and Bernice—with great pomp
> and was entered into **the place of hearing**
> with the chief captains and principal men of the city
> at Festus' commandment Paul was brought forth

There is really nothing wrong with "a place **of** standing" in Alma 31:13.

Summary: Restore the preposition *of* in Alma 31:13 ("a place of standing") since the original expression is quite acceptable.

■ **Alma 31:14**

therefore whosoever desired to worship must go forth and stand upon the top thereof
and stretch forth his hands towards [the Heavens 0 | Heaven 1 | heaven ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]

Here the original manuscript reads "towards the heavens", which Oliver Cowdery accidentally miscopied as "towards heaven" in the printer's manuscript. In other words, he omitted the definite article *the* and reduced the plural *heavens* to the singular *heaven.* The printed editions have continued with the reading in 𝓟, but the critical text will restore the original *the heavens* in Alma 31:14 since there is nothing inappropriate about it.

Elsewhere in the Book of Mormon text, there are 38 occurrences of *the heavens.* When the preposition is *toward(s),* we have three examples of "toward(s) heaven" (in 3 Nephi 11:5, 3 Nephi 11:8, and 3 Nephi 17:24), but none of "toward(s) the heavens". Yet we do get instances of *the heavens* with other prepositions besides *toward(s),* such as these examples, with the second one being a quote from the King James Bible (Isaiah 51:6):

> 1 Nephi 1:14   thy throne is high **in** the heavens
> 2 Nephi 8:6   lift up your eyes **to** the heavens
> 3 Nephi 28:36   yea even three which were caught up **into** the heavens

Summary: Restore in Alma 31:14 the plural *the heavens,* the reading of the original manuscript; this phraseology is indirectly supported by usage elsewhere in the text.

■ **Alma 31:16**

and we do not believe
in the [*tradition* 0ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST | *traditions > tradition* 1] *of our brethren*
which **was** *handed down to them by the childishness of their fathers*

The original manuscript definitely has the singular *tradition*. In the printer's manuscript, Oliver Cowdery initially copied this word as a plural, but then crossed out the plural *s*. The crossout appears to be virtually immediate since there is no change in the level of ink flow. Moreover, this crossout on line 23 of page 250 of 𝒫 is like other crossouts on this page of 𝒫, including the crossout of *of* seven lines earlier on the page where Oliver supralineally inserted an ampersand to replace the *of* (the ampersand is definitely Oliver's, so we can be confident that the crossout is also his).

Of course, the use of the singular *was* here in Alma 31:16 is not conclusively supportive of the singular *tradition* since we do have cases where the plural *traditions* takes a singular verb form in the earliest text. For discussion of this possibility, see under Alma 9:16. For further discussion regarding the grammatical number for *tradition(s),* see under Mosiah 1:5.

Summary: Accept the singular reading *tradition* in Alma 31:16, which is the reading in 𝒪 as well as the corrected reading in 𝒫.

■ **Alma 31:20**

for behold every man did go forth and offer up
[*these* 01T | *the* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRS] *same prayers*

Both manuscripts read "every man did go forth and offer up **these** same prayers". The 1830 compositor accidentally mis-set *these* as *the*. The 1981 LDS edition, following the reading of the manuscripts, restored the original *these*. The critical text will, of course, maintain the original determiner. For further discussion regarding the tendency in the early history of the text to mix up *these* and *the,* see under Jacob 1:1.

Summary: Maintain in Alma 31:20 the reading of the original manuscript, "every man did go forth and offer up **these** same prayers".

■ **Alma 31:22**

now from this stand they did offer up every man the selfsame prayer unto God
thanking their God that they were chosen of him
and that he [*had not led* 0 | *did not lead* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *them away*
after the tradition of their brethren

The original manuscript has the past perfect "he **had not led** them away". Later, as Oliver Cowdery was copying the text into the printer's manuscript, he switched to a new page of 𝒫. Here his short-term memory failed to retain the original reading, and he accidentally replaced the past perfect with the past tense, thus "he **did not lead** them away". His error may have been influenced by the past-tense *were* in the immediately preceding "they **were** chosen of him".

This change makes a difference in the time aspect for this passage. If the passage were revised as a direct quotation, we would get something like the following for the original reading:

Alma 31:22 (original text revised as a direct quote)
> now from this stand they did offer up every man
> the selfsame prayer unto God / thanking their God :
> "we **are** chosen of him and he **has** not led us away
>> after the tradition of our brethren"

If we followed the reading in 𝓟 ("did not lead them away"), the direct quotation would read something like "we **are** chosen of him and he **does** not lead us away". These Zoramites have already rejected the tradition of their brethren, so there is no longer any chance that they would be led away (or so they claim). Thus the perfect is expected. Note, in addition, that when the Zoramites' prayer is directly quoted earlier in this chapter, there are many instances of the perfect auxiliary *have* but in the present tense since the quotation is direct:

Alma 31:16–17
> we believe that thou **hast** separated us from our brethren . . .
> but we believe that thou **hast** elected us to be thy holy children
> and also thou **hast** made it known unto us that there shall be no Christ . . .
> and thou **hast** elected us that we shall be saved . . .
> and we also thank thee that thou **hast** elected us

Thus the use of the past-tense perfect in "and that he **had not led** us away" is perfectly acceptable in the indirect quotation in verse 22. The critical text will restore the original reading.

Summary: Restore the past perfect reading of the original manuscript in Alma 31:22: "he **had not led** them away after the tradition of their brethren".

■ **Alma 31:23**

now [when 0 | after 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] the people had all offered up thanks
> *after their manner*
they returned to their homes

The original manuscript has the subordinate conjunction *when,* which Oliver Cowdery accidentally copied into the printer's manuscript as *after,* perhaps under the influence of the following prepositional phrase "**after** their manner".

Elsewhere in the Book of Mormon text there are numerous occurrences where the subordinate conjunction *when* has the meaning 'after'. Here are two examples:

Mosiah 18:11
> and now **when** the people had heard these words
> they clapped their hands for joy

Alma 24:21
> and it came to pass that
> **when** the people saw that they were coming against them
> they went out to meet them

So there is nothing wrong with the original use of *when* in Alma 31:23.

Summary: Restore the original *when* in Alma 31:23 ("now **when** the people had all offered up thanks"), the reading of the original manuscript.

■ **Alma 31:23**

now when the people had all offered up thanks
after [their 1 | this ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *manner*
they returned to their homes never speaking of their God again
until they had assembled themselves together again to the holy stand
to offer up thanks after **their** *manner*

The original manuscript is not extant for the first instance in this passage of the phrase "after their manner", but the printer's manuscript is. The 1830 typesetter accidentally misread the *their* as *this*. We find further support for "after their manner" in the same phraseology later on in the verse ("to offer up thanks after **their** manner").

Summary: Restore in Alma 31:23 the original reading "after their manner" so that there are two occurrences of this prepositional phrase in the verse.

■ **Alma 31:29**

how long wilt thou suffer that
such wickedness and [infidelity 0T | *iniquity* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRS]
shall be among this people

The original manuscript here reads "such wickedness and **infidelity**". When copying from 𝒪 into 𝒫, Oliver Cowdery misread *infidelity* as *iniquity,* undoubtedly because the text otherwise has only instances of *iniquity* and its plural *iniquities* (for a total of 226 instances). There are no other instances in the Book of Mormon text of the word *infidelity* (nor in the King James Bible, for that matter). The 1981 LDS edition, by reference to 𝒪, restored the original *infidelity* here.

Summary: Maintain in Alma 31:29 the original but unique occurrence in the text of the noun *infidelity*.

■ **Alma 31:29**

how long wilt thou suffer that such wickedness and infidelity
[NULL >+ *shall be* 0 | *shall be* 1ABCDEFGIJLMNOPQRST | *will be* HK] *among this people*

Here Oliver Cowdery omitted the verb phrase *shall be* when he initially took down Joseph Smith's dictation in 𝒪. Oliver later supplied the verb phrase, perhaps after he read the text back to Joseph (the supralinear *shall be* is written with somewhat heavier ink flow). The 1874 RLDS edition accidentally replaced the auxiliary *shall* with *will,* apparently prompted by the preceding "**wilt** thou". This error was corrected in the 1908 RLDS edition, probably by reference to 𝒫. In theory, either auxiliary is possible in this passage. For some discussion regarding the variation between *shall* and *will* in the Book of Mormon text, see under 2 Nephi 27:15.

Summary: Maintain the verb *shall* in Alma 31:29, the reading of the earliest textual sources.

■ **Alma 31:35**

behold O Lord their souls are precious
and many of them are our [*near* 01APS | BCDEFGHIJKLMNOQRT] brethren

The original and printer's manuscripts as well as the 1830 edition have "our **near** brethren". The 1837 edition deleted the *near,* perhaps accidentally since the change was not marked by Joseph Smith in 𝓟. The 1908 RLDS edition restored it to the RLDS text. The reading without the *near* ("and many of them are our brethren") seems like a gratuitous statement since the Book of Mormon text considers all the Nephites as well as the Lamanites as "brethren" (that is, as related). Moreover, the original text states that only "many of them"—not all of them—"are our near brethren". Perhaps many of the Zoramites belong to the same Nephite tribe as Alma and his fellow missionaries. Note, for instance, the explicit reference (in Jacob 1:13, 4 Nephi 1:36−38, and Mormon 1:8−9) to the division of the Nephites and Lamanites into tribes based on the original members of Lehi's immigrating group:

Nephites	Nephites, Jacobites, Josephites, Zoramites
Lamanites	Lamanites, Lemuelites, Ishmaelites

Of course, the Zoramites referred to in these tribal divisions are the descendants of Zoram, the servant of Laban, while the Zoramites referred to in the book of Alma (from Alma 30:59 through Alma 52:33)—and also once in 3 Nephi 1:29—originally settled in the land of Antionum (see Alma 31:3) and named themselves, it would appear, after their own leader Zoram rather than the original Zoram:

> Alma 30:59
> and it came to pass that as he went forth among the people
> yea among a people which had separated themselves from the Nephites
> and called themselves **Zoramites**
> being led by a man whose name was **Zoram**

One could speculate that these Zoramites were largely made up of people belonging to the original Zoramite tribe, but the text itself does not make that connection. Even so, Alma's reference to many of the Zoramites in the land of Antionum as being "our near brethren" could mean that some of these Zoramites belonged to the same tribe as Alma and his fellow missionaries (one might suspect the Nephite tribe).

Another possible interpretation, pointed out by David Calabro (personal communication), is that the term *brethren* could mean 'religious brethren', so that "our near brethren" in Alma 31:35 could be referring to former fellow members of the church who had been led astray. In support of this kind of usage, Calabro cites an 1877 non-LDS religious essay "To the Work", published in *The Church Advocate* 41/46 (16 May 1877): 3 (found on <www.google.com>):

> Neither have we a right to bring availing accusation
> against **our near brethren in the Lord** . . .

The Book of Mormon has one other occurrence of *near* that refers to relationship—and that example definitely refers to kinship rather than religious brotherhood:

Alma 10:7

> as I was a journeying to see **a very near kindred**
> behold an angel of the Lord appeared unto me

This example suggests a third possible interpretation for Alma 31:35 — namely, among the Zoramites there were many close personal relatives of Alma and his fellow missionaries. The use of adjectival *near* to refer to close relatives is noted in the Oxford English Dictionary under definition 1 for the adjective *near,* with the following examples (accidentals regularized here), including one from the King James Bible:

Leviticus 18:17 (1611)

> for they *are* her **near kinswomen**

Joseph Addison (1711)

> to raise uneasiness among **near relations**

Thomas Arnold (1840)

> the sons or **near relations** of the most influential members of the senate

There are quite a few examples in the King James Bible that use *near* in reference to close family relationship:

Leviticus 18:6	none of you shall approach to any that is **near of kin** to him
Leviticus 18:12	she *is* thy father's **near kinswoman**
Leviticus 18:13	for she *is* thy mother's **near kinswoman**
Leviticus 20:19	for he uncovereth **his near kin**
Leviticus 21:2	but for **his kin** that is **near** unto him
Ruth 2:20	the man *is* **near of kin** unto us / one of our next kinsmen
Ruth 3:9	for thou *art* **a near kinsman**
Ruth 3:12	and now it is true that I *am **thy** near* kinsman
Ruth 3:12	howbeit there is **a kinsman nearer** than I
2 Samuel 19:42	because the king *is* **near of kin** to us

There is one other biblical use of *near* with the meaning 'close', but it refers to friends rather than kin:

Acts 10:24	and had called together his kinsmen and his **near friends**

This last example shows that *near brethren* in Alma 31:35 could be referring to closely associated church brethren rather than near relatives. Of course, as far as determining the original text of the Book of Mormon is concerned, it doesn't really matter who "our near brethren" is referring to; the important point here is that the modifier *near* is definitely intended and will be restored in the critical text.

Summary: Restore in Alma 31:35 the original *near* in "many of them are our **near** brethren"; the *near* occurs in the earliest textual sources and is clearly intended, no matter how we interpret the referent of "our near brethren".

Alma 32

■ **Alma 32:2**

they began to have success
among the [*poorer* 0 | *poor* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *class*
of [NULL > *the* 0 | 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *people*

The original manuscript initially read "the poorer class of people". Virtually immediately Oliver Cowdery corrected "of people" to "of **the** people" by inserting the definite article *the* supralinearly and with the same level of ink flow (although the insert mark is written with somewhat heavier ink flow and the *the* is awkwardly inserted between the lines). Since either "of people" or "of the people" works, it seems reasonable to assume that this correction is not due to editing but was based on Oliver correcting to what Joseph Smith had dictated. Unfortunately, when Oliver copied this sentence into the printer's manuscript, the definite article fell out once more, this time permanently. But more significantly, in his copying from 𝒪 into 𝒫, Oliver also changed the comparative *poorer* to the base adjective *poor*. The original "the poorer class of the people" implies a less "Marxian" reading, suggesting that the poverty of these people is relative rather than absolute. The noun *class* appears only one other place in the text: "and they began to be divided into classes" (4 Nephi 1:26).

Elsewhere the text generally refers to "the poor" (24 times), including one specific reference to "the poor of the Zoramites":

> Alma 35:9
> and he breathed out many threatenings against them
> and now the people of Ammon did not fear their words
> therefore they did not cast them out
> but they did receive all **the poor of the Zoramites** that came over unto them

The uniqueness of *poorer* in Alma 32:2 suggests the possibility that it is an error, perhaps a mishearing on Oliver Cowdery's part. Note that *poor* ends in *r*, which could have made it difficult to hear the difference between *poor* and *poorer*. A similar example is the unique occurrence of *nearer* in 1 Nephi 2:5 ("in the borders which was **nearer** the Red Sea"). As discussed under that passage, *nearer* (the reading in 𝒪) could be a mishearing of *near*. But since "nearer the Red Sea" will work, the critical text will maintain the comparative form there. Similarly, since "the poorer class of the people" (the reading in 𝒪) definitely works here in Alma 32:2, the critical text will accept this one instance of *poorer*. For general discussion, see under COMPARISON OF ADJECTIVES in volume 3.

Summary: Restore the corrected reading of the original manuscript in Alma 32:2, "the poorer class of the people" (thus changing *poor* back to *poorer* and inserting the definite article before *people*).

■ **Alma 32:3–4**

therefore they were poor
yea they were esteemed by their brethren as dross
therefore they were poor as to [01ABCDEFGIJLMNOPQRST | *the* HK] *things of the world*
and also they were poor in heart
now as Alma was teaching and speaking unto the people upon the hill Onidah
there came a great multitude unto him
which were those of which we have been speaking
which were poor in heart because of their poverty
as to [01 | *the* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *things of the world*

In both these verses, the original text read "as to things of the world". The tendency in the transmission of this phraseology has been to add the definite article *the* before "things of the world". In verse 3, the 1874 RLDS edition added the *the,* but it was removed from the RLDS text in 1908. In verse 4, the 1830 typesetter added the *the,* which has never been removed from either the LDS or RLDS text. This tendency to add the *the* is natural given the occurrence elsewhere in the text of *the* in all other references to things of the world (15 in all):

"the things of the world"	2 times
"the vain things of the world"	9 times
"the vain things of the world"	1 time
"the things of **this** world"	1 time
"the vain things of **this** world"	2 times

More generally, in phrases beginning with *as to,* the definite article *the* is lacking before *things,* although there are a couple cases with the *the,* each indicated below with an asterisk (including one of the instances of "the things of the world"):

*	1 Nephi 15:33	as to **the** things which are spiritual
*	2 Nephi 9:30	as to **the** things of the world
	Alma 5:42	as to things pertaining unto righteousness
	Alma 12:16	as to things pertaining unto righteousness
	Alma 12:31	as to things which were temporal
	Alma 12:32	as to things pertaining unto righteousness
	Alma 40:26	as to things pertaining to things of righteousness
	Helaman 11:19	as to things pertaining to righteousness
	Helaman 14:16	both as to things temporal and to things spiritual
	Helaman 14:18	as to things pertaining to righteousness

Thus the occurrence twice in Alma 32:3–4 of "as to things of the world" is quite possible.

Summary: Remove in Alma 32:4 the definite article *the* before "things of the world"; in the original text, both instances of "as to things of the world" in Alma 32:3–4 read without any *the* before *things*.

■ **Alma 32:4**

now as Alma was teaching and speaking unto the people upon the hill Onidah
there came a great multitude unto him
[*which* 0A | *which* >js who 1 | *who* BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *were those*
of [*which* 0A | *which* >js *whom* 1 | *whom* BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
[*we* 0ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST | NULL > *we* 1] *have been*
    [*speaking* 0ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST | *spoken* > *speaking* 1]
[0PS | NULL >jg , 1 | , ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOQRT]
[NULL >+ *of* 0 | NULL > *of* 1 | *of* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRT | S]
[01ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOQRT | , PS]
[*which* 0A | *which* >js *who* 1 | *whom* BCDEFGHIJKLMNOQRT | *who* PS] *were poor in heart*

Originally, the original manuscript read "of which we have been speaking / which were poor in heart". In both manuscripts, after the word *speaking,* Oliver Cowdery inserted *of* supralinearly, but with a difference. In 𝓟, Oliver initially wrote "of which have been spoken". Virtually immediately he supralinearly inserted a subject *we* and the present participle *speaking,* having crossed out the past participle *spoken.* In this manner, Oliver restored the original reading in 𝓞 ("which we have been speaking") except that when he supralinearly wrote the correct *speaking* in 𝓟, he also added the preposition *of* after *speaking.* In other words, the entire supralinear insertion *speaking of* was written without any change in the level of ink flow. In 𝓞, on the other hand, the *of* was supralinearly inserted at some later time, given that the ink flow for that *of* is very uneven and heavier. This difference suggests that Oliver, after adding the *of* in 𝓟, consciously decided to also insert the *of* in 𝓞.

The printed editions have struggled with how to deal with this extra *of.* There is already an *of* at the beginning of the relative clause "**of** which/whom we have been speaking (of)", so there is really no need for one at the end of that clause. Elsewhere in the text, relative clauses involving the verb *speak* can have *of* either at the beginning or end of the relative clause, but there are no instances of such relative clauses having *of* at both the beginning and end of the clause. The text favors *of* at the beginning of the clause (for some statistics, see the discussion under 1 Nephi 10:16). Thus the original reading here in Alma 32:4, with *of* only at the beginning of the relative clause, is the expected reading. More generally, however, the Book of Mormon text allows relative clauses to have the same preposition at both the beginning and the end of the clause. For examples involving the preposition *in,* see under Alma 23:1.

There is also some evidence that Oliver Cowdery struggled with the need for *of* in this kind of relative clause. Another example where Oliver may have supralinearly inserted an *of* in 𝓞 at the same time he inserted the *of* in 𝓟 is found later in the book of Alma:

    Alma 40:24
        and now my son this is the restoration
        [NULL >+ *of* 0 | NULL > *of* 1 | *of* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
        which has been spoken by the mouths of the prophets

In that instance, the evidence argues that the *of* was necessary. For discussion, see under Alma 40:19.

The 1830 typesetter tried to deal with the problem of the two *of*'s in Alma 32:4 by considering the second *of* as part of the following relative clause; that is, he placed a comma after *speaking,* thus producing the unexpected and rather strange relative clause "of which were poor in heart".

For the 1837 edition, Joseph Smith changed the *which* to *who,* not *whom* (which suggests that he understood that the *of* belonged at the end of the preceding relative clause). But he did not alter the punctuation, and the 1837 edition ended up replacing Joseph Smith's *who* with a *whom* and leaving the position of the comma unchanged (thus continuing with basically the same difficult relative clause, "of whom were poor in heart"). This interpretation continues in the LDS text. As David Calabro points out (personal communication), the reading with the *of* ("of which/whom were poor in heart") implies that only some of the multitude were poor in heart. The original reading, without the *of,* implies that this "great multitude" of people that came to Alma were all poor in heart.

The 1908 RLDS edition, by moving the comma from after *speaking* to after the *of* and by restoring Joseph Smith's *who,* correctly reinterprets the *of* as belonging to the preceding relative clause ("of whom we have been speaking of, who were poor in heart"). Finally, the 1953 RLDS edition removed the repeated *of,* thus producing "of whom we have been speaking, who were poor in heart". In accord with the original text of the Book of Mormon, Oliver Cowdery's inserted *of* will be removed from the critical text.

Summary: Remove the intrusive *of* after the word *speaking* in Alma 32:4; of course, the original uses of *which* rather than the edited *who* and *whom* will be restored (as is generally the case in the critical text).

■ **Alma 32:5**

and they came unto Alma
and the one which was the [*most* 01ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQ| RST] *foremost among them*
saith unto him . . .

The original manuscript is extant here and reads as "the most foremost". The 1920 LDS edition and the 1953 RLDS removed what appears to be a redundant *most.* Grammatically, *foremost* refers to the categorical property of being first; thus one could object to its use as a scaler adjective in the phrase *most foremost* (as if there are varying degrees of being foremost). Yet in a similar way, speakers of English frequently treat the adjective *unique* as a scaler, as in sentences like "he was one of the most unique persons I have ever met" or "she is more unique than him". Here in Alma 32:5, the original text implies that there were a number of leading ("foremost") individuals and in this instance the "most foremost" of them was speaking to Alma.

Interestingly, the Oxford English Dictionary cites an example of *most* modifying *foremost* (although in an adverbial expression):

> *Ballad of Jephthah* (about 1700)
> When he saw his daughter dear
> Coming on **most foremostly,**
> He wrung his hands.

The OED also points out (under definition 4) that *foremost* is often strengthened by using the redundant phrase "first and foremost". Such usage implies a semantic vagueness in the use of *foremost.* Another example of *most foremost* is found on *Literature Online* <lion.chadwyck.com>, with accidentals here retained:

Theodore Martin (1894)
> Can this be so? Within this blooming vale,
> Where all is marvellous, there lives concealed,
> And its **most foremost** wonder, a fair girl,
> Whose praise not all Provence's troubadours
> Could chant in measures equal to her worth.

The critical text will therefore restore the original instance of *most foremost* in Alma 32:5, despite its seeming redundancy.

For another Book of Mormon example involving morphological repetition, see the discussion regarding the original phrase *wild wilderness* in Jacob 7:26.

Summary: Despite its redundancy, restore the original reading *most foremost* in Alma 32:5.

■ **Alma 32:5**

and they have cast us out
because of [*this* 01A | BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *our exceeding poverty*

Here the 1837 edition omitted the demonstrative *this,* probably accidentally. Elsewhere in the text there are five other examples of "this our X":

Mosiah 7:23	this our afflictions
Alma 44:3	this our faith
Alma 56:19	this our weakness
Alma 56:23	this our desire
Alma 58:27	this our march

We have already discussed one other case where an original *this* occurring before a possessive pronoun was deleted (namely, from the phrase "this my people" in Mosiah 24:13). Also see the discussion under Mosiah 7:23 for additional examples of "this <possessive pronoun> X".

Summary: Restore the missing *this* in Alma 32:5 since this is how both manuscripts and the 1830 edition read.

■ **Alma 32:5**

and they have cast us out
because of this our exceeding poverty
[0 | NULL >jg , 1 |, ABCDEFGHIJKLNPS |; MOQRT]
[*that* 01A | *and* BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *we have no place to worship our God*

Originally, we have a resultive *that*-clause here; in other words, the original text is equivalent to "they have cast us out **with the result that** we have no place to worship our God". The 1837 edition substituted *and* for *that,* perhaps accidentally. One could argue that the resultive nature of the following clause can still be deduced from the context.

It is possible that Joseph Smith actually dictated some other word(s) before the *that,* such as *insomuch* or simply *so.* Nonetheless, there are examples in the current text where the resultive *that* stands alone:

> Mosiah 5:2
>> and also we know of their surety and truth
>> because of the Spirit of the Lord Omnipotent
>> which hath wrought a mighty change in us or in our hearts
>> **that** we have no more disposition to do evil but to do good continually

> Alma 24:15
>> let us hide them away **that** they may be kept bright

> Alma 24:16
>> yea even we will bury them deep in the earth **that** they may be kept bright

> Alma 44:5
>> and now Zerahemnah I command you
>> in the name of that all-powerful God who hath strengthened our arms
>> **that** we have gained power over you

So the resultive *that* originally in Alma 32:5 is consistent with other usage in the text and should be restored. If so, the earlier comma should be restored in the LDS text, replacing the semicolon dating from the 1905 LDS edition.

Summary: Restore in Alma 32:5 the original resultive conjunction *that* (as well as the comma in the standard text) that follows *poverty.*

■ **Alma 32:5**

and [*now* 0| 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *behold*
what shall we do

The original manuscript had "and now behold"; while copying to the printer's manuscript, Oliver Cowdery dropped the *now.* The critical text will restore the *now.* For other examples where Oliver omitted the narrative *now* in 𝔓, see the discussion under 1 Nephi 19:4 and Alma 5:6.

Summary: In accord with the reading in the original manuscript for Alma 32:5, restore the *now* in "and now behold / what shall we do".

■ **Alma 32:6**

and now when Alma heard this / he turned **him** *about*

In modern-day English we expect the reflexive *himself* in this construction ("he turned **himself** about"). Nonetheless, the nonreflexive pronominal form is characteristic of the Book of Mormon text:

Alma 43:36	the Lamanites . . . turned **them** about
Alma 56:53	the Lamanites had turned **them** about
Helaman 5:36	he turned **him** about

In fact, there are no examples in the text with the reflexive pronominal form in this expression, "to turn one(self) about". The King James Bible has four examples of "to turn one(self) about", of which only the single Old Testament example takes the reflexive pronoun:

Genesis 42:24	and he turned **himself** about from them
Matthew 9:22	but Jesus turned **him** about
Mark 5:30	and Jesus . . . turned **him** about in the press
Luke 7:9	he marveled at him and turned **him** about

It should be noted here that the Bible translators are responsible for the pronominal *him(self)* since the original Hebrew and Greek basically say that "X turned" (or "X turned about"). William Tyndale, the original translator of the Bible into Early Modern English, translated the Genesis passage (in 1530) as simply "and he turned from them", while his two translations of the New Testament (dating from 1526 and 1534) have the expression "turned **him** (round) about" (that is, with the added *him*).

Summary: Maintain in Alma 32:6 and elsewhere the characteristic biblically styled expression "to turn one about", meaning 'to turn oneself about'.

■ **Alma 32:6**

> *for he beheld that their afflictions had truly humbled them*
> *and that they were in* **a** *preparation to hear the word*

The expression "in a preparation" seems quite strange. One wonders if the indefinite article *a* is an accident. There are no other examples of "in a preparation" in the Book of Mormon text. But there is one example of "in preparation", and most interestingly this one example was initially written in 𝒪 as "in a preparation", but then Oliver Cowdery erased the indefinite article *a:*

> Alma 47:7
>> they had gathered themselves together
>> upon the top of the mount which was called Antipas
>> in [*apreperation* >% *preperation* 0 | *preperation* 1 |
>>   *preperation* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] to battle

Here Oliver Cowdery wrote "a preparation" in 𝒪 as a single word (namely, as *apreperation*). One could interpret this correction in Alma 47:7 as evidence that Oliver tended to write "in a preparation", which he caught once (in Alma 47:7) but not in Alma 32:6.

There are a few other places in the manuscripts where Oliver wrote the indefinite article *a* and its following noun as a single word; in most cases, he caught his error and made some correction to indicate that the *a* and the noun were separate words:

Alma 50:30 (in 𝒪, Oliver Cowdery wrote a tail for the *a* in order to separate
the *a* from *cause*)

which would have been [*acause* > *a cause* 0 | *a cause* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
to have been lamented

Helaman 1:12 (in 𝒪, Oliver Cowdery started to write *aman,* but then he aborted
the *m* and wrote *manner* as a separate word)

in [*amanner* > *a manner* 0 | *a manner* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
that they all could not be found

Helaman 7:4 (in 𝒫, Oliver Cowdery initially wrote *a* at the end of the line,
followed by a hyphen, which was then erased)

and seeing the people in [*astate* >% *a state* 1 | *a state* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
of such awful wickedness . . .

Helaman 12:20 (in 𝒫, the 1830 typesetter penciled in a vertical line under the *m* of *man*)

and behold if the Lord shall say
unto [*aman* >jg *a man* 1 | *a man* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] . . .

These corrections suggest an alternative interpretation for Alma 47:7: perhaps Oliver intended to
rewrite *apreperation* as *a preperation,* so he erased the *a* but then neglected to rewrite it (sepa-
rated, of course, from *preperation* with a space). In other words, the original text for Alma 47:7
may actually be a second instance of "in a preparation".

In support of the strange "in a preparation", it is worth noting that there are other instances
in the text where we get unexpected uses of the indefinite article *a:*

Mosiah 18:33 ("to stir up someone to **a** rebellion")

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

Alma 52:26 ("to obtain **a** possession of something")

and thus Moroni had obtained
[*a* 01A | BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] possession of the city Mulek

In these examples, the 1837 edition omitted the unusual *a* (for evidence that these unexpected uses
of *a* represent the original text, see the discussion under each passage). But in Alma 32:6 the *a* in
"in a preparation" has never been removed from the text.

Interestingly, there is strong support for maintaining "in a preparation", at least in Alma 32:6,
since examples of this phraseology can be found in English as far back as Early Modern English.
Although there are no online examples of this expression in the Oxford English Dictionary, there
are 16 different texts with examples of this usage in *Literature Online* <lion.chadwyck.com>, with
two in the latter 1700s and the rest in the 1600s. Here is a sampling, with accidentals regularized:

John Donne (1627)

God speaks in anger and **in a preparation** to destruction

Richard Brathwaite (1639)

as he was **in a preparation** for an army

William Sherlock (1689)

for were we always **in a preparation** to die . . .

Anthony Horneck (1698)
>and lived many years **in a preparation** for death

George Cockings (1781)
>three weeks were **in a preparation** spent
>to carry war upon the continent

Thus the critical text will maintain in Alma 32:6 the unusual use of *a* in the phrase "in a preparation", even though this use of *a* may be an early error in the transmission. As far as Alma 47:7 is concerned, it is probably safer to follow the corrected reading in 𝕆 (namely, "in preparation") rather than supposing that the correction is an error for "in a preparation". This decision means that we end up with variation, one case of "in a preparation" (Alma 32:6) and one of "in preparation" (Alma 47:7).

Summary: Maintain in Alma 32:6 the indefinite article *a* in the prepositional phrase "in a preparation", the consistent reading of all the textual sources; usage from Early Modern English up to the late 1700s supports the occurrence of *a* here, although it is possible that this *a* is an error, as shown by Alma 47:7 where Oliver Cowdery initially wrote "in a preparation" in 𝕆 but then erased the *a*; less likely is the possibility that Alma 47:7 represents a failed attempt to rewrite the single-word spelling *apreperation* as two words, *a preperation*.

■ **Alma 32:10**

do ye suppose that ye cannot worship God save it be
in your [Synagogue > Synagogues 0 | Synagogues 1 | synagogues ᴀʙᴄᴅᴇꜰɢʜɪᴊᴋʟᴍɴᴏᴘQʀsᴛ] only

Here in the original manuscript, Oliver Cowdery initially wrote the singular *synagogue* (the initial *s* was capitalized in 𝕆); then virtually immediately Oliver supplied the plural *s* (there is no change in the level of ink flow for the *s* that was inserted inline). The surrounding text consistently shows that there was more than one synagogue among the Zoramites:

Alma 31:12	they found that the Zoramites had built synagogues
Alma 32:1	entering into their synagogues and into their houses
Alma 32:2	for behold they were cast out of the synagogues
Alma 32:3	therefore they were not permitted to enter into their synagogues
Alma 32:5	for they have cast us out of our synagogues
Alma 32:9	for we are cast out of our synagogues
Alma 32:12	it is well that ye are cast out of your synagogues
Alma 33:2	because ye are cast out of your synagogues

For another example showing Oliver's tendency to omit the plural *s* for *synagogues,* see under Alma 23:2.

Summary: Maintain in Alma 32:10 the plural *synagogues,* the corrected reading in 𝕆.

■ **Alma 32:12**

for it is because that ye are cast out
[*that* > NULL > *that* 1 | *that* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *ye are despised*
[*of* 01ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRT | *for* S] *your brethren*

Here in the printer's manuscript, Oliver Cowdery initially wrote "**that** ye are despised", but the ink flow for his quill was very broad and rather messy. He either cleaned his quill or sharpened it; then he crossed out the defectively written *that* and rewrote it supralinearly. In other words, one should not interpret this correction as an attempt to reverse an initial decision to remove the *that*. The original manuscript is not extant for this part of the sentence, but there is space between extant fragments for the *that*. The critical text will maintain this instance of the subordinate conjunction *that*.

This passage also has an unusual typo in the 1953 RLDS edition, namely, the replacement of the preposition *of* with *for* in the clause "ye are despised **of** your brethren". Clearly, "ye are despised **for** your brethren" makes no sense here. The text otherwise uses the preposition *of* or *by* for this expression:

> Mosiah 14:3   he is despised and rejected **of** men
> Alma 32:5   for they are despised **of** all men
> Alma 33:10   when I . . . have been despised **by** mine enemies

(The first example is a quotation from Isaiah 53:3 and follows the language of the King James Bible.) The critical text will maintain the use of *of* here in Alma 32:12.

Summary: Retain in Alma 32:12 the conjunction *that* and the preposition *of* in the clause "**that** ye are despised **of** your brethren".

■ **Alma 32:15**

the same shall be blessed
yea much more blessed
than they who [*art* / *are* 1 | *art* A | *are* BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *compelled to be humble*

The original manuscript is not extant for "they who are/art". In the printer's manuscript, Oliver Cowdery wrote "they who **art**". The *art* in 𝓟 was carried over into the 1830 edition, but the 1837 edition replaced it with the standard *are*.

As noted under Mosiah 2:24, Oliver Cowdery sometimes accidentally crossed the final *e* of *are* (especially if the *e* was written larger than normal), thus ending up with *art*. There are at least three cases of this error in the manuscripts:

> Mosiah 2:24
>   and ye are still indebted unto him
>   and [*are* / *art* 1 | *are* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
>   and will be

> Alma 27:12
>   and blessed [*are* / *art* 0 | *art* >js *are* 1 | *art* A | *are* BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
>   this people in this generation

Alma 37:11

> now these mysteries [*art* >+ *are* 0 | *are* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] not yet
> fully made known unto me

For each of these cases, we find no independent evidence for the use of *art* in similar construc-
tions, but there is considerable evidence for *are* (for this point, see the discussion under each of
these passages).

One could propose that the *art* here in Alma 32:15 is also the result of accidentally crossing
the final *e* of *are* (as is suggested in the discussion under Mosiah 2:24). But there is a more rea-
sonable possibility—namely, the original text for this passage actually read *art:* "yea much more
blessed than they who **art** compelled to be humble". The evidence for this alternative comes from
the following four instances of original but nonstandard *art:*

Alma 10:7

> for thou shalt feed a prophet of the Lord / yea a holy man
> which [*art* >js *is* 1 | *art* A | *is* BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] a chosen man of God

Alma 36:18

> 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

> I Parhoron which [*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

> 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

In these four cases, there is no real possibility that the original text read *are,* which means that in
these cases we can eliminate the possibility that *art* was simply *are* with the *e* accidentally crossed.
But of greater importance for Alma 32:15 is that for all these four other cases the *art* is preceded
by a relative pronoun (so we have either "which art" or "who art"), just like here in Alma 32:15.
This similarity strongly suggests that in Alma 32:15 we have a fifth case of "which/who art", irre-
spective of the fact that the antecedent for the relative pronoun is the plural pronoun *they* (which
does take *are* in standard English). The critical text will therefore accept *art* as the original read-
ing in Alma 32:15, although the possibility remains that the *art* is simply a case of *are* where the
final *e* was accidentally crossed.

Summary: Restore in Alma 32:15 the *art* that occurs in the printer's manuscript, the earliest extant
source for the verb form (thus "yea much more blessed than they who **art** compelled to be humble");
there is some possibility that the *art* here is the result of scribal error, with Oliver Cowdery acciden-
tally crossing the final *e* of an original *are.*

■ **Alma 32:17**

if thou [*wilt* 01ABDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST | *will* C] *show unto us a sign from heaven . . .*

Here in the phrase "if thou **wilt**", the 1840 edition introduced the subjunctive modal verb form *will* in place of the *wilt* of the earliest textual sources (the two manuscripts and the first two editions). But subsequent editions in the RLDS textual tradition (which derives from the 1840 edition) have the original *wilt*. Actually, the Book of Mormon text allows instances of both "if thou wilt" and "if thou will" (see the discussion under Alma 22:16). Here in Alma 32:17, we follow the earliest reading, "if thou **wilt**".

Summary: Maintain in Alma 32:17 the original occurrence of the indicative *wilt* in "if thou **wilt**".

■ **Alma 32:19**

and now how much more cursed is he that knoweth the will of God and doeth it not
than he that only [*believest > believeth* ₀ | *believeth* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]

Here Oliver Cowdery initially wrote *believest* in ⊙, but then virtually immediately he corrected the inflectional ending *est* by overwriting the *st* with *th*. As explained under 1 Nephi 11:2, Oliver sometimes miswrote the ending *-eth* as *-est*. Here in Alma 32:19, the critical text will follow the corrected reading in ⊙.

Summary: Accept in Alma 32:19 the corrected inflectional ending *-eth* in "than he that only believeth".

■ **Alma 32:20**

now of this thing [*ye* 01ABCDEFGHIKLMNOPQRST | *we* J] *must judge*

Here the typesetter for the 1888 LDS edition misread the pronoun *ye* as *we*. This error was not transmitted into any subsequent LDS edition since the 1888 edition never served as a copytext. Throughout this part of Alma's discourse here in Alma 32:8–25, he never uses the pronoun *we* (or its related forms *us* or *our*) in speaking to his audience (although he does use these first person plural forms twice, in verses 9 and 17, when quoting someone else). Clearly, *ye* rather than *we* must be correct here in verse 20.

Summary: Maintain the use of *ye* in Alma 32:20; such usage occurs throughout this part of Alma's discourse.

■ **Alma 32:21**

faith **is** *not to have a perfect knowledge of things*
therefore if ye have faith / ye hope for things
which [*is* 0A | *is >*js *are* 1 | *are* BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *not seen which are true*

One wonders here if the singular *is* might be an error for *are,* especially since the following relative clause reads "which **are** true". Perhaps the *is* was prompted by the preceding occurrence of *is* in

"faith **is** not to have a perfect knowledge of things". In his editing for the 1837 edition, Joseph Smith emended the second *is* to the expected plural *are*. Nonetheless, the earliest text has numerous instances of singular *is* for the plural noun *things*. See, for instance, the discussion and examples listed under 2 Nephi 2:14 for the biblically styled phrase "all things that in them **is**". Other examples from the original text include the following sampling of instances of "things which is":

Omni 1:25	and in **all things** which **is** good
Mosiah 7:26	and prophesied of **many things** which **is** to come
Mosiah 8:17	and **things** which **is** not known
Alma 7:8	to do **all things** which **is** according to his word
Alma 18:29	he created **all things** which **is** in the earth
Moroni 10:23	ye can do **all things** which **is** expedient unto me

The critical text will therefore restore the original instance of "things which is" in Alma 32:21: "ye hope for **things** which **is** not seen which are true".

Summary: Restore in Alma 32:21 the original singular *is* in "things which is not seen"; such usage was quite frequent in the original text of the Book of Mormon.

■ **Alma 32:23**

little children [*doth* 0A | *doth* >js *do* 1 | *do* BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *have words*
    given unto them many times
which [*doth* 0A | *doth* >js *do* 1 | BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *confound the wise and the learned*

In his editing of 𝓟 for the 1837 edition, Joseph Smith replaced the singular *doth* with the plural *do* twice here in this verse. In both instances the subject is plural; thus he edited the text to "children do have" and "words . . . do confound". But the 1837 edition itself followed only the first of Joseph's grammatical emendations in 𝓟. In the second case, the 1837 edition dropped the *do,* perhaps accidentally. There seems to be little grammatical motivation for dropping the second *do* auxiliary in the 1837 edition while leaving the first one, especially since the *do* auxiliary is sometimes repeatedly used within the same passage (as in the example from Helaman 6:3 cited below).

The original text of the Book of Mormon freely allowed plural subjects to take verb forms with the *-(e)th* inflectional ending (which was historically the third person singular ending). For discussion of this point, see the phrase "Nephi's brethren rebelleth against him" in the 1 Nephi preface. In modern English, the nonemphatic uses of *do have* and *do confound* sound awkward. It is actually easier to accept *doth* in these two cases because the archaic *doth* is biblical sounding, but *do* is not; we are therefore more inclined to accept "children doth have" and "words . . . doth confound" than "children do have" and "words . . . do confound". For another example of the editing of *doth* to *do* in the text, see under 2 Nephi 4:18 (also see the more general discussion under INFLECTIONAL ENDINGS in volume 3).

Elsewhere in the text, there is one instance of *do have,* namely in Alma 9:23: "contrary to the light and knowledge which they **do have**". There are also 16 instances in the text of the past-tense *did have,* including one that shows multiple use of the *do* auxiliary (as originally in Alma 32:23):

Helaman 6:3
>   and they **did fellowship** one with another
>   and **did rejoice** one with another
>   and **did have** great joy

There are also seven other instances of the *do* auxiliary used directly with the verb *confound*, as in Alma 37:7: "and by very small means the Lord **doth confound** the wise". The critical text will, of course, restore both instances of *doth* in Alma 32:23. For further discussion of this usage, see under 1 Nephi 2:14 (or, more generally, under DO AUXILIARY in volume 3).

Summary: Restore in Alma 32:23 the two original instances of *doth:* "little children **doth** have words given unto them many times which **doth** confound the wise and the learned"; the Book of Mormon text allows verb forms with the inflectional ending *-(e)th* to occur with plural subjects.

■ **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*

As discussed under Alma 12:9, there is a need here in the standard text for a comma before *only* in order to get the right meaning of 'except'. In this passage, none of the printed editions have ever had a comma before *only.*

■ **Alma 32:25**

for I verily believe [01A | *that*   BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *there are some among you which would humble themselves . . .*

Here the earliest text lacked the subordinate conjunction *that* after the verb *believe*. The 1837 edition supplied the *that;* Joseph Smith did not mark this emendation in 𝔓, so the addition of the *that* may have been unintentional. As discussed under Alma 19:9, nearly all instances of the verb *believe* have the *that* for finite clausal complements. But Alma 32:25 is an exception.

■ **Alma 32:25**

for I verily believe there are some among you which would humble **themselves**
let **them** *be in whatsoever circumstances* [*he* 1 | *they* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *might*

Here the printer's manuscript has the singular pronoun *he,* not *they.* The 1830 typesetter changed the *he* to the plural *they.* The original manuscript is not extant for the *he,* but *he* fits better than *they* given the space between surviving fragments. On the other hand, the preceding plural pronouns *themselves* and *them* are extant in the original manuscript. But it is possible that the *them* is actually a mistake for *him,* especially since both are pronounced identically (as *'em* /əm/) in casual speech. Errors mixing up *him* and *them* have been found elsewhere in the original manuscript (see, for instance, the discussion under 1 Nephi 10:18–19). In other words, Joseph Smith

may have actually dictated "there are some among you which would humble themselves / let **him** be in whatsoever circumstances **he** might". The tendency to misinterpret the *him* as *them* would have been prompted by the preceding *themselves*. On the other hand, the chances of an original *they* being replaced by *he,* especially given a preceding *them,* seems quite implausible. If there is an error here in Alma 32:25, most likely the *them* is an error for *him.*

There is considerable switching between singular and plural pronouns in the text, especially in generic statements (see the many examples listed under 1 Nephi 17:48). In virtually all cases, the switch in number is found in different clauses, as in the following example:

> Mosiah 5:10 (earliest text)
>> whosoever shall not take upon **them** the name of Christ
>> must be called by some other name
>> therefore **he** findeth **himself** on the left hand of God

This kind of usage would support emending the *them* in Alma 32:25 to *him:*

> Alma 32:25 (suggested emendation)
>> there are some among you which would humble **themselves**
>> let **him** be in whatsoever circumstances **he** might

There is one case, however, where in the original text the switch in number is within the same clause:

> Alma 12:34
>> 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

But in this example, the third person singular *mine Only Begotten Son* intervenes between the *he* and the *their.* The use of the original *their* prevents the reader from misinterpreting the other possibility, *his,* as referring to the nearest third person singular—namely, *mine Only Begotten Son*—rather than the earlier generic *he.*

Ultimately, the switch in number in the earliest text for Alma 32:25 is just too jarring to accept. Given that, the most plausible emendation is to replace *them* with *him* rather than *he* with *they.*

Summary: Emend Alma 32:25 to read "let **him** be in whatsoever circumstances **he** might"; the earliest extant text, "let **them** be in whatsoever circumstances **he** might", is probably the result of Oliver Cowdery, the scribe in ◯, mishearing Joseph Smith's dictated *him* as *them;* the misinterpretation could have occurred as a result of *him* being pronounced as /əm/ and the immediately preceding text reading in the plural ("there are some among you which would humble **themselves**").

■ **Alma 32:26**

now as I said concerning faith
—that it was not a perfect knowledge—
even so it is with my words
ye cannot know of [*their* 01ABCDEGHIJKLMNOPQRST | *this* F] *surety at first*

> In the 1852 LDS edition, the typesetter appears to have accidentally replaced *their* with *this,* a visual misreading. This error was reversed in the subsequent LDS edition (in 1879). Given the context, *their* works perfectly well since it refers to the preceding plural noun *words.*

Summary: Maintain in Alma 32:26 the possessive pronoun *their* as the determiner for *surety.*

■ **Alma 32:28**

now if ye give place that a seed may be planted in your **heart** . . .

> One wonders here if the singular *heart* might be an error for the plural *hearts,* especially since the word is not extant in 𝒪. There is considerable evidence in the text for mix-ups between *heart* and *hearts.* One particular example later on in this section of Alma refers once more to the same subject matter as here in Alma 32 (namely, the word of God as a seed):

> > Alma 34:4
> > yea even that ye would have so much faith as even to plant the word
> > in your [*heart* >+ *hearts* 01 | *hearts* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
> > that ye may try the experiment of its goodness

> For Alma 34:4, the corrected text in both 𝒪 and 𝒫 reads in the plural. On the basis of this plural reading, I earlier conjectured that Alma 32:28 originally read in the plural in 𝒪. Thus the printed transcription for 𝒪 (see volume 1 of the critical text) gives Alma 32:28 as reading "that a seed may be planted in your **hearts**". Correspondingly, the assumption is that in copying from 𝒪 into 𝒫 for Alma 32:28, Oliver Cowdery is responsible for replacing the plural *hearts* with *heart.*
>
> Two problems with this analysis have arisen. First, there are numerous places where the earliest text has the singular *heart* rather than the expected plural *hearts:*

> > 2 Nephi 16:10 (no textual variation for *heart*)
> > lest they see with their eyes and hear with their ears
> > and understand with their **heart** and convert and be healed

> > 2 Nephi 27:25 (changed by the 1830 typesetter)
> > but have removed their [*heart* 1 | *hearts* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] far from me

> > Alma 21:6 (changed in the 1920 LDS edition)
> > how knowest thou the thought and intent
> > of our [*heart* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQS | *hearts* RT]

> > Helaman 13:22 (changed in the 1852 LDS edition)
> > yea your [*heart is* 1ABCDEHKP | *hearts are* FGIJLMNOQRST] not drawn out
> >   unto the Lord
> > but **they** do swell with great pride

Helaman 13:27 (changed in the 1905 LDS edition)
> yea he will say : walk after the pride of your own **hearts**
> yea walk after the pride of your eyes
> and do whatsoever your [*heart* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLNOPRST | *hearts* MQ] desireth

3 Nephi 12:29 (no textual variation for *heart*)
> behold I give unto you a commandment
> that ye suffer none of these things to enter into your **heart**

Mormon 9:27 (plural *s* erased by scribe 2 of 𝓟, an immediate correction)
> and come unto the Lord
> with all your [*hearts* >% *heart* 1 | *heart* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]

The first two passages are quotations from the King James Bible (namely, Isaiah 6:10 and Isaiah 29:13), and both read in the singular there as well. And for the last two examples, the 1830 edition was set from 𝒪—and in both cases the 1830 edition as well as 𝓟 reads in the singular.

We note from these seven examples that the natural tendency in the text has been to replace the unexpected *heart* with *hearts* (in five out of the seven cases). On the other hand, instances of plural *hearts* have generally been maintained in the text. To be sure, there are a few random cases of mix-ups between *heart* and *hearts,* but none of these errors have persisted. For instance, there are two cases where the obvious reading is the singular *heart,* yet *heart* was mistakenly replaced by the plural:

Alma 12:7 (corrected to singular *heart* by Oliver Cowdery when proofing scribe 2's copywork in 𝓟)
> for he was convinced that they knew the thoughts and intents
> of his [§2 *hearts* >+ §1 *heart* 1 | *heart* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]

Alma 39:11 (error in the 1841 British edition, corrected in the following LDS edition)
> suffer not that the devil lead away
> your [*heart* 1ABCEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST | *hearts* D] again
> after those wicked harlots

There are also a couple places in the manuscripts where the scribe initially wrote the singular *heart* instead of the plural *hearts.* In these two cases, the expected reading is in the plural; each error was simply a scribal slip and was caught before being transmitted:

2 Nephi 30:18 (virtually immediately corrected in 𝓟 by Oliver Cowdery)
> and Satan shall have power
> over the [*heart* > *hearts* 1 | *hearts* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
> of the children of men no more for a long time

Mormon 1:17 (correction by scribe 2 of 𝓟 with heavier ink flow)
> but I were forbidden that I should preach unto them
> because of the hardness of their **hearts**
> and because of the hardness
> of their [*heart* >+ *hearts* 1 | *hearts* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
> the land was cursed for their sake

In the second example, the 1830 edition was set from 𝒪—and the 1830 edition reads in the plural (as does the corrected reading in 𝓟).

So the first important point in analyzing Alma 32:28 is that there has been a persistent tendency in the history of the text to emend unexpected occurrences of the singular *heart* to the plural *hearts*. The second point is that in Alma 34:4 the corrected reading in both 𝒪 and 𝒫 appears to be secondary. In each case, the ink flow in the manuscript is heavier (somewhat heavier in 𝒫 and even more heavy in 𝒪). Moreover, the plural *s* is inserted inline quite awkwardly in both manuscripts. These secondary corrections argue that as Oliver was copying from 𝒪 into 𝒫, he consciously decided that the singular *heart* was wrong in Alma 34:4, and thus he added an *s* to *heart* in both manuscripts. Consequently, the critical text will read in the singular *heart* for both these passages:

> Alma 32:28 (earliest extant reading)
> now if ye give place that a seed may be planted in your **heart** . . .

> Alma 34:4 (original reading in both manuscripts, each emended later to *hearts*)
> yea even that ye would have so much faith
> as even to plant the word in your **heart**

In other words, in these two passages the critical text will adopt the more difficult reading, the singular *heart.*

One could argue that elsewhere the allegory of the seed uses plural noun forms in referring to the growth of the seed:

> Alma 32:28   it will begin to swell within your **breasts**
> Alma 32:34   the word hath swelled your **souls**

Even so, there is one other instance where a singular noun form is used in this allegory:

> Alma 32:34   and your **mind** doth begin to expand

This variability implies that in each case we should follow the earliest textual sources in determining whether *heart* and these other nouns occur in the singular or plural.

Summary: Accept in Alma 32:28 the singular *heart,* the reading of 𝒫 (the earliest extant reading): "that a seed may be planted in your **heart**"; similarly, Alma 34:4 should read in the singular: "as even to plant the word in your **heart**".

■ **Alma 32:28**

it must [*kneeds >+ needs* 0 | *needs* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *be*
that [NULL >+ *this* 0 | *this* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *is a good seed*
or that the word is good

The subject *this* seems to have been missed when Oliver Cowdery initially wrote down the text here in the original manuscript. Somewhat later, perhaps when reading the passage back to Joseph Smith, Oliver noticed the missing subject and inserted it supralinearly and with heavier ink flow. Probably at the same time, he also crossed out the initial *k* in his original spelling, *kneeds,* of the word *needs.* This nearby change is definitely due to editing, and one wonders if the inserted *this* might also be due to editing.

One possibility is that the immediately preceding word *that* is actually not a subordinate conjunction but a pronominal subject. Under this interpretation, the subordinate conjunction

that would be lacking. But this goes against the rest of the usage in the text. Immediately follow-ing the verbal phrase "must needs be", the Book of Mormon text otherwise has the subordinate conjunction *that* (14 times); in other words, there are no examples of this phraseology where the *that* is lacking. In all probability, the *that* in the original manuscript stands for the subordinate conjunction *that,* not a subject *that.* Also note the use in Alma 32:28 of *that* in the following con-joined *that*-clause: "or **that** the word is good".

It is possible here in Alma 32:28 that a different pronominal subject could have been inserted, such as *it:* "it must needs be that **it** is a good seed". In nearby sentences, either *it* or *this* can be used as a subject pronoun to refer to "a good seed":

Alma 32:28	behold if **it** be a true seed or a good seed
Alma 32:30	I know that **this** is a good seed
Alma 32:31	are ye sure that **this** is a good seed

Since either *it* or *this* will work here in Alma 32:28, the safest solution is to follow the corrected reading in 𝒪 for this second occurrence of "a good seed", namely, "it must needs be that **this** is a good seed".

Summary: Accept in Alma 32:28 Oliver Cowdery's inserted *this* in 𝒪 as the probable reading of the original text and a correction in accord with what Joseph Smith originally dictated.

■ **Alma 32:28**

yea it beginneth to enlighten my understanding
yea [& 01| *and* ABCDEGHKPS| FIJLMNOQRT] *it beginneth to be delicious to me*

The 1852 LDS edition accidentally omitted the conjunction *and* here in Alma 32:28. Elsewhere in the text, there are 15 occurrences of "yea and it" and 19 of "yea it". So either reading is possible. In this context, the use of the *and* is appropriate since earlier in the verse it reads "yea it begin-neth to enlighten my understanding", so the following "yea **and** it" adds to the list of the seed's effects. In fact, the near identity of the preceding "yea it beginneth" may have been the reason the 1852 typesetter accidentally omitted the following *and* in this passage. For some other instances where the text has lost the *and* from *yea and,* see under 2 Nephi 25:5. For another example in which *and* was lost from "yea and it", see under Jacob 2:6.

Summary: Restore the *and* here in Alma 32:28 ("yea **and** it beginneth to be delicious to me"); its loss from the LDS text (in 1852) seems to have been accidental.

■ **Alma 32:30**

but behold as the seed swelleth and sprouteth and beginneth to grow
[*so* > & 0| & >js NULL 1| *and* A| BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
then ye must needs say that the seed is good

Initially, Oliver Cowdery wrote *so* as the connector between the *as*-clause and its following main clause (thus "so then ye must needs say"). Actually, there are no instances of *so then* as a connector

in the entire Book of Mormon text. Here Oliver replaced the *so* with *and* (written as an ampersand), thus ending up with one more example of the Hebrew-like (and non-English) use of *and* after a sentence-initial subordinate clause. In his editing for the 1837 edition, Joseph Smith removed this *and*. For other examples of original *and* following an *as*-clause, see under 1 Nephi 8:13 and 1 Nephi 16:10. For a complete list of this Hebrew-like construction, now generally removed from the text, see under HEBRAISMS in volume 3. Also see under verses 38 and 41 in this chapter for other examples of this non-English use of *and* but with different subordinate conjunctions (*when* and *if*).

Summary: Restore the Hebraistic use of *and* after the *as*-clause in Alma 32:30.

■ **Alma 32:30 – 31**

but behold as the seed swelleth and sprouteth and beginneth to grow
and then ye must needs say that the seed is good
for behold it swelleth and **sprouteth and beginneth to grow**

    □ **and now behold**   01PST
    will not this strengthen your faith
    yea it will strengthen your faith
    for ye will say : I know that this is a good seed
    for behold it **sprouteth and beginneth to grow**

    □ NULL   ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOQR

and now behold
are ye sure that this is a good seed

This portion of the text was accidentally omitted by the 1830 typesetter. It was restored in 1908 in the RLDS text and in 1981 in the LDS text. The entire text is extant in 𝒪 (and in 𝒫). This omission was a visual skip based on the repetition of the words "sprouteth and beginneth to grow / and now behold".

    Ross Geddes (personal communication, 7 February 2006) suggests that the last clause in the omitted portion may have actually read "for behold it **swelleth and** sprouteth and beginneth to grow". Elsewhere the text includes the verb *swell* with *sprouteth* (and in three out of four cases, the language is specifically "swelleth and sprouteth and beginneth to grow"):

Alma 32:30 (two times)
  (1) but behold as the seed **swelleth and sprouteth and beginneth to grow**
      and then ye must needs say that the seed is good
  (2) for behold it **swelleth and sprouteth and beginneth to grow** . . .
      for ye will say : I know that this is a good seed
  → for behold it **sprouteth and beginneth** to grow

Alma 32:33
      and now behold because ye have tried the experiment and planted the seed
  (3) and it **swelleth and sprouteth and beginneth to grow**
      ye must needs know that the seed is good

Alma 32:34

(4) for ye know that the word hath **swelled** your souls
and ye also know that it hath **sprouted** up
that your understanding doth begin to be enlightened
and your mind doth begin to expand

> [In this last case, there is no explicit statement that the word has begun to grow;
> however, the final clause ("and your mind doth begin to expand") seems to be
> referring to the same idea.]

Thus it is possible that at the end of Alma 32:30 the original text read "for behold it **swelleth and**
sprouteth and beginneth to grow". If so, this case would literally repeat the full language of the
second case ("for behold it swelleth and sprouteth and beginneth to grow")—and in verbal agree-
ment with the first case (in verse 30) and the third case (in verse 33).

Since 𝒪 is extant for the entire verse 30 and it reads without *swelleth and* near the end of the
verse, the possible loss of *swelleth and* would have occurred as Joseph Smith read off the text to
Oliver Cowdery, the scribe here in 𝒪. One possibility is that Joseph's eye may have skipped over
the first verb to the second one (especially since *swelleth* and *sprouteth* are visually similar and
have the same visual contour). Another possibility is that Oliver missed the *swelleth and* as he
took down Joseph's dictation. Of course, there is always the possibility that the original text here
just didn't have *swelleth and*. Since the reading in 𝒪 will work for this case, despite its lack of full
parallelism with the two other cases in verse 30 and the one in verse 33, the safest solution is to
simply follow the reading of the original manuscript, while recognizing that *swelleth and* could
have been lost early on here in the transmission of the text.

Summary: Maintain the earliest text in Alma 32:30 (the reading in 𝒪) where *swelleth and* is lacking
from the last instance in this verse of "sprouteth and beginneth to grow".

■ **Alma 32:31**

yea for every seed bringeth **forth** *unto its own likeness*

One wonders here if the direct object for the phrasal verb *bring forth* is missing. We expect
"bringeth forth **fruit**", as in other places in the allegory of the seed:

Alma 32:37	and bring forth **fruit** unto us
Alma 32:37	and bring forth **fruit**
Alma 32:43	waiting for the tree to bring forth **fruit** unto you

Elsewhere in the text there are 98 occurrences of "to bring forth" in the active (there are also four
cases of the passive, all excluded from this discussion). For 97 cases, the direct object for the verb
bring forth is explicitly stated. The single exception is found in a biblical quote where the direct
object relative pronoun is lacking but implied: "and none to guide her among all the sons she
hath brought forth" (2 Nephi 8:18). Interestingly, this exception is a King James biblical quote
that cites Isaiah 51:18, which actually has the direct object relative pronoun (namely, *whom*) but
in italics (which means that the relative pronoun is not in the Hebrew). In any event, there is no
other passage like the one here in Alma 32:31 with its unexpressed direct object. 𝒪 is extant for
this passage and reads without the direct object, so if *fruit* was lost from the text, it would have

occurred as Joseph Smith dictated the text to Oliver Cowdery. One possibility is that the visual similarity of *forth* and *fruit* could have led Joseph to accidentally skip over the word *fruit* as he read off the text to Oliver.

Of course, there is really nothing wrong with Alma 32:31 since it is understood that every seed brings forth in its likeness. And in the King James Bible, there are 20 instances where the verb *bring forth* lacks an explicit direct object; and two of these deal with the fruit of plants:

> Haggai 2:19
> > is the seed yet in the barn
> > yea as yet the vine and the fig tree and the pomegranate and the olive tree
> > > **hath not brought forth**

> Luke 12:16
> > and he spake a parable unto them saying
> > the ground of a certain rich man **brought forth plentifully**

The reading "for every seed bringeth **forth** unto its own likeness" in Alma 32:31 is perfectly acceptable, although unique for the Book of Mormon.

Summary: Accept in Alma 32:31 the reading in ℴ, which lacks a direct object for the verb *bring forth:* "for every seed bringeth **forth** unto its own likeness"; unique for the Book of Mormon text, this usage can be found in the King James Bible (and more generally in English).

■ **Alma 32:36**

for ye have only exercised your faith to plant the seed
that ye might try the experiment to know
if the seed [*were > was* 01 | *was* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *good*

Here in both manuscripts, Oliver Cowdery initially wrote *were;* then he crossed out the *were* and inserted *was* supralinearly with the same level of ink flow (the crossout itself in both cases has heavier ink flow, but this is because Oliver crossed out the *were* several times in order to ensure its deletion). It seems that Oliver's inclination here was to write the subjunctive "if the seed were", even in both manuscripts; but in each case he caught his error virtually immediately and restored the *was*.

In *if*-clauses elsewhere in the text, we have examples of both *was* and *were* when the subject (or delayed subject) is singular. There are eight occurrences with the singular *was* in the original text for which the *was* has been maintained in the text:

Alma 42:17	if there was no law
Alma 42:19	if there was no law given
Alma 42:20	if there was no law given against sin
Alma 42:21	and if there was no law given
Alma 47:17	if their chief leader was killed
Helaman 14:3	as if it was day
3 Nephi 8:2	if there was no mistake made by this man
3 Nephi 8:6	as if it was about to divide asunder

On the other hand, there are at least 36 original occurrences with the subjunctive *were*. Some of the *were* examples are otherwise virtually identical with *was* examples:

(A) 3 Nephi 8:6   as if it **was** about to divide asunder

Helaman 5:33   as if it **were** about to divide asunder

(B) Helaman 14:3   as if it **was** day

Helaman 14:4   as if it **were** one day

These parallel examples show that either *was* or *were* is possible in *if*-clauses with singular subjects. And since Oliver Cowdery showed no predilection to emend the eight invariant instances of "if X was" to "if X were", it seems reasonable to assume here in Alma 32:36 that his virtually immediate correction of *were* to *was* in both manuscripts was simply the result of his attempt to get the text down correctly.

Summary: Accept in Alma 32:36 Oliver Cowdery's corrected *was* in the *if*-clause ("if the seed was good"); the correction is found in both manuscripts and appears to be virtually immediate.

■ **Alma 32:37**

let us nourish it with great care that it may get root
[& >% NULL 0 | 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *that it may grow up*
and bring forth fruit unto us

When Oliver Cowdery took down Joseph Smith's dictation here, he initially supplied an *and* (written as an ampersand) between the two resultive *that*-clauses. But Oliver then erased the ampersand, giving two asyndetic *that*-clauses. Such usage is possible in the Book of Mormon, as in the following nearby example where several resultive *that*-clauses are strung together without any *and:*

Alma 34:39
yea and I also exhort you my brethren
that ye be watchful unto prayer continually
that ye may not be led away by the temptations of the devil
that ye may not overpower you
that ye may not become his subjects at the last day

Of course, there are also examples of resultive *that*-clauses where the *and* is found:

Alma 32:12
it is well that ye are cast out of your synagogues
that ye may be humble
and that ye may learn wisdom

In each case, we therefore follow the earliest textual sources. Here in Alma 32:37 the critical text will accept the immediately corrected reading in ⊖, without any *and* between the two resultive *that*-clauses.

Summary: Maintain in Alma 32:37 the corrected reading in ⊖ that removed the *and* between the two resultive *that*-clauses: "that it may get root / that it may grow up".

■ **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

> Here we have an example of the Hebrew-like use of *and* after a *when*-clause. This non-English use of *and* was removed by Joseph Smith in his editing for the 1837 edition. For other examples of this construction with *when*-clauses, see under HEBRAISMS in volume 3. The critical text will restore this usage whenever it is supported by the earliest textual sources.

Summary: Restore the Hebraistic use of *and* after the *when*-clause in Alma 32:38.

■ **Alma 32:40**

and thus
[01ABCDGHKPS | , EFIJLMNOQRT]
[*it is* 01PS | ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOQRT]
if ye will not nourish the word
looking forward with an eye of faith to the fruit thereof
ye can never pluck of the fruit of the tree of life

> In this passage, the 1830 typesetter accidentally deleted *it is,* the reading in both manuscripts. The 1908 RLDS edition restored the *it is,* based on the reading in the printer's manuscript. In addition to restoring *it is* to the LDS text, it would also help if a colon was placed after *it is* in both the LDS and RLDS texts, along with removing the comma after *thus* (the comma was introduced in the 1849 LDS edition):

> > Alma 32:40 (revised punctuation)
> > And thus it is: if ye will not nourish the word,
> > looking forward with an eye of faith to the fruit thereof,
> > ye can never pluck of the fruit of the tree of life.

> Elsewhere in the text there are five occurrences of "and thus it is" (1 Nephi 9:6, 1 Nephi 14:30, 1 Nephi 22:31, Alma 13:9, and Helaman 12:26), although each of these five examples is followed by the word *Amen* rather than by a conditional clause.

> It should be noted that there is actually one occurrence of "and thus if" in the Book of Mormon text:

> > Helaman 10:8
> > **and thus if** ye shall say unto this temple
> > it shall be rent in twain
> > and it shall be done

> In any event, the simple clause "and thus it is" definitely does occur in the Book of Mormon text, including here in Alma 32:40.

Summary: Restore the simple declarative clause "and thus it is" in Alma 32:40 (along with appropriate changes in punctuation for the standard text).

■ **Alma 32:41**

but if ye will nourish the word
yea nourish the tree as it beginneth to grow
by your faith with great diligence and with patience
looking forward to the fruit thereof
[*&* 0 | *&* >js NULL 1 | *and* A | BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
it shall take root

Here is the third instance in this chapter of the Hebrew-like use of *and* after a subordinate clause, in this case an *if*-clause. This non-English use of *and* was removed by Joseph Smith in his editing for the 1837 edition. For other examples of this construction with *if*-clauses, see under HEBRAISMS in volume 3. Also see the discussion under 1 Nephi 17:50. The critical text will restore this usage whenever it is supported by the earliest textual sources.

Summary: Restore the Hebraistic use of *and* after the *if*-clause in Alma 32:41.

■ **Alma 32:42**

behold by and by ye shall pluck the fruit thereof which is most precious
which is sweet above all that is sweet
and which is white above all that is white
yea and pure above all [NULL > *that is pure* 0 | *that is pure* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]

Here in the original manuscript, Oliver Cowdery initially omitted the relative clause "that is pure". Virtually immediately he inserted this clause (there is no change in the level of ink flow for the supralinear insertion). Parallelism with the preceding clauses supports the corrected reading in 𝒪:

> Alma 32:42
>
> | | |
> |---|---|
> | which is sweet | above all that is sweet |
> | and which is white | above all that is white |
> | yea and pure | above all that is pure |

Summary: Accept in Alma 32:42 the corrected reading in 𝒪, "yea and pure above all **that is pure**"; there is no change in the level of ink flow for this correction, and this relative clause is supported by parallelism in the immediately preceding text.

Alma 33

■ **Alma 33:2**

but behold I say unto you
if ye suppose that ye cannot worship [*your* 01| ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *God*
ye do greatly err

Here the two manuscripts read *your God.* The 1830 typesetter omitted the possessive pronoun *your.* This omission appears to have been accidental since the same *your God* is found in a parallel statement earlier in the verse and it has been retained in the text:

> Alma 33:2
> behold ye have said that ye could not worship **your God**
> because ye are cast out of your synagogues

The use of *your God* sounds like the God of the Zoramite poor might not be the same as Alma's God, but this kind of interpretation is not found in the Book of Mormon. The expression *your God* occurs nine other times in the text, just as it does twice here in Alma 33:2, and in each instance there is nothing contrastive or negative about its use. (This also holds for 12 instances of *the Lord your God* and one of *your holy God*.) In each instance the text could just have easily read *our God* (which also occurs in the text). In other words, the speaker never attempts in any of these instances of *your God* to distinguish his God from his listeners' God.

Summary: Restore in Alma 33:2 *your God,* the reading of both manuscripts ("if ye suppose that ye cannot worship **your God**"); the same use of *your God* is found in the previous sentence in this verse ("ye have said that ye could not worship **your God**").

■ **Alma 33:2**

[*for* 01A| BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *if ye suppose that they have taught you this*
ye do not understand them

The 1837 edition dropped the conjunction *for* here in Alma 33:2, probably accidentally. The change was possibly influenced by the preceding *if*-clause, which does not begin with a *for* ("if ye suppose that ye cannot worship your God / ye do greatly err"); both *if*-clauses otherwise have the same initial words ("if ye suppose that"). The *for* beginning the second *if*-clause helps connect this *if*-clause with the preceding discourse. Moreover, the conjunction *for* introduces *if*-clauses quite frequently elsewhere in the text (29 times).

Summary: Restore in Alma 33:2 the conjunction *for* before "if ye suppose that they have taught you this".

■ **Alma 33:8**

yea thou art merciful unto [*thy* 1ABCGHIJKLMNOPQRST | *my* DE | *my* > *thy* F] *children*
[NULL >jg , 1 |, A | BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
when they cry unto thee to be heard of thee and not of men
[0 | NULL >jg ; 1 |; A |, BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
[*&* 1 | *and* ABCDEFGIJLMNOPQRST | HK] *thou wilt hear them*

Here we have two minor typos in the history of the text. In the first instance, the compositor for the 1841 British edition mis-set *thy children* as *my children*. This typo continued in the LDS text until it was removed in the second printing of the 1852 edition, either by reference to the 1840 edition or simply because "thou art merciful unto **my** children" just doesn't make much sense here.

The second typo involves the loss in the 1874 RLDS edition of the conjunction *and* before the final clause "thou wilt hear them". The 1908 RLDS edition restored the *and* to the RLDS text. As suggested by Ross Geddes (personal communication, 27 July 2004), the original occurrence of the *and* here could be interpreted as one more instance in the Book of Mormon text of the Hebrew-like use of *and* following a subordinate clause. In other words, the subordinate clause could be interpreted as belonging to the following main clause rather than the preceding main clause. Such an interpretation would require a revision in the punctuation for this verse:

> Alma 33:8 (with revised standard punctuation)
> yea, thou art merciful unto thy children;
> when they cry unto thee, to be heard of thee and not of men,
> **and** thou wilt hear them.

This kind of Hebraistic construction has generally been removed from the text. So if this interpretation is accepted in the critical text, the omission of the *and* would be an appropriate revision in the standard text: "when they cry unto thee to be heard of thee and not of men / thou wilt hear them".

This interpretation works better than the current one since it directly states that the Lord hears the prayers of those who sincerely pray to him. Earlier, in verse 5, there is another example of this same Hebraistic construction, one that has never been removed from the text:

> Alma 33:5 (with standard punctuation)
> yea, O God, and thou wast merciful unto me
> when I did cry unto thee in my field;
> when I did cry unto thee in my prayer,
> **and** thou didst hear me.

The critical text will therefore recommend that each case of the extra *and* in verses 5 and 8 be treated as connecting the immediately preceding *when*-clause to the following main clause. For further discussion of the Hebraistic *and,* see under HEBRAISMS in volume 3.

Summary: Maintain in Alma 33:8 the original phrase *thy children* as well as the *and* immediately preceding the final clause, "thou wilt hear them"; this *and* is probably one of the Hebraistic *and*'s that are found in the earliest text and are used to connect the following main clause to the immediately preceding subordinate clause (another example of this usage is found in verse 5); in the standard text, the punctuation in Alma 33:8 would need to be adjusted to show that the *when*-clause belongs to the following main clause, not the preceding one.

■ **Alma 33:10**

yea and thou [*hast also* 0ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST | *also hast* >+ *hast also* 1] *heard me when I have been cast out*

Here the original manuscript reads "thou hast also heard me", but when Oliver Cowdery copied the text from 𝓞 into 𝓟, he initially wrote "thou also hast heard me"; with somewhat heavier ink flow he corrected 𝓟 to agree with 𝓞 (his correction may have occurred when he proofed 𝓟 against 𝓞). As discussed under 2 Nephi 11:3, both word orders are found in the Book of Mormon text. The critical text will here maintain the original word order, with *also* between the perfect auxiliary and the main verb.

Summary: In accord with the reading in 𝓞 and the corrected reading in 𝓟, retain in Alma 33:10 the placement of *also* after the perfect auxiliary rather than before it (thus "thou hast also heard me").

■ **Alma 33:11**

and thou didst hear me because of [*mine* 01ABCEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST | *my* D] *afflictions and* **my** *sincerity*

Here the 1841 British edition, probably because of the *my* in the following "**my** sincerity", ended up with "**my** afflictions" rather than the original "**mine** afflictions". Elsewhere in the Book of Mormon, given the word *afflictions,* the possessive pronoun is normally *mine* (eight times) rather than *my* (once, in 1 Nephi 15:5). The dominance of the *mine* form here is statistically consistent with two occurrences in the text of *thine afflictions* but none of *thy afflictions*. (There are, it should be pointed out, no examples in the Book of Mormon of the singular "mine/my affliction" or "thine/thy affliction".)

The 1841 change was undoubtedly accidental. Notice that there is another occurrence of *mine afflictions* in this same passage: "therefore I will cry unto thee in all **mine afflictions**" (Alma 33:11). This other instance was not changed in the 1841 edition, nor were any of the seven other instances of *mine afflictions*. Moreover, this occurrence of *my afflictions* in the 1841 edition was never perpetuated in subsequent LDS editions.

Summary: Maintain in Alma 33:11 both occurrences of *mine afflictions,* the reading in each case of the earliest textual sources.

■ **Alma 33:13**

behold if ye do / ye must believe what Zenos [*says* > *sayeth* 0 | *sayeth* >js *said* 1 | *saith* A | *said* BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *for behold he* [*sayes* > *sayeth* 0 | *sayeth* >js *said* 1 | *saith* A | *said* BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *thou hast turned away thy judgments*

Here we have two instances in 𝓞 where Oliver Cowdery started to write *says* rather than the correct *saith* (but spelled by Oliver as *sayeth* in 𝓞 and 𝓟). In this passage, either inflected form of the verb *say* (that is, *sayeth* or *says*) is theoretically possible. The form ending in *s* is, of course, the

modern form, the one that Oliver would have expected in normal English, while the form ending in *-eth* is the archaic form expected in biblically styled language. Here in ⊙, both initial instances of *says* were immediately changed to *sayeth*. In the first instance, Oliver crossed out the *s* ending, overwrote it with an *e*, and then continued inline with the *th*. In the second instance, Oliver initially wrote *sayes*, a blend of *says* and *sayeth*; he aborted his final *s* before finishing it, overwrote it with a *t*, and then wrote inline the *h*. In both these instances of the verb *say*, the critical text will accept *saith* as the original reading. (For discussion of Oliver's spelling *sayeth*, see under 1 Nephi 2:1 as well as more generally under SAITH in volume 3.)

It turns out that in the original text there were no examples at all of the inflected form *says*. The current text has five instances of *says*, all the result of Joseph Smith's editing for the 1837 edition:

> 1 Nephi 16:38
>
> now he [*saith* 0A | *saith* >js *says* 1 | *says* BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] that . . .

> 2 Nephi 10:21
>
> wherefore as it [*sayeth* >js *says* 1 | *sayeth* A | *says* BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] isles . . .

> Mosiah 26:31
>
> when he [*sayeth* >js *says* 1 | *saith* A | *says* BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] that . . .

> Alma 10:28
>
> and now he [*saith* >js *sais* 1 | *saith* A | *says* BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] that . . .

> Mormon 8:20
>
> behold what the scripture [*saith* >js *sais* >js *says* 1 | *saith* AK |
>   *says* BCDEFGHIJLMNOPQRST] . . .

For further discussion of this kind of grammatical emendation, see under INFLECTIONAL END-INGS in volume 3. In the original text, the form *saith* frequently represented the historical present tense, which Joseph typically emended to the past-tense *said* in his editing for the 1837 edition (as he did both times here in Alma 33:13). For further discussion of this other kind of grammatical emendation (from *saith* to *said* rather than to *says*), see under HISTORICAL PRESENT in volume 3. The critical text will restore both instances of *saith* here in Alma 33:13.

Summary: Restore the two instances of the present-tense *saith* in Alma 33:13; in the original manuscript, Oliver Cowdery started to write these instances of *saith* as *says*, but he immediately caught his error and corrected each *says* to *sayeth* (a typical spelling of his for *saith*).

■ **Alma 33:13**

for behold he saith
[*that > thou* 0 | *thou* 1BCDEFG | *Thou* AHIJKLMNOPQRST] *hast turned away thy judgments because of thy Son*

Here Oliver Cowdery started to write "for behold he saith that . . .", but he aborted writing the *that* (he did not cross the final *t*) and overwrote the *at* with *ou*, thus immediately replacing the subordinate conjunction *that* with the subject pronoun *thou*; then he wrote the rest of the clause inline, giving "for behold he saith : thou hast turned away thy judgments because of thy Son".

Oliver was expecting the verb *say* to introduce an indirect quote, thus his initial *that*. But the following quote is a direct quote. Undoubtedly the original text had the direct quote. For some discussion of the optionality of *that* after the verb *say,* see under 2 Nephi 30:2. Also see the general discussion under THAT in volume 3.

Summary: Accept in Alma 33:13 the corrected reading in ☉, namely, without *that* before the direct quote "thou hast turned away thy judgments because of thy Son".

■ **Alma 33:14**

now behold my brethren I would ask
if ye have read [*these* 01 | *the* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *scriptures*

Both manuscripts read "**these** scriptures". The 1830 typesetter accidentally replaced the *these* with *the.* In the preceding verses (Alma 33:3–11 and Alma 33:13), Alma specifically quotes Zenos rather than the scriptures in general; thus the use of "**these** scriptures" in verse 14 is perfectly appropriate since Alma is asking his audience if they have read what Zenos said about the Son of God. For an extensive list of mix-ups between *these* and *the* in the early history of the text, see the list under Jacob 1:1.

Summary: Restore the demonstrative pronoun *these* in Alma 33:14: "if ye have read **these** scriptures".

■ **Alma 33:14**

now behold my brethren
I would ask if ye have read these scriptures
[NULL > *if ye have* 0 | *how can* >+ *if ye have* 1 | *If ye have* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
how can ye disbelieve on the Son of God

Stan Larson has proposed that here in the manuscripts we have an example of Oliver Cowdery first making a change in ℗, then transferring that change into ☉. See his discussion on pages 11–12 of "Textual Variants in Book of Mormon Manuscripts", *Dialogue: A Journal of Mormon Thought* 10/4 (1977): 8–30. Larson argues that the original text read identically to what Oliver initially wrote in ☉:

> Alma 33:14 (initial reading in ☉)
> now behold my brethren I would ask :
> if ye have read these scriptures / how can ye disbelieve on the Son of God

Oliver corrected the text by supralinearly inserting the short *if*-clause "if ye have", thus giving the final reading:

> Alma 33:14 (corrected reading in ☉)
> now behold my brethren
> I would ask if ye have read these scriptures
> if ye have / how can ye disbelieve on the Son of God

The transcript for this correction in 𝒪 reads as follows:

Alma 33:14–15 (lines 16–17, page 288′ of 𝒪)

```
                                            if ye have
(         m)y Brethren I would ask if ye have read these scriptures ^ how can ye
   BEHOLD

disbeli(e e) on the son of God for it is not written that Zenos alone spake of
          V
```

There is no apparent change in the level of ink flow for this supralinear insertion in 𝒪, although the ink for the insertion appears somewhat unevenly applied. The unevenness of the ink does suggest that the correction was made later when Oliver copied the text from 𝒪 into 𝒫.

The corresponding transcript for this correction in 𝒫 reads as follows (here I ignore the punctuation that John Gilbert, the 1830 typesetter, later added to 𝒫):

Alma 33:14–15 (lines 6–7, page 256 of 𝒫)

```
                                       if    ye have
-ren I would ask if ye have read these scriptures ^ <how ca^>n how can ye disbelieve

on the Son of God for it is not written that Zenos alone spake of these things
```

Here in 𝒫, the supralinear correction was written with somewhat heavier ink flow. Also note that in 𝒫, unlike 𝒪, Oliver first crossed out the two words *how can,* made the supralinear correction, and then continued inline by writing the entire question, "how can ye disbelieve on the Son of God". It appears that Oliver redipped his quill just before making the supralinear correction (thus explaining why the ink level for the correction is somewhat heavier).

An alternative interpretation to Larson's is that here in both manuscripts Oliver Cowdery made the same mistake twice. He didn't expect two *if*-clauses in a row; so after writing the first *if*-clause, he skipped the second one and went directly to writing the question, "how can ye disbelieve on the Son of God". In the original manuscript, he seems to have written the entire question before supralinearly inserting the second *if*-clause ("if ye have"). Perhaps the missing *if*-clause was noticed when Oliver read back the text to Joseph Smith. On the other hand, in the printer's manuscript, Oliver had just started to write the *how*-question (writing only "how can") when he made the correction. In this instance, Oliver seems to have simply made the same mistake a second time.

We can find evidence that sometimes Oliver Cowdery independently made the same error in both manuscripts, with each error being corrected immediately or virtually immediately at the time each manuscript was being written down. For a nearby example, see under Alma 32:36, where Oliver initially wrote "if the seed **were** good" in both 𝒪 and 𝒫; in each case, he virtually immediately corrected the *were* to *was*. As discussed under that passage, evidence elsewhere in the manuscripts supports *was* as the original reading in Alma 32:36.

In support of Larson's hypothesis, there is evidence that Oliver Cowdery sometimes made the correction first in 𝒫, then corrected 𝒪 to agree with 𝒫. Here are two nearby examples of this kind of emendation: (1) in Alma 32:4, Oliver inserted an extra *of* after *speaking* (thus ending up with "of which we have been speaking **of** "); (2) in Alma 34:4, Oliver changed *heart* to *hearts* in the original infinitival clause "as even to plant the word in your **heart**". As described under these two passages, evidence elsewhere in the manuscripts argues against making these two emendations. Further, in both manuscripts, each of these emendations is distinctly secondary (with cramped and uneven writing and a different level of ink flow, especially in 𝒪).

Here in Alma 33:14, either reading (with or without "if ye have") is theoretically possible. One important consideration is that the corrected text in this verse is supported by parallel language earlier in verses 12–13:

> Alma 33:12–13
>> and now Alma saith unto them
>> do ye believe those scriptures which have been written by them of old
>> behold **if ye do** / ye must believe what Zenos saith

Note here, in particular, the ellipted form of this summarizing *if*-clause ("if ye do" rather than "if ye do believe those scriptures"). This usage in verse 13 argues that the corrected reading in verse 14 (the ellipted "if ye have") is characteristic of Alma's discourse style.

Moreover, instances of rhetorical summarizing of a preceding *if*-clause with a repeated but shortened form of that *if*-clause are scattered throughout the Book of Mormon, with examples from various individuals:

> ▫ *Mosiah* (Mosiah 29:13)
>> 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**
>> then it would be expedient that ye should always have kings to rule over you

> ▫ *Alma* (Alma 9:23)
>> and now behold I say unto you that
>> **if** this people who have received so many blessings from the hand of the Lord
>> should transgress contrary to the light and knowledge which they do have
>> → **I say unto you that if this be the case**
>> that if they should fall into transgression
>> that it would be far more tolerable for the Lamanites than for them

> ▫ *Amulek* (Alma 34:28)
>> for after ye have done all these things
>> **if** ye turn away the needy and the naked
>> and visit not the sick and afflicted
>> and impart of your substance—if ye have—to those which stand in need
>> → **I say unto you : if ye do not any of these things**
>> behold your prayer is vain and availeth you nothing

> ▫ *Nephi* (Helaman 11:16)
>> and now O lord wilt thou turn away thine anger
>> and try again **if** they will serve thee
>> → **and if so** O Lord thou canst bless them

Internal evidence thus supports the repetition of the *if*-clause in Alma 33:14. The critical text will therefore accept the corrected reading in the manuscripts for this passage:

Alma 33:14 (original text)
> I would ask **if** ye have read these scriptures
> **if ye have** / how can ye disbelieve on the Son of God

Since the initial reading without the second *if*-clause is a perfectly good reading, there would have been no motivation for Oliver Cowdery or Joseph Smith to have inserted this clause on their own. The critical text will therefore follow the corrected reading in 𝓞 and 𝓟, with its added *if*-clause ("if ye have").

Summary: Maintain in Alma 33:14 the corrected reading in both manuscripts ("**if ye have** / how can ye disbelieve on the Son of God"); there is considerable evidence elsewhere in the text for the summarizing *if*-clause.

■ **Alma 33:15**

for [*it is* 01ABCEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST|*is it* D] *not written*
that Zenos alone spake of these things
[0|NULL >jg , 1|, ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
but Zenoch also spake of these things
[0|NULL >jg ; 1|; ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQS|‒ RT]

The typesetter for the 1841 British edition switched the order of *it is,* thus creating a yes-no question: "for **is it** not written that Zenos alone spake of these things". However, that edition did not insert a question mark after *things* (neither at the end of this clause nor at the end of the following clause, which also ends in *things*). The 1841 change in word order was probably unintentional; it was perhaps prompted by Alma's preceding question: "how can ye disbelieve on the Son of God" (Alma 33:14). In any event, the original declarative word order ("for it is not written") was restored in the subsequent LDS edition (in 1849). As David Calabro points out (personal communication), the yes-no question is not really possible here since there is a logical connection between the two sentences in this passage: that is, not only did Zenos speak about these things but Zenoch also did.

Summary: Maintain in Alma 33:15 the declarative word order, "for **it is** not written" (the reading of the earliest textual sources, including both manuscripts).

■ **Alma 33:16**

because they will not understand [*of* 01ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQS| RT] *thy mercies*

In the Book of Mormon text, the preposition *of* is possible, but rare, after the verb *understand.* Here in Alma 33:16 the original *of* means 'concerning' and could be thought of as adding a partitive sense to the direct object, *thy mercies.* Because of its strangeness in modern English, the committee for the 1920 LDS edition eliminated this instance of *of* in their editing for that edition. The change is intentional because it was marked in the committee copy.

There is one other example of "to understand of X" in the Book of Mormon; this other example has the same basic meaning as the one here in Alma 33:16 (namely, 'to have comprehension of'), yet in this case the *of* was not edited out of the 1920 edition:

Mosiah 1:5
were it not for these things
which have been kept and preserved by the hand of God
that we might read and **understand of** his mysteries
and have his commandments always before our eyes . . .

There is an example of "to understand of X" in the King James Bible but with the meaning 'to find out about':

Nehemiah 13:7
and I came to Jerusalem and **understood of** the evil that Eliashib did for Tobiah

Despite the difference in meaning, the preposition *of* here, as with the Book of Mormon examples, means 'concerning'. The online Oxford English Dictionary lists numerous examples of "to understand of X", with either the meaning 'to have comprehension of something' (see definition 10b under the verb *understand*) or the meaning 'to find out about something' (see definition 11). The OED also indicates that the use of the preposition *of* in these instances is either archaic or obsolete. Here I give one citation for each of these meanings (with original accidentals retained):

'to have comprehension of', Henry More (1676)
Which is wonderfull how else to **understand of** the Humanity of Christ,
unless he had such a soul as other men have, of itself indeed peccable
but by reason of his perpetuall Faythfulnesse, always devoyd of sin.

'to find out about', Lodowick Lloyd (1573)
The Philosopher . . . having **under-stood of** his mothers death . . .

The critical text of the Book of Mormon will therefore accept the archaic use of "to understand of X" in Mosiah 1:5 and Alma 33:16.

Summary: Restore in Alma 33:16 the preposition *of* in the clause "because they will not understand **of** thy mercies"; such archaic usage occurred in Early Modern English and can be found elsewhere in the Book of Mormon text, namely in Mosiah 1:5: "that we might read and understand **of** his mysteries".

■ **Alma 33:20**

now the reason [*that* 01A | BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *they would not look*
is because they did not believe that it would heal them

Both manuscripts and the 1830 edition have the subordinate conjunction *that* after *reason*. The 1837 edition, perhaps unintentionally, omitted the *that*. There are no other examples of *reason* postmodified by a finite clause in the Book of Mormon text. However, there is one example of this construction in a revelation given to Joseph Smith in July 1828, during the same general time period as the translation of the Book of Mormon:

Book of Commandments 2:5 (Doctrine and Covenants 3:14)
and this is the reason **that** thou hast lost thy privileges for a season

Clearly, there is nothing wrong with *reason* being postmodified by a *that*-clause. It is quite common in English.

Summary: Restore the subordinate conjunction *that* after *reason* in Alma 33:20: "now the reason **that** they would not look is because they did not believe that it would heal them".

■ **Alma 33:20**

now the reason that they would not look
[*is* 01ABDEFIJLMNOQRT | *was* CGHKPS] *because they did not believe*
that it would heal them

> The use of the present tense *is* in this passage is perfectly acceptable. Even though Alma is describing past events, the reason for why those events occurred remains true in present time and, more generally, throughout time.
>
> Here in Alma 33:20, the 1840 edition changed the present-tense *is* to the past-tense *was,* which has been maintained throughout the RLDS textual tradition. This change to *was* could have been the result of Joseph Smith's editing for the 1840 edition—or it may simply represent a typo on the part of the 1840 typesetter. Note that the larger narrative is all in the past tense: "a type **was** raised up . . . and many **did** look . . . but few **understood** . . . but there **were** many which **were** so hardened . . . therefore they **perished** . . . because they **did** not believe" (Alma 33:19–20). Since the original present-tense reading works ("the reason . . . **is** because . . ."), the critical text will maintain it.

Summary: Accept the original present-tense *is* in Alma 33:20 since the reason why something has occurred can be considered timeless ("now the reason that they would not look **is** because they did not believe that it would heal them").

■ **Alma 33:21**

O my brethren if ye could be healed by merely casting about your eyes
that ye might [*behold* 0 | *be healed* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
would ye not behold quickly

> Partially extant evidence from the original manuscript shows that the original text here read "that ye might **behold**", not "that ye might **be healed**". We have the following in the transcript of 𝒪:
>
> Alma 33:21 (lines 30–31, page 288′ of 𝒪)
>
> ( )ren if ye could be healed by mearly casting about your eyes that ye might beh
>   -
>
> ( )ld would ye not behold quickly or would ye rather heardon your hearts in un
>   -0
>
> The first three letters of *behold* are extant at the end of line 30 on this page of 𝒪. The *e* and the *h* are definitely connected; that is, there is no space between the *e* and the *h*. The phrase *be healed* was otherwise always spelled by Oliver Cowdery with a space between *be* and *healed* (twice in 𝒪 and five times in 𝒫). On the other hand, Oliver virtually always spelled the very frequent *behold* as one word; only once, in 𝒪 for Alma 57:14, did he spell *behold* as *be hold.* If the end of line 30 in 𝒪 read *be h* rather than *beh,* then we could not be sure about whether the reading was *be healed* or *behold* (although *be healed* would be favored); but since 𝒪 reads *beh,* evidence from

Oliver's spellings strongly supports *behold* as the reading. At the beginning of the next line of ⊙ (line 31), the vowel portion (theoretically either *o* or *ea*) is missing; the word-final *ld* is extant. In terms of spacing considerations, the single vowel *o* fits best, but it is also feasible that Oliver squeezed in two vowels here.

The probability is high that Oliver Cowdery, while copying from the original to the printer's manuscript, misread *behold* as *be healed* since he frequently made errors reading the text at the end of the line in the original manuscript (for a list of examples, see the discussion regarding *this* versus *thus* under Alma 11:21). The chances for error are further increased by the preceding occurrence of *be healed* in the verse ("if ye could **be healed** by merely casting about your eyes"). For a similar example of manuscript error involving the phrase *be healed* (although only momentary), see under Alma 15:8.

From a semantic point of view, *behold* is clearly better here in Alma 33:21. The point of this sentence is to emphasize the word *quickly;* that is, the text means to say, "if you could be healed by just looking, would you not look **quickly**?" On the other hand, the current reading, based on 𝒫, is wholly redundant and unnecessary: "if **ye could be healed** by merely casting about your eyes that **ye might be healed**". The critical text, following the partially extant reading in ⊙ as well as the internal evidence, will restore the original *behold* here in Alma 33:21.

Summary: In accord with what remains of the original manuscript as well as internal evidence, replace *be healed* with *behold* in Alma 33:21: "if ye could be healed by merely casting about your eyes that ye might **behold** / would ye not behold quickly".

■ **Alma 33:23**

I desire that ye [*should* 01A | *shall* BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *plant this word in your hearts*

Here the 1837 edition replaced the subjunctive *should* with the indicative *shall*. This change appears to be a typo since elsewhere in the text, whenever we have a present-tense form of the verb *desire* followed by a *that*-clause as the direct object, we always get *should* rather than *shall*. There are 16 other cases of "X desires that Y **should** do something" but no others of the form "X desires that Y **shall** do something". In Alma's and Amulek's discourses to the Zoramites, there are three other examples with *should:*

Alma 32:22	therefore he desireth in the first place that ye **should** believe
Alma 32:24	now I do not desire that ye **should** suppose that . . .
Alma 34:37	I desire that ye **should** remember these things

The critical text will therefore restore the subjunctive *should* here in Alma 33:23.

Summary: Restore the original *should* in Alma 33:23 since in all other places in the Book of Mormon text the verb *desire,* when used in the present tense, takes *should* over *shall* in any following *that*-clause acting as the direct object of *desire*.

Alma 34

■ **Alma 34:4**

yea even that ye would have so much faith
as even to plant the word in your [*heart >+ hearts* 01 | *hearts* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]

> As discussed under Alma 32:28, the original text here in Alma 34:4 had the singular *heart,* which is what Oliver Cowdery wrote down in 𝒪 and later copied into 𝒫. At that later time, he consciously decided to pluralize *heart:* he inserted inline the plural *s* in 𝒪 and 𝒫, the *s* in both cases with heavier ink flow and very awkwardly. Usage elsewhere shows that the singular is probably the correct reading here.

■ **Alma 34:6**

and ye also [*behold* 0 | *beheld* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *that*
my brother hath proven unto you in many instances that the word is in Christ unto salvation

> Here the original manuscript reads in the present tense, "and ye also behold". When he copied from 𝒪 into 𝒫, Oliver Cowdery replaced *behold* with the past-tense *beheld*. The surrounding text is in the present perfect, such as "my brother **hath** proven" in the following clause and "we **have** beheld" in the preceding sentence:

> > Alma 34:5
> > and we **have beheld** that the great question which is in your minds
> > is whether the word be in the Son of God
> > or whether there shall be no Christ

> This preceding instance of the past participle *beheld* in verse 5 may have prompted the change to the past-tense *beheld* in verse 6. The critical text will restore the original present-tense *behold* here in Alma 34:6. For further discussion of the mix-ups between *behold* and *beheld,* see under Jacob 5:37.

> *Summary:* Restore in Alma 34:6 the simple present-tense reading *behold* found in the original manuscript; the present-tense usage is consistent with the present perfect in the surrounding text.

■ **Alma 34:6**

and ye also behold that
my brother hath [*proven* 01ABCDEFGHIJKLMNPQS | *proved* ORT] *unto you in many instances*
that the word is in Christ unto salvation

The 1907 LDS vest-pocket edition and the 1920 LDS edition (independently, it would appear) replaced the past participle *proven* with its alternative, *proved.* In the current text, there are two other cases of past participle *proven/proved,* one of which has also undergone editing, but in the opposite direction as the change here in Alma 34:6:

> 3 Nephi 3:4
> and I knowing of their unconquerable spirit
> having **proved** them in the field of battle . . .

> Moroni 8:27
> behold the pride of this nation or the people of the Nephites
> hath [*proved* 1A | *proven* BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] their destruction

The King James Bible has only instances of *proved* for the past participial form (ten times), as in the following example:

> 2 Corinthians 8:22
> and we have sent them our brother
> whom we have oftentimes **proved** diligent in many things

According to Merriam Webster's Dictionary of English Usage (under *proved, proven*), both forms are acceptable and about equally frequent in current usage. The critical text will follow the earliest textual sources in each instance. Here in Alma 34:6, *proven* will be restored while *proved* will be maintained in 3 Nephi 3:4 and restored in Moroni 8:27. For a list of alternative past participial forms for verbs in the Book of Mormon, see under PAST PARTICIPLE in volume 3.

Summary: Restore *proven* in Alma 34:6, the reading of the original manuscript; also restore *proved* in Moroni 8:27, the reading of the printer's manuscript (the original manuscript is not extant for the book of Moroni).

■ **Alma 34:7**

and also he hath appealed unto Moses
to prove that these [*things* 01ABCDEFGHIKLMNOPQRST | J] *are true*

The 1888 LDS edition accidentally omitted the noun *things,* leaving only the demonstrative *these.* Of course, *these things* is clearly correct since *these,* used alone, allows the reader to interpret the demonstrative as referring to either people or to words, at least theoretically. The 1888 edition was never used as a copytext, so this typo was never transferred into any subsequent LDS edition (as if its oddity wouldn't have been enough to prevent that).

Summary: Maintain in Alma 34:7 the occurrence of *these things,* the reading in the earliest textual sources.

■ **Alma 34:8**

for the Lord God
[*hath* 0AEFIJLMNOQRT | *hath* >js *has* 1 | *has* BCDGHKPS] *spoken it*

Joseph Smith frequently replaced the biblically styled *hath* with *has* in his editing for the 1837 edition. In this instance, the 1849 LDS edition replaced the secondary *has* with *hath*, probably because of the high expectation of "the Lord God hath" (the biblical phraseology, as in "for the LORD God of Israel **hath** spoken *it*" in Isaiah 21:17 and similarly elsewhere in the King James Bible). This restoration of *hath* in the 1849 edition was probably unintended since nowhere else did that edition change *has* to *hath*. In fact, there are only a few sporadic incidents of *has* being changed to *hath* in the editions:

> 1 Nephi 20:17 (1920 LDS edition)
>> the Lord thy God which teacheth thee to profit
>> which leadeth thee by the way thou shouldst go
>> [*hath* 01ART | *has* BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQS] done it

> Mosiah 12:14 (1840 edition; 1841 edition)
>> therefore this man [*hast* >js *has* 1 | *hast* A | *has* BDEFIJLMNOPQRST |
>>   *hath* CGHK] lied concerning you
>> and he [*hath* 1AD | *has* BCEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] prophesied in vain

> Alma 29:10 (1911 LDS edition)
>> then do I remember
>> what the Lord [*has* 01ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPRST | *hath* Q] done for me

> Helaman 9:20 (1852 LDS edition)
>> who is this man that [*hath* 1AFIJLMNOQRT | *has* BCDEGHKPS] done this murder

In general, the critical text will restore the inflectional form found in the earliest textual sources. For further discussion, see under INFLECTIONAL ENDINGS in volume 3.

Summary: Maintain in Alma 34:8 the *hath* in "for the Lord God hath spoken it" since this is the earliest reading (the reading in 𝒪); although in this instance Joseph Smith replaced *hath* with *has* in his editing for the 1837 edition, *hath* was restored (but unintentionally, it would seem) in the 1849 edition probably because of the high expectation of the biblical language "the Lord God hath <done something>".

■ **Alma 34:9**

for it is expedient that an atonement should be made
for according to the great [*plans* 0 | *plan* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *of the eternal God*
there must be an atonement made or else all mankind must unavoidably perish

The original manuscript definitely has the plural *plans*, but Oliver Cowdery copied it into 𝒫 as the singular *plan*, which is consistent with other usage in the Book of Mormon. God's *plan* with respect to the atonement is referred to 29 other times in the text; nowhere else is it referred to as God's *plans*. Here are the examples that refer to God's plan as a great plan (like here in Alma 34:9, except for grammatical number); two of these examples are from this same chapter of Alma:

2 Nephi 9:13	O how great the plan of our God
2 Nephi 11:5	the great and eternal plan of deliverance from death
Jacob 6:8	a mock of the great plan of redemption
Alma 34:16	the great and eternal plan of redemption
Alma 34:31	the great plan of redemption
Alma 42:5	the great plan of salvation
Alma 42:8	the great plan of happiness
Alma 42:31	the great plan of mercy

There is also one other instance of "great plan":

| 3 Nephi 1:16 | the great plan of destruction which they had laid |

But there are no other examples of "the great plans of X".

When *plan* is postmodified by an *of*-prepositional phrase, we usually get a noun that refers to the atonement:

"plan of redemption"	17 times
"plan of mercy"	3 times
"plan of salvation"	3 times
"plan of happiness"	2 times
"plan of deliverance"	1 time
"plan of restoration"	1 time

In the earliest text, there are only three instances that refer to "the plan(s) of God", counting the one here in Alma 34:

2 Nephi 9:6	the merciful **plan** of the great Creator
2 Nephi 9:13	O how great the **plan** of our God
Alma 34:9	the great **plans** of the eternal God

So when the postmodifying noun phrase refers to God directly, there are two instances with *plan* and one with *plans* (but only in 𝒪). When we compare this result with cases of "the plan(s) of X", where X refers to an adversary, either Satan or a person, we get the same statistics, two with singular *plan* and one with the plural *plans*:

2 Nephi 9:28	O that cunning **plan** of the evil one
Alma 12:5	now this was a **plan** of thine adversary
Helaman 11:26	and they did search out all the secret **plans** of Gaddianton

For these three instances, the opposing grammatical number is impossible because of the determiners: "**that** cunning **plan**", "**this** was a **plan**", and "**all** the secret **plans**". So in theory, God can have "great plans", although here in Alma 34:9 this may be an error for "great plan".

Elsewhere in the text there are no passages where *plan* and *plans* have ever been mixed up in the history of the text. But in general, we know that Oliver frequently mixed up singular and plurals in 𝒪 and 𝒫. For some discussion, see under 1 Nephi 2:5 (regarding *borders* and *shores*). Thus *plans* in 𝒪 could be an error for *plan* here in Alma 34:9.

The plural reading *plans* does seem wrong here in Alma 34:9, given that elsewhere the text consistently uses the singular *plan* to refer to the plan of salvation. Nonetheless, *plans* is not impossible, and it is the clear reading in ℧. The critical text will therefore restore the earliest reading, *plans,* even though the chances are high that it is an error for *plan.* For a similar example, see the discussion under Mosiah 16:1 regarding the clause "he stretched forth his **hands**" (where the earliest textual source reads in the plural rather than the expected singular).

Summary: Restore in Alma 34:9 the plural *plans* in "according to the great plans of the eternal God" (the reading in ℧), despite the possibility that *plans* could be an error for *plan.*

■ **Alma 34:10**

for it is expedient that there should be a great and last sacrifice
yea not a sacrifice of man
neither of [*Beasts* 0 | *beast* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
neither of any manner of fowl

The original manuscript has the plural *beasts* (written with a capital *B*), but Oliver Cowdery changed this plural to the singular when he copied the text into the printer's manuscript. This loss of the plural *s* may be related to the same kind of change that took place in verse 9, where *plans* was replaced by *plan* when Oliver copied the text from ℧ into ℘. The question here, as with verse 9, is whether Oliver accidentally added the plural *s* in the original manuscript or whether the plural was actually intended.

Preceding *beast(s),* we have a singular *man* ("a sacrifice of **man**"); and following *beast(s),* we have a singular *fowl* ("any manner of **fowl**"). So one could argue that all three nouns in the list should be singulars. There are only two other examples in the Book of Mormon involving a conjunction of *beast(s)* and *fowl(s)*—and neither one has any mixture of singular and plural within the same conjunctive structure:

> 2 Nephi 2:15 (all plural)
> > after that he had created our first **parents**
> > and the **beasts** of the field and the **fowls** of the air
> > and in fine **all things** which are created . . .
>
> Ether 6:4 (all singular)
> > and also food for their flocks and herds
> > and whatsoever **beast** or **animal** or **fowl** that they should carry with them

But in the last example the singular conjunctive noun phrase "whatsoever beast or animal or fowl" is conjoined to a preceding plural conjunctive noun phrase, "their flocks and herds". Thus this last example could be viewed as a case of mixture in number across a larger and more complex conjunctive structure.

In the King James Bible, there are numerous passages where *beast(s)* and *fowl(s)* collocate. In most cases, there is agreement in number, either both singular (16 times) or both plural (29 times). Nonetheless, there are four passages in the King James Bible where such a collocation disagrees in number:

Genesis 6:7 (*beast, fowls*)

> I will destroy man whom I have created from the face of the earth
> both man and **beast** and the creeping thing and the **fowls** of the air

Leviticus 11:46 (*beasts, fowl*)

> this *is* the law of the **beasts** and of the **fowl**
> and of every living creature that moveth in the waters
> and of every creature that creepeth upon the earth

I Kings 4:33 (*beasts, fowl*)

> he spake also of **beasts** and of **fowl**
> and of creeping things and of fishes

Psalm 148:10 (*beasts, fowl*)

> **beasts** and all cattle / creeping things and flying **fowl**

So these mixtures from the English of the King James translation support the possibility of allowing the plural *beasts* and the singular *fowl* to be conjoined in Alma 34:10. Interestingly, these four cases of mixture in the King James Bible are all instances of singular *beast* and singular *fowl* in the Hebrew original, which one could take as support for the current reading in Alma 34:10. But since the mixture is possible in English, the critical text will here follow the reading of the earliest textual source, the plural *beasts* and the singular *fowl* (both are extant in 𝄞).

Summary: Restore in Alma 34:10 the plural *beasts* in "neither of **beasts** neither of any manner of **fowl**"), the reading in 𝄞; there is nothing wrong in English with conjoining the plural *beasts* with the singular *fowl* in this passage (such conjunctive phrases are also found in the King James Bible).

■ **Alma 34:10**

but it must be an infinite and [*an* 01A | BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *eternal sacrifice*

There are numerous cases where a repeated indefinite article in a conjunctive noun phrase has been accidentally lost during the transmission of the text. (For a general discussion and listing of all the cases, see under CONJUNCTIVE REPETITION in volume 3.) Here is an example where the form for the indefinite article is *an* rather than *a*. Its loss before *eternal* occurred in the 1837 edition, probably as a typo since its deletion was not marked in 𝒫 by Joseph Smith in his editing for the 1837 edition. Nor did Joseph ever remove instances of the repeated determiner in his editing. All instances of this error in the printed editions are accidental and are sporadic. In each case, we follow the earliest textual sources in deciding whether the determiner is repeated or not. The critical text will therefore restore the original repeated *an* here in Alma 34:10.

Summary: Restore the repeated indefinite article *an* in Alma 34:10 ("an infinite and **an** eternal sacrifice"), which is consistent with numerous examples of repeated determiners found throughout the Book of Mormon.

■ **Alma 34:11**

now there is not any man that can sacrifice his own blood
which will atone for [NULL > *the sins of* 0 | *the sins of* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *another*

Here Oliver Cowdery initially wrote "which will atone for another"; then virtually immediately he supralinearly inserted "the sins of" (there is no change in the level of ink flow). Elsewhere the text consistently uses the verb phraseology "to atone for sins" (seven times), never "to atone for a person". In fact, there are two other passages that specifically refer to blood as atoning for sins:

> Mosiah 3:11   and also his blood atoneth for the sins of those who have fallen
> Mosiah 3:16   even so the blood of Christ atoneth for their sins

Here in Alma 34:11, the critical text will follow the corrected reading in ℗.

Summary: Maintain in Alma 34:11 the corrected reading in ℗, "his own blood which will atone for **the sins of** another".

■ **Alma 34:12**

therefore there [*can* 0A | *is* > *can* >js *can be* 1 | *can be* BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *nothing*
which is short of an infinite atonement which will suffice for the sins of the world

Here the earliest text, the original manuscript itself, reads "there **can** nothing which is short of an infinite atonement". It appears that the main verb *be* is missing here, which Joseph Smith added in his editing for the 1837 edition (thus changing "there **can** nothing" to "there **can be** nothing"). Note that Oliver Cowdery, when he copied from ℗ into 𝒫, initially wrote "there **is** nothing" in 𝒫, which will work; but virtually immediately Oliver crossed out the *is* and supralinearly inserted *can* (there is no change in the level of ink flow). Yet he supplied only the modal *can,* the reading in ℗, not *can be.*

    Every other existential *there*-clause involving the word *nothing* has a main verb, normally the static *be* (the dynamic *come* occurs once); four of these (each marked below with an asterisk), take a modal verb (*should, can,* or *could*):

> 1 Nephi 18:20   and there **was** nothing save it were the power of God which . . .
> 2 Nephi 30:17   there **is** nothing which is secret save it shall be revealed
> 2 Nephi 30:17   and there **is** nothing which is sealed upon earth
>   save it shall be loosed
> Enos 1:23   and there **was** nothing save it was exceeding harshness . . .
> Enos 1:23   I say there **was** nothing short of these things
> Omni 1:25   for there **is** nothing which is good save it comes from the Lord
> * Mosiah 2:14   and that there **should** nothing **come** upon you
>   which was grievious to be borne
> Mosiah 25:22   for there **was** nothing preached in all the churches
>   except it were repentance and faith in God
> Mosiah 27:18   there **was** nothing save the power of God that could shake the earth
> * Alma 36:21   there **can be** nothing so exquisite and so bitter as was my pains

*	Alma 36:21	there **can be** nothing so exquisite and sweet as was my joy
	3 Nephi 6:5	and now there **was** nothing in all the land to hinder the people . . .
*	3 Nephi 19:25	yea even there **could be** nothing upon earth so white

Note that there are two cases of "there can be nothing" and one of "there could be nothing", which argues that if *be* is to be supplied in Alma 34:12, it should come before *nothing,* not after it.

There is also evidence that the *be* verb could be omitted by Oliver Cowdery, as in the following existential *there*-clause:

Moroni 7:42 (Oliver Cowdery's initial error in 𝒫)
  for without faith
  there cannot [NULL >+ *be* 1 | *be* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] any hope

Thus one could argue that Oliver made the same error in the original manuscript for Alma 34:12, writing "**there can nothing** which is short of an infinite atonement" and never correcting it, even when he copied the passage into 𝒫.

It is true that one could argue for *can* without *be* based on the fact that in earlier English, from Old English up into the 1800s, *can* could occur as a main verb with the meaning 'to know' or 'to know how'. The Oxford English Dictionary (under definitions 1 and 2) lists a number of examples, such as Walter Scott's "Thou **canst** well of wood-craft" (1825). But this meaning of 'to know (how)' does not work at all in the existential *there*-clause here in Alma 34:12. Thus the odds are that "there **can** nothing" is an early error for "there **can be** nothing". The critical text will here follow Joseph Smith's emendation for the 1837 edition.

Summary: Accept in Alma 34:12 Joseph Smith's addition of *be* as the probable reading of the original text (thus "there can **be** nothing which is short of an infinite atonement"), even though the earliest textual sources, including 𝒪, are missing the *be.*

■ **Alma 34:13**

therefore it is **expedient that there** *should be a great and last sacrifice*
and then shall there be or it is **expedient there** *should be a stop to the shedding of blood*

The question here is whether the subordinate conjunction *that* is missing after the second *expedient;* in other words, perhaps the original text read "or it is expedient **that** there should be a stop to the shedding of blood". The original manuscript is very clear here; there is no *that* written either inline or supralinearly.

Elsewhere in the text, there are 48 occurrences of *expedient* complemented by a full finite clause, and in each case *that* precedes the clause. In fact, earlier in this verse, we have one of these examples: "therefore it is expedient **that** there should be a great and last sacrifice". But the second instance of *expedient* in this passage is unique in that the clause itself begins with the conjunction *or* ("or it is expedient there shall be a stop to the shedding of blood"). The use of the *or* corrects the previous clause, left unfinished, in which Alma says "and then shall there be"; at this point Alma decides to correct himself by adding "or it is expedient there should be". The previous incomplete clause has no *that,* and it is probably because of parallelism with that clause that the

following corrective *or*-clause also lacks the expected *that* after *expedient*. The critical text will here maintain the reading of the original manuscript in Alma 34:13 since the lack of *that* after the second *expedient* does work.

Summary: Even though Alma 34:13 has the only example in the text where *that* does not connect *expedient* with a following finite clause, the use of the corrective *or* in this verse creates a strong parallelism with the preceding conjoined clause, which has no *that* ("and then shall there be or it is expedient there should be a stop to the shedding of blood").

■ **Alma 34:13**

yea it shall [all be 1ABCDEFGHKPS | be all IJLMNOQRT] fulfilled

As noted under Mosiah 25:20, *all be* is the normal order in the Book of Mormon (with seven occurrences); there is only one instance of *be all* in the earliest text (namely, in Mosiah 25:20). Here in Alma 34:13, the 1879 LDS edition accidentally switched the order to *be all,* and that order has been retained in the LDS text. There are three other instances in the text of "all be fulfilled" (see the list under Mosiah 25:20). The critical text will restore the original order here in Alma 34:13.

Summary: Restore the original order *all be* in Alma 34:13: "it shall **all be** fulfilled".

■ **Alma 34:15**

and thus he shall bring salvation
[unto >? to 0 | to 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] all those
who shall believe on his name

The original manuscript is only partially extant for the preposition *unto/to*. Only part of the last letter, *o,* is extant. Spacing between extant fragments provides room for the *un,* but it is possible that the *un* was crossed out. The printer's manuscript reads *to.* It should also be noted that we cannot be sure that there wasn't some other correction in the lacuna in 𝔒 and that 𝔒 actually read *to* without any correction.

Elsewhere in the text there are three occurrences of "bring salvation (un)to X", and all three have the preposition *unto:*

2 Nephi 2:3	that in the fullness of time he cometh to bring salvation **unto** men
2 Nephi 29:4	in bringing forth salvation **unto** the Gentiles
3 Nephi 18:32	and ye shall be the means of bringing salvation **unto** them

The use of *unto* is also supported by two occurrences of "bring salvation unto X" in the King James Bible:

| Isaiah 59:16 | therefore his arm brought salvation **unto** him |
| Isaiah 63:5 | therefore mine own arm brought salvation **unto** me |

Based on usage in the King James text and elsewhere in the Book of Mormon text, the most probable preposition in the original manuscript would be *unto,* but *to* cannot be ruled out.

Unique readings do occur in the Book of Mormon text (as with any text). In fact, in a revelation through Joseph Smith in February 1829, we have an example of "bring salvation **to** X":

> Book of Commandments 3:1 (Doctrine and Covenants 4:1)
>> the same layeth up in store that he perish not
>> but bringeth salvation **to** his soul

There is clear evidence that the scribes mixed up *unto* and *to*. For instance, there are at least 17 cases in the manuscripts where Oliver Cowdery wrote *unto* as *to,* including the following four cases where 𝕆 is extant and reads *unto* while the change to *to* is found in 𝕇 (if only momentarily):

> 1 Nephi 17:22
>> because we would hearken
>> [0ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST | *to* > NULL 1] **unto** his word

> Alma 24:7
>> that our great God has in goodness sent these our brethren the Nephites
>> [*unto* 0ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST | *to* > *unto* 1] us to preach unto us

> Alma 52:12
>> and had made known
>> [*unto* 0ABCEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST | *to* > *unto* 1 | *uuto* D] the queen
>> concerning the death of his brother

> Alma 53:17
>> yea to protect the land
>> [*unto* 0ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST | *to* > *unto* 1] the laying down of their lives

But it should also be noted that in all these cases Oliver caught his initial error in 𝕇 and corrected the preposition from *to* to *unto.*

More generally, there is textual variability between *unto* and *to* in the text. For instance, consider a phrase which is semantically related to "bring salvation (un)to X", namely, "salvation comes (un)to X". For this phrase, we get examples of both *unto* and *to:*

> Mosiah 3:9   that salvation might come **unto** the children of men
> Mosiah 3:12   for salvation cometh **to** none such except . . .
> Mosiah 3:17   nor no other way nor means whereby salvation can come
>> **unto** the children of men
> Mosiah 4:6   that thereby salvation might come **to** him
>> that should put his trust in the Lord
> Mosiah 15:27   for salvation cometh **to** none such
> Alma 11:40   and salvation cometh **to** none else
> Alma 39:16   or rather that salvation might come **unto** them
> Helaman 15:4   but behold salvation hath come **unto** them

For another instance that shows the textual competition between *unto* and *to,* see the discussion under 1 Nephi 15:33 regarding the phrase "pertaining un(to) righteousness": in the earliest text there are five instances of "pertaining **unto** righteousness" and five of "pertaining **to** righteousness", so either preposition is possible. Even though all three other instances of "bring salvation (un)to X" read *unto,* the preposition *to* is still possible. Ultimately, 𝕆 provides no conclusive evidence

in favor of *unto* in Alma 34:15; the earliest extant reading, 𝔓, reads *to.* Since *to* is possible, the critical text will accept it here in Alma 34:15.

Summary: Maintain the preposition *to* in Alma 34:15, the earliest extant reading (in 𝔓): "and thus he shall bring salvation **to** all those who shall believe on his name"; however, the possibility remains that *to* is an error for *unto,* the more probable preposition for the expression "bring salvation (un)to X".

■ **Alma 34:15**

this being the intent of this last sacrifice
to bring about the bowels of mercy
which overpowereth justice and bringeth about
[*ways & >? * null 0 | 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *means unto men*
that they may have faith unto repentance

In the original manuscript the word *means* occurs at the edge of what survives of the leaf; there is clearly room in the now-missing portion for *ways &.* Earlier in his copywork, in Nephi 17:3, Oliver Cowdery twice copied instances in 𝒪 of the phrase "ways and means" as simply *means* in 𝔓:

> 1 Nephi 17:3
>> he doth nourish them and strengthen them
>> and provide [*ways & means* 0 | *means* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
>> whereby they can accomplish the thing which he hath commanded them
>> wherefore he did provide [*way & means > ways & means* 0 |
>>   *means* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] for us
>> while we did sojourn in the wilderness

The critical text will restore these two original instances of "ways and means", as explained under 1 Nephi 17:3. Also listed in the discussion there are four other instances where the original text uses the phraseology "ways and means" or its negative variant "no other way nor means". So it is clearly possible that Oliver could have made the same change here in Alma 34:15, which would explain the extra length of the lacuna in 𝒪. Of course, the *ways &* might have also been crossed out in 𝒪. Or some other scribal crossout or rewriting could have been responsible for the difference in length.

Most important for this discussion, there are clear instances in the earliest text where *means* is not conjoined with *way(s),* yet "ways and means" (or some variant of it) would be a permissible substitute:

> Jacob 7:24 (not "many ways and means were devised")
>> **many means** were devised to reclaim and restore the Lamanites
>>   to the knowledge of the truth

> Mosiah 4:8 (not "this is the way and means")
>> and this is **the means** whereby salvation cometh

> Alma 42:12 (not "there was no way nor means")
>> and now there was **no means** to reclaim men from this fallen state
>> which man had brought upon himself because of his own disobedience

Alma 60:21 (not "make use of the ways and means")
> or do ye suppose that the Lord will still deliver us
> while we sit upon our thrones and do not make use of **the means**
> which the Lord hath provided for us

These examples definitely show that *means* alone is possible.

For the two instances in 1 Nephi 17:3 where "ways and means" was simplified to *means,* the phrase "ways and means" acts as the direct object of the verb *provide*. Here in Alma 34:15, the phrasal verb *bring about* takes *means* (or "ways and means") as the direct object. Both *provide* and *bring about* are semantically similar, so one could argue that each verb favors the longer "ways and means" as the direct object. But there is an example where the verb *provide* takes only *means* as the direct object:

Mosiah 18:8
> thus God hath provided **a means**
> that man through faith might work mighty miracles

Here the earliest text (based on 𝒫 since 𝒪 is not extant) does not read "God hath provided a way and a means".

Given all these different arguments, it is probably safest to follow the extant earliest reading in Alma 34:15, the reading in 𝒫 ("and bringeth about means unto men"), although the original text may very well have read "and bringeth about ways and means unto men".

Summary: Maintain in Alma 34:15 the earliest textual reading without the additional *ways and,* thus "and bringeth about **means** unto men"; the possibility remains, however, that the original text read "and bringeth about **ways and means** unto men" since there is room between extant fragments of 𝒪 for an extra *ways &*.

■ **Alma 34:15**

and bringeth about means unto [*man > men* 01 | *men* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
that **they** *may have faith unto repentance*

Here in both manuscripts, Oliver Cowdery initially wrote the singular *man* ("and bringeth about means unto **man**"). In both instances, Oliver overwrote the original *a* letter with an *e,* and there is no apparent difference in the level of ink flow for the overwriting. One possibility here is that in both cases Oliver mistakenly wrote *men* as *man* and then virtually immediately corrected his error. Here is one example where it is clear that Oliver sometimes mistakenly wrote *man* instead of *men* and corrected it immediately:

Alma 28:14
> and thus we see the great call of the diligence
> of [*man > men > NULL* 0 | 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] **men**
> to labor in the vineyards of the Lord

Initially in 𝒪, Oliver wrote "the diligence of man"; then he overwrote the *a* with *e* (as here in Alma 34:15). But the resulting word, *men,* seemed unclear, so Oliver crossed it all out and wrote inline the correct plural *men*. Thus in Alma 28:14 we have an immediate correction.

On the other hand, it is also possible in Alma 34:15 that Oliver Cowdery's correction in 𝒪 and 𝒫 of *man* to *men* was in both instances due to conscious editing, although virtually immediate. The word *man* is followed only two words later by the plural pronoun *they* ("and bringeth about means unto **man** that **they** may have faith unto repentance"). The jarring violation in number could have led Oliver to quickly emend *man* to *men*. It's even possible that he made both changes when he was copying from 𝒪 into 𝒫. And we can also find independent evidence in the manuscripts that Oliver would sometimes consciously emend *man* when it was surrounded by instances of the plural *men* or plural pronouns referring to *men:*

> Alma 29:4
>> for I know that he granteth unto **men** according to **their** desires
>> whether it be unto death or unto life
>> yea I know that he allotteth
>> unto [*man* 0D | *man > men* 1 | *men* ABCEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
>> yea decreeth unto **them** decrees which are unalterable
>> according to **their** wills

In this instance, 𝒪 is sufficiently extant to determine that it read *man,* which is what Oliver initially wrote in 𝒫. Yet here he seems to have soon, if not virtually immediately, corrected *man* to *men.* There is, once more, no apparent change in the level of ink flow for the correction, although in this case Oliver did not simply overwrite the *a* with an *e;* instead, he crossed out the entire word *man* and supralinearly inserted the plural *men.* These conflicting sources for the manuscript correction of *man* to *men* (Alma 28:14 versus Alma 29:4) make it difficult to decide in Alma 34:15 whether the original text read *man* or *men.*

Considering other verses that contain the word *means,* we find that either *man* or *men* can occur, including one instance (marked below with an asterisk) where the verse has both:

> Mosiah 8:18
>> thus God hath provided a **means**
>> that **man** through faith might work mighty miracles
>> therefore **he** becometh a great benefit to **his** fellow beings

> Alma 38:9
>> there is no other way nor **means** whereby **man** can be saved
>> only in and through Christ

> * Alma 42:12
>> and now there was no **means** to reclaim **men** from this fallen state
>> which **man** had brought upon **himself** because of **his** own disobedience

> Helaman 5:9
>> yea remember that there is no other way nor **means**
>> whereby [*man* 1ABCDEFIJLMNOPQRST | *men* GHK] can be saved
>> only through the atoning blood of Jesus Christ

Of course, one could argue that the unique use of *men,* in Alma 42:12, could be an error for *man.* But that passage is extant in 𝒪 and shows this variability between *man* and *men.*

We should also note that there are other instances of *man,* inevitably with the meaning 'mankind', that take a plural pronoun. The following instances are interesting in that the plural

pronoun follows closely upon *man*, yet Oliver Cowdery never emended any of these instances of *man* to *men*:

> 2 Nephi 9:6 (*man* changed to *men* in the 1907 LDS edition)
>> and because [*man* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNPQRST | *men* O] became fallen
>> **they** were cut off from the presence of the Lord

> Alma 12:27 (*man* changed to *men* in the 1920 LDS edition)
>> but it was appointed unto [*man* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQS | *men* RT]
>> that **they** must die

> Alma 42:6
>> but behold it was appointed unto **man** to die
>> therefore as **they** were cut off from the tree of life
>> therefore **they** should be cut off from the face of the earth
>> and **man** became lost forever / yea **they** became fallen **man**

> Moroni 7:38
>> and awful is the state of **man**
>> for **they** are as though there had been no redemption made

These examples show that Oliver Cowdery didn't make the emendation of *man* to *men* particularly often, but we know he did it at least once (in 𝒫 for Alma 29:4) and possibly here in both 𝒪 and 𝒫 for Alma 34:15.

So it is very difficult to decide the case of *man* versus *men* in Alma 34:15. One suggestive difference is that for the immediate correction of *man* to *men* in Alma 28:14, Oliver Cowdery initially emended *man* by overwriting the *a* with *e,* while in the case of the one clear case of emendation (in Alma 29:4), Oliver corrected *man* to *men* by crossing out the entire *man* and then supralinearly inserting *men.* Since here in Alma 34:15, the correction is by overwriting the *a* with *e* (and in both 𝒪 and 𝒫), the critical text will accept the plural *men* as a correction to the actual text and not as a deliberate emendation.

Summary: Accept in Alma 34:15 the virtually immediate correction of *man* to *men* in both 𝒪 and 𝒫, although it is almost equally probable that this correction was due to editing on Oliver Cowdery's part.

■ **Alma 34:16**

and thus mercy can satisfy the demands of justice
[O | NULL >jg , 1 |, ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
and [*insercle* O | *insercles* 1 | *encircles* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *them in the arms of safety*

Here the original manuscript does not have the third person singular *-s* ending for *encircle*—that is, the verb form in 𝒪 is the infinitive. Thus the modal verb *can* here in Alma 34:16 conjoins two infinitives, *satisfy* and *encircle,* giving the equivalent reading "mercy can satisfy the demands of justice and [can] encircle them in the arms of safety".

When copying to the printer's manuscript, Oliver Cowdery added the *-s* ending (perhaps accidentally), with the result that *can satisfy* is now conjoined with *encircles*. This usage is not consistent with the rest of the Book of Mormon text. In every instance of *can* followed by conjoined

verbs, the second verb is an infinitive just like the first one. In the following I give every example besides the one here in Alma 34:16 and mark with an asterisk those examples for which the second verb clearly takes the infinitive form. The other examples are ambiguous as far as the form goes, but from a semantic point of view they are all infinitives (that is, the scope of the modal verb *can* includes the conjoined verb):

> * 2 Nephi 31:13 (*and shout* is not equivalent to "and then do ye shout")
>> and then can ye **speak** with the tongue of angels
>> and **shout** praises unto the Holy One of Israel

> * Mosiah 8:13 (*and translate* is not equivalent to "and he translates")
>> for he hath wherewith that he can **look** and **translate** all records
>> that are of ancient date

> Alma 5:17
>> that ye can **lie** unto the Lord at that day and **say**
>> Lord / our works have been righteous works upon the face of the earth

> * Alma 5:53 (*and trample* is not equivalent to "and do ye trample")
>> yea can ye **lay** aside these things and **trample** the Holy One under your feet

> Alma 26:31
>> we can **look** forth and **see** the fruits of our labors

> * Helaman 14:31 (*and be restored* is not equivalent to "and ye are restored")
>> and ye can **do** good and **be restored** unto that which is good

> Helaman 14:31
>> or ye can **do** evil and **have** that which is evil restored unto you

> 3 Nephi 27:32
>> and which thieves can **break** through and **steal**

The critical text will restore the correct infinitive form *encircle,* the reading in 𝓞, in Alma 34:16. Correspondingly, in the standard text the comma that occurs after *justice* should be removed so that the conjunctive connection between the two infinite forms *satisfy* and *encircle* is more apparent.

Summary: Restore in Alma 34:16 the infinitive form *encircle* (the reading in 𝓞) since the text conjoins *encircle* with the infinitive *satisfy,* not with the verb phrase *can satisfy;* also remove the comma after *justice.*

■ **Alma 34:17**

therefore may God grant unto you my brethren
that ye [might 0A | might >js may 1 | may BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] begin to exercise
  your faith unto repentance
that ye begin to call upon his holy name that he would have mercy upon you

Here the original manuscript is extant for only the last letter of the modal verb; that letter is clearly a *t* rather than a *y,* which means that 𝓞 read *might* rather than *may.* 𝓟 also reads *might,* as does the 1830 edition. In his editing for the 1837 edition, Joseph Smith replaced the *might* with

may, probably because he wanted to avoid the subjective or conditional aspect that *might* carries in modern English. For a list of six cases where Joseph made this emendation, see under Jacob 5:13; also see the discussion under 1 Nephi 3:19. There are, it turns out, parallel passages in which the modal *might* has not been edited to *may,* although it could have, as in the following example:

> Helaman 12:24
> > and may God grant in his great fullness
> > that men **might** be brought unto repentance and good works
> > that they **might** be restored unto grace for grace

Summary: Restore in Alma 34:17 the original modal *might* (the reading of all the earliest textual sources).

■ **Alma 34:26**

but this is not all
ye must pour out your souls **in** *your closets and your secret places*
and **in** *your wilderness*

Lyle Fletcher suggests (personal communication, 21 April 2004) that the preposition *in* may be missing for the middle conjunct; that is, the original text may have read "in your closets and **in** your secret places and in your wilderness". However, as discussed under Mosiah 24:1, there are instances in the original text where the preposition *in* is not repeated for every conjunct in a conjunctive phrase, especially if there is some closer connection between the nouns. In fact, as discussed under Alma 22:34, there is a closer connection in the text between *closets* and *secret places,* which would explain why the *in* is lacking before "your secret places" here in Alma 34:26.

Summary: Maintain in Alma 34:26 the earliest text which lacks the repeated *in* before "your secret places".

■ **Alma 34:26**

but this is not all
ye must pour out your souls in your closets and your secret places
and in your **wilderness**

As discussed under Jacob 4:7, there are instances of the noun *weakness* in the original text that may mean 'weaknesses'—that is, the form is singular but the meaning is plural. There is also evidence that *witness* may sometimes be equivalent to *witnesses* in the original text (see the discussion under 2 Nephi 31:18). In Early Modern English, words ending in unstressed /əs/ often lacked the inflectional ending *(e)s,* such as the third person singular present-tense ending for verbs or the plural or possessive ending for nouns. The Oxford English Dictionary gives examples from Early Modern English of *witness* standing for *witnesses,* as in "he witness it" (meaning 'he witnesses it') or "his witness" (meaning 'his witnesses').

Similarly, the word *wilderness,* although normally singular, may stand for the plural. Here in Alma 34:26, for instance, Amulek refers to people praying not only in their closets and secret places

(both in the plural) but also, it would seem, in their personal "wildernesses". Other examples in the text of *wilderness* that may take a plural sense include the following instances where the text refers to places of retreat used by the Gaddianton robbers; in each case, conjoined nouns that also refer to places of retreat are consistently in the plural:

> Helaman 11:25
>> and then they would retreat back into the **mountains**
>> and into the **wilderness** and **secret places**
>> hiding themselves that they could not be discovered

> Helaman 11:28
>> therefore they sent an army of strong men
>> into the **wilderness** and upon the **mountains**
>> to search out this band of robbers

> Helaman 11:31
>> and they were again obliged to return
>> out of the **wilderness** and out of the **mountains** unto their own lands
>> because of the exceeding greatness of the numbers of those robbers
>> which infested the **mountains** and the **wilderness**

> 3 Nephi 3:20
>> pray unto the Lord and let us go up
>> upon the **mountains** and into the **wilderness**
>> that we may fall upon the robbers
>> and destroy them in their own lands

> 3 Nephi 4:1
>> those armies of robbers had prepared for battle
>> and began to come down and to sally forth from the **hills**
>> and out of the **mountains** and the **wilderness**
>> and their **strong holds** and their **secret places**

But as David Calabro points out (personal communication), there is one example in the King James Bible for which the underlying Hebrew as well as the English translation pairs up a grammatically plural *mountains* with a grammatically singular *wilderness*:

> Lamentations 4:19
>> they pursued us upon the **mountains**
>> they laid wait for us in the **wilderness**

This biblical example reminds us that the examples of *wilderness* listed in Helaman 11 and 3 Nephi 3–4 may nonetheless be semantically singular.

Of course, none of these Book of Mormon instances of *wilderness* will be emended to the plural *wildernesses*. We simply recognize the possibility that in some cases the singular form *wilderness* may actually take a plural meaning.

Summary: Maintain the singular form *wilderness* in the text, even if the intended meaning may be in the plural (in Alma 34:26 as well as elsewhere in reference to the places of retreat for the Gaddianton robbers).

■ **Alma 34:28**

and now behold my [01PS | *beloved* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOQRT] *brethren
I say unto you . . .*

Here the original manuscript (as well as the printer's) reads "behold my brethren". The 1830
typesetter added the word *beloved;* undoubtedly, he expected the phrase "my beloved brethren".
The visual similarity between *behold* and *beloved* may have also contributed to this error. In accord
with the reading in 𝒫, the 1908 RLDS edition restored the original text here in Alma 34:28.

Elsewhere in the text there are 150 occurrences of "my brethren" and 59 of "my beloved
brethren", so either one is perfectly acceptable. Here in Alma 32–34, in Alma's and Amulek's dis-
courses, there are three instances of "my beloved brethren" but ten of "my brethren". In each
instance, the critical text will follow the evidence of the earliest textual sources as to whether
beloved is there or not. Thus here in Alma 34:28 the critical text will read simply "my brethren".

Summary: Restore "my brethren", the reading of the original text in Alma 34:28, thus removing the
intrusive *beloved* that the 1830 typesetter supplied.

■ **Alma 34:28**

*if ye turn away the needy and the naked
and visit not the sick and* [01ABDEFIJLMNOPQRST | *the* CGHK] *afflicted
and impart of your substance . . .*

The 1840 edition increased the parallelism in the text by changing "the sick and afflicted" to "the sick
and **the** afflicted". This change may be due to Joseph Smith's editing for that edition, or it may simply
be a typo. This reading with the repeated *the* continued in the RLDS textual tradition until 1908.

Elsewhere in the text all other examples of *sick* conjoined with *afflicted* have the repeated
determiner (or no determiner at all for either conjunct):

> 1 Nephi 11:31 (NULL, NULL)
>> and I beheld multitudes of people
>> which were **sick** and which were **afflicted**
>> of all manner of diseases and with devils and unclean spirits

> Jacob 2:19 (*the, the*)
>> 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**

> Alma 1:27 (*the, the*)
>> and they did impart of their substance
>> every man according to that which he had
>> to the poor and the needy and **the sick** and **the afflicted**

> Alma 4:12 (NULL, NULL)
>> 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**

3 Nephi 17:9 (*their, their*)

    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

Mormon 8:37 (*the, the*)

    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 / **the sick** and **the afflicted**

Mormon 8:39 (*the, the*)

    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 and notice them not

These examples strongly suggest that the 1840 reading may in fact be correct. Nonetheless, the original manuscript is extant here in Alma 34:28, and there is definitely no *the* before *afflicted* in the original manuscript (or the printer's).

More generally, there is some evidence for variation with respect to the repeated *the* in conjuncts. See, for instance, the discussion regarding "the wickedness and (the) abominations" under Mosiah 3:7, where it is argued that for each case of conjoined *wickedness* and *abominations,* the earliest text should be followed in deciding whether a determiner is repeated or not. Given the possibility of variation, the earliest reading for Alma 34:28 should be maintained ("the sick and afflicted"), the reading of the original manuscript.

Summary: Accept in Alma 34:28 the nonrepetition of the determiner *the* ("the sick and afflicted") since this is how it reads in the original manuscript; nonetheless the missing *the* may actually be an error since for all other occurrences of "sick and . . . afflicted" any initial determiner is always repeated.

■ **Alma 34:30**

seeing that the holy scriptures
[*testifies* 0 | *testifies* >js *testify* 1 | *testify* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *of these things . . .*

𝒪 is extant here and reads "the holy scriptures **testifies**" rather than the expected "the holy scriptures **testify**". Oliver Cowdery copied the third person singular *testifies* into 𝒫, but the 1830 typesetter changed it to *testify.* In his editing for the 1837 edition, Joseph Smith corrected 𝒫 to *testify,* thus making 𝒫 agree with the 1830 reading.

One possibility is that in the original text *holy scriptures* is acting as a single semantic unit here in Alma 34:30. There is actually one other example of this usage in the text:

    3 Nephi 28:33

        and if ye had all the scriptures
        which [*gives* >js *give* 1 | *gives* A | *give* BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
        an account of all the marvelous works of Christ . . .

In this instance, the 1830 typesetter retained the original "all the scriptures which **gives** an account", but Joseph Smith made the change to the standard *give* in his editing for the 1837 edition. Otherwise, the plural form *scriptures* is consistently paired with plural verb forms (such as *are, were,* and *have*) or referred to by means of plural pronouns. There are no examples like "the scriptures is" or "the scriptures was". The critical text, however, will restore the two instances where the associated verb for *scriptures* is a third person singular, here in Alma 34:30 and in 3 Nephi 28:33.

Summary: Restore in Alma 34:30 the third person singular present-tense form *testifies* ("the holy scriptures testifies of these things"); this is one of two instances in the text where *scriptures* acts like a singular and takes a singular verb form (the other one is in 3 Nephi 28:33).

■ **Alma 34:30 – 31**

and now my brethren **I would that**
after ye have received so many witnesses
seeing that the holy scriptures testifies of these things
[01ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQS | *ye* RT] **come forth** *and bring fruit unto repentance*
yea **I would that ye would come forth** *and harden not your hearts any longer*

The reading of the original manuscript here in Alma 34:30 seems to be missing at least a subject. If we ignore the intervening *after*-clause, we have "I would that . . . come forth", which is clearly ungrammatical. The committee for the 1920 LDS edition supplied the subject pronoun *ye* here, giving "I would that . . . ye come forth", which seems possible. But the modal verb *would* (or *should*) could have also been supplied, as if the text originally read, "I would that . . . **ye would** come forth" (or "I would that . . . **ye should** come forth"). The original text could have also read something like "I would that <*after*-clause> <present participial clause> **that ye would** come forth". This specific reading is found in the immediately following clause: "yea I would **that ye would** come forth and harden not your hearts any longer" (Alma 34:31). The occurrence of the repeated *that* is fairly common in the original text, especially when there is an intervening subordinate clause, as in the following example involving an *after*-clause:

> 2 Nephi 10:24
> and remember [*that* >js NULL 1 | *that* A | BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
> after ye are reconciled unto God
> **that** it is only in and through the grace of God that ye are saved

In his editing for the 1837 edition, Joseph Smith removed the first *that* from this sentence in order to avoid the repetition. For further discussion of the repeated *that,* see under THAT in volume 3.

Elsewhere in the original text there are 83 examples of "X would (not) that S", where X is a subject and S is a finite clause. In every case, the S has an explicit subject, usually *ye* (61 times). In most instances, the S contains the model verb *should* (71 times), but there are also examples with other modals: *might* (4 times), *would* (3 times), *could* (2 times). There are also three examples without any modal at all, as in the following example: "I would that **ye say** in your hearts that I give not because I have not" (Mosiah 4:24). But none of these 83 examples have any intervening clause between the *that* and the finite clause S. The uniqueness of the reading here in Alma 34:30 makes it all that more difficult to interpret the text or to propose an acceptable emendation,

especially one that would be preferred over all the other possibilities. Nor is there any help from the King James Bible; although there are 17 examples of "X would (not) that S" in the King James Bible, none of these have an intervening clause.

David Calabro suggests (personal communication) that here in Alma 34:30 one could accept the shortest possible emendation, namely, the 1920 LDS addition of the pronoun *ye*, under the assumption that if a word or phrase was accidentally omitted as Joseph Smith dictated the text to Oliver Cowdery, the most reasonable candidate would be a single short word like *ye* (rather than, say, a phrase like *that ye would*). Here one could interpret the transcription of ℧ as consistent with this proposal since the last three lines on this page of ℧ read as follows:

Alma 34:30−31 (lines 33−35, page 290′ of ℧)

```
<soma> so many witnesses seeing that the holy scriptures testifies of these things

(c)ome forth & bring fruit unto repentance yea I would that ye would

(c)ome forth & hardon not your hearts any longer for behold now is the time
```

The outer (left) edge of the leaf in ℧ is somewhat worn off; it is possible that a *ye* was originally written at the beginning of line 34, perhaps inserted in the left margin but missed in the copying, especially since the beginning of the next line (line 35) began with *come forth.* See under Alma 30:35 for another example where a small word (*and* written as an ampersand) was inserted at the beginning of a line in ℧ and then lost when ℧ was copied into ℘. Here in Alma 34:30, there does not appear to be any word at the end of line 33, the previous line, although there might be an erasure of an indecipherable single letter after the last word in the line, *things.*

Don Brugger (personal communication) suggests another approach here. Instead of trying to emend the text by inserting a word or phrase right before *come forth,* perhaps what was lost in Alma 34:30 was a subject *ye* immediately after the occurrence of "I would that", that is, near the beginning of the sentence: "I would that **ye** after ye have received so many witnesses . . ."). This emendation would be equivalent to the 1920 LDS emendation, which also added *ye* but right before *come forth.* Brugger's emendation suggests another one, supplying not only *ye* but also *would* (thus, "I would that **ye would** after ye have received so many witnesses . . ."). Obviously, a plethora of emendations suggest themselves.

One final possibility, suggested by Calabro, is that we leave the text unchanged here in Alma 34:30. Calabro notes that the occurrence of "come forth and bring fruit unto repentance" could be considered an imperative-like construction for which no subject *ye* or *you* would be required. Since we have no other examples like this example in Alma 34:30 with its intervening clauses, we cannot say that the earliest reading, the one without any subject for *come forth,* is textually wrong. The safest solution, without any additional information, is to accept the earliest reading despite its difficulty: "I would that after ye have received so many witnesses / seeing that the holy scriptures testifies of these things / **come forth** and bring fruit unto repentance".

Summary: Restore in Alma 34:30 the earliest reading without any subject *ye* or *you* (or any additional words) for the predicate "come forth and bring fruit unto repentance"; this predicate, although difficult, can be interpreted as an imperative; there are no other examples of this kind of complex construction in the Book of Mormon or in the King James Bible; the possibility remains that *ye* or even some longer phrase such as *that ye would* was lost as Joseph Smith dictated the text to Oliver Cowdery.

■ **Alma 34:34**

for that same **spirit** *which doth possess your* **bodies** *at the time that ye go out of this life*
that same **spirit** *will have power to possess your* **body** *in that eternal world*

The original manuscript is extant here and has the plural "your bodies" in the earlier clause but "your body" in the later clause. Meanwhile, this same passage twice uses the singular "that same spirit". Amulek here is speaking to many people, which might explain the plural use of "your bodies", but one wonders about the lack of consistency, especially since the otherwise identical phraseology "possess your body/bodies" is used each time. And if there is an error here, we wonder which reading is correct, the singular *body* or the plural *bodies*.

We have already discussed one case where there was an apparent mix-up between singular *body* and plural *bodies:*

> 2 Nephi 9:12–13
>> and hell must deliver up its captive **spirits**
>> and the grave must deliver up its captive **bodies**
>> and the **bodies** and the **spirits** of men will be restored one to the other . . .
>> for on the other hand the paradise of God must deliver up the **spirits**
>>> of the righteous
>> and the grave deliver up the [*body* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRT | *bodies* s]
>>> of the righteous
>> and the **spirit** and the **body** is restored to itself again

In this case, the 1953 RLDS emendation to the plural *bodies* appears to be correct.

On the other hand, here in Alma 34:34 the plural usage "your bodies" with the singular "that same spirit" can be defended. Consider, for instance, the following example which mixes singular and plural in a similar way:

> Alma 40:11
>> behold it hath been made known unto me by an angel
>> that the **spirits** of all men
>> as soon as they are departed from this mortal **body**
>> yea the **spirits** of all men—whether they be good or evil—
>> are taken home to that God who gave them life

Quite clearly, the text here consistently refers to plural spirits, but just as clearly uses the singular "this mortal body" (which is undoubtedly intended since both *this* and *body* are singular). In the same way, the usage in Alma 34:34 is possible.

There is one other passage that switches from singular to plural, but in that instance the number is consistent within each clause of the passage:

> Alma 11:45
>> now behold I have spoken unto you
>> concerning the death of the mortal **body**
>> and also concerning the resurrection of the mortal **body**
>> I say unto you that this mortal **body** is raised to an immortal **body** . . .
>> that they can die no more
>> their **spirits** uniting with their **bodies**
>> never to be divided

This example suggests that as long as grammatical number is kept consistent within the same clause, we can have mixtures of singular and plural forms of *spirit* and *body*. In 2 Nephi 9:13, on the other hand, the occurrence of "the body of the righteous" is incorrect since *the righteous* refers to a plurality, as in the previous clause ("the spirits of the righteous"). In other words, in the earliest extant text for 2 Nephi 9:13 there is a mixture of singular *body* and plural *righteous*. So the emendation within the clause for 2 Nephi 9:13 should be followed, but mixtures across separate clauses (as in Alma 11:45, Alma 34:34, and Alma 40:11) can be kept.

Summary: Accept the mixture in grammatical number for *spirit/spirits* and *body/bodies* in Alma 11:45, Alma 34:34, and Alma 40:11; on the other hand, the emendation in 2 Nephi 9:13 of "the **body** of the righteous" to "the **bodies** of the righteous" should be maintained.

■ **Alma 34:36**

and this I know because the Lord [*hath* 01ABCDEFGIJLMNOQRT | *has* HKPS] *said*
he dwelleth not in unholy temples
but in the hearts of the righteous doth he dwell
yea and he [*hath* 0A | *hath* >js *has* 1 | *has* BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *also said*
that the righteous should sit down in his kingdom

Normally, the grammatical emendation of *hath* to *has,* when found in the text, is the result of Joseph Smith's editing for the 1837 edition. In general, this editing was applied unevenly, as in this verse (where only the second instance of *hath* was changed to *has* in the 1837 edition). With regard to the first instance of *hath,* the 1874 RLDS made the change to *has,* perhaps in an attempt to increase the parallelism between these two phrases that refer to what the Lord said:

◻ *original text*   the Lord **hath** said . . . yea and he **hath** also said
◻ *1837 text*   the Lord **hath** said . . . yea and he **has** also said
◻ *RLDS text*   the Lord **has** said . . . yea and he **has** also said

Of course, the critical text will restore the original text, with its parallelism (*hath* both times rather than *has*). For further discussion, see under INFLECTIONAL ENDINGS in volume 3.

Summary: Restore the two original occurrences of *hath* in Alma 34:36 — and whenever else *hath* is found in the earliest textual sources.

■ **Alma 34:36**

yea and he hath also said that
the righteous [*should* 01A | *shall* BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *sit down in his kingdom*
    to go no more out
but their garments **should** *be made white through the blood of the Lamb*

The original manuscript twice uses the modal *should* in this verse. The 1837 edition changed the first *should* to *shall,* but this change was probably a typo rather than due to intentional editing since later the verse continues to use *should* ("but their garments **should** be made white"). A similar use of *should* after the verb *say* is found near the end of the Book of Mormon:

Mormon 5:9

> and also that a knowledge of these things must come
> unto the remnant of these people and also unto the Gentiles
> which the Lord hath said **should** scatter this people

Both passages (at least originally) have "hath said" followed by *should* rather than *shall,* so there is textually nothing wrong with having *should* in a prophetic expression dealing with the future. For further discussion of the variation between *shall* and *should,* see under Jacob 7:9 as well as more generally under MODAL VERBS in volume 3.

Summary: Restore in Alma 34:36 the original modal *should,* which agrees with the *should* in the following clause as well as with the similar construction in Mormon 5:9.

■ **Alma 34:39**

that ye may not be led away
by the [temptations 01T | *temptation* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRS] *of the devil*

In accord with the reading of both manuscripts, the 1981 LDS edition restored the correct plural *temptations* here in Alma 34:39. Elsewhere in the Book of Mormon text, we always have a semantically plural use of *temptation* when this word is postmodified by a prepositional phrase beginning with *of* (usually the phrase is "of the devil"):

1 Nephi 12:17	and the mists of darkness are **the temptations** of the devil
1 Nephi 12:19	and because of the pride of my seed and **the temptations** of the devil . . .
Alma 7:11	and he shall go forth suffering . . . **temptations** of every kind
Alma 37:33	teach them to withstand **every temptation** of the devil
3 Nephi 6:17	to be carried about by **the temptations** of the devil

It seems that the change in Alma 34:39 to "the temptation of the devil" in the 1830 edition was an error (and probably unintentional since the plural is perfectly acceptable).

Summary: Maintain the correct plural *temptations* in Alma 34:39 ("the temptations of the devil"), the reading of the manuscripts.

Alma 35

■ **Alma 35:3**

a*fter the more popular part of the Zoramites had consulted together*
concerning **the words** *which had been preached unto them*
they were angry because of **the word**
for it did destroy their craft
therefore they would not hearken
unto [*there* >% *the* ₀ | *the* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] **words**

The original manuscript is extant here and reads *the words* at the end of the verse. One wonders
if this might not be some sort of error since it seems incomplete. Elsewhere in the text, for the
expression "hearken (un)to . . . word(s)", the noun *word(s)* is always made specific, usually by a
preceding possessive pronoun or by some kind of postmodification (such as an *of*-initial preposi-
tional phrase):

"my words"	15 times
"thy words"	1 time
"his words"	4 times
"our words"	1 time
"their words"	4 times
"the words of the Lord"	4 times
"the words of Jesus"	1 time
"the words of the evil one"	1 time
"the words of <a person>"	6 times
"the words of <persons>"	3 times
"the words which the Lord saith"	1 time
"the words of him who gave them unto you"	1 time
"his word"	1 time
"the word of the Lord"	3 times
"the word of God"	1 time
"these words"	1 time
"the words of the book"	1 time

There is only one occurrence of "hearken (un)to . . . word(s)" without any additional specifica-
tion for *words*—namely, here in Alma 35:3.

A number of possible emendations suggest themselves. First of all, Oliver Cowdery initially
wrote the final occurrence of *the words* here in 𝒪 as *there words*. He immediately corrected the

there to *the* by erasing the *re*. Since *there* is a homophone for *their,* the initial reading in ⊖, *there words,* may have been an error for *their words*. Oliver, after erasing the *re,* could have neglected to add the *ir,* thus ending up with the unusual phrase *the words*. One problem with *their words* as an emendation is that the reader would tend to interpret the *their* as referring to the Zoramites rather than to Alma and his missionary companions: "therefore **they** would not hearken unto **their words**". Nonetheless, the text actually has examples of this kind of pronominal usage, as in the following example: "**the people** hardened **their** hearts and would not hearken unto **their words**" (Ether 11:13).

A second possible emendation is that the plural *words* is an error for *word*—that is, the original text here read "therefore they would not hearken unto **the word**". Here the singular would agree with the preceding occurrence of *the word:* "they were angry because of **the word**". This earlier instance of the singular *word* is extant in ⊖ and is supported by the subsequent singular pronoun *it* ("for **it** did destroy their craft"). There is clear evidence of mix-ups in the history of the text for *word* and *words,* especially with the phrase "to hearken (un)to X"; in fact, two of these mix-ups show the tendency to replace the correct singular *word* with the plural *words* (each marked below with an asterisk):

> * 1 Nephi 17:22 (initial error in 𝒫; error in the 1830 edition; reversed in
>   the 1858 Wright edition)
>   and our father hath judged them
>   and hath led us away because we would hearken
>   unto his [*word* 0GHKPS | *words* > *word* 1 | *words* ABCDEFIJLMNOQRT]

> Jacob 3:11 (error in the 1830 edition; reversed in the 1981 LDS edition)
>   O my brethren
>   hearken unto my [*words* 1T | *word* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRS]

> * Mosiah 20:21 (error in the 1841 British edition)
>   and all this because we would not hearken
>   unto the [*word* 1ABCGHKPS | *words* DEFIJLMNOQRT] of the Lord

> Helaman 12:4 (error in the 1906 LDS edition)
>   yea how quick to hearken
>   unto the [*words* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMOPQRST | *word* N] of the evil one

> Ether 11:13 (error in the 1879 LDS edition; reversed in the 1920 LDS edition)
>   the people hardened their hearts and would not hearken
>   unto their [*words* 1ABCDEFGHKPRST | *word* IJLMNOQ]

A third possibility is that the bare phrase *the words* was followed by a postmodifying relative clause that was somehow lost in the early transmission of the text. Further on in Alma 35 the text refers to "the words which had been spoken" (at the end of verse 4) and "the words which had been spoken by Alma and his brethren" (in the middle of verse 6). These examples suggest an emendation in verse 3 like "the words which had been preached unto them", as suggested by the language earlier in verse 3: "concerning the words which had been preached unto them". The problem with this emendation is that it seems very doubtful that a whole relative clause would have been lost during the dictation of the text.

But this last possibility suggests that such a postmodification may have been left unexpressed—that is, the use of *the words* at the end of verse 3 refers to the earlier plural occurrence of *the words* (that is, "concerning the words which had been preached unto them"). In other words, the text at the end of the verse intentionally avoids the repetition of the postmodifying relative clause "which had been preached unto them". Another way, of course, to have the final instance of *the words* in verse 3 refer to the earlier instance of *the words* ("the words which had been preached unto them") would be to replace the *the* with a demonstrative determiner such as *these* or *those:* "therefore they would not hearken unto **these** words" or "therefore they would not hearken unto **those** words".

Ultimately, we have a number of possible emendations. Note, however, that no edition has ever attempted to alter the occurrence of *the words* at the end of verse 3. Probably the best solution is to leave the corrected reading in 𝒪, "therefore they would not hearken unto **the words**", where the postmodifying relative clause "which had been preached unto them" is implied.

Summary: Maintain in Alma 35:3 the corrected reading of the original manuscript: "therefore they would not hearken unto **the words**"; here *the words* is not postmodified in any way, but the apparent meaning is that *the words* refers to "the words which had been preached unto them" (stated earlier in the verse).

■ **Alma 35:6**

and it came to pass that after they had found out the minds of all the people
[*these* > *those* 0 | *those* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *which were in favor of the words*
    which had been spoken by Alma and his brethren
were cast out of the land

Oliver Cowdery initially wrote *these* in 𝒪; then he overwrote the first *e* in *these* with an *o,* thus changing the demonstrative to *those.* There is no change in the level of ink flow for the overwriting, which suggests a virtually immediate correction. As noted under Alma 14:15, the phrase "those who(m)/which" is considerably more frequent than "these who(m)/which" in the Book of Mormon text (181 to 6 in the original text). Although either *these* or *those* is in general possible, here in Alma 35:6 the use of *those* is definitely preferred. Even so, the correction in 𝒪 was probably not due to explicit editing on Oliver's part, but instead it represents his attempt to get the text down correctly. For some discussion (and examples) of Oliver's tendency to mix up *these* and *those,* see under Alma 3:25. The critical text will maintain the corrected reading here in Alma 35:6, "**those** which were in favor of the words which had been spoken by Alma and his brethren".

Summary: Accept in Alma 35:6 Oliver Cowdery's virtually immediate correction in 𝒪 of *these* to *those* for the phrase "those which were".

■ **Alma 35:13**

and thus commenced [*the > a* ⊙ | *a* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *war*
betwixt the Lamanites and the Nephites
in the eighteenth year of the reign of the judges
and an account shall be given
of their [*war >– wars* ⊙ | *wars* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *hereafter*

In the first part of this verse, Oliver Cowdery initially wrote *the* instead of *a* before *war.* Since this war is mentioned here for the first time, the use of the definite article seems strange. Oliver crossed out the *the* and supralinearly wrote *a.* Since the correction appears to have been virtually immediate (there is no change in the level of ink flow), the critical text will accept here the indefinite article *a* as the original reading.

Later on in this passage, Oliver Cowdery initially wrote the singular *their war* in ⊙; then somewhat later he inserted the plural *s* (the *s* is somewhat raised off the line). The ink flow for the *s* is less distinct and somewhat smeared. This smeared *s* does not show any erasure; we therefore conclude that the change from the singular to the plural was not reversed. Oliver probably initially wrote the singular because earlier in the passage the text read "and thus commenced **a war** betwixt the Lamanites and the Nephites". The singular *their war* seems perfectly reasonable here; thus there would have been no motivation for Oliver to consciously emend *their war* to *their wars.* Oliver probably made the correction to *their wars* after reading the text back to Joseph.

There is strong evidence that the plural *their wars* is correct since later in the text, when Mormon returns to his promised account of "their war(s)" in this particular year ("the eighteenth year of the reign of the judges"), he once more uses the plural *wars:*

> Alma 43:3
> and now I return to an account of **the wars**
> between the Nephites and the Lamanites
> in the eighteenth year of the reign of the judges

There is a direct link between Alma 35:13 and Alma 43:3; thus the use of the plural *their wars* in Alma 35:13 is undoubtedly correct.

Summary: Accept in Alma 35:13 Oliver Cowdery's two corrections in ⊙, the change of *the war* to *a war* and the change of *their war* to *their wars;* the first correction was virtually immediate, while the second probably occurred when Oliver read back the text to Joseph Smith.

■ **Alma 35:14**

after having been instruments in the hands of God
of *bringing many of the Zoramites to repentance*

The earliest text here reads "**of** bringing many of the Zoramites to repentance". The preposition *of* is found in the original manuscript. Greg Wright (personal communication, 29 August 2006) suggests that the *of* in this passage could be an error for *in,* especially since there are four similar sentences involving the word *instrument* where the preposition is *in* (three of these also have the same verb form, *bringing*):

2 Nephi 1:24

    and who hath been an instrument in the hands of God
    in bringing us forth into the land of promise

Mosiah 23:10

    the Lord did hear my cries and did answer my prayers
    and hath made me an instrument in his hands
    in bringing so many of you to a knowledge of his truth

Mosiah 27:36

    and thus they were instruments in the hands of God
    in bringing many to the knowledge of the truth

Alma 1:8

    and it was him that was an instrument in the hands of God
    in delivering the people of Limhi out of bondage

One could argue that in Alma 35:14 the *of* entered the text because of the surrounding occurrences of *of* ("in the hands **of** God *of* bringing many **of** the Zoramites to repentance").

Even so, there is one other example with the *of,* although this *of* is not extant in the original manuscript:

Alma 26:15

    yea and we have been instruments in his hands
    of doing this great and marvelous work

Note that in this last case there are no surrounding *of*'s that could have prompted replacing an original *in* with *of.* It looks like the *of* is intended in both Alma 26:15 and Alma 35:14, despite its difficulty for modern readers. The critical text will maintain the occurrence of *of* in both these passages.

Summary: Maintain the occurrence of *of* rather than the expected *in* in Alma 26:15 ("**of** doing this great and marvelous work") and in Alma 35:14 ("**of** bringing many of the Zoramites to repentance").

■ **Alma 35:14**

and they have taken up arms to defend themselves
and their wives and [*their* 01A | BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *children and their lands*

Here the 1837 edition removed the repeated determiner *their* from the phrase "their wives and **their** children". As explained under Mosiah 23:28, most instances of conjoined *wives* and *children* repeat the determiner, as originally here in Alma 35:14. But there are a few instances where the determiner is not repeated. In each case, the critical text will follow the earliest textual sources. Thus the repeated *their* will be restored here in Alma 35:14. For a more general discussion, see under CONJUNCTIVE REPETITION in volume 3.

Summary: Restore in Alma 35:14 the repeated determiner *their* in "their wives and **their** children".

Alma 36

▪ **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

The 1841 British edition here replaced the correct present-tense *swear* with the past-tense *sware*. The subsequent LDS text maintained *sware* until the 1879 edition. The 1841 typesetter was prone to make this error of replacing *swear* with *sware,* as noted under Mosiah 20:24. For further discussion of *swear* versus *sware,* see under Enos 1:14 as well as more generally under SWEAR in volume 3.

When Alma speaks later with his son Shiblon, he uses a similar present-tense verb form in referring to this conditional promise, originally given to Nephi and Lehi (see 1 Nephi 2:20 and 2 Nephi 1:9):

> Alma 38:1
>> for I **say** unto you even as I said unto Helaman
>> that inasmuch as ye shall keep the commandments of God
>> ye shall prosper in the land

In fact, Alma specifically refers to having said the same thing to Helaman ("even as I said unto Helaman"). Thus there is a direct connection between Alma 36:1 and Alma 38:1, which explains the parallel language between these two passages:

> Alma 36:1   for I **swear** unto you that <the promise>
> Alma 38:1   for I **say** unto you . . . that <the promise>

And there is no difference at all in the wording of the promise: "inasmuch as ye shall keep the commandments of God / ye shall prosper in the land". The important point regarding Alma 36:1 is that the verb *swear* is a performative and is therefore in the present tense, just as the performative *say* in Alma 38:1 is also in the present tense.

Summary: Maintain the present-tense *swear* in Alma 36:1; the verb here is acting as a performative, thus the present tense; a similar use of the performative is found in Alma 38:1, where Alma directly refers to what he had earlier said to Helaman ("for I **say** unto you even as I said unto Helaman that . . .").

■ **Alma 36:2**

for they [was > were o | were >+ were 1 | were ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] in bondage
and none could deliver them
except it [were o | were >p was 1 | was ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
the God of Abraham and the God of Isaac and the God of Jacob

Here in the manuscripts we see a tendency to replace the verb form *were* with *was*. In the first instance, Oliver Cowdery initially wrote *they was* in ℗; but then virtually immediately he corrected the *was* to *were*, crossing out the *was* and supralinearly inserting *were* (there is no change in the level of ink flow). When it came to copying the text into ℗, Oliver correctly wrote *they were*, although somewhat later he apparently thought to alter this to *they was* and crossed out the *were*. But then, rather than writing the *was,* Oliver changed his mind and rewrote the correct *were* supralinearly (the rewriting of the *were* is with slightly heavier ink flow). We see here in Oliver's scribal work a persistent influence from his own dialectal language, namely, his tendency to write *was* in place of standard *were;* for an extensive discussion regarding this tendency, see under Mosiah 10:14. As noted there, it is also clear that the original text sometimes used nonstandard *was* in plural contexts; for a list of various examples, see under 1 Nephi 4:4. In general, we follow the earliest textual sources in choosing between *was* and *were* with plural subjects, thus *were* for "they were in bondage" in Alma 36:2.

There is another instance of original *were* later on in this verse, namely, in the *except*-clause: "except it **were** the God of Abraham and the God of Isaac and the God of Jacob". ℗ is extant here and reads *were,* the subjunctive form. Oliver Cowdery originally copied this *were* into ℗, but at some later time (probably in Grandin's print shop in Palmyra) Oliver changed the *were* to *was* in pencil. (For a list of corrections made later in ℗ with pencil, all apparently in the print shop, see the discussion under Alma 10:28.) Elsewhere in the text, there are 14 occurrences of "except it **were**" but none of "except it **was**". The critical text will restore the original subjunctive *were* in the *except*-clause here in Alma 36:2.

Summary: Restore in Alma 36:2 the subjunctive form *were* in "except it **were**", the reading in ℗ and the consistent usage elsewhere in the text; also maintain the corrected manuscript reading *they were* earlier in this verse ("they were in bondage").

■ **Alma 36:2**

and none could deliver them
except it were the God of Abraham
and [NULL > the o | the 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] God of Isaac
and the God of Jacob

In the original manuscript, Oliver Cowdery initially omitted the definite article *the* before "God of Isaac"; but virtually immediately he corrected the reading by supralinearly inserting the *the* (there is no change in the level of ink flow). Elsewhere the text always has the *the* before "God of Isaac" (four times). This initial error provides one more example of the problem Oliver had in getting down all the repetitive elements in the long conjunctive phrase that lists the three patriarchs

Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob; for further discussion of this difficulty, see the examples listed under 1 Nephi 17:40, Mosiah 23:23, and Alma 29:11. Also see under 1 Nephi 19:10 the discussion regarding the inherent variability of this phrase.

Summary: Maintain the occurrence of *the* in the phrase "the God of Isaac" in Alma 36:2 and elsewhere in the text.

■ **Alma 36:3**

for I do know that
[*whomesoever* 0 | *whomsoever* >js *whosoever* 1 | *whomsoever* A |
whosoever BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *shall put his trust in God . . .*

As discussed under Alma 3:10, the critical text will restore the occasional occurrence of nonstandard *whomsoever* in subject position whenever the earliest textual sources support it. In this instance here, Joseph Smith emended *whomsoever* to the standard *whosoever* in his editing for the 1837 edition.

■ **Alma 36:3**

for I do know that
whomsoever shall put [*his* 0A | *his* >js *their* 1 | *their* BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *trust in God*
shall be supported in **their** *trials and* **their** *troubles*
and [NULL > *their* 0 | *their* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *afflictions*

Here we have two instances of variation involving the possessive pronoun *their*. In the first instance, we have a case of the singular pronoun *his* in a generic clause: "whomsoever shall put **his** trust in God". But since the following text uses the plural generic pronoun *their,* Joseph Smith emended the earlier *his* to *their* in his editing for the 1837 edition. As explained under Alma 32:25, the original text allows (under certain conditions) mixtures of the generic pronouns *he* and *they*. The critical text will restore the original use of the generic *his* here in the nominal clause "whomsoever shall put **his** trust in God".

The other instance of variation here in Alma 36:3 involves the repetitive *their* in the conjunctive phrase "in **their** trials and **their** troubles and **their** afflictions". When Oliver Cowdery initially took down this phrase in 𝒪, he omitted the final *their.* But almost immediately, he supplied it by supralinear insertion (there is no change in the level of ink flow). Such multiple repetition of the possessive pronoun is found in another instance of this same conjunctive phrase (namely, later when Alma talks to his second son, Shiblon): "ye shall be delivered out of **your** trials and **your** troubles and **your** afflictions" (Alma 38:5). The critical text will, of course, maintain the multiple repetition of the *their* in Alma 36:3. For further discussion, see under CONJUNCTIVE REPETITION in volume 3.

Summary: Maintain the repetitive *their*'s in Alma 36:3 ("in **their** trials and **their** troubles and **their** afflictions"), but restore the original *his* in the *whomsoever*-clause ("whomsoever shall put **his** trust in God").

■ **Alma 36:4**

and I would not that ye think that I know of myself

Lyle Fletcher (personal communication, 21 April 2004) suggests that the text here should read "and I would not that ye think that I know **these things** of myself". This part of the text is extant in ◌, so if *these things* was lost, it must have happened as Joseph Smith dictated the text to Oliver Cowdery. Usage elsewhere in the text supports the proposed inclusion of *these things* in the expression "to know of oneself":

Alma 5:46	that I might know **these things** of myself
Alma 38:6	I would not that ye should think that I know **these things** of myself
Helaman 7:29	it is not of myself that I know **these things**

There are also a few instances where instead of *these things* in this construction we have a *that*-clause acting as the direct object:

Alma 5:46	and now I do know of myself **that** they are true
Alma 5:48	I know of myself **that** whatsoever I shall say unto you concerning that which is to come is true
Alma 30:35	thou of thyself knowest **that** we receive no gain
Helaman 15:7	ye do know of yourselves—for ye have witnessed it— **that** as many of them as are brought . . .

Yet in support of the text in Alma 36:4, there are two examples where the direct object is left unexpressed:

2 Nephi 9:28	for they set it aside / supposing they know of themselves
Helaman 15:8	as many as have come to this—ye know of yourselves—are firm and steadfast in the faith

Given these last two examples, the critical text will accept the reading in Alma 36:4 where no direct object is expressed: "and I would not that ye think that I know of myself".

Summary: Accept in Alma 36:4 the reading of all the textual sources, including ◌: "and I would not that ye think that I know of myself"; usage elsewhere in the text shows that no direct object need be expressed in the construction "to know of oneself".

■ **Alma 36:4**

and I would not that ye think that I know of myself

   □ **not of the carnal mind** *but of the spiritual*   0*

   □ *not of the temporal but of the spiritual*   0ᶜ¹0ᶜ²1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST

not of the carnal mind *but of God*

Oliver Cowdery had considerable difficulty getting down this complex sentence in ◌. The transcript for ◌ reads as follows:

Alma 36:3–5 (lines 23–25, page 293′ of 🜨)

```
-tions & shall be lifted up at the last day & I would not that ye think that
                         <tempral but of> <the spiritual>
I know of myself not of the <Carnal mind> <but of> <the spiritual> temporal but of
the spiritual not of the Carnal mind (b t) of God now behold I say unto you if
                                       U
```

It appears that when Joseph Smith initially dictated this passage, he read off most of the sentence at once (possibly the part beginning with "that I know of myself" and ending with "not of the carnal mind but of God", a total of 21 words). The parallelism in this long sentence appears to have led Oliver to accidentally write the later *carnal mind* too early; that is, Oliver initially wrote "carnal mind but of the spiritual", which he then crossed out and supralinearly corrected to "temporal but of the spiritual". Oliver seems to have gotten confused in his crossouts and decided to rewrite this correcting part; he crossed out his supralinear correction, rewrote inline "temporal but of the spiritual", and then finished writing down inline the last part of the sentence ("not of the carnal mind but of God"), which contained the phrase *carnal mind* that he had originally anticipated. All of these corrections appear to be immediate since there is no change in the level of ink flow and ultimately the entire correct reading is written inline. There is evidence elsewhere in the text that Joseph sometimes read off too much, with the result that Oliver anticipated the later part of the text by writing it down too early. For an example of anticipation involving 20 words, see under Alma 56:41.

Stan Larson has claimed that here in Alma 36:4 Joseph Smith decided to rephrase the original text, that this was a conscious revision on his part, one of the "efforts by Joseph Smith at the time of the original translation to clarify or restate a thought, indicating his intimate involvement in the process". See pages 9–10 of his article "Textual Variants in Book of Mormon Manuscripts", *Dialogue: A Journal of Mormon Thought* 10/4 (1977): 8–30. This interpretation of the correction as revision seems doubtful since there are so few examples in the original manuscript that can even serve as candidates for conscious revision by Joseph. Nearly all manuscript corrections in 🜨 can be explained as Oliver Cowdery's attempts to get the text down correctly. (On the other hand, there is substantial evidence that Oliver himself occasionally emended the text of 🜨. See the list of examples under 1 Nephi 20:11.) Here in Alma 36:4, the correction can be explained as resulting from Oliver's difficulty in writing down a long and complex sentence. Moreover, there is definite evidence for errors of anticipation elsewhere in the original manuscript (see, for instance, the discussion under Alma 56:41). And finally, there would have been no reason for Joseph to have emended the text here in Alma 36:4 since there is nothing wrong with what Oliver initially wrote, "not of the carnal mind but of the spiritual". Such language is found elsewhere in the text:

> 2 Nephi 9:39
> to be carnally minded is death
> and to be spiritual minded is life eternal

In Alma 36:4 it was probably the parallel construction in the original reading that made it especially difficult for Oliver to get the phraseology written down correctly.

Summary: Accept in Alma 36:4 Oliver Cowdery's corrected reading in 𝒪 as the original text: "not of the temporal but of the spiritual / not of the carnal mind but of God"; Oliver's initial error in 𝒪 probably resulted from the complexity of the parallelism in the latter part of the sentence, which Joseph Smith seems to have dictated all at once to Oliver.

■ **Alma 36:7**

and behold he spake unto us **as it were** *the voice of thunder*

Paul Thomas (personal communication, 5 December 2003) wonders about the odd use of the expression "as it were" in this verse. One possibility is that the subordinate conjunction *if* is missing, so that the original text read "he spake unto us as **if** it were the voice of thunder". Elsewhere in the text, there are nine examples of the expression "as if it were".

Another possibility, suggested by Lyle Fletcher (personal communication, 21 April 2004), is that the preposition *with* is missing from this sentence, so that the original text read "he spake unto us as it were **with** the voice of thunder". Support for this second emendation can be found in the earlier account of the conversion of Alma along with the sons of king Mosiah:

> Mosiah 27:11
>> behold the angel of the Lord appeared unto them
>> and he descended as it were in a cloud
>> and he spake as it were **with** a voice of thunder

There is evidence elsewhere in the text in support of both these proposed emendations, either adding *if* or adding *with*. For instance, there is evidence in the printed history of the text (but not in the manuscripts) for the loss of the subordinate conjunction *if* (including one from the expression "as if it were"):

> Helaman 5:44 (loss in the 1840 edition)
>> yea they were encircled about
>> yea they were as [*if* 1ABDEFIJLMNOPQRST | CGHK] in the midst of a flaming fire

> 3 Nephi 19:14 (loss in the 1858 Wright edition)
>> and behold they were encircled about
>> as [*if* 1ABCDEFHIJKLMNOPQRST | G] it were fire

On the other hand, there is evidence in the manuscripts for the occasional loss of the preposition *with,* including these two examples by Oliver Cowdery:

> 2 Nephi 1:23 (initial error in 𝒪)
>> shake off the chains
>> [NULL >+ *with* 𝒪 | *with* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] which ye are bound

> 3 Nephi 14:2 (initial error in 𝒫; Matthew 7:2 has the *with*)
>> and [NULL > *with* 1 | *with* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] what measure ye mete
>> it shall be measured to you again

When we consider the parenthetical phrase "as it were" elsewhere in the Book of Mormon text, we discover that in every case (12 times) the phrase could be removed without affecting the structure of the sentence, as in the following example that also deals with fire:

3 Nephi 17:24

> and they saw angels descending out of heaven
> **as it were** in the midst of fire

There is nothing ungrammatical about "and they saw angels descending out of heaven . . . in the midst of fire". But this is not the case in Alma 36:7: if we remove "as it were", the resulting sentence is ungrammatical: "and behold he spake unto us . . . the voice of thunder". It is this difficulty which leads to the two proposals: either add *if* so that the phrase is no longer parenthetical or add *with* so that the parenthetical "as it were" can be omitted (thus "and behold he spake unto us . . . **with** the voice of thunder").

Despite these arguments regarding the parenthetical nature of "as it were" for the Book of Mormon text, there are examples in the King James Bible for which the loss of "as it were" leads to an unacceptable sentence:

James 5:3 (not "and shall eat your flesh . . . **with** fire")

> your gold and silver is cankered
> and the rust of them shall be a witness against you
> and shall eat your flesh **as it were** fire

Revelation 8:10 (not "burning as **if** it were a lamp")

> and there fell a great star from heaven
> burning **as it were** a lamp

These examples show that the use of "as it were" in Alma 36:7 is textually acceptable, even if it is difficult for modern readers. The critical text will therefore retain the occurrence of "as it were" in Alma 36:7 without adding either the subordinate conjunction *if* or the preposition *with*.

Summary: Maintain in Alma 36:7 the difficult reading "and behold he spake unto us **as it were** the voice of thunder"; although this usage is unique to the Book of Mormon text, similar examples of "as it were" can be found in the King James Bible; there is no need to insert either an *if* or a *with* in this sentence.

- **Alma 36:8**

and I arose and stood [NULL > *up* 0 | *up* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]

In the original manuscript, Oliver Cowdery initially wrote "and I arose and stood"; but then virtually immediately he added the adverbial *up* (the supralinear insertion was written without any change in the level of ink flow). Variability in the occurrence of *up* is possible, as is exemplified by the following passage:

3 Nephi 20:2

> and he commanded them that they should arise and stand
> [𝔖2 NULL > 𝔖1 *up* 1 | *up* ABCDEFGIJLMNOQRT | HKPS] upon their feet
> and they arose [*up* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMOPQRST | N]
> and stood [1ABCDEFGHIJKLMOPQRST | *up* N] upon their feet

In this passage, scribe 2 of 𝔓 omitted the first *up*, but it was supplied by Oliver Cowdery when he proofed 𝔓 against 𝔒. The 1830 edition has the *up*, and for this part of the text the 1830 edition was set from 𝔒. So we can be confident that in this instance 𝔒 read "stand **up** upon their feet".

But later on in the passage, both 𝓟 and the 1830 read "and they arose **up** and stood upon their feet", with *up* after *arose* and not after *stood*. Yet the 1906 LDS edition shifted the *up* from after *arose* to after *stood*. This variation argues that in each case we should follow the earliest textual sources. Thus the *up* will be maintained in Alma 36:8. (For a complete list of cases where Oliver Cowdery either omitted or added *up* in the text, see under Alma 27:3.)

Summary: Accept in Alma 36:8 the corrected reading in 𝓞 where *up* follows *stood* ("and I arose and stood **up**").

■ **Alma 36:9**

and he said unto me
if thou wilt [01ABCDEGHIJKLMNOPQRT | *not* > NULL F | *not* S] *of thyself be destroyed*
seek no more to destroy the church of God

The original language in verse 9 (which has been retained in the LDS text) is undoubtedly intended since it is repeated in verse 11 (with variation only in the placement of the phrase *of thyself*):

> Alma 36:11
> for when I heard the words
> if thou wilt [1ABCDEGHIJKLMNOPQRT | *not* > NULL F | *not* S] be destroyed
>   of thyself
> seek no more to destroy the church of God . . .

The first occurrence of the *if*-clause (in verse 9) is fully extant in 𝓞; the second (in verse 11) is not except for the very end of the clause:

> Alma 36:11 (line 3, page 294′ of 𝓞)
>
> ```
> (                          y)self seek no more to destroy <be> the church of God...
>   IF THOU WILT BE DESTROID OF TH
> ```

The variation in the placement of the phrase *of thyself* is found in 𝓞 itself, which means that this slight syntactic difference in the angel's language should be retained in verses 9 and 11.

The use of uncompleted positive *if*-clauses with a negative meaning is characteristic of strong imperative and declarative statements in Hebrew. Similar Hebrew-like uses of uncompleted conditional clauses can be found elsewhere in the Book of Mormon text. See, for instance, the examples discussed under 1 Nephi 19:20–21 and Alma 30:39. For a general discussion of uncompleted conditional clauses, see under HEBRAISMS in volume 3.

The same basic type of *if*-clause is also found in the earlier account of Alma's conversion; this account also quotes the words of the angel to Alma:

> Mosiah 27:16
> and now I say unto thee Alma
> go thy way and seek to destroy the church no more
> that their prayers may be answered
> and this **even if thou wilt of thyself be cast off**

In this instance, the *if*-clause uses a different verb ("cast off") while the phrase *of thyself* precedes the verb (as in Alma 36:9). But a more significant difference between the Mosiah 27 example and

the two examples here in Alma 36 is the occurrence of *even* before the *if* in Mosiah 27:16 ("and this **even if** thou wilt of thyself be cast off"). In theory, the word *even* can be attached either to the preceding *this* ("and this even / if thou wilt of thyself be cast off") or to the following *if* ("and this / even if thou wilt of thyself be cast off"). Usage elsewhere in the text argues for the latter possibility since there are no other occurrences of *this even,* but *even if* is fairly frequent:

1 Nephi 22:17	**even if** it so be that the fullness of his wrath must come
1 Nephi 22:17	**even if** it so be as by fire
2 Nephi 30:10	yea **even if** it so be that he must destroy the wicked by fire
Enos 1:13	**even if** it so be by the power of his holy arm
Mosiah 3:16	and **even if** it were possible that little children could sin
Alma 32:27	yea **even if** ye can no more than desire to believe
Alma 48:14	**even if** it were necessary
Alma 60:35	**even if** it must be by the sword
Helaman 15:11	yea **even if** they should dwindle in unbelief

Moreover, there are instances of *and this* in the text, as in "and this because of your iniquities" (1 Nephi 3:29). The most reasonable syntactic interpretation for Mosiah 27:16 is "and this / even if thou wilt of thyself be cast off".

David Calabro has suggested (personal communication) that the two instances of the *if*-clause in Alma 36:9, 11 should be interpreted as meaning 'even if'. The use of *even* in Mosiah 27:16 implies a negation, which may explain why the *if*-clause there has not undergone any grammatical emendation. On the other hand, the two instances in Alma 36 do not have the *even,* and both of these have undergone the same grammatical emendation in the 1852 LDS edition and in the 1953 RLDS edition—namely, the insertion of the negative *not* after the modal verb *wilt:* "if thou wilt **not** be destroyed". But in the second printing of the 1852 edition, both cases of this intrusive *not* were removed (the corrections were made in the stereotyped plates), with the result that no *not* shows up for this clause in subsequent LDS editions.

Another possible grammatical emendation for the two unusual *if*-clauses in Alma 36, where the *even* is lacking, would be to replace the subordinate conjunction *if* with *unless* (the corresponding negative conjunction):

Alma 36:9
    unless thou wilt of thyself be destroyed
    seek no more to destroy the church of God

Alma 36:11
    unless thou wilt be destroyed of thyself
    seek no more to destroy the church of God

In any event, the consistency of the usage in Alma 36:9, 11 (an *if*-clause where negation is implied) argues that this construction, without any supplied *not* or other negative element, is fully intended as an instance of the uncompleted Hebraistic conditional clause. The critical text will retain these two instances of the negative *if*-clause in Alma 36, despite the difficulty they cause for English readers. The standard LDS and RLDS editions have generally resisted supplying an overt negative marker for this particular *if*-clause.

Summary: Accept in Alma 36:9, 11 the use of two uncompleted *if*-clauses with their implied negative; the related warning from the angel in Mosiah 27:16 contains the implicitly negative *even,* "and this / even if thou wilt of thyself be cast off"; also accept the syntactic variation regarding the placement of the phrase *of thyself* in these *if*-clauses since this difference in word order is supported by the original manuscript in the case of the two Alma 36 examples.

■ **Alma 36:10**

and it was for the space of three days
and [*three* 0ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST | NULL >+ *three* 1] *nights*
that I could not open my mouth

Here 𝒪 is extant and reads "for the space of **three** days and **three** nights". When Oliver Cowdery copied the text into 𝒫, he accidentally omitted the repeated number *three,* probably because that is what we expect in English ("three days and nights"). Later Oliver supralinearly inserted in 𝒫 the repeated *three* with somewhat heavier ink flow, perhaps when he proofed 𝒫 against 𝒪.

The Book of Mormon text always repeats the plural number in conjuncts involving *days* and *nights:*

Mosiah 27:23	for the space of **two** days and **two** nights
Alma 18:43	for the space of **two** days and **two** nights
Alma 19:1	after **two** days and **two** nights
Alma 19:5	for the space of **two** days and **two** nights
Alma 36:10	for the space of **three** days and **three** nights
Alma 36:16	for **three** days and for **three** nights
Alma 38:8	I was **three** days and **three** nights in the most bitter pain

In fact, there is a similar kind of repetition involving the number *one,* although in that case the repeated number is not *one* but the indefinite article *a* (which, it turns out, is historically derived from the number *one*):

Mosiah 9:18	and in **one** day and **a** night we did slay three thousand and forty-three
Helaman 14:4	there shall be **one** day and **a** night and **a** day as if it were one day

For a general discussion of this kind of repetition, see under CONJUNCTIVE REPETITION in volume 3.

Summary: Maintain the repeated *three* in Alma 36:10 ("and it was for the space of **three** days and **three** nights"), the reading in 𝒪 and the corrected reading in 𝒫.

■ **Alma 36:11**

[NULL > & 1 | *And* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
the angel spake more things unto me . . .

Here in the printer's manuscript, Oliver Cowdery initially omitted the ampersand but then virtually immediately supplied it (there is no change in the level of ink flow for the supralinearly

inserted &). The original manuscript is not extant here, but it probably had the &, although this conclusion is not based on spacing considerations between extant fragments of 𝒪 since the lacuna here is large. Rather, the argument is that either reading, with or without the *and*, will work in theory, so there would have been no motivation for Oliver to have consciously emended the text here by adding an *and*. A similar example of this kind of initial loss of & in 𝒫 (and its virtually immediate correction) is found later on in this chapter, when Oliver started copying to a new page of 𝒫:

> Alma 36:16
>
> [& 0 | NULL > & 1 | *And* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] now
> for three days and for three nights . . .

In this second case, 𝒪 is extant and it has the &.

Summary: Maintain the occurrence of sentence-initial *and* in Alma 36:11 and Alma 36:16, in each case the reading of the earliest textual sources.

■ **Alma 36:11**

for when I heard the words
if thou wilt [1ABCDEGHIJKLMNOPQRT | *not* > NULL F | *not* S] *be destroyed of thyself*
seek no more to destroy the church of God

For discussion of the syntax in this *if*-clause, see the nearby discussion under Alma 36:9.

■ **Alma 36:11**

I was struck with such great fear and amazement
lest perhaps [*that* 0A | *that* >js NULL 1 | BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *I should be destroyed*
that I fell to the earth and I did hear no more

As discussed under Alma 22:22, there are several instances in the original text of the Book of Mormon (as well as in the King James Bible) of *lest that*. For this instance in Alma 36:11, the word *perhaps* intervenes, which may have had something to do with Joseph Smith's decision to remove the *that* from "lest perhaps that" in his editing for the 1837 edition. For the two examples of *lest that* (listed under Alma 22:22), Joseph never removed the *that* in his editing.

There is one more example of *lest perhaps* in the text. In this case, there is no *that* (based on the reading in 𝒫 and the spacing between extant fragments of 𝒪):

> Alma 52:28
>
> they fled in much confusion
> **lest perhaps** they should not obtain the city Mulek
> before Lehi should overtake them

So Joseph Smith's removal of the *that* in Alma 36:11 is consistent with this one other example of *lest perhaps* in the Book of Mormon text. It is also consistent with the only occurrence of *lest perhaps* in the King James Bible:

2 Corinthians 2:7

> so that contrariwise ye *ought* rather to forgive *him* and comfort *him*
> **lest perhaps** such a one should be swallowed up with overmuch sorrow

In any event, the critical text will restore the original *that* in "lest perhaps that" in Alma 36:11 since it is clearly intended.

Summary: Restore the original *that* in Alma 36:11 ("lest perhaps **that** I should be destroyed").

■ **Alma 36:13 – 14**

yea I saw that I had rebelled against my God
and that I had not kept his holy commandments
[01|; ABCDEFGHIJKLMOPQS|. NRT]
yea and [*that* >? NULL 0| 1ABCDEFGIJLMNOPQRST|*that* HK]
I had murdered many of his children
or rather led them away unto destruction

The current text at the beginning of verse 14 reads "yea and I had murdered many of his children". The earliest extant textual sources, including the printer's manuscript, read this way. When the 1830 compositor set this passage from 𝒫, he placed a semicolon before the *yea*-clause that begins verse 14 since the *yea*-clause in his copytext was a main clause, not a subordinate *that*-clause. In the 1874 RLDS edition, the subordinate conjunction *that* was added (probably unintentionally). This intrusive *that* was removed in the 1908 RLDS edition since the printer's manuscript does not have it.

The original manuscript is not extant for this part of the verse, yet spacing between surviving fragments clearly provides room for the *that*. Of course, such a *that* could have also been crossed out in the original manuscript. Or there could have been some other textual correction or difference in the lacuna that explains the extra length.

The possible occurrence of the subordinate conjunction *that* here in verse 14 (indicated below with an arrow) is consistent with the two occurrences of *that* previously in verse 13:

> Alma 36:13 – 14 (proposed emendation)
> yea I saw **that** I had rebelled against my God
> and **that** I had not kept his holy commandments
> → yea and **that** I had murdered many of his children
> or rather led them away unto destruction

With this emendation, the text explicitly states that Alma himself is aware that he has committed three serious sins, each introduced by a *that:* "yea I saw that S_1 and that S_2 yea and that S_3" (where the S stands for a finite clause). Elsewhere in the text, there are five examples of "yea and that S":

> Alma 5:23
> behold will they not testify **that** ye are murderers
> → yea and also **that** ye are guilty of all manner of wickedness

Alma 37:21

    and now I will speak unto you concerning those twenty-four plates
    that ye keep them . . .
→ yea and **that** ye preserve these directors

Alma 45:21

    it became expedient **that** the word of God should be declared among them
→ yea and **that** a regulation should be made throughout the church

Alma 58:41

    and now my beloved brother Moroni
    that the Lord our God . . . may keep you continually in his presence
→ yea and **that** he may favor this people . . .

Helaman 7:21

    but behold it is to get gain / to be praised of men
→ yea and **that** ye might get gold and silver

Notice that in the first four examples there is a preceding *that*-clause, just like here in Alma 36:13–14. Thus there is internal support for the subordinate conjunction *that* at the beginning of verse 14.

On the other hand, there are examples in the text of "yea and S" where an extra *that* is possible yet it is lacking:

1 Nephi 4:11 (not "yea and **that** he would not hearken . . .")

    yea and I also knew **that** he had sought to take away mine own life
→ yea and he would not hearken unto the commandments of the Lord

Alma 56:11 (not "yea and **that** they are happy")

    nevertheless we may console ourselves in this point
    that they have died in the cause of their country and of their God
→ yea and they are happy

Alma 62:10 (not "yea and **that** whosoever was found a denying their freedom was . . .")

    and thus it became expedient **that** this law should be strictly observed
      for the safety of their country
→ yea and whosoever was found a denying their freedom was speedily executed
      according to the law

So it is quite possible that there was no *that* in Alma 36:14 either. The critical text will therefore follow the reading of the earliest extant source for Alma 36:14, the printer's manuscript: "yea and I had murdered many of his children". The possibility remains, of course, that there was a *that* here in the original text (and in the original manuscript).

Summary: Maintain in Alma 36:14 the reading of the earliest extant source, the printer's manuscript: "yea and I had murdered many of his children"; the possibility remains that in 𝕆 there was a *that* ("yea and **that** I had murdered many of his children"), yet elsewhere the text has examples of this kind of *yea*-clause where the *that* is lacking.

■ **Alma 36:14**

yea and in fine so great had been my iniquities
that the very [thoughts 01ABDEFIJLMNOPQS | thought CGHKRT] of coming
    into the presence of my God
did rack my soul with inexpressible horror

The original text here reads "the very thoughts". The 1840 edition replaced the plural *thoughts* with the expected singular *thought,* as did the 1920 LDS edition. In accord with the reading of 𝓟, the 1908 RLDS edition restored the plural *thoughts* to the RLDS text. There is a second occurrence of "the very thoughts", in Mosiah 28:3; see the discussion there for earlier examples in English of the expression "the very thoughts". The critical text will restore the plural *thoughts* here in Alma 36:14.

Summary: Restore in Alma 36:14 the original plural *thoughts,* the reading of the earliest textual sources ("the very thoughts of coming into the presence of my God").

■ **Alma 36:16**

and now for three days and [for 01ABCDEFGIJLMNOPQRST | HK] three nights
was I racked even with the pains of a damned soul

Here the 1874 RLDS edition accidentally omitted the repeated preposition *for.* The 1908 RLDS edition restored the *for* to the RLDS text. In theory, either reading is possible. The critical text will follow the earliest reading, with the repeated *for.* For further examples where prepositions are repeated in conjuncts, see under CONJUNCTIVE REPETITION in volume 3.

Summary: Maintain in Alma 36:16 the repeated preposition *for* in the conjunctive prepositional phrase "for three days and **for** three nights".

■ **Alma 36:16**

and now for three days and for three nights was I racked
even with the [pain > pains 0 | pains 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] of a damned soul

As discussed nearby under Alma 36:20, the plural *pains* is the correct reading (here it is the corrected reading in 𝒪).

■ **Alma 36:18**

now as my mind [caghed >% cached >% cacht 0 | caught 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] hold
upon this thought . . .

Here the original manuscript reads *catched* (spelled as *cacht*) instead of the standard past-tense form *caught.* Oliver Cowdery, when he copied from 𝒪 into 𝓟, replaced *catched* with the standard *caught.* Oliver was also the scribe in 𝒪, which makes one think that *catched* must have been what Joseph Smith dictated. Moreover, Oliver initially wrote *cacht* as *caghed* in 𝒪, which he then

changed to *cached* with erasure and overwriting (and ultimately, with further erasure and over-writing, to *cacht*); the initially written *g* in *caghed* seems to show that Oliver was thinking of writing *caught* but that he consciously decided otherwise. It is natural to suspect here that the nonstandard *catched* represents Joseph's dialect, especially since elsewhere the text has only *caught* for the simple past tense and the past participle of the verb *catch* (eight times).

Even so, there is considerable evidence that in Early Modern English *catched* was an accept-able past-tense form for the verb *catch;* according to the Oxford English Dictionary, the form *catched* was common in literary English from Middle English up into the 1800s (the alternative *caught* was also common during this time period). Only in the 19th century did *catched* become nonstandard and restricted to dialectal usage. The online OED provides numerous examples of *catched* from writers of literary English, including these examples (with original spellings retained):

> Miles Coverdale (1535)
>> And Samson wente and **catched** thre hundreth foxes . . .

> Thomas Browne (1658)
>> We were hinted by the occasion,
>> not **catched** the opportunity to write of old things,
>> or intrude upon the Antiquary.

> Richard Steele (1712)
>> I **catched** her once . . . at Chuck-Farthing among the Boys.

The first example comes from Coverdale's biblical translation of Judges 15:4. Thus the use of *catched* is possible in the original text of the Book of Mormon, and the critical text will therefore accept it (although the possibility remains that *catched* may be the result of Joseph Smith's own dialect). For another example where the original text has the standard past-tense form except for one instance, consider the case of *drowned* versus *drownded,* discussed under 1 Nephi 4:2.

Summary: Accept the use of *catched* in Alma 36:18, now nonstandard ("now as my mind **catched** hold upon this thought"); Oliver Cowdery ended up spelling *catched* as *cacht* in ◎; the form *catched* was a common past-tense form in earlier English.

■ **Alma 36:18**

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

Here the earliest text, the original manuscript, has two instances of *who art* where *who am* is the correct form in biblically styled language (as in this sampling from the King James Bible):

> John 4:9
>> how is it that thou being a Jew askest drink of **me**
>> **which am** a woman of Samaria

1 Corinthians 15:9
>   for **I** am the least of the apostles
>   **that am** not meet to be called an apostle

1 Peter 5:1
>   the elders which are among you **I** exhort
>   **who am** also an elder

The original Book of Mormon text also has one example of "<relative pronoun> am" (in this case, *which am*):

3 Nephi 21:11
>   therefore it shall come to pass that
>   whosoever will not believe in **my** words
>   [*which* >js *who* 1 | *which* A | *who* BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] **am** Jesus Christ . . .

But there is also evidence in the earliest text of the Book of Mormon for *art* rather than *am* immediately following a relative pronoun. First of all, we have these two examples in Alma 36:18, both of which are extant in ℗. In the first example, it should be noted, Oliver Cowdery initially wrote *are* in ℗, then corrected it virtually immediately to *art* by overwriting the final *e* with a *t* (there is no difference in the level of ink flow for the overwriting). The second example of *art* here in Alma 36:18 is written in ℗ without correction. The 1906 LDS edition made the grammatical change from *art* to *am* for both instances in Alma 36:18; this change was then followed in the third printing (in 1907) of the 1905 LDS missionary edition and in all subsequent LDS editions. The RLDS text, on the other hand, has continued with the original two instances of *art* in this passage.

There is also a third example of "<relative pronoun> art" in the original text of the Book of Mormon:

Alma 61:2
>   **I** Parhoron [*which art* >js *who am* 1 | *which are* A |
>   *who am* BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] the chief governor of this land
>   do send these words unto Moroni

In this instance, it was Joseph Smith (in his editing for the 1837 edition) who made the change from *art* to *am* (as well as from *which* to *who*). Here the RLDS text maintains Joseph's edited *am*.

As discussed under Alma 32:15, the earliest text has other instances of "<relative pronoun> art" where there is no preceding second person singular referent like *thou, thee, thy,* or *thine*. In each of these cases, the critical text will follow the earliest textual sources. Therefore, here in Alma 36:18 and in Alma 61:2 the original instances of *art* will be restored.

Summary: Restore in Alma 36:18 the two original occurrences of *art:* "who **art** in the gall of bitterness and **art** encircled about"; also restore the original *art* in Alma 61:2: "I Parhoron which **art** the chief governor"; this nonstandard usage is fully intended in the original text.

■ **Alma 36:19**

I could remember my pains
[*no* 01ABCDFGHIJKLMNOPQRT | *nor* ES] *more*

The 1849 LDS edition and the 1953 RLDS edition both read *nor more,* an obvious typo. The probable source for the extra *r* was the following word *more* (thus we end up with a rhyming pair, *nor more*). The 1953 typo, of course, was created independently of the 1849 one. As might be expected, this typo is not found later on in this verse, which reads without variation in the editions as "yea I was harrowed up by the memory of my sins **no more**" (Alma 36:19).

Summary: Maintain both occurrences of *no more* in Alma 36:19.

■ **Alma 36:20**

yea my soul was filled with joy
as exceeding as was my [*pains* 0 | *pain* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]

The original manuscript here reads in the plural as *my pains*. In his copying into the printer's manuscript, Oliver Cowdery accidentally changed this phrase into the singular *my pain.* The singular *pain* has been retained in all the printed editions. Earlier in this chapter, Oliver made the same error initially in 𝓞; but in that case he virtually immediately corrected *pain* to *pains* by inserting the plural *s.* The *s* is written inline but somewhat above the line, and there is no change in the level of ink flow for the inserted *s:*

> Alma 36:16
>> and now for three days and for three nights was I racked
>> even with the [*pain* > *pains* 0 | *pains* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
>>> of a damned soul

The plural usage is correct here in both Alma 36:16 and Alma 36:20. In fact, *pains* is the consistent reading of the manuscripts elsewhere in this chapter for every instance used to describe Alma's suffering:

> Alma 36:13
>> yea I did remember all my sins and iniquities
>> for which I was tormented with the **pains** of hell

> Alma 36:19
>> and now behold when I thought this
>> I could remember my **pains** no more

> Alma 36:21
>> there can be nothing so exquisite and so bitter
>> as [*was* 01ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOP | *were* QRST]
>> my [*pains* 01ABCDEGHIJKLMNOPQRST | *pain* > *pains* F]

In the last example, the earliest text reads "as was my **pains**". The 1852 LDS edition, in its first printing, reads "as was my **pain**". The singular here probably resulted from the preceding singular verb form *was.* The second 1852 printing, following the 1840 edition, restored the plural *pains*

("as was my **pains**"). Finally, the 1911 LDS edition removed the subject-verb disagreement in Alma 36:21 by replacing the *was* with *were* ("as **were** my pains"). The critical text will, of course, restore the original "as was my pains". For discussion regarding the use of *was* with plural subjects, see under 1 Nephi 4:4 (and, more generally, under SUBJECT-VERB AGREEMENT in volume 3).

Summary: In accord with the reading of the original manuscript, restore the plural *pains* in Alma 36:20 ("as was my pains"); this reading is consistent with Alma's use of the plural *pains* throughout this chapter to refer to his suffering; in Alma 36:21, the singular verb form *was* should also be restored (thus "as was my pains", the same as in verse 20).

■ **Alma 36:21**

yea I say unto you [NULL > *my Son* 0 | *my Son* 1 | *my son* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
that there can be nothing so exquisite and so bitter as was my pains
yea and again I say unto you [*my Son* 01 | *my son* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
that on the other hand there can be nothing so exquisite and sweet as was my joy

Here in the original manuscript, Oliver Cowdery initially skipped the first instance of the phrase *my son;* but virtually immediately he supralinearly inserted it (there is no change in the level of ink flow). Later in this verse, we get a second use of *my son* ("yea and again I say unto you my son"). The strong parallelism in this verse argues for the use of *my son* in both cases.

Either reading, with or without *my son,* is theoretically possible. In his discourses to his three sons (Alma 36–42), Alma uses the phrase "I say unto you" 14 times. In four cases, that phrase is followed by *my son* (twice in speaking to Helaman, here in Alma 36:21, plus once in speaking to Shiblon, in Alma 38:3, and once in speaking to Corianton, in Alma 39:6). But in the ten other cases, *my son* does not follow "I say unto you". In each case, we therefore follow the reading of the earliest extant source, thus "I say unto you **my son**" twice in Alma 36:21.

Summary: Maintain in Alma 36:21 the two occurrences of "I say unto you my son", the corrected reading in 𝒪 for the first occurrence and the invariant reading for the second one.

■ **Alma 36:21**

yea I say unto you my son that
there [*can* 0 | *could* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *be nothing so exquisite*
     and so bitter as was my pains
yea and again I say unto you my son that on the other hand
there **can** *be nothing so exquisite and sweet as was my joy*

Here the original manuscript twice reads *can*. Oliver Cowdery copied the first instance of *can* as *could* in the printer's manuscript, probably accidentally. Parallelism supports the use of the modal *can* in both instances.

Summary: Restore the original *can* found in the first sentence of Alma 36:21 ("there **can** be nothing so exquisite and so bitter as was my pains"), which parallels the use of *can* later on in the verse ("there **can** be nothing so exquisite and sweet as was my joy").

■ **Alma 36:21**

yea I say unto you my son that
there can be nothing so exquisite and so bitter
as [*was* 01ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOP | *were* QRST]
my [*pains* 01ABCDEGHIJKLMNOPQRST | *pain > pains* F]
yea and again I say unto you my son that on the other hand
there can be nothing so exquisite and sweet as **was** *my joy*

As discussed under Alma 36:20, in this chapter Alma always uses the plural *pains* to refer to his suffering. The critical text will here maintain the original plural *pains* but will restore the original singular verb form *was*. Note also the parallelism for the verb form in "as **was** my pains" and "as **was** my joy".

■ **Alma 36:21**

yea I say unto you my son that
there can be nothing **so** *exquisite and* **so** *bitter as was my pains*
yea and again I say unto you my son that on the other hand
there can be nothing **so** *exquisite and sweet as was my joy*

One wonders here why the repeated *so* in the first part of the verse is not found in the second part; that is, we have "**so** exquisite and **so** bitter" versus "**so** exquisite and sweet". The original manuscript is basically extant for this whole passage; the *so* definitely appears before *bitter* but not before *sweet*. In theory, there are two possibilities for error: an extra *so* was added in the first case or the *so* was omitted in the second case. The error, if there is one, would have occurred as Joseph Smith dictated the text to Oliver Cowdery.

Internal evidence definitely argues that if there is an error, it is the repeated *so* in the first case, "so exquisite and **so** bitter". Elsewhere in the text, when simple adjectives are conjoined, the *so* is never repeated (I include here the second case from Alma 36:21):

Alma 36:21	there can be nothing **so** exquisite and sweet as was my joy
3 Nephi 3:3	that ye should be **so** foolish and vain
3 Nephi 3:16	and **so** great and marvelous were the words and prophecies of Lachoneus
3 Nephi 17:16	the eye hath never seen neither hath the ear heard before **so** great and marvelous things
3 Nephi 17:17	neither can the hearts of men conceive **so** great and marvelous things
3 Nephi 19:34	**so** great and marvelous were the words which he prayed
Ether 14:21	and **so** great and lasting had been the war
Ether 14:22	**so** swift and speedy was the war

There are also nonrepeating instances of "so <adjective>" where simple nouns are conjoined:

Alma 7:5	by the cause of **so much** afflictions and sorrow
Alma 45:12	because they shall sin against **so great** light and knowledge
Alma 62:35	the cause of **so much** war and bloodshed
Alma 62:44	because of **so many** wars and contentions

Elsewhere there are examples of the repeated *so*, but only in more complex conjuncts involving the repetition of "so <adjective>":

1 Nephi 7:8	ye are **so hard** in your hearts and **so blind** in your minds
Alma 9:19	having had **so much** light and **so much** knowledge given unto them
Alma 58:32	to maintain **so great** a number of cities and **so great** possessions
Alma 62:35	the cause of **so much** war and bloodshed yea and **so much** famine
Helaman 1:18	because of **so much** contention and **so much** difficulty
Helaman 3:25	and **so great** was the prosperity of the church and **so many** the blessings
3 Nephi 5:6	there were **so much** wickedness and **so many** murders committed
Ether 14:21	and **so great** and lasting had been the war and **so long** had been the scene of bloodshed and carnage

We note that two of these examples (Alma 62:35 and Ether 14:21) include instances of simple conjuncts of adjectives or nouns where, as we have seen, the *so* is not repeated.

If the extra *so* in "so exquisite and **so** bitter" is an early error in the text, one wonders how it could have been introduced. There are no nearby instances of the repeated *so* that could have reasonably prompted such an error (the nearest preceding instance, "so much light and so much knowledge", is in Alma 9:19). And the following nonrepeating "so exquisite and sweet" in this verse could not have caused the repetition of the *so*. These considerations argue that the use of the repeated *so* in "so exquisite and so bitter" must be intended, despite its exceptionality. The critical text will therefore maintain the variability in Alma 36:21, with one instance of repeated *so* ("so exquisite and **so** bitter") and one of nonrepeated *so* ("so exquisite and sweet").

The King James Bible has only one example of the repeated *so* with adjectival conjuncts. In this case, two verbless predicates are conjoined:

> Revelation 16:18
>   and there was a great earthquake
>   such as was not since men were upon the earth
>   **so mighty** an earthquake *and* **so great**

There are no examples in the King James text itself of the nonrepeated *so*. Interestingly, however, there is an example of nonrepeated *so* for conjoined adjectives in the dedication that the 1611 translators wrote to the king: "that . . . it may receive approbation and patronage from **so learned and judicious** a Prince as Your Highness is".

Summary: Retain in Alma 36:21 the earliest text (the reading in 𝓞) with its repeated *so* in "so exquisite and **so** bitter" but its nonrepeated *so* in the parallel "so exquisite and sweet"; in this case, the instance of repetition is exceptional for the text but nonetheless appears to be intended.

■ **Alma 36:22**

yea [& 01| *and* A | BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *methought I saw even as our father Lehi saw God sitting upon his throne surrounded with numberless concourses of angels*

In the 1837 edition, the conjunction *and* was accidentally omitted here in Alma 36:22. This change was not marked by Joseph Smith in the printer's manuscript, nor is it consistent with Joseph's

editing for the 1837 edition. In addition, the use of *yea and* is very frequent elsewhere in the text. There is no reason for it to have been deleted here in Alma 36:22. For another example of the loss of *and* from *yea and,* see nearby under Alma 36:27; for a more extensive list, see under 2 Nephi 25:5.

Sum mary: Restore the conjunction *and* in Alma 36:22 ("yea **and** methought I saw . . .").

■ **Alma 36:23**

and I stood **upon** *my feet*
and did manifest [*unto* 01ABCGHIJKLMNOPQRST | *upon* DE | *upon > unto* F] *the people*
that I had been born of God

> Here the typesetter for the 1841 British edition accidentally replaced the preposition *unto* with *upon.* He was undoubtedly influenced by the preceding occurrence of *upon* in "and I stood upon my feet". This secondary reading is not impossible, which perhaps explains why the incorrect *upon* was copied into the 1849 LDS edition and the first printing of the 1852 LDS edition. The second printing of the latter edition restored the original *unto.*

Summary: Maintain the preposition *unto* in Alma 36:23 ("and did manifest **unto** the people").

■ **Alma 36:25**

yea and now behold O my son
the Lord doth give [*me* 01ABCDEFGIJLMNOPQRST | HK]
exceeding great joy in the fruits of my labors

> The 1874 RLDS edition accidentally omitted the indirect object *me* in this verse. It was restored to the RLDS text in the 1908 RLDS edition. The *me* is definitely appropriate here since the sentence ends with "in the fruits of **my** labors".

Summary: Maintain the indirect object *me* in Alma 36:25, the reading of the original manuscript; the use of *me* is perfectly acceptable here.

■ **Alma 36:25**

yea and now behold O my son
the Lord doth give me exceeding great joy
in the [*fruits* 0 | *fruit* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *of my labors*

> 𝒪 is extant here and reads "in the fruits of my labors". Oliver Cowdery, when he copied from 𝒪 into 𝒫, replaced the plural *fruits* with the singular *fruit.* As explained under Alma 29:17, the original text seems to have number agreement in collocations of *fruit(s)* and *labor(s);* thus "in the **fruits** of my **labors**" is quite appropriate. For a more extensive discussion regarding the number for *fruits,* see under Jacob 5:74. Generally, we follow the earliest textual sources, thus *fruits* (the reading here in 𝒪) for Alma 36:25.

Summary: Restore the plural *fruits* in Alma 36:25, the reading of the original manuscript.

■ **Alma 36:27**

and I have been supported under trials and troubles of every kind
yea [*&* 01│*and* ABCDEFGIJLMNOPQRST│ HK] *in all manner of afflictions*

> Nearby, under Alma 36:22, we have an example where the text accidentally omitted *and* after *yea.*
> In that instance, the 1837 edition was responsible for the loss. Here in Alma 36:27, the *and* was
> omitted in the 1874 RLDS edition but then restored to the RLDS text in 1908. In each case, we fol-
> low the earliest textual sources, thus *yea and* here in Alma 36:27. For general discussion of *yea and,*
> see under 2 Nephi 25:5.

Summary: Maintain the occurrence of *yea and* in Alma 36:27, the reading of the earliest textual sources.

■ **Alma 36:27**

yea God hath delivered me
from [*prisons* 01│*prison* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *and from bonds and from death*

> The 1830 typesetter accidentally changed the plural *prisons* to *prison.* Alma's usage here is consis-
> tent with the conjoining of the same nouns (namely, the singular *death* and the plurals *bonds* and
> *prisons*) later on in the text:

> > Alma 62:50
> > yea they did remember how great things the Lord had done for them
> > that he had delivered them from **death** and from **bonds** and from **prisons**
> > and from all manner of afflictions

> Although the order of the conjuncts differs, this parallel passage retains the plural *prisons.* There
> is nothing wrong with the original plural *prisons* in Alma 36:27.

Summary: In accord with the reading of the two manuscripts, restore the plural *prisons* in Alma 36:27
("God hath delivered me from **prisons** and from bonds and from death); this same plural usage is
found in Alma 62:50 ("he had delivered them from death and from bonds and from **prisons**").

Alma 37

■ **Alma 37:2**

and I also command you that
ye [*shall* 0A | *shall* >js NULL 1 | BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *keep a record of this people*
      according as I have done upon the plates of Nephi
and keep all these things sacred which I have kept

> In his editing for the 1837 edition, Joseph Smith eliminated the modal verb *shall* near the beginning
> of Alma 37:2, perhaps because the preceding verse is very similar but does not have any modal:

> > Alma 37:1
> > and now my son Helaman I command you that
> > **ye take** the records which have been entrusted with me

> Thus the change in verse 2 makes the beginning of the chapter read more consistently. Nonethe-
> less, *shall* is clearly possible and is found in this context elsewhere in the text:

> | | |
> |---|---|
> | 2 Nephi 26:24 | he commandeth none that they **shall** not partake of his salvation |
> | 2 Nephi 26:29 | he commandeth that there **shall** be no priestcrafts |
> | Helaman 10:11 | I command you that ye **shall** go and declare unto this people . . . |
> | 3 Nephi 16:4 | and I command you that ye **shall** write these sayings |
> | Ether 8:23 | the Lord commandeth you . . . that ye **shall** awake |
> | | to a sense of your awful situation |

> The critical text will therefore restore the occurrence of *shall* here in Alma 37:2.

> *Summary:* Restore in Alma 37:2 the original *shall* in "I also command you that ye **shall** keep a record
> of this people", despite the fact that the preceding verse lacks the *shall* ("I command you that ye take
> the records"); either usage occurs elsewhere in the text.

■ **Alma 37:2−4**

and I also command you that ye shall keep a record of this people
      according as I have done upon the plates of Nephi
and keep all these things sacred which I have kept even as I have kept them
for it is for a wise purpose that they are kept
(1) [01 |; ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQS |. RT]
and these plates of brass which contain these engravings
which have the records of the holy scriptures upon them
which have the genealogy of our forefathers even from the beginning
(2) [0 |. 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQS |— RT]

[& 01 | *And* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQS | RT] *behold*
it hath been prophesied by our fathers
that they should be kept and handed down from one generation to another
and be kept and preserved by the hand of the Lord

Verse 3 begins with the phrase "and these plates of brass", which is modified by a sequence of three relative clauses that all begin with *which*. Then, without apparently providing any predicate for the initial noun phrase, the text abruptly shifts and starts over in verse 4 with a new clause that nonetheless refers to "these plates of brass"—namely, "and behold it hath been prophesied by our fathers that **they** [the plates of brass] should be kept and handed down from one generation to another". The *and* that begins verse 4 heightens the sense of abruptness, which may explain why the editors for the 1920 LDS edition deleted it. They also decided to replace the original period at the end of verse 3 (identified above at position 2) with a dash, thus providing a more direct link between verses 3 and 4. The removal of the *and* was intentional since it was marked in the 1920 committee copy.

But as David Calabro points out (personal communication), the real problem here is that the 1830 typesetter placed a semicolon between verses 2 and 3 (that is, at position 1); the 1920 LDS edition replaced the semicolon with a period, but this did not affect the sentential structure. Calabro argues that the phrase at the beginning of verse 3, "and these plates of brass", actually serves as part of the direct object for the earlier verb *keep* in verse 2. By omitting the parenthetical statements in verse 2, the relationship becomes clear:

> Alma 37:2−3
>> and I also command you that ye shall keep a record of this people . . .
>> and **keep** all these things sacred which I have kept . . .
>> and these plates of brass which contain these engravings . . .

In other words, Alma commands Helaman to keep all these things sacred, not only the Nephite records and artifacts but also the plates of brass. Under this interpretation, the sentence beginning verse 2 is completed at the end of verse 3. Consequently, verse 4 begins a new sentence ("and behold it hath been prophesied by our fathers that . . ."), which makes perfectly good sense. Thus there was no need in the 1920 edition to remove the *and* at the beginning of verse 4 and to replace the period at the end of verse 3 with a dash.

Summary: For Alma 37:2−3, the punctuation at the boundary between verses 2 and 3 should be emended so that these two verses act as a single sentence; correspondingly, the original full stop, a period, at the end of verse 3 should be restored since verse 4 begins a new sentence; consequently, the original *and* at the beginning of verse 4 should also be restored.

■ **Alma 37:6**

and small means in many [*instances* 01ABDEFIJLMNOPQRST | *instance* CGHK]
doth confound the wise

The 1840 edition replaced the plural *instances* with *instance*, giving "in many instance". This reading continued in the RLDS textual tradition until the 1908 RLDS edition. The singular "in many

instance" is a colloquial form that derives from earlier English when the ending *-(e)s* was not always expressed after words ending in /s/ in an unstressed syllable (see the discussion under 2 Nephi 31:18 regarding the occasional use of *witness* for *witnesses* in the earliest text). *Literature Online* <lion.chadwyck.com> provides the following examples of *many instance:*

> Martin Lister (1670)
>> we have **many instance** in Mr. Boyle
>
> Washington Irving (1819/20)
>> I have seen **many instance** of women running to waste and self-neglect

Usage like this may explain why the secondary "in many instance" in Alma 37:6 lasted so long in the RLDS textual tradition. (It is still prevalent in English, as exemplified by the many examples of "in many instance" found on <google.com>.) Elsewhere in the Book of Mormon, this phrase is consistently rendered in the plural ("in many instances"):

2 Nephi 28:14	in many instances they do err
Alma 31:11	they did pervert the ways of the Lord in very many instances
Alma 34:6	my brother hath proven unto you in many instances that . . .

The critical text will maintain the plural expression "in many instances" in Alma 37:6.

Summary: Maintain in Alma 37:6 and elsewhere in the text the plural expression "in many instances".

■ **Alma 37:6–7**

(1) *and* **small means** *in many instances doth confound the wise*
(2) *and the Lord God doth work by* **means** *to bring about his great and eternal purposes*
(3) *and by* **very small means** *the Lord doth confound the wise and bringeth about the salvation of many souls*

One might wonder if the occurrence of *means* near the beginning of verse 7 (listed above under 2) is an error for *small means* since otherwise the larger passage has only *small means* (listed above under 1 and 3). If we accept such an emendation, the subsequent occurrence of *very small means* later on in verse 7 would then emphasize the *very* and contrast it with the "small means" that the Lord generally uses "to bring about his great and eternal purposes").

There are three arguments against emending *means* to *small means* here in Alma 37:7. First of all, the original manuscript is basically extant for this whole passage, and it reads just like the current text:

Alma 37:6–7 (lines 31–34, page 295′ of 𝒪)

```
simple things are great things brought to pass & small means in m(  )
                                                              AN
-y instances doth confound the wise & the Lord God doth work by me( )
                                                               A
-ns to bring about his great & eternal purposes & by <smal> verry small

means the Lord doth confound the wise & bringeth about the salvation of
```

In this passage, the three instances of *means* read respectively as *small means, means,* and *very small means*. In the second instance, Oliver Cowdery wrote *mea* at the end of line 32, then finished the word by writing *-ns* at the beginning of the next line. There is some noise above *by mea* at the end of line 32, but there is no evidence for any supralinearly inserted *small*. So manuscript evidence supports the current reading in Alma 37:7 of *means* alone.

The second argument against emending *means* to *small means* deals with the issue of whether the *very* in the third instance should really be considered a case of emphasis. Note that the first and third instances of *means* (one as *small means* and the other as *very small means*) seem to be saying the same thing:

> Alma 37:6   and **small means** in many instances doth confound the wise
>
> Alma 37:7   and by **very small means** the Lord doth confound the wise

The parallelism between the first and third instances implies that the addition of *very* in verse 7 is not intended to be contrastive. In fact, when writing down Joseph Smith's dictation of the third instance of the word *means,* Oliver Cowdery started to write *small means* in line 33, but before finishing *small* (he had only written *smal*), he crossed out the word and then wrote inline *very* (spelled as *verry*) followed by *small means*. In other words, Oliver expected *small means,* not *very small means*.

But perhaps the most significant argument against emending *means* to *small means* in verse 7 is that God does generally work through means (that is, the physical matter and beings of this world) "to bring about his great and eternal purposes". It is true that there are two other scriptures that refer to the *small means* of the Lord, both of which specifically refer to the operation of the Liahona:

> 1 Nephi 16:29
>> and there was also written upon them a new writing which was plain to be read
>> which did give us understanding concerning the ways of the Lord
>> and it was written and changed from time to time
>> according to the faith and diligence which we gave unto it
>> and thus we see that by **small means** the Lord can bring about great things

> Alma 37:40–41
>> therefore if they had faith to believe that God could cause
>> that those spindles should point the way they should go
>> behold it was done
>> therefore they had this miracle and also many other miracles
>> wrought by the power of God day by day
>> nevertheless because those miracles were worked by **small means**
>> nevertheless it did shew unto them marvelous works

Yet there are also passages that more generally refer to the *means* that the Lord provides:

> 1 Nephi 17:3
>> and if it so be that the children of men keep the commandments of God
>> he doth nourish them and strengthen them and provide **ways and means**
>> whereby they can accomplish the thing which he hath commanded them
>> wherefore he did provide **ways and means** for us
>> while we did sojourn in the wilderness

Mosiah 8:18
    thus God hath provided **a means**
    that man through faith might work mighty miracles

Alma 34:15
    and thus he shall bring salvation to all those who shall believe on his name
    this being the intent of this last sacrifice
    to bring about the bowels of mercy which overpowereth justice
    and bringeth about **means** unto men that they may have faith unto repentance

Alma 60:21
    or do ye suppose that the Lord will still deliver us
    while we sit upon our thrones and do not make use of **the means**
    which the Lord hath provided for us

Since *means* alone will work, the critical text will retain the invariant use of *means* near the beginning of Alma 37:7.

Summary: Maintain in Alma 37:7 the use of *means* alone in the sentence "the Lord God doth work by **means** to bring about his great and eternal purposes"; not only is this the invariant reading in all the textual sources, but there are other passages in the text that generally refer to God using means (and not necessarily small means) to accomplish his purposes.

■ **Alma 37:9**

were it not for these [*plates > things* 1 | *things* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
that these records do contain which are on these plates

Here in the printer's manuscript, Oliver Cowdery initially wrote *these plates* ("were it not for these plates"). Virtually immediately he caught his error, crossed out *plates,* and supralinearly inserted *things.* The original manuscript is not extant here but probably read *these things* since "these plates that these records do contain" doesn't make any sense. Oliver's initial error was undoubtedly the result of him anticipating the following *these plates* ("which are on these plates").

Summary: Maintain in Alma 37:9 the corrected reading in 𝒫, "were it not for these **things**".

■ **Alma 37:9**

Ammon and his brethren could not have convinced
so many [*thousands* 01BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST | *thousand* A] *of the Lamanites*
of the incorrect tradition of their fathers

As discussed under the Words of Mormon 1:14, the original text permits *many thousand* but only when directly followed by a noun, such as "many thousand lives" (in Alma 28:10). When post-modified by a prepositional phrase headed by *of,* we always get the plural *thousands* ("many thousands of X"). Here in Alma 37:9, the 1830 compositor accidentally set "many thousand of the Lamanites". The subsequent 1837 edition restored the correct *thousands.*

Summary: Maintain in Alma 37:9 the plural *thousands* in "so many thousands of the Lamanites", the reading of the manuscripts; usage elsewhere consistently supports the plural *thousands* in "many thousands of X".

■ **Alma 37:10**

and who knoweth but what they [*will* 01ABCDEFGIJLMNOPQRST | *shall* HK] *be the means of bringing many thousands of them . . . to the knowledge of their Redeemer*

> Here the earliest text has the modal *will.* The 1874 RLDS edition replaced it with *shall;* the 1908 RLDS edition restored the original *will* to the RLDS text. Either reading is theoretically possible here, so we follow the earliest reading ("they **will** be the means of bringing many thousands of them . . . to the knowledge of their Redeemer"). There is one other example in the text with similar phraseology, and it has *will* rather than *shall:* "for ye know not but what they **will** return and repent" (3 Nephi 18:32).

Summary: Maintain in Alma 37:10 the modal verb *will,* the reading of all the earliest sources ("and who knoweth but what they **will** be the means of bringing many thousands of them . . . to the knowledge of their Redeemer").

■ **Alma 37:10**

yea and also many thousands of our stiff-necked brethren the Nephites
which are now hardening their hearts
in [*sins* 1GHKPS | *sin* ABCDEFIJLMNOQRT] *and iniquities*

> The 1830 typesetter accidentally replaced the plural *sins* (in the prepositional phrase "in sins and iniquities") with the singular *sin.* The 1858 Wright edition (which the RLDS textual tradition follows) restored the plural *sins,* probably unintentionally. As discussed under Mosiah 29:30–31, in phrases conjoining *sin/sins* and *iniquity/iniquities,* the original text always shows number agreement. In Alma 37:10, the critical text will restore the original plural *sins* in the conjunctive phrase "in sins and iniquities".

Summary: Restore in Alma 37:10 the plural *sins* in the phrase "in sins and iniquities", the reading of the earliest extant source (the printer's manuscript).

■ **Alma 37:10**

and who knoweth but what they will be the means of bringing many thousands of them
yea and also many thousands of our stiff-necked brethren the Nephites
which are now hardening their hearts in sins and iniquities
to the knowledge of [*their* 01ABCDEFGHIJKMNOPQRST | *the* L] *Redeemer*

> The 1902 LDS missionary edition replaced the determiner *their* with *the.* In theory, either determiner will work here, so we follow the earliest reading, "to the knowledge of **their** Redeemer". Perhaps the 1902 typesetter was influenced by *the Lord* in the previous verse: "they brought them

to the knowledge of **the Lord** their God". Elsewhere the text has six instances of "the knowledge of **their** Redeemer" but none of "the knowledge of **the** Redeemer".

Summary: Maintain in Alma 37:10 the occurrence of *their* in the phrase "the knowledge of **their** Redeemer", the reading of all the earliest textual sources (including ౮).

■ **Alma 37:11**

now these mysteries [*art >+ are* 0 | *are* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *not yet fully made known unto me*

Here Oliver Cowdery initially wrote "these mysteries **art**". Later, perhaps when he read the text back to Joseph Smith, he crossed out the *art* and supralinearly wrote *are* (the correction was made with somewhat heavier ink flow). As discussed under Mosiah 2:24, there is some evidence that once in a while Oliver accidentally crossed the final *e* of *are,* giving *art.* This example of *art* here in Alma 37:11 appears to be an instance of this error, one that Oliver corrected. There are, on the other hand, a few instances of *art* (chiefly in relative clauses) that appear to be intended, although nonstandard for the biblical style deriving from Early Modern English (for discussion of this possibility of actual *art,* see under Alma 32:15). But the use of initial *art* here in Alma 37:11 appears to be a scribal slip on Oliver's part. There are no other examples in the text where a plural subject takes an immediately adjacent *art* as its verb.

Summary: Accept in Alma 37:11 Oliver Cowdery's correction in ౮ of his initial *art* to *are,* the probable reading of the original text: "these mysteries **are** not yet fully made known unto me".

■ **Alma 37:12**

and his paths are [*strait* 01 | *straight* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *and his course is one eternal round*

As discussed under 1 Nephi 8:20, the word here is *straight* (meaning 'not crooked'), rather than *strait* (meaning 'narrow').

■ **Alma 37:13**

how strict [*is >+ are* 0 | *is > are* 1 | *are* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *the commandments of God*

Here in both ౮ and ℘, Oliver Cowdery initially wrote "how strict **is** the commandments of God"; and in both manuscripts, he corrected the *is* to *are* by crossing out the *is* and supralinearly inserting the *are.* For the correction in ℘, there is no change in the level of ink flow; but in ౮ the supralinear *are* is written unevenly and with somewhat heavier ink flow. The correction in ౮ definitely appears secondary, and it seems highly unlikely that Oliver would have incorrectly written the *are* as *is* in ℘ if ౮ had already been corrected so noticeably to *are.* These two corrections, taken together, suggest that Oliver decided to correct the *is* to *are* as he was copying from ౮ into ℘. After correcting *is* to *are* in ℘ (this correction was virtually immediate), he then made the same correction in ౮. In other words, here in Alma 37:13 we probably have an instance of conscious editing.

Elsewhere in the text, there are 17 examples of the plural "how <adjective> **are** <plural subject>" and 5 of the singular "how <adjective> **is** <singular subject>". In other words, for this expression there are no other instances that violate the standard rules of subject-verb agreement. In fact, none of these 22 instances show any variation in the grammatical number for the subject noun or any variation between *is* and *are*. In particular, there is no independent evidence that Oliver Cowdery ever accidentally wrote "how <adjective> **is** <plural subject>". This systematicity argues that "how strict **is** the commandments of God" is probably not the result of a scribal error on Oliver's part.

More generally in the text, we do find clear evidence in the manuscripts and in the 1830 edition for expressions where a plural subject is delayed and the preceding verb is the nonstandard *is* rather than the standard *are*. In the following cases, the original manuscript (where extant), the printer's manuscript (before it was edited by Joseph Smith for the 1837 edition), and the 1830 edition all support the earliest nonstandard reading with *is*:

> 1 Nephi 22:6 ("thus **is** the covenants")
>> for thus [*is the covenants* 01ABDE | *are the covenants* CGHKPRST |
>> *is the covenant* FIJLMNOQ] of the Lord with our fathers
>
> 2 Nephi 10:21 ("great **is** the promises")
>> but great [*is* >js *are* 1 | *is* A | *are* BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] the promises of the Lord
>
> Mosiah 4:8 ("neither **is** there any conditions")
>> neither [*is* 1ABDEP | *are* CGHIJKLMNOQRST | *is* > *are* F] there
>> any [*conditions* 1ABCDEGHIJKLMNOPQRST | *condition* > *conditions* F]
>
> Mosiah 18:8 ("here **is** the waters")
>> behold here [*is* 1A | *are* BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
>> the [*water* > *waters* 1 | *waters* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] of Mormon
>
> Alma 11:22 ("here **is** six onties")
>> behold here [*is* 1ABDEFIJL | *are* CGHKNOPQRST | *is* > *are* M] six onties of silver
>
> Alma 44:8 ("here **is** our weapons")
>> behold here [*is* 01A | *are* BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] our weapons of war
>
> Mormon 9:7 ("there **is** no revelations")
>> that there [*is* >js *are* 1 | *is* A | *are* BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
>> no revelations nor prophecies

It is important to note here that Oliver Cowdery did not emend any of these instances of *is* to *are*. On the other hand, none of these are of the specific form "how <adjective> is <plural subject>", which may have seemed particularly objectionable to Oliver.

Ultimately, here in Alma 37:13 the critical text will rely on the distinct difference between how the *is* was corrected to *are* in the manuscripts. The correction in 𝓞 is definitely secondary, which means that originally 𝓞 probably read "how strict **is** the commandments of God". Thus the critical text will follow the difficult reading in this instance.

Summary: Restore in Alma 37:13 the original *is* that Oliver Cowdery wrote in 𝓞: "how strict **is** the commandments of God"; in this case, evidence from the manuscripts argues that when Oliver copied the text from 𝓞 into 𝓟, he decided to grammatically emend the *is* to *are;* he first corrected 𝓟, then made the correction in 𝓞.

■ **Alma 37:13**

and he saith
if ye will keep **my** *commandments / ye shall prosper in the land*
but if ye keep not [*his* 01ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRT | *my* S] *commandments*
ye shall be cut off from [*his* 01ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRT | *my* S] *presence*

Here the 1953 RLDS edition made this whole passage into a direct quote. In the original text (which is wholly extant in the original manuscript), the first part of the passage is a direct quote (thus "**my** commandments"), but the second part is an indirect quote ("**his** commandments . . . **his** presence"). A similar example of this kind of mixture (a direct quote for the positive form of the promise, immediately followed by an indirect quote for the negative form of the promise) is found in 2 Nephi 1:20. In that instance, Oliver Cowdery made the correction of *his* to *my* in 𝓞 itself, but only later. Thus the original readings in 2 Nephi 1:20 and in Alma 37:13 support each other. The original use of *his* here in Alma 37:13 will be maintained in the critical text. For an extensive discussion of how this promise is quoted throughout the text, in both its positive and negative forms, see under 2 Nephi 1:20.

Summary: Accept in Alma 37:13 the switch from a direct quote (in positive form) to an indirect quote (in negative form) of the Lord's promise that he originally gave to Nephi and Lehi; the same switch in usage can be found originally in 2 Nephi 1:20.

■ **Alma 37:17–18**

for he will fulfill all his promises which he shall make unto you
for he hath fulfilled his [*promise* 01A | *promises* BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
which he hath made unto our [*fother* > *fothers* 0 | *fathers* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
for he promised unto them that he would preserve these things for a wise purpose in him

In the second half of verse 17, the original manuscript reads *his promise,* although earlier in the verse we have the plural *all his promises.* The preceding plural usage probably influenced the 1837 printer (or perhaps Joseph Smith) to change the following singular *his promise* to *his promises.* Nonetheless, we have two different kinds of promises in this passage. In verse 17, Alma is telling Helaman that God will fulfill all his future promises ("all his promises which he shall make unto you"), just as he has already fulfilled a previous promise made "unto our fathers"—namely, that the records would be preserved ("that he would preserve these things for a wise purpose in him"). We can find specific reference in the small plates of Nephi to this particular prophetic promise made centuries earlier to Lehi and to Nephi:

> 1 Nephi 5:17–19 (Nephi's record of Lehi's prophesying)
> and now when my father saw all these things
> he was filled with the Spirit and began to prophesy concerning his seed
> that these plates of brass should go forth
> unto all nations kindreds tongues and people which were of his seed
> wherefore he said that these plates of brass should never perish
> neither should they be dimmed any more by time

2 Nephi 25:21 (Nephi speaking)
>   wherefore for this cause hath the Lord God promised unto me
>   that these things which I write shall be kept and preserved
>   and handed down unto my seed from generation to generation

Thus the occurrence of the singular *promise* in the latter half of Alma 37:17 should be restored to the text.

We also note here a minor variant at the end of verse 17: namely, in the original manuscript, Oliver Cowdery initially wrote the singular *fother* (a scribal slip for *father*). Shortly thereafter Oliver corrected this singular to the plural by inserting inline the plural *s* (there is no change in the level of ink flow for the *s*). This correction undoubtedly reflects the reading of the original text. Note, for instance, that the following plural *them* supports *fathers*: "for he promised unto **them** that he would preserve these things for a wise purpose in him". And from the two quotations from the small plates of Nephi (cited above), the small plates record this promise as having been made to both Lehi and Nephi. Moreover, the use of a singular *our father* here in Alma 37:17 seems virtually impossible unless the name of that father was added, as in Alma 9:9 ("our father Lehi"), Alma 13:15 ("our father Abraham"), or 3 Nephi 10:17 ("our father Jacob"). Finally, we have explicit evidence later in this chapter of Oliver's tendency to initially write *father* rather than the correct *fathers*. In that instance, the initial error was in 𝓟 but was corrected by reference to 𝓞, which is extant and reads twice as *Fathers:*

Alma 37:38 (Oliver Cowdery's initial *father* in 𝓟 is corrected to *fathers*)
>   I have somewhat to say concerning the thing
>   which our [*Fathers* 0|*fathers* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] call a ball or director
>   or our [*Fathers* 0|*father* >+ *fathers* 1|*fathers* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
>   called it Liahona

The plural *fathers* is undoubtedly the correct reading in Alma 37:17 as well.

Summary: In accord with the reading of the earliest textual sources (𝓞, 𝓟, and the 1830 edition), restore the singular *his promise* in the second half of Alma 37:17; the preceding *all his promises* refers to future promises, not the particular one made centuries earlier to Lehi and to Nephi that the plates would be preserved; contextually, the use of the plural *our fathers* is correct in this passage.

■ **Alma 37:18**

for he promised unto them
that he would [*preserve* 0T|*reserve* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRS] *these things*
for a wise purpose in him

The original manuscript here reads *preserve*, which Oliver Cowdery misread as *reserve* when he copied from 𝓞 into 𝓟. The 1981 LDS edition restored the correct *preserve* in the LDS text. As discussed under Alma 17:31, either reading will actually work here since in Early Modern English the word *reserve* had the meaning 'preserve'. Here in Alma 37:18, we follow the earliest textual source (namely, the original manuscript) and maintain *preserve*. Usage elsewhere in this chapter supports the use of *preserve* in referring to the promise the Lord made that he would not allow these records to be lost:

Alma 37:4	and be kept and **preserved** by the hand of the Lord
Alma 37:8	that these things should be **preserved**
Alma 37:12	they are **preserved** for a wise purpose
Alma 37:14	and also which he will keep and **preserve** for a wise purpose in him
Alma 37:19	therefore they shall be **preserved**

The same language is also found in the Lord's original promise to Nephi, as recorded in the small plates of Nephi:

2 Nephi 25:21	that these things which I write shall be kept and **preserved**

Summary: Maintain in Alma 37:18 the original verb *preserve* rather than the misreading *reserve* that Oliver Cowdery introduced into the text when he copied from ℴ into P.

■ **Alma 37:20**

therefore I command you my son Helaman
that ye be diligent in fulfilling
all my [*word >+ words* 0 | *word > words* 1 | *words* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]

Here we have a correction in both manuscripts that parallels the correction of *is* to *are* earlier in verse 13: Oliver Cowdery wrote the singular *word* in ℴ, with the result that when he copied the text from ℴ into 𝒫, he initially wrote *word* but then virtually immediately corrected it to *words*. Finally, he made the same correction in ℴ. In both manuscripts, the plural *s* was inserted inline after the singular *word*. The level of ink flow for the correction in 𝒫 is without change, but in ℴ the *s* is distinctly heavier, thus arguing for its secondary nature.

In verse 13, the change of *is* to *are* appears to have been purely grammatical; that is, the original text seems to have read *is*. Here in Alma 37:20, there is strong evidence that *words* is the reading of the original text. The reading *all my word* seems impossible; it occurs nowhere else in the Book of Mormon (nor in any of the other scriptures for that matter). On the other hand, *all my words* occurs three other times in the Book of Mormon:

2 Nephi 29:10	ye need not suppose that it contains **all my words**
3 Nephi 17:2	ye cannot understand **all my words** which I am commanded of the Father to speak unto you at this time
Mormon 9:25	unto him will I confirm **all my words**

There are two other examples in the history of the text where "all the words" has been accidentally replaced by "all the word":

1 Nephi 10:17 (initial error in 𝒫)

   I Nephi having heard
   all the [*words* 0ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST | *word > words* 1] of my father

2 Nephi 5:4 (1953 RLDS edition)

   now I do not write upon these plates
   all the [*words* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRT | *word* s]
   which they murmured against me

In the first example, 𝓞 is extant and correctly reads *words;* when Oliver Cowdery copied the text into 𝓟, he initially wrote *word* but then virtually immediately inserted the plural *s* inline (there is no change in the level of ink flow). Discussion under 2 Nephi 5:4 shows that there are 19 instances in the original text of "all the words" but none of "all the word". In addition, there are ten occurrences of "all his words" in the text as well as one each of "all thy words" (Alma 18:23) and "all their words" (Mosiah 12:19). But there are none of "all his word", "all thy word", or "all their word".

Finally, there is independent evidence that Oliver Cowdery tended to write *words* as *word* in the manuscripts, if only momentarily. In one very clear example, Oliver initially wrote *these word* in 𝓞 but then corrected the manuscript to *these words:*

> Alma 46:19
> and when Moroni had said
> these [*word > words* 0 | *words* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
> he went forth among the people

For other examples of this same error, see under 2 Nephi 29:2–3 and Mosiah 22:4. The critical text will therefore accept Oliver Cowdery's correction of *word* to *words* in Alma 37:20 as the original reading even though it apparently resulted from his own conscious editing.

Summary: Accept in Alma 37:20 Oliver Cowdery's correction of *word* to *words* in the manuscripts since the singular is essentially impossible in the phrase "all my word(s)".

■ **Alma 37:21**

and now I will speak unto you
concerning [*those* 01ABCDEFIJLMNOPQRST | *these* GHK] *twenty-four plates*

Here the 1858 Wright edition replaced *those* with *these,* probably unintentionally. The original *those* was restored to the RLDS text in the 1908 RLDS edition. In this chapter, Alma seems to have the plates and other artifacts (like the Liahona) before him as he speaks to Helaman (Alma is handing over these objects to his son); thus we find the use of *these* elsewhere in this chapter:

verse 2	and keep all **these** things sacred
verse 3	and **these** plates of brass which contain **these** engravings
verse 8	that **these** things should be preserved
verse 9	were it not for **these** things that **these** records do contain which are on **these** plates
verse 9	yea **these** records and their words brought them unto repentance
verse 14	God hath entrusted you with **these** things
verse 15	behold **these** things which are sacred shall be taken away from you
verse 16	and do with **these** things which are sacred according to that which the Lord doth command you
verse 18	that he would preserve **these** things for a wise purpose in him
verse 21	and that ye preserve **these** directors
verse 24	**these** directors were prepared that the word of God might be fulfilled
verse 47	see that ye take care of **these** sacred things

On the other hand, *those* is never otherwise used in this section of Alma's discourse to refer to these objects. Presumably the twenty-four plates (containing the Jaredite record) would have been in Alma's possession and present. So it is possible that the unique use of *those* here in verse 21 is an error for *these*. There is considerable evidence that the scribes occasionally mixed up *these* and *those* (for a nearby example, see under Alma 37:29). Nonetheless, *those* will work here in Alma 37:21, especially since here Alma brings up a new topic (namely, the Jaredite plates); the shift from *these* to *those* allows the shift in topic to be more prominent. Another possible reason for the use of *those* here in verse 21 is that these particular plates, given their sensitive nature, may not have been actually present. Note that Alma later explains to Helaman that he must keep back all the specifics regarding the Jaredites' secret abominations:

> Alma 37:27
> > I command you that ye retain all their oaths and their covenants
> > and their agreements in their secret abominations
> > yea and all their signs and their wonders ye shall retain from this people

Since *those* will work here in verse 21, the critical text will follow the earliest textual sources and maintain that unique occurrence of *those*. In general, the text allows for variation between *these* and *those,* as in the following pair of examples, also occurring in this chapter:

> Alma 37:29   ye shall keep **these** secret plans of their oaths and their covenants
> > from this people
> Alma 37:32   trust not **those** secret plans unto this people

Summary: Maintain in Alma 37:21 the demonstrative determiner *those,* the reading of all the earliest textual sources, including ○: "and now I will speak unto you concerning **those** twenty-four plates".

■ **Alma 37:21**

yea and that ye preserve [*the > these* 1 | *these* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *directors*

The original manuscript is not extant here, but spacing between extant fragments of ○ suggests that there was room for the longer *these*. Oliver Cowdery, when copying to the printer's manuscript, initially wrote *the,* then inserted the *se* inline. His addition of *se* may actually be purely scribal since the *the* occurs at the end of the line; that is, he may have decided to insert the *se* at the end of the line rather than write it at the beginning of the next line (thus he would have avoided hyphenating the word). There is no change in the level of ink flow, which suggests that this correction was virtually immediate. (For a list of cases where the scribes tended to write *the* instead of *these,* see under Jacob 1:1.)

The use of *these* also makes sense. The directors seem to have been at hand as Alma conversed with Helaman (see the immediately previous discussion regarding the dominant use of *these* throughout this part of the text). The definite article *the* would work only if Alma had already mentioned the directors, but he had not. Further support for *these directors* is found several verses later where the text once more uses *these:* "and now my son **these** directors were prepared that the word of God might be fulfilled" (Alma 37:24).

Summary: Maintain in Alma 37:21 the use of the demonstrative *these* (the corrected reading in 𝔓) to refer to the directors: "yea and that ye preserve **these** directors".

■ **Alma 37:21**

yea and that ye preserve these [*directors* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQS | *interpreters* RT]

Here in the 1920 LDS edition, the word *directors* was replaced by *interpreters*. The same change was made a few verses later:

> Alma 37:24
>> and now my son
>> these [*directors* 01ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQS | *interpreters* RT] were prepared
>> that the word of God might be fulfilled

Elsewhere the Book of Mormon refers to these directors as *interpreters:*

> Mosiah 8:13
>> and the things are called **interpreters**
>> and no man can look in them except he be commanded

> Mosiah 8:19
>> and these **interpreters** was doubtless prepared
>> for the purpose of unfolding all such mysteries to the children of men

> 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**

> Ether 4:5
>> wherefore I have sealed up the **interpreters**
>> according to the commandment of the Lord

On the other hand, the singular *director* is used systematically in the text to refer to the Liahona:

> Mosiah 1:16
>> 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
>> and the **ball or director** which led our fathers through the wilderness

> Alma 37:38
>> and now my son I have somewhat to say concerning the thing
>> which our fathers call **a ball or director**
>> or our fathers called **it** Liahona which is being interpreted a compass

> Alma 37:45
>> for just assuredly as **this director** did bring our fathers
>> by following **its** course to the promised land . . .

Also note that the text consistently uses singular function words (*a, it, this,* and *its*) to refer to the Liahona. Thus the original Book of Mormon text twice uses the plural *directors* as a synonym for *interpreters,* but the singular *director* refers only to the Liahona. Yet in a revelation given during the translation (in June 1829), the plural term *directors* was used to refer to the Liahona (although the specific reading here may date from as late as 1835):

Doctrine and Covenants 17:1 (current LDS edition)
> you shall have a view of the plates
> and also the breastplate
> the sword of Laban
> the Urim and Thummim
> —which were given to the brother of Jared upon the mount
> when he talked with the Lord face to face—
> and the miraculous **directors** which **were** given to Lehi
> while in the wilderness on the borders of the Red Sea

This revelation does not appear in the 1833 Book of Commandments (or at least in that part of the book that was printed prior to the press being destroyed). It first appeared in the 1835 Doctrine and Covenants (there it is found in section 42). The term *Urim and Thummim* used in section 17 of the current LDS Doctrine and Covenants was Joseph Smith's later designation for what the Book of Mormon generally refers to as the interpreters (although apparently the term *Urim and Thummim* was sometimes used to refer to the seer stone that Joseph also used in translating). In a letter dated 7 September 1834, written by Oliver Cowdery to William W. Phelps and published in the October 1834 issue of the *Latter Day Saints' Messenger and Advocate* (1:13–16), Oliver explained that the term *Urim and Thummim* referred to the Nephite interpreters:

> Day after day I continued, uninterrupted, to write from his mouth, as he translated with the Urim and Thummim, or, as the Nephites would have said, "Interpreters," the history or record called "The Book of Mormon."

Yet in Alma 37:21, 24, the Book of Mormon uses the term *directors* to refer to the interpreters.

The original manuscript is not extant for the first occurrence of *directors* (in Alma 37:21), but spacing in the lacuna favors *directors* instead of the somewhat longer *interpreters*. Moreover, the second occurrence of *directors* is extant in the original manuscript, so the evidence seems quite strong that the original text in Alma 37 read *directors* and not *interpreters*. Nor is there any nearby preceding occurrence of *director* that could have prompted Oliver Cowdery or Joseph Smith to accidentally replace an original *interpreters* with *directors* in 𝓞 (the only previous instance of *director* is in Mosiah 1:16); the word *director* for the Liahona does show up in chapter 37, but only later in verses 38 and 45.

Joseph Smith later indicated (in his 1839 History) that the Urim and Thummim were used at the time of the Book of Mormon translation to receive a number of revelations, including sections 3, 6, 7, 11, 14–16, and 17 (the numbering assigned in the current LDS Doctrine and Covenants). In this later account, Joseph wrote as if the Urim and Thummim were the Nephite interpreters, not the seer stone that he also used to translate the Book of Mormon. See Joseph's commentary before each of these revelations as found on pages 287–295 in Dean C. Jessee, *The Papers of Joseph Smith,* volume 1 (Salt Lake City, Utah: Deseret Book, 1989).

In other words, the Nephite interpreters had broad revelatory powers: Joseph could use them not only to translate but also to receive personal revelations, with instructions regarding the translation (as in section 3 of the current LDS Doctrine and Covenants). These extended uses of the interpreters to give general directions on what to do suggest that such an instrument could also give, if needed, physical directions (although no instance of this capability is specifically mentioned).

In any event, the plural term *directors* (at least in its general sense) is an acceptable alternative for *interpreters*. And we should also note that even the Liahona, consistently referred to in the text by the singular *director,* was used to receive revelations as well as physical directions:

> 1 Nephi 16:26–29
> and it came to pass that the voice of the Lord said unto him
> look upon the ball and behold the things which are written
> and it came to pass that when my father beheld the things
>   which were written upon the ball
> he did fear and tremble exceedingly
> and also my brethren and the sons of Ishmael and our wives
> and it came to pass that I Nephi beheld that the pointers which were in the ball
> that they did work according to the faith and diligence and heed
>   which we did give unto them
> and there was also written upon them a new writing which was plain to be read
> which did give us understanding concerning the ways of the Lord
> and it was written and changed from time to time
> according to the faith and diligence which we gave unto it

Ultimately, there is no necessary distinction in the text between the terms *directors* and *interpreters*. The critical text will therefore restore the original plural *directors* in Alma 37:21, 24 since the term is clearly intended.

Summary: Restore in Alma 37:21, 24 the two original occurrences of the alternative term *directors* in place of the more general term *interpreters* (used elsewhere in the text); the second instance of *directors* (in verse 24) is extant in ℗, and spacing between extant fragments of ℗ supports the original occurrence of *directors* in the first instance as well (in verse 21); in the original Book of Mormon text, the plural *directors* is distinguished from the singular *director,* which refers only to the Liahona.

- **Alma 37:23**

I will prepare unto my servant **Gazelem**
[01|, ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *a stone*
[01|, ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *which shall shine forth in darkness unto light*

The Book of Mormon text reads *Gazelem* in all the textual sources, including the original manuscript, although the last vowel of the name has sometimes been spelled differently in other texts (described below).

It is difficult to tell here whether *Gazelem* is the name of the servant or the stone. The 1830 typesetter placed commas around the phrase *a stone*. One could interpret this punctuation as forcing *Gazelem* to be associated with the preceding servant (thus *Gazelem* is the name of the servant). Or one could interpret *a stone* as a nonrestrictive appositive, thus describing *Gazelem* as a stone.

Joseph Smith adopted *Gazelem* as one of his code names in a number of sections in the first published edition of the Doctrine and Covenants (in 1835). Orson Pratt's explanation of why this name was chosen for Joseph suggests the interpretation that *Gazelem* was the name of a person (original accidentals here retained):

Orson Pratt, *Journal of Discourses* 16:156 (16 August 1873)

> And when the Lord was about to have the Book of Covenants given to the world, it was thought wisdom, in consequence of the persecutions of our enemies in Kirtland and some of the regions around, that some of the names should be changed, and Joseph was called Baurak Ale, which was a Hebrew word; meaning God bless you. He was also called **Gazelum**, being a person to whom the Lord had given the Urim and Thummim. He was also called Enoch.

The name here was spelled as *Gazelum.* And the code name in the 1835 Doctrine and Covenants was spelled yet another way, as *Gazelam* (six times). For additional discussion on the use of code names in the original Doctrine and Covenants, see David J. Whittaker, "Substituted Names in the Published Revelations of Joseph Smith", *Brigham Young University Studies* 23/1 (1983): 103–112.

There is also evidence that the name *Gazelem* could be the name of the stone. Assigning a name to an instrument of revelation is supported in verse 38 where the ball or compass that Lehi found is referred to by its name Liahona. One example of interpreting *Gazelem* as the name of the stone is found in the index for the 1841 British edition (which was printed under the direction of Brigham Young, Heber C. Kimball, and Parley P. Pratt); here we have the following list of objects (plates and instruments of translation) that Alma handed over to Helaman:

> Plates given to Helaman 349
> 24 plates, and directors 351
> Gazelem, a stone, (secret) . . . 351
> Liahona, or compass 353

The index for the 1841 edition, produced in Britain at the time of the publication of that edition, was created independently and without any input from Joseph Smith. Subsequent derivative indexes made for the earlier printed 1837 and 1840 editions repeat the same identification of *Gazelem* as a stone. On the other hand, the index for the 1830 edition (which was not produced at the time of the 1830 publication) ignores the stone and refers only to the directors ("The directors spoken of ").

Most likely, the phrase here in Alma 37:23, "my servant Gazelem", intends to say that the name of the servant was Gazelem. One reason is that there are numerous instances in the text of the expression "my servant <name>":

> Mosiah 26:15   my servant Abinadi
>
> Alma 8:29   my servant Amulek
>
> 3 Nephi 23:9   my servant Samuel the Lamanite
>
> Ether 4:16   my servant John

Another reason is that if the name of the stone were *Gazelem,* we would expect the word order to be different, with the indefinite *a stone* preceding its name (something like "I will prepare unto my servant a stone, Gazelem"). For example, names like *Rameumptom* and *Liahona* are given only after the object itself has been described or identified:

> Alma 31:13, 21
>
> > for they had **a place** built up in the center of their synagogue
> > **a place** of standing which was high above the head . . .
> > now the place was called by them **Rameumptom**
> > which being interpreted is the holy stand

Alma 37:38

and now my son I have somewhat to say concerning the thing
which our fathers call **a ball or director**
or our fathers called it **Liahona**
which is being interpreted a compass

The critical text will therefore interpret the name *Gazelem* as the name of the servant, not the name of the stone.

Summary: In Alma 37:23, the name of the servant is spelled *Gazelem;* based on usage elsewhere in the text, there is less chance that *Gazelem* is the name of the stone.

■ **Alma 37:24**

and now my son
these [directors 01ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRS | *interpreters* RT] *were prepared*
that the word of God might be fulfilled

For discussion regarding the term *directors* in the original text, see under Alma 37:21.

■ **Alma 37:26**

and thus far the word [NULL > *of God* 0 | *of God* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
hath been fulfilled

Here in the original manuscript, Oliver Cowdery initially wrote "the word hath been fulfilled". Virtually immediately, Oliver supralinearly inserted *of God* (there is no change in the level of ink flow for the correction). Here *of God* is expected, especially since Alma is referring to what he just said earlier in verses 24–25 in reference to the Jaredites; the conceptual parallelism between the two passages is clearly intended:

Alma 37:24–25
    these directors were prepared
(1) that **the word of God** might be fulfilled which he spake saying
(2) I will bring forth out of darkness unto light all their secret works
        and their abominations
(3) and except they repent I will destroy them from off the face of the earth
(4) and I will bring to light all their secrets and abominations unto every nation
        which shall hereafter possess the land

Alma 37:26
(3′) we see that they did not repent / therefore they have been destroyed
(1′) and thus far **the word of God** hath been fulfilled
(2′) yea their secret abominations have been brought out of darkness
(4′) and made known unto us

The critical text will therefore maintain in Alma 37:26 the corrected reading in 𝓞, "the word of God".

Summary: Accept in Alma 37:26 the corrected reading in 𝓞, "and thus far the word **of God** hath been fulfilled"; the language in this verse parallels the language in the preceding verses (Alma 37:24–25).

■ **Alma 37:27**

I command you that ye retain all their oaths and their covenants
and their agreements **in** *their secret abominations*

One wonders here if the preposition *in* near the end of this series of conjuncts isn't a mistake for the conjunction *and.* The original manuscript clearly reads *in,* but it is possible that the scribe, Oliver Cowdery, could have misheard an original *and* as the preposition *in,* especially since the *and* in context would have normally been pronounced as a syllabic *n.* Further evidence for emending *in* to *and* here in Alma 37:27 can be found when we consider all other cases in the text where *abomination(s)* is conjoined with a preceding noun. Except for this case in Alma 37:27, *abomination(s)* is always conjoined with the preceding noun by an *and* (63 times in all). There is no other case where *abomination(s)* is headed by the preposition *in* so that the resulting prepositional phrase postmodifies a preceding noun (as in "their agreements **in** their secret abominations"). In other words, we expect *abomination(s)* to occur as a part of a conjunctive list. In fact, elsewhere in Alma 37 alone there are eight occurrences of *abominations* in conjunctive lists, and in each instance *abominations* is conjoined using *and:*

verse 21	and all their wickedness **and** abominations
verse 22	secret murders **and** abominations
verse 23	and their wickedness **and** abominations
verse 25	all their secret works **and** their abominations
verse 25	all their secrets **and** abominations
verse 29	their wickedness and their murders **and** their abominations
verse 29	such wickedness **and** abominations and murders
verse 29	their wickedness **and** abominations

But there are some problems with this analysis. First of all, here in Alma 37:27 *abominations* occurs with an infrequent word, *agreement;* there are two occurrences of the singular *agreement* in the text (in Helaman 9:20 and 3 Nephi 7:14) and only one of the plural *agreements* (here in Alma 37:27). When we examine the 63 examples of conjoined *abomination(s)* in the text, we find that *abomination(s)* is typically conjoined with words like *wickedness, iniquities, murders,* and *whoredoms,* words that specifically refer to evil acts. But here in verse 27 (according to the current text), Alma commands his son to retain or keep back "all their oaths and their covenants and their agreements in their secret abominations". Notice that *oaths, covenants,* and *agreements* all refer to promises made by members of these secret societies. In other words, Alma is telling Helaman to keep these ritualistic promises hidden from the people. There is nothing inherently evil in oaths, covenants, and agreements, but there is in wickedness, iniquities, murders, and whoredoms. Similarly, later on in verse 27, Helaman is also commanded to retain or keep back the signs and wonders of these secret societies: "yea and all their signs and their wonders ye shall retain from this people". And *signs* and *wonders* may be considered neutral terms (in principle, at least). Thus Alma is commanding his son to keep back the specific information regarding the rituals of these secret combinations.

Secondly, when we consider the eight instances in Alma 37 (listed above) where *abominations* is conjoined by means of an *and* with a preceding noun, the text states that the actual evil acts of these secret combinations will be made known. In other words, the Lord wants their evil abominations to be revealed to the people, not retained or kept back. In fact, this distinction is specifically referred to:

Alma 37:29
> therefore ye shall keep these secret plans of their oaths and their covenants
>> from this people
> and only their wickedness and their murders and their abominations
>> shall ye make known unto them

Thus in verse 27 the word *abominations* should not be conjoined with *oaths, covenants,* and *agreements.* Alma is not asking Helaman to keep back the knowledge of their abominations, only their system of secrecy. The critical text will therefore maintain in Alma 37:27 the invariant reading of all the textual sources for the expression "and their agreements **in** their secret abominations".

Summary: Maintain in Alma 37:27 the phrase "and their agreements **in** their secret abominations"; this phraseology is actually what we should expect, despite the uniqueness of the expression; the abominations are to be revealed, but the system of oaths, covenants, and agreements behind those abominations are to be kept back from the people.

■ **Alma 37:27**

yea and all their signs and [NULL > *their* 0 | *their* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *wonders*
ye shall retain from this people

Here in the original manuscript, Oliver Cowdery initially omitted the repeated *their;* virtually immediately he supplied it, inserting it supralinearly (there is no change in the level of ink flow). Either reading is theoretically possible, so the critical text will follow the corrected reading in 𝓞. There are three other examples of the repeated determiner for conjuncts of *sign(s)* and *wonder(s):*

Helaman 14:28	that **these** signs and **these** wonders should come to pass
Helaman 16:23	notwithstanding **the** signs and **the** wonders which was wrought
3 Nephi 2:1	and began to be less astonished at **a** sign or **a** wonder from heaven

The natural tendency in English is not to repeat the determiner for such conjuncts. For further discussion, see under CONJUNCTIVE REPETITION in volume 3.

Summary: Follow the corrected reading in 𝓞 for Alma 37:27: "yea and all their signs and **their** wonders ye shall retain from this people".

■ **Alma 37:27**

and now my son I command you that ye **retain** *all their oaths*
and their covenants and their agreements in their secret abominations
yea and all their signs and their wonders
ye shall [*retain* 01ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQS | *keep* RT] *from this people*

For the 1920 LDS edition, the editors changed the second *retain* in this verse to *keep,* but the first one was left unchanged. The meaning of *retain* in both cases is 'keep back' (or equivalently, 'hold back'). Since the preposition *from* came right after the second *retain,* the 1920 editors were able to make the replacement for the second *retain* since the *keep* in "keep from this people" implies 'keep back'. The critical text will, of course, maintain both instances of original *retain* here in Alma 37:27.

One of the problems with the word *retain* in the Book of Mormon is that it sometimes takes on unexpected meanings. For instance, in Alma 44:8–12 there are at least two, perhaps three, occurrences of this verb with the meaning 'take back', even though modern English readers tend to interpret *retain* in that passage as meaning simply 'keep' (for discussion, see under Alma 44:11). Most uses of *retain* with unexpected meanings have been edited, but others have not (for instance, two of the three instances in Alma 44:8–12). Besides the change of one of the *retain*'s here in Alma 37:27 to *keep,* there are two idiosyncratic changes later in the book of Alma, namely, in Alma 39:13 (where *retain* is deleted) and in Alma 44:11 (where *retain* is replaced with *recall*). There are also seven places where *retain* is replaced with *regain,* from Alma 58 through Helaman 4 (see the discussion under Alma 58:3).

Summary: Restore in Alma 37:27 the original *retain* that was emended in the 1920 LDS edition to *keep;* the original text for this verse has two instances of the verb *retain,* each with the meaning 'keep or hold back'.

■ **Alma 37:28**

[& >% NULL 0 | 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *therefore I desire that this people might not be destroyed*

The original manuscript had an ampersand before *therefore,* but it appears to have been erased. The ultraviolet photographs clearly show smearing from the erasure, even up into the supralinear space above the ampersand. There is nothing wrong with "and therefore"; it occurs 18 times in the text. So the removal of the *and* here in Alma 37:28 seems to be a correction to what Joseph Smith actually dictated. For an opposite example where the scribe omitted the *and* before *therefore,* see under Alma 12:10.

Summary: Accept in Alma 37:28 the corrected reading without the *and* before *therefore;* Oliver Cowdery initially wrote an ampersand before *therefore* but then immediately erased it.

■ **Alma 37:29**

and ye shall teach them to abhor such wickedness and [*abominations* 01ABCDEFGIJLMNOPQRST | *abomination* HK] *and murders*

The 1874 RLDS edition replaced the plural *abominations* with the singular, but the 1908 RLDS edition restored the plural to the RLDS text. Not only is the plural the earliest reading here, but surrounding usage in this verse supports it:

Alma 37:29
(1) and only their wickedness and their murders and their **abominations** shall ye make known unto them
(2) and ye shall teach them to abhor such wickedness and **abominations** and murders and ye shall also teach them that those people were destroyed
(3) on account of their wickedness and **abominations** and their murders

In fact, the use of *such* in the second conjunctive phrase ("such wickedness and abominations and murders") directly connects that phrase to the preceding conjunctive phrase.

Summary: Maintain the plural *abominations* throughout Alma 37:29.

■ **Alma 37:29**

and ye shall also teach them
that [*those* 0 | *these* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *people were destroyed*
on account of their wickedness and abominations and their murders

Here 𝒪 reads "**those** people were destroyed". When he copied from 𝒪 into 𝒫, Oliver miscopied *those* as *these,* which all the printed editions have followed. The initial *th* of *those* was written at the end of the line in 𝒪, with the hyphenated *-ose* beginning the next line. Sometimes as Oliver copied the text into 𝒫, he would misread a word at the end of the line in 𝒪, as here. Of course, either reading, *these* or *those,* will work in this passage, so we follow the earliest reading. For a list of other places where Oliver mixed up *those* and *these,* see under Alma 3:25.

Summary: In accord with the reading of the original manuscript, restore *those* in Alma 37:29: "**those** people were destroyed on account of their wickedness and abominations and their murders".

■ **Alma 37:36**

yea let [*all* 0T | 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRS] *thy thoughts be directed unto the Lord*

When Oliver Cowdery copied from 𝒪 into 𝒫, he accidentally omitted the *all* in this sentence. In accord with the reading of 𝒪, the 1981 LDS edition restored the *all.* The use of "all thy thoughts" is undoubtedly correct since it is supported by similar instances of "all thy X" in the preceding text:

> Alma 37:36
> yea and cry unto God for **all thy support**
> yea let **all thy doings** be unto the Lord

Summary: Maintain in Alma 37:36 the use of *all* in the phrase "all thy thoughts", the reading of the original manuscript.

■ **Alma 37:37**

counsel [01ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQS | *with* RT] *the Lord in all thy doings*

There are two instances in the original text where the expression "counsel X" means 'counsel **with** X'. The first one is here in Alma 37:37. The second one is found in Alma's advice to his third son, Corianton:

> Alma 39:10
> and I command you to take it upon you
> to counsel [01ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQS | *with* RT] your elder brothers
> in your undertakings . . .
> and give heed to their counsel

The 1920 LDS edition emended the text in both these passages by adding the preposition *with* (which is what we expect in modern English). Briefly referred to in the discussion regarding *ceremony* under Mosiah 19:24, the usage "counsel X" with the meaning 'counsel **with** X" is archaic in English and seems to have died out before 1600. The last example cited under definition 4 for the verb *counsel* in the Oxford English Dictionary dates from the middle of the 16th century:

> John Hooper (1547)
> Moses . . . counselled the Lord
> and thereupon advised his subjects what was to be done.

Clearly, the meaning here is 'Moses counseled **with** the Lord'. We have the same meaning in Alma 37:37 and Alma 39:10 but without any *with* in the original text.

It is doubtful that *with* was accidentally lost from both these Book of Mormon instances of "counsel X". 𝓞 is extant in the first instance; in the second instance, spacing between extant fragments of 𝓞 indicates that there was no room for the *with* except by supralinear insertion. Moreover, there is no independent evidence that Oliver ever omitted the preposition *with* when it was followed by a simple noun phrase. There is one case in 𝓞 where Oliver Cowdery initially omitted the preposition *with*, but this was at the head of a relative clause:

> 2 Nephi 1:23
> shake off the chains
> [NULL >+ *with* 0 | *with* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] which ye are bound

There is considerable evidence that Oliver generally had difficulty with prepositions that headed relative clauses. See, for instance, the discussion under 1 Nephi 1:16 and Mosiah 2:32 regarding the preposition *of*. For a complete discussion of this difficulty with prepositions, see under RELATIVE CLAUSES in volume 3.

Elsewhere in the Book of Mormon, there are two examples of "counsel X" with the expected meaning 'give counsel to X':

> Jacob 4:10   seek not to counsel the Lord but to take counsel from his hand
> Jacob 5:22   and the Lord of the vineyard saith unto him : counsel me not

And there is also one actual example of "counsel **with** X" in the earliest Book of Mormon text:

> Mosiah 17:6   having counseled **with** his priests

Thus there seems to have been some variation in the original text for the expression "counsel (with) X", including two instances of the archaic "counsel X", meaning 'counsel **with** X'.

Jeffrey R. Holland, in a graduate paper dating from 1965, suggests that the Doctrine and Covenants has a revelation (given 1 November 1831) where "counsel X" means 'counsel **with** X':

> Book of Commandments 1:4 (Doctrine and Covenants 1:19)
> the weak things of the world should come forth
> and break down the mighty and strong ones
> that man should not **counsel his fellow man**
> neither trust in the arm of flesh

The clause "man should not counsel his fellow man" may mean 'man should not counsel **with** his fellow man'. Such an interpretation provides a stronger semantic parallel with the following conjoined predicate: "neither trust in the arm of flesh". Counseling with one's fellow man would be one way of trusting in the arm of flesh. See page 31 of Jeffrey R. Holland, "Some Changes in the Book of Mormon, 1830–1920", a course paper for Daniel H. Ludlow, Graduate Religion 622 course at Brigham Young University, 15 August 1965 (a copy of this paper can be found in the special collections of the Harold B. Lee Library at Brigham Young University).

David Calabro (personal communication) suggests another possibility for these two cases of "counsel X": namely, *counsel* could be an error for the verb *consult*. In other words, perhaps the original text read "consult the Lord in all thy doings" (Alma 37:37) and "consult your elder brothers in your undertakings" (Alma 39:10). If *counsel* is an error for *consult* in these two passages, it would have entered the text when Joseph Smith dictated the text to Oliver Cowdery, at least for the first occurrence in Alma 39:10 (which is extant in 𝓞 and reads *counsel*). Theoretically, emending "counsel X" to "consult X" will work, but there are a couple of problems with it. First, there is no evidence in the entire textual history for mix-ups between *consult* and *counsel*. Second, whenever the Book of Mormon refers to consulting a person X, the form is actually "consult **with** X", not "consult X":

1 Nephi 3:10	I and my brethren did consult one **with** another
Mosiah 22:1	Ammon and king Limhi began to consult **with** the people
Mosiah 27:1	and Mosiah consulted **with** his priests
Alma 23:16	the king consulted **with** Aaron and many of their priests
Alma 35:4	and they sent and gathered together . . . all the people and consulted **with** them

In only one case is the *with* missing, but in that case there is no explicit X either:

Alma 35:3	after the more popular part of the Zoramites had consulted together

These examples suggest that "consult X" wouldn't have occurred in the Book of Mormon text: if *counsel* were an error for *consult,* we would expect "consult **with** X" in the original text for Alma 37:37 and Alma 39:10.

Summary: Restore in Alma 37:37 and Alma 39:10 the two original instances of "counsel X" where the meaning is 'counsel **with** X'; such archaic usage dates from Early Modern English.

■ **Alma 37:37**

and if ye [always 01| ᴀʙᴄᴅᴇꜰɢʜɪᴊᴋʟᴍɴᴏᴘǫʀsᴛ] do these things
ye shall be lifted up at the last day

The 1830 typesetter accidentally omitted the word *always* in this passage. The use of *always* helps to support the necessity of being righteous continually. Moreover, the previous text strongly emphasizes the need for constant devotion to the Lord, in every way and at all times and in all places:

Alma 37:36 – 37

 yea and cry unto God for **all** thy support
 yea let **all** thy doings be unto the Lord
 and **whithersoever** thou goest / let it be in the Lord
 yea let **all** thy thoughts be directed unto the Lord
 yea let the affections of thy heart be placed upon the Lord **forever**
 counsel the Lord in **all** thy doings and he will direct thee for good

The text is then followed by an admonition to pray every day, both morning and night:

Alma 37:37

 yea when thou liest down at night
 lie down unto the Lord
 that he may watch over you in your sleep
 and when thou risest in the morning
 let thy heart be full of thanks unto God

And finally, the text concludes with this summarizing statement: "and if ye **always** do these things / ye shall be lifted up at the last day". The original text here is further supported by the Savior's words in 3 Nephi 18:12: "and if ye shall **always** do these things / blessed are ye".

 None of the more recent LDS or RLDS editions have supplied the *always*. As discussed above regarding verse 36, the 1981 LDS edition, by reference to ○, supplied the *all* in "yea let **all** thy thoughts be directed unto the Lord". And in general, 𝒫 was consulted in preparing the 1908 RLDS edition. Here in verse 37, *always* is extant in both ○ and 𝒫 yet has never been added to either the LDS or RLDS text.

Summary: Restore in Alma 37:37 the adverb *always* in "and if ye **always** do these things / ye shall be lifted up at the last day"); the 1830 typesetter accidentally omitted the *always* here.

■ **Alma 37:38**

and now my son I have somewhat to say concerning the thing
which our fathers **call** *a ball or director*
or our fathers **called** *it Liahona*
which is being interpreted a compass

One wonders here if the present-tense *call* might be a mistake for *called* or *did call,* especially since the following conjoined clause reads in the past tense as "or our fathers **called** it Liahona". There is evidence elsewhere in the early transmission of the text for the occasional loss of the past-tense ending *-(e)d,* as in the following examples where Oliver Cowdery made the mistake:

1 Nephi 19:13 (error copying from ○ into 𝒫)

 because they [*crucified* 0 | *Crucify* 1 | *crucify* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
 the God of Israel

Alma 56:37 (*supposed that* misheard as *suppose that* as Joseph Smith dictated the text)

 and as we [*suppose* 01EFGHIJKLMNOPQRST | *supposed* ABCD]
 [*that* 01 | ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] it was their intent to slay us
 before Antipus should overtake them . . .

3 Nephi 15:10 (initial error in 𝓟, corrected virtually immediately)
and this is the law and the prophets
for they truly [*testify > testified* 1|*testified* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] of me

Ether 15:15 (initial error in 𝓟, corrected virtually immediately)
and they fought all that day
and [*conquour > conquored* 1|*conquered* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] not

There is less evidence, but still some, for Oliver accidentally omitting the helping verb *did:*

Alma 44:22 (initial error in 𝓟, corrected virtually immediately)
and it came to pass that
they [*did* 0ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST|NULL > *did* 1] cast their dead
into the waters of Sidon

It should be noted, however, that in this one instance the loss of *did* did not lead to a change in tense since *cast* is also the standard past-tense form for the verb *cast.*

Here in Alma 37:38, 𝕺 is extant for both instances of the verb *call* (first the present-tense *call,* then the past-tense *called*), and the text has consistently maintained this difference in tense, from 𝓟 through every printed edition.

This difference in tense could be intentional. One possible explanation is that the three common nouns translated into English as *ball, director,* and *compass* occurred in the language of Alma and Helaman's time (Alma uses all three of them here in Alma 37:38), but because the particular name for this object (namely, *Liahona*) was no longer current in Alma and Helaman's time, it was necessary for Alma to provide the interpretative language for his son Helaman: "which is being interpreted a compass" (Alma could have read the term *Liahona* on the plates of Nephi). And it may be this difference in vocabulary that led Alma to use the present-tense *call* to refer to the names *ball* and *director* (and *compass* itself if he had wanted to) but the past-tense *called* to refer to *Liahona,* by then an unknown term. Because the word *Liahona* appears to be archaic for Alma and Helaman (but not *ball, director,* or *compass*), the critical text will maintain the difference in tense for the verb *call* in Alma 37:38, with the present-tense *call* applying to the words *ball* and *director* but the past-tense *called* to *Liahona:* "which our fathers **call** a ball or director / or our fathers **called** it Liahona". Even so, the possibility remains that *call* may be a mistake for *called* or *did call.*

Summary: Maintain in Alma 37:38 the present-tense *call* and the past-tense *called* since it appears that during the time of Alma and Helaman the words *ball, director,* and *compass* (but not *Liahona*) were current in the Nephite language; nonetheless, it is possible that the present-tense *call* is an error for the past-tense *called* or *did call.*

■ **Alma 37:38**

and now my son I have somewhat to say concerning the thing
which our fathers call a ball or director
[*or* 01ABCGHKPRST | *for* DEFIJLMNOQ] *our fathers called it Liahona*
which is being interpreted a compass

> The 1841 British edition replaced the conjunction *or* with *for,* which was maintained in the LDS text until the 1920 edition. The *or* is the reading of the original manuscript, although one could imagine that Oliver Cowdery, the scribe of ⊙, misheard an original *for* as *or.* In any event, the corrective *or* works perfectly well since Alma's apparent intent here was to tell Helaman the actual word used by Lehi and Nephi in referring to the ball that led them in the wilderness and across the sea.

Summary: Maintain in Alma 37:38 the corrective *or,* which is the reading in all the earliest textual sources.

■ **Alma 37:40**

therefore if they had faith to believe that
God could cause that those spindles should point
[*towards* >? *to* >? NULL 0 | 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *the way they should go*
behold it was done

> Here only part of the phrase "should point the way" is extant in the original manuscript. We can see from the extant portions that Oliver Cowdery first started to write *towards the way* (he wrote the *to* and then part of the *w*); then he crossed out the *tow* and inserted *the* supralinearly. Continuing inline, Oliver then wrote "way they should go". The problem is that the portion of paper right before the supralinear *the* is now gone, so we cannot tell if Oliver also surpralinearly inserted *to* before the *the*. (There is room for only a two- or three-letter word, in any event.) If Oliver did insert *to,* he missed it when he copied the text into the printer's manuscript—and usually Oliver did not miss copying into 𝒫 his supralinear insertions in ⊙.
>
> The small plates of Nephi contain a description of the Liahona that parallels the description here in Alma 37:

> > 1 Nephi 16:10
> > > and within the ball was two spindles
> > > and the one **pointed the way** whither we should go into the wilderness

> In this passage, there is no preposition, neither *towards* nor *to,* between the verb *point* and *the way.* This parallel expression thus supports the current text in Alma 37:40.
>
> We also note that there is one difference. 1 Nephi 16:10 has the adverbial relative pronoun *whither* after *the way,* but Alma 37:40 does not. Nonetheless, the original manuscript is extant in Alma 37:40 for that portion of the text after *the way,* and clearly there is no *whither* or some other relative pronoun such as *that* or *which* after *the way.* Therefore, this slight difference between the two passages should be maintained.

Summary: Maintain in Alma 37:40 the current reading, "those spindles should point the way they should go" (that is, without any preposition before *the way* or any relative pronoun like *whither* before *they should go*).

■ **Alma 37:41**

nevertheless because those miracles were worked by small means
[01RT |, ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQS]
[*nevertheless* 0A | *nevertheless* >js NULL 1 | BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
it did shew unto them marvelous works
[01 |. ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
they were slothful and forgat to exercise their faith and diligence

Hugh Nibley has suggested that this passage was punctuated incorrectly by the 1830 typesetter. The first *nevertheless*-clause is completed by the final main clause, thus "because those miracles were worked by small means . . . they were slothful and forgat to exercise their faith and diligence". This interpretation means that the second *nevertheless*-clause should be treated as a parenthetical one; that is, the second *nevertheless*-clause should be surrounded by either dashes or parentheses:

> Alma 37:41 (with emended punctuation)
> nevertheless because those miracles were worked by small means
> —nevertheless it did shew unto them marvelous works—
> they were slothful and forgat to exercise their faith and diligence

Under this interpretation, there was no need for Joseph Smith's removal of the second *nevertheless* in his editing for the 1837 edition. The 1830 typesetter had placed a period at the end of the second *nevertheless*-clause, which made it impossible for the first *nevertheless*-clause to achieve closure. For discussion of Nibley's proposal, see page 89 of his "The Liahona's Cousins", *Improvement Era* 64/2 (1961).

Summary: Restore the second *nevertheless* in Alma 37:41 since this instance of *nevertheless* heads a parenthetical clause ("nevertheless it did shew unto them marvelous works"), which should be punctuated as parenthetical in the standard text; the first *nevertheless*-clause is completed by the main clause, "they were slothful and forgat to exercise their faith and diligence".

■ **Alma 37:41**

they were slothful
and [*forget > forgat* 0 | *forgat* >js *forgot* 1 | *forgot* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
to exercise their faith and diligence

The original text here has the archaic simple past-tense form *forgat* rather than the modern *forgot.* Both manuscripts originally read *forgat,* although Oliver Cowdery initially wrote *forget* in 𝓞 but then virtually immediately corrected it to *forgat* by overwriting the *e* with an *a* (there is no change in the level of ink flow for the overwriting). Oliver wrote *forgat* in 𝓟, but the 1830 compositor set the modern form *forgot.* When Joseph Smith grammatically edited 𝓟 for the 1837 edition, he emended the *forgat* in 𝓟 to *forgot.*

The archaic *forgat* is also found later in the book of Alma, where it serves three times as the past participle for the verb *forget:*

> Alma 60:20
>> have ye [*forgat* 01 | *forgot* ABCDEFGHIJKLMPS | *forgotten* NOQRT]
>>> the commandments of the Lord your God
>> yea have ye [*forgat* 1 | *forgot* ABCDEFGHIJKLMPS | *forgotten* NOQRT]
>>> the captivity of our fathers
>> have ye [*forgat* 1 | *forgot* ABCDEFGHIJKLMOPS | *forgotten* NQRT]
>>> the many times we have been delivered out of the hands of our enemies

Note here that the 1830 compositor consistently replaced *forgat* with *forgot.* The 1906 LDS edition made the change from *forgot* to *forgotten,* the standard past participial form. The original Book of Mormon text frequently used simple past-tense verb forms for the past participle. For discussion, see under PAST PARTICIPLE in volume 3. Here *forgat* parallels the archaic past-tense form *gat* for the verb *get;* both forms, *forgat* and *gat,* are found in the original Book of Mormon text. For discussion of *gat,* see under Alma 10:32. Also see the discussion under PAST TENSE for other instances of nonstandard past-tense forms in the original Book of Mormon text.

The earliest text of the Book of Mormon has only one occurrence of the simple past-tense form for *forget* and it reads *forgat* (here in Alma 37:41). As far as the past participle is concerned, there are eleven occurrences of *forgotten* and three of the nonstandard *forgat* in the earliest text (all three are in Alma 60:20, listed above). These results are in part similar to what we find in the King James Bible: *forgat* is consistently the simple past-tense form for the verb *forget* (eight times), never *forgot;* for the past participle, the King James translation has 46 occurrences of the standard *forgotten* but one of *forgot* (in Deuteronomy 24:19). For each form of the verb *forget,* the critical text will follow the earliest reading, thus *forgat* as the simple past-tense form here in Alma 37:41 and as the past participle three times in Alma 60:20 (otherwise, *forgotten* is the past participial form).

Summary: In accord with the original reading in the manuscripts, restore in Alma 37:41 the archaic *forgat* as the simple past-tense form; also restore the same form, but as the past participle, three times in Alma 60:20.

■ **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* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]

The original manuscript has the singular *transgression,* which Oliver Cowdery accidentally copied into the printer's manuscript as the plural *transgressions*. Elsewhere in the Book of Mormon text, every occurrence of "because of transgression(s)" is in the singular, never the plural:

> 2 Nephi 2:21   they were lost because of the **transgression** of their parents
> Alma 3:6   which was a curse upon them because of their **transgression**
> Alma 22:12   because of **transgression** man had fallen

Alma 28:13   how great the unequality of man is because of sin and **transgression**

Alma 30:25   because of the **transgression** of a parent

Helaman 4:26   yea thus had they become weak because of their **transgression**

In one example, Alma 3:6, scribe 2 of 𝓟 initially wrote *transgressions,* but then he immediately erased the plural *s* (thus showing once more the tendency in this context to write the plural *transgressions* instead of the correct singular).

Summary: Restore in Alma 37:42 the singular *transgression,* the reading in 𝓞 ("because of their transgression").

■ **Alma 37:44**

for behold it is [NULL > *as* 1 | *as* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *easy*
to give heed to the word of Christ
which will point to you a straight course to eternal bliss
as *it was for our fathers to give heed to this compass*

In the printer's manuscript, Oliver Cowdery initially omitted the first *as* in this passage. But almost immediately, he caught his error and supralinearly inserted the *as* (the level of ink flow is unchanged). 𝓞 is not extant here; the lacuna between extant fragments is long, so we cannot tell from spacing whether *as* was there. Presumably it was since the correction in 𝓟 is virtually immediate. And in clausal comparisons such as this one, we expect a pair of *as*'s. Oliver frequently omitted the *as,* at least momentarily, in the manuscripts. For a list of examples, see under 2 Nephi 9:16.

Summary: Maintain in Alma 37:44 the original comparative construction with its pair of *as*-clauses.

■ **Alma 37:44**

which will point [*to you* 01ABCEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST | D] *a straight course to eternal bliss*

The 1841 British edition omitted the prepositional phrase *to you,* perhaps because it somewhat awkwardly intrudes between the verb and its direct object. The subsequent LDS edition (1849) restored this prepositional phrase.

Even though *to you* is extant in 𝓞, one wonders here if the original text might have read *unto you,* as in the parallel relative clause that ends this sentence: "which would point **unto them** a straight course to the promised land". Each of these instances of *to you* and *unto them* is extant in 𝓞, so we may reasonably assume a case of variation here between *to* and *unto.* For another example where the text shows variation between *to* and *unto,* see under 1 Nephi 15:33. For each case of *to* versus *unto,* we generally follow the earliest textual evidence.

Summary: Maintain in Alma 37:44 the prepositional phrase *to you* in "which will point **to you** a straight course to eternal bliss"; the preposition *to* is also firm, even though the sentence ends with "which would point **unto them** a straight course to the promised land".

■ **Alma 37:44**

for behold it is as easy to give heed to the word of Christ
which will point to you a [*strait* 01 | *straight* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *course to eternal bliss*
as it was for our fathers to give heed to this compass
which would point unto them a [*strait* 1 | *straight* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *course*
  to the promised land

As discussed under 1 Nephi 8:20, here are two instances of the word *straight* (meaning 'not crooked')
rather than *strait* (meaning 'narrow').

■ **Alma 37:45**

for just [*as suredly as* 1ABDE | *as surely as* CFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *this director*
  did bring our fathers by following its course to the promised land
shall the word of Christ—if we follow its course—carry us beyond this vale of sorrow

Here the 1840 edition replaced *assuredly as* with *as surely as.* This change was also made in the
1852 LDS edition, probably independently (the 1840 edition was consulted to make corrections in
the stereotyped plates for the second printing of the 1852 edition, but not for the first printing).
    Elsewhere in the original text, there are four original occurrences of *assuredly as,* two of *as*
surely as, and two of *as sure as:*

2 Nephi 9:16	and **assuredly as** the Lord liveth
2 Nephi 27:31	for **assuredly as** the Lord liveth
Alma 19:13	for **as sure as** thou livest
Alma 22:8	behold **assuredly as** thou livest O king
Alma 23:6	and **as sure as** the Lord liveth
Helaman 15:17	and **as surely as** the Lord liveth
3 Nephi 5:24	and **as surely as** the Lord liveth
Moroni 7:26	and **assuredly as** Christ liveth

Here in Alma 37:45, the earliest textual sources (𝓞 is not extant here) spelled *assuredly as* with
three words, *as suredly as.* This misspelling was probably the reason for the change to *as surely as*
in the 1840 and 1852 editions. Basically, *suredly* was misread or misinterpreted as *surely.* For three
of the four other examples of *assuredly as,* the earliest textual sources spelled the word *assuredly*
without any space, thus avoiding in those three cases the tendency to replace the phrase *assuredly as*
with *as surely as.* But the last example listed above, in Moroni 7:26, was spelled *as suredly as* in 𝓟
and in the 1830 edition, which led Joseph Smith in his editing for the 1837 edition to replace *as*
suredly as with *as sure as.* This emendation was undoubtedly prompted by the original spelling
as suredly as. The more colloquial *as sure as* was emended to *as surely as* in the 1981 LDS edition
(but the two other instances of *as sure as,* in Alma 19:13 and Alma 23:6, were not). For further dis-
cussion, see under Moroni 7:26.
    These eight other examples all involve an oath, either in reference to the Lord (six times) or
in addressing a queen or king of the Lamanites (in Alma 19:13 and in Alma 22:8). The example
here in Alma 37:45 is therefore different. The eight other examples indicate that in theory the text

allows a free choice between *assuredly as, as surely as,* and *as sure as.* The critical text will therefore restore in Alma 37:45 the original phraseology, *assuredly as* (and similarly in Moroni 7:26).

Historically, the expression *assuredly as* was common in Early Modern English, as in the following examples found on <google.com> and *Literature Online* <lion.chadwyck.com>; typically, the expression occurs in the beginning of sentences (accidentals regularized here):

> John Knox (1554)
> but even so **assuredly as** our God lives . . .

> Richard Younge (1641)
> **assuredly as** that holy martyr said . . .

In these examples, *assuredly as* is equivalent to *as surely as* (or to *as sure as,* the more colloquial expression). This equivalence in expression can be found in today's English, as in the following examples from <google.com> of "just assuredly as" (with *assuredly as* preceded by *just,* as here in Alma 37:45):

> Melanie Curtsinger (2004)
> It's an annual rite of passage—**just assuredly as** the seasons come and go and the hurricanes head toward the state of Florida, NBA teams all around the country are getting revved up for the pre-season of the pre-season: training camp.

> *Washington Examiner* (2006)
> To deprive them of that education by forcibly blocking their entrance to campus was robbing them **just assuredly as** if the protesters had taken their wallets.

The critical text will retain all instances in the Book of Mormon of *assuredly as* whenever they are supported by the earliest textual sources.

Summary: Restore the original *assuredly as* in Alma 37:45; the spelling of this phrase in the earliest sources as three words, *as suredly as,* led to the 1840 and 1852 misreading or misinterpretation of *suredly* as *surely,* giving the more standard expression *as surely as;* Moroni 7:26 contains another original example of the spelling *as suredly as,* which was emended by Joseph Smith in his editing for the 1837 edition to *as sure as* (and in later editing to *as surely as*).

■ **Alma 37:45**

for just assuredly as this director did bring our fathers by following its course to the promised land
shall the [word 1 | words ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] of Christ
if we follow [its 0A | its >js their 1 | their BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] course
carry us beyond this vale of sorrow

The original manuscript is not extant for "the word(s) of Christ", but the singular *its* is extant in 𝕆. The printer's manuscript originally had the singular *word* as well as the singular *its* (prior to Joseph Smith's editing for the 1837 edition). The 1830 typesetter accidentally replaced the singular *word* with *words* but left the *its* (giving the anomalous 1830 reading "the **words** of Christ / if we follow

its course"). In his editing for the 1837 edition, Joseph changed the singular *its* in 𝒫 to *their* (but left the singular *word* unchanged in 𝒫).

The consistent use of the singular ("the **word** of Christ / if we follow **its** course") is the correct reading, especially since in the previous verse we have another reference to "the **word** of Christ":

> Alma 37:44
>> for behold it is as easy to give heed to **the word of Christ**
>> which will point to you a straight course to eternal bliss

Elsewhere in the text, the plural form ("the words of Christ") dominates (with at least ten instances), but there are three firm cases of "the word of Christ" (2 Nephi 31:19, 2 Nephi 31:20, and Moroni 7:31). There is also one complicated case in 3 Nephi 29:7, which is discussed there.

Summary: Restore the singular reading in Alma 37:45: "the **word** of Christ / if we follow **its** course"); this reading agrees with the singular "the **word** of Christ", used earlier in verse 44.

■ **Alma 37:45**

for just assuredly as this director did bring our fathers
by following its course to the promised land
shall the word of Christ—if we follow its course—carry us beyond
[*this/the* 0 | *this* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *vale*
of [*tears >+ sorrow* 1 | *sorrow* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]

Here the reading for *this* in the original manuscript is difficult to determine; the word looks most like a defective *this,* but *the* is also possible. Oliver Cowdery copied this word into 𝒫 as *this.* Also while copying, he initially wrote "vale of tears" in 𝒫; then somewhat later (with slightly heavier ink flow) he corrected *tears* to *sorrow.* His correction was probably made when he proofed 𝒫 against 𝒪. Although 𝒪 is not extant for the word *sorrow* or *tears,* it probably read "vale of sorrow" since either reading, "vale of tears" or "vale of sorrow", is possible here, and consequently there would have been little tendency for Oliver to have consciously edited out one version in favor of the other. In fact, *Literature Online* <lion.chadwyck.com> lists numerous instances of "this vale of tears" and "this vale of sorrow", but there are about 14 times more instances with *tears* than with *sorrow.* This difference in frequency probably explains why Oliver initially wrote "this vale of tears" in 𝒫. There are examples of "this vale of sorrow" dating from Early Modern English up to the present, as in these examples from *Literature Online* <lion.chadwyck.com> (with accidentals modernized here):

> Nicholas Breton (1597)
>> living in this vale of sorrow and misery

> John Taylor (1630)
>> a beggar lives here in this vale of sorrow

> John Gay (1720)
>> let us from this vale of sorrow go

Walter Scott (1815)
sorrow is for those that remain in this vale of sorrow and darkness

The Oxford English Dictionary also specifically notes that the determiner for this phrase is usually *this* (see definition 2b under *vale*). For that reason, it is probably best to reject *the* as the reading of the original manuscript in Alma 37:45.

Summary: Accept the idiomatic expression "this vale of sorrow" in Alma 37:45, the reading in 𝓟 (with initial *tears* corrected to *sorrow*).

Alma 38

■ **Alma 38:1**

ye shall be [cut 01T | cast ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRS] off from his presence

Here the two manuscripts read "ye shall be **cut** off from his presence". The 1830 typesetter acci-
dentally replaced *cut* with *cast*. The 1981 LDS edition, following the manuscripts, restored the
original *cut*. Here Alma is talking with Shiblon (his second son). Earlier in his discourse with
Helaman (his first son), Alma twice used these same words: "ye shall be **cut** off from his presence"
(Alma 36:30 and Alma 37:13). Overall in the original text, there are 21 occurrences of "to be **cut**
off from God's presence" but only two of "to be **cast** off from God's presence" (1 Nephi 8:36 and
Helaman 12:25). So either reading is possible, although *cut* is considerably more frequent. For a
general discussion of the competition between *cut* and *cast,* see under 2 Nephi 30:2.

Summary: Maintain in Alma 38:1 the use of *cut* rather than *cast* in "ye shall be **cut** off from his presence",
the reading of both manuscripts and the more frequent reading in the text.

■ **Alma 38:3–4**

I have had great joy in thee already
because of thy faithfulness and thy diligence and thy patience
and thy long-suffering among the people of the Zoramites
for I [knew 01ABPS | know CDEFGHIJKLMNOQRT]
   that thou wast in bonds
yea and I also [knew 01ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQS | know RT]
   that thou wast stoned for the word's sake

Here the original and printer's manuscripts have the past-tense form *knew* for both of these sen-
tences in verse 4. The first *knew* was accidentally changed to *know* in the 1840 edition and, inde-
pendently, in the 1841 British edition (which was set from the 1837 edition, not from the 1840
edition). We know that this change of the first *knew* to *know* was an accident in both editions
because this change was not made to the second *knew* in either of those editions. Conscious edit-
ing, one would think, should have led to changing the second *knew* as well. Later editing removed
the discrepancy in tense. Following the reading in 𝒫, the 1908 RLDS edition restored the original
past-tense *knew* to the RLDS text. On the other hand, the 1920 LDS edition made the LDS text
consistent by changing the second *knew* to *know.*

The use of the present-tense perfect *have* at the beginning of this passage ("I have had great
joy in thee already") leads the reader to expect the present-tense *know.* Moreover, the verb *know*

has a stative sense, so if Alma knew earlier of Shiblon's difficulties, then he would still know of these difficulties while speaking to Shiblon. These expectations help explain the tendency to replace *knew* with *know* in the history of the text.

The use of the past-tense *knew* here in verse 4 means that Alma found out during the mission to the Zoramites (as described in Alma 31–35) that Shiblon had been in bonds and had been stoned. The present-tense *know,* on the other hand, makes it less clear when Alma found out. At the beginning of verse 3, Alma indicates that "I have had great joy in thee **already** because of thy faithfulness and thy diligence and thy patience and thy long-suffering". The use of *already* here supports Alma's claim in verse 4 that he had already known, even during the Zoramite mission, of two important examples of Shiblon's patience and long-suffering, namely, being in bonds and being stoned.

Summary: In accord with the past-tense reading in both manuscripts, restore the two occurrences of *knew* in Alma 38:4 ("for I knew that . . . yea and I also knew that . . .").

■ **Alma 38:5**

and now my son
[*Shiblom >% Shiblon* 0 | *Shiblon* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] . . .

The manuscripts consistently support *Shiblon* as the name for Alma's second son, not *Shiblom.* Twice Oliver initially wrote the name as *Shiblom,* once in 𝒪 (here in Alma 38:5) and another time in 𝒫 (in Alma 49:30). Both times he immediately caught his error and erased the final stroke of the *m* to give an *n.* All the extant occurrences in the manuscripts of the name for Alma's son consistently support the spelling *Shiblon:*

	𝒪	𝒫
Alma 31:7	——	Shiblon
Alma 38 preface	Shib(l)	Shiblon
Alma 38:5	Shiblom >% Shiblon	Shiblon
Alma 49:30	Shiblon	Shiblom >% Shiblon
Alma 63:1	(i)blon	Shiblon
Alma 63:10	Shiblon	Shiblon
Alma 63:11	Shiblon	Shiblon
Alma 63:13	Shiblon	Shiblon
Alma 63:17	——	Shiblon

The tendency to produce the labial *m* at the end of the name may be the result of assimilation to the preceding labial *b* in *Shiblon.* I myself find the pronunciation of the assimilated *Shiblom* easier to say. This error tendency may help in determining whether the name *Shiblon/Shiblom,* the name of a different person in the book of Ether, should end in an *m* or an *n.* For discussion, see under Ether 1:11–12.

Summary: Maintain the name *Shiblon* as the name for Alma's son, not *Shiblom,* the misspelling that Oliver Cowdery initially wrote twice in the manuscripts (in 𝒪 for Alma 38:5 and in 𝒫 for Alma 49:30).

■ **Alma 38:5**

I would that ye should remember that
as much **as** *ye shall put your trust in God*
even so much [01ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRT | *as* S] *ye shall be delivered out of*
   your trials and your troubles and your afflictions
and ye shall be lifted up at the last day

The connective *even so much* normally needs a connective word after it. The 1953 RLDS edition supplied the word *as* here in Alma 38:5, apparently because *as much as* occurs in the preceding clause ("as much as ye shall put your trust in God"). There is some evidence that Oliver Cowdery sometimes omitted *as,* if only momentarily (for a list of examples, see under 2 Nephi 9:16). So it is possible that Oliver omitted the *as* in Alma 38:5 as he took down Joseph Smith's dictation.

It seems that the meaning in this passage does not involve a comparison of degree; that is, the text does not say that "you will be delivered out of difficulties according to the degree that you put your trust in God". Rather, the meaning is basically conditional: "by putting your trust in God / you will be delivered out of difficulties". The 1953 addition of *as* to the RLDS text does not improve the reading at all, but makes it even more confusing. The manuscript reading without any conjunctive element after *even so much* is apparently correct, although difficult.

Elsewhere in the text, we have three occurrences of *even so much;* each of these is followed by *that:*

> 1 Nephi 17:6
> and notwithstanding we had suffered many afflictions and much difficulty
> —yea **even so much that** we cannot write them all—
> we was exceedingly rejoiced when we came to the seashore

> Mosiah 7:25
> but there arose contentions among them
> **even so much that** they did shed blood among themselves

> Alma 2:2
> now this Amlici had by his cunning drawn away much people after him
> **even so much that** they began to be very powerful

Yet in all three of these examples, we expect the subordinate conjunction *that* because *even so much* introduces a resultive clause. This is not the situation in Alma 38:5. Here we have a conjunctive pair of connectives: "as much as . . . even so much . . .", with a finite clause after each connective phrase.

Summary: Despite the difficulty of the reading, there is no need in Alma 38:5 to emend *even so much* by adding a subordinate conjunction (such as the 1953 RLDS edition's *as* or possibly *that*) to precede the following finite clause.

■ **Alma 38:7**

but behold the Lord in his great mercy sent his angel to declare unto me
that I must stop the work of destruction among his people
yea [0 | & 1 | *and* ᴀʙᴄᴅᴇꜰɢʜɪᴊᴋʟᴍɴᴏᴘǫʀsᴛ] *I have seen an angel face to face*
and he spake with me and his voice was as thunder and it shook the whole earth

Here the original manuscript does not have an *and* (which Oliver Cowdery would have written as an ampersand) after the *yea*. When Oliver copied this passage into the printer's manuscript, he accidentally inserted an ampersand, which was then typeset in the 1830 edition as *and*.

The first part of this verse already mentions that the Lord had sent an angel to speak to Alma, so there is no need to have an *and* when the *yea*-clause begins. The connective *yea* is used in the Book of Mormon text to amplify what has just been said. The original reading suggests that Alma wants to emphasize that this angel spoke to him face to face. The intrusive *and* seems to imply that this information is almost an afterthought. The original reading without the *and* puts the proper emphasis on how the angel appeared before Alma.

There is nothing wrong, of course, with having the subject pronoun *I* immediately follow *yea* in the text; elsewhere in the original text there are 62 occurrences of *yea I*. As expected, *yea and I* also occurs in the text (24 times originally). In each case, we follow the earliest textual sources.

Summary: In accord with the reading of the original manuscript, remove the intrusive *and* after the *yea* in Alma 38:7, thus providing a more appropriate connection with the first part of the verse.

■ **Alma 38:9**

and now my son I have told you this
that ye [*might* 0 | *may* 1ᴀʙᴄᴅᴇꜰɢʜɪᴊᴋʟᴍɴᴏᴘǫʀsᴛ] *learn wisdom*
that ye **may** *learn of me that there is no other way nor means*
whereby man can be saved / only in and through Christ

The original manuscript is extant here and reads *might* in "that ye might learn wisdom". When Oliver Cowdery copied the text from 𝒪 into 𝒫, he mistakenly replaced *might* with *may,* undoubtedly because of the *may* in the following clause, "that ye may learn of me". For a list of other cases where *may* and *might* have been mixed up in the history of the text, see under Jacob 5:13.

Summary: Restore *might,* the reading of the original manuscript in Alma 38:9: "that ye **might** learn wisdom".

■ **Alma 38:9**

there is no other way [*nor* 01ᴀʙᴄᴅᴇɢʜᴋᴘs | *or* ꜰɪᴊʟᴍɴᴏǫʀᴛ] *means*
whereby man can be saved

Here the 1852 LDS edition replaced *nor* with *or*. This change may have been unintended since the *nor* has been retained in two other cases of "no other way nor means" (although in the first case Joseph Smith grammatically emended the *no* to *any* in his editing for the 1837 edition):

Mosiah 3:17

 there shall be no other name given
 nor [*no* >js *any* 1 | *no* A | *any* BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] other way **nor** means
 whereby salvation can come unto the children of men
 only in and through the name of Christ the Lord Omnipotent

Helaman 5:9

 there is no other way **nor** means whereby man can be saved
 only through the atoning blood of Jesus Christ which shall come

The critical text will therefore restore the original use of *nor* here in Alma 38:9. For additional discussion regarding *nor* versus *or,* see under Mosiah 27:4; also see the general discussion under NEGATION in volume 3.

Summary: Restore the original *nor* in Alma 38:9 ("no other way **nor** means"); similar instances of *nor* have remained unchanged in the text.

■ **Alma 38:10**

and now as ye have begun to teach
the word [*of God* >? NULL 0 | 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
even so I would that ye should continue to teach

Spacing between extant portions of the original manuscript here in Alma 38:10 suggests that the original manuscript may have read "the word of God" (whereas "the word of Christ" would perhaps be too long to fit appropriately). Even so, the prepositional phrase *of God* could have been crossed out. And, of course, there could have been some other correction in the text that could be responsible for the difference in length.

As explained under Alma 17:8, either reading ("the word of God" or "the word") is possible. More specifically, we find that with the verb *teach*, both possibilities occur (although "teach the word of God" is more frequent):

Jacob 1:19 if we did not teach them the word **of God** with all diligence
Mosiah 26:38 teaching the word **of God** in all things
Alma 17:4 and they had been teaching the word **of God**
Alma 23:4 and to teach the word **of God** among them
Alma 38:15 and teach the word unto this people
Helaman 5:14 to teach the word **of God** among all the people of Nephi
Helaman 16:21 for we depend upon them for to teach us the word

Note that Alma 38:15, which contains the instance nearest to Alma 38:10, lacks the *of God*. Moreover, Alma also commands each of his other sons to "declare the word":

Alma 37:47 (to Helaman)

 go unto this people and declare **the word** and be sober

Alma 42:31 (to Corianton)

 go thy way declare **the word** with truth and soberness

The critical text will follow the earliest extant reading (in 𝒫) for Alma 38:10, without the post-modifying *of God:* "and now as ye have begun to teach the word".

Summary: Maintain in Alma 38:10 the earliest extant reading: "and now as ye have begun to teach the word".

■ **Alma 38:10**

and now as ye have begun to teach the word
even so I would that ye **should** *continue to teach*
and I would that ye [*should* 0 | *would* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *be diligent*
  and temperate in all things

The original text here has a parallel use of "would . . . should":

> even so I **would** that ye **should** continue to teach
>
> and   I **would** that ye **should** be diligent

Here the original manuscript is extant for the *sh* of the second *should,* thus showing that in 𝒪 the text read "and I would that ye **should** be diligent". When Oliver Cowdery copied the text from 𝒪 into 𝒫, he replaced this *should* with *would,* an error that has been perpetuated in every printed edition. The critical text will restore the second *should* here in Alma 38:10. For further discussion of the expression "X would that S", where S is a finite clause, see under Alma 34:30–31; the most common modal in the finite clause is *should,* which originally occurred twice here in Alma 38:10.

Summary: Restore in Alma 38:10 the original *should,* the reading in 𝒪: "and I would that ye **should** be diligent".

■ **Alma 38:11**

yea see that ye do not boast
in your [NULL >− *own* 0 | *own* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *wisdom*
nor of your much strength

Here in the original manuscript, Oliver Cowdery initially wrote "in your wisdom", but then somewhat later, with weaker ink flow, he supralinearly inserted *own.* It is difficult to read the *own,* but the insert mark is clearly visible. The printer's manuscript has the *own,* as do all the printed editions. As explained under Alma 5:14, Oliver sometimes added an intrusive *own* in the manuscripts, but only when there was a nearby *own* that prompted the intrusive one. Here in Alma 38:11 there is no nearby *own,* which argues that the inserted *own* was in the original text.

  Elsewhere the original text has nine instances of "in one's (own) wisdom", of which two have the *own:*

2 Nephi 3:19	the words which is expedient in my wisdom should go forth
2 Nephi 27:22	until I shall see fit in mine **own** wisdom to reveal all things
Alma 22:33	the Nephites in their wisdom . . . had hemmed in the Lamanites
Alma 26:11	I do not boast in my own strength or in my **own** wisdom

Alma 29:8	the Lord doth counsel in his wisdom
Alma 39:2	thou didst go on unto boasting in thy strength and thy wisdom
3 Nephi 28:29	when the Lord seeth fit in his wisdom that . . .
3 Nephi 29:1	when the Lord shall see fit in his wisdom that . . .
Mormon 5:13	when he shall see fit in his wisdom

The occurrence of *own* is even more prevalent in the expression "boast in one's (own) <noun>":

Mosiah 11:19	they did boast in their **own** strength
Alma 26:11	I do not boast in my **own** strength or in my **own** wisdom
Helaman 4:13	and because of this their great wickedness and their boastings in their **own** strength . . .
Mormon 3:9	they began to boast in their **own** strength

But *own* can also be missing when the verb is *boast:*

Alma 39:2	thou didst go on unto boasting in thy strength and thy wisdom

Thus either reading, with or without the *own,* is possible. Here in Alma 38:11, the corrected reading in 𝒪 ("in my **own** wisdom") appears to be the original reading.

Summary: Accept in Alma 38:11 Oliver Cowdery's apparent correction in 𝒪, "in my **own** wisdom", which is also the reading in 𝒫 as well as in all the printed editions.

■ **Alma 38:15**

now go my son
and [*preach >% teach* 0 | *teach* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *the word unto this people*

Here in the original manuscript, Oliver Cowdery initially wrote *preach* rather than *teach*. But he immediately corrected the word by erasing the *pre* and overwriting it with *te*. Either reading is theoretically possible here. In Alma 8:4, scribe 2 of 𝒫 made the same error when he copied from 𝒪 into 𝒫, writing *preach* initially and then immediately correcting it to *teach* (in this case by crossing out the *preach* and then writing *teach* inline).

Summary: Follow in Alma 38:15 the immediately corrected reading in 𝒪, namely, *teach* rather than *preach* ("now go my son and **teach** the word unto this people").

Alma 39

■ **Alma 39:1–2**

And now my son
I have somewhat more to say unto thee than what I said
(1) *unto thy* [Brothers >% Brother 0 | brother 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
for behold have ye not observed the steadiness
(2) *of thy* [Brothers >% Brother 0 | brother 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
his *faithfulness and* **his** *diligence in keeping the commandments of God*
behold has **he** *not set a good example for thee*
for thou didst not give so much heed unto my words
(3) *as did thy* [Brother 0 | brother 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *among the people of the Zoramites*

Oliver Cowdery, the scribe in 𝒪, at first expected the plural *brothers* since this is the third brother that Alma has addressed. Oliver initially wrote the first two instances as *brothers* (with the *b* capitalized); then in each case, he immediately erased the plural *s*. The following singular pronouns, *his* and *he,* show that the singular is intended. Thus when Oliver finally got to the third instance of *brother* (in verse 2), he wrote it in the singular without error. And only then do we finally realize that Alma is speaking about Shiblon as the other brother, not Helaman, since Shiblon was the brother who was with Corianton "among the people of the Zoramites". (Alma 31:7 explains that Helaman did not go on the mission to the Zoramites.) Moreover, Alma's words to Shiblon, especially in Alma 38:10–14, could be interpreted, perhaps incorrectly, as applying to Shiblon personally (for instance, "see that ye are not lifted up unto pride / yea see that ye do not boast in your own wisdom"), with the result that here at the beginning of chapter 39 one might think that Alma was referring to Helaman, not Shiblon, as the unnamed brother. Yet it is Shiblon that Alma praises for his steadiness, faithfulness, and diligence: "because of your steadiness and your faithfulness unto God . . . because of thy faithfulness and thy diligence and thy patience and thy long-suffering among the people of the Zoramites" (Alma 38:2–3). And finally, as Alma himself observes here in Alma 39:1 ("I have somewhat more to say unto thee than what I said unto thy brother"), his message to Shiblon was quite short, while his message to Helaman was almost as long as the one to Corianton (we get the following number of pages in the 1830 edition for each of the three discourses: 7.0 for Helaman, 1.5 for Shiblon, and 8.2 for Corianton).

So by the middle of verse 2, it would have become clear to Oliver Cowdery that Alma is recommending Shiblon to Corianton. Of course, Alma could have recommended both brothers; in fact, he does precisely that later on in this chapter:

Alma 39:10

 and I command you to take it upon you to counsel
(1) your elder [*brother > brothers* 1|*brothers* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
  in your undertakings
 for behold thou art in thy youth
 and ye stand in need to be nourished
(2) by your [*Brothers* 0|*brothers* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]

The original manuscript is not extant for the first occurrence of *brothers* in Alma 39:10, although it probably read that way (but with a capitalized *B*). In the printer's manuscript, Oliver initially wrote the singular *brother* for the first occurrence in verse 10, probably because he had gotten used to the singular *brother* in verses 1–2. Here in verse 10, Oliver virtually immediately corrected *brother* to *brothers* in 𝓟 by overwriting the final *r* with *rs*. And for the second occurrence of the word in verse 10, the text reads *your brothers* in both manuscripts and without variation. Alma is indeed referring to both older brothers in verse 10.

 There is a similar switching in number for *brother(s)* at the beginning of 1 Nephi, where the text first refers to Nephi and Sam, then to Nephi alone:

1 Nephi 3:28–29

 wherefore Laman and Lemuel did speak many hard words unto **us**
(1) their younger [*Brother* 0|*Brethren >%+ Brothres* 1|
  brothers ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
 and they did smite **us** even with a rod
 and it came to pass as they smote **us** with a rod
 behold an angel of the Lord came and stood before them
 and he spake unto them saying
(2) why do ye smite your younger [*Brother* 0|*Brethers >+ Brother* 1|
  brother ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] with a rod
 know ye not that the Lord hath chosen **him** to be a ruler over you

Here Oliver Cowdery once more had difficulty writing the correct number (and understandably so). For discussion, see under 1 Nephi 3:28, 29. Ultimately, Oliver was able to get the number correct in 1 Nephi 3:28–29 as well as here in Alma 39:1–2 and in Alma 39:10.

Summary: Maintain the use of the singular *brother* in Alma 39:1–2 and the use of the plural *brothers* in Alma 39:10; despite the tendency to mix up the grammatical number for *brother,* Oliver Cowdery was finally able to correctly write down the appropriate singular and plural in Alma 39.

■ **Alma 39:2–3**

(1) *for thou **didst** not give so much heed unto my words*
as did thy brother among the people of the Zoramites
now this is what I have against thee
(2) *thou **didst** go on unto boasting in thy strength and thy wisdom*
and this is not all my son
(3) *thou [dids 0|didst 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] do that which was grievious unto me*
(4) *for thou **didst** forsake the ministry*
(5) *and **did** go over into the land of Siron . . .*

Grammatically, the conjoined *did* near the end of this passage does not agree with the preceding four occurrences of *thou didst*. One could consider grammatically editing the last *did* to *didst* in the standard text. All five occurrences of *did(st)* in this passage are extant in the original manuscript. The third is spelled *dids,* which suggests that the conjoined *did* at the end might just be a scribal error for *didst.* Even so, there is evidence elsewhere in the text that verbs can initially have the second person singular ending, then lack that ending for later conjoined instances of verbs in the passage:

> Alma 22:16 (original text)
>> if thou **desirest** this thing
>> if thou **will** bow down before God
>> yea if thou **repent** of all thy sins
>> and **will** bow down before God . . .

Notice that the passage ends with *and will,* somewhat parallel to the instance of *and did* here in Alma 39:3 (both lack the *thou* found previously in the passage). The tendency in the history of the text has been to add the appropriate second person singular ending in Alma 22:16 except for the last case, *and will,* the only one that lacks the *thou* (see the discussion under Alma 22:16). Similarly, there has been no tendency to emend *and did* in Alma 39:3 to *and didst.* The critical text will, as expected, leave unchanged the occurrence of *and did* in Alma 39:3 (as well as the *and will* in Alma 22:16).

Summary: Maintain the nonstandard use of conjoined *did* in Alma 39:3 ("for thou didst forsake the ministry **and did** go over into the land of Siron"); similar usage can be found elsewhere in the original text.

■ **Alma 39:4**

yea she did [*seal >+ seal >+ steal* 0 | *steal* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *away the hearts of many*

Here Oliver Cowdery initially wrote *steal* as *seal.* He later (with distinctly heavier but uneven ink flow) corrected his scribal slip to *steal* (although in his supralinear correction he started to write *seal* once more). The correction of *seal* to *steal* was definitely made later. Oliver probably made the correction on his own, perhaps when he copied the text from 𝒪 into 𝒫. Stan Larson has claimed that Oliver originally wrote *lead* in 𝒪 and that the correction to *steal* is an example of conscious editing on Joseph Smith's part as he dictated the text. The problem with this claim is that Oliver's initial word in 𝒪 does not at all read *lead,* but *seal.* For Larson's claim, see pages 9–10 of his "Textual Variants in Book of Mormon Manuscripts", *Dialogue* 10/4 (1977): 8–30. Later on in this chapter, the text refers three times to "leading away the heart" (the first instance refers to sexual temptation, just as here in verse 4):

> Alma 39:11   suffer not that the devil **lead** away your heart again
>> after those wicked harlots
>
> Alma 39:12   lest they **lead** away the hearts of many people to destruction
>
> Alma 39:13   that ye **lead** away the hearts of no more to do wickedly

Elsewhere in the text, there are ten other instances that refer to "leading away the heart". Clearly *lead* is possible here in Alma 39:4, but 𝓞 does not read *lead*. And as we might expect, there is independent evidence in the text for "stealing away the heart":

| Mosiah 27:9 | **stealing** away the hearts of the people |
| Alma 31:22 | and that their hearts were not **stolen** away to believe in things to come |

The scribal error of *seal* for *steal* is not that unusual; Book of Mormon scribes occasionally omitted the second consonant from an orthographic word-initial consonant cluster. We have the following examples for Oliver Cowdery (the scribe in 𝓞 for Alma 39:4):

SCRIBAL SLIP	INTENDED SPELLING	MANUSCRIPT SOURCE
fed	f**l**ed	Alma 43:50 (𝓟)
kew	k**n**ew	Alma 55:1 (𝓞*), Alma 56:43 (𝓞)
kow	k**n**ow	Alma 32:36 (𝓞)
pay	p**r**ay	3 Nephi 3:20 (𝓟*), Moroni 7:9 (𝓟*)
pepare	p**r**epare	Alma 48:15 (𝓟)
pepared	p**r**epared	2 Nephi 28:23 (𝓟), Alma 49:8 (𝓟), Ether 12:32 (𝓟*)
pove	p**r**ove	Helaman 2:13 (𝓟)
sould	s**h**ould	Alma 20:26 (𝓟)
witten	w**r**itten	1 Nephi 22:30 (𝓟)

Although there are no other examples of Oliver miswriting an initial *st* as *s,* scribe 2 of 𝓟 made this mistake a couple of times:

SCRIBAL SLIP	INTENDED SPELLING	MANUSCRIPT SOURCE
seadiness	s**t**eadiness	Alma 1:29 (𝓟*)
sedfastly	s**t**edfastly	3 Nephi 19:30 (𝓟)

The first case was corrected to *steadiness* by Oliver when he proofed 𝓟; but in the second case, Oliver missed correcting *sedfastly* (scribe 2 of 𝓟's typical spelling of *steadfast* was *stedfast*).

It is very doubtful that the original text here in Alma 39:4 actually read as originally written in 𝓞, "she did **seal** away the hearts of many". There are two references in the text, one positive and one negative, that refer to sealing people as either the Lord's or Satan's in advance of the day of judgment:

Mosiah 5:15

    therefore I would that ye should be steadfast and immovable
    always abounding in good works
    that Christ the Lord God Omnipotent may **seal you his**
    that you may be brought to heaven
    that ye may have everlasting salvation and eternal life

Alma 34:35

    behold ye have become subjected to the spirit of the devil
    and he doth **seal you his**
    therefore the Spirit of the Lord hath withdrawn from you and hath no place in you
    and the devil hath all power over you
    and this is the final state of the wicked

On the other hand, the use of the verb *seal* in 𝄞 for Alma 39:4 seems very much to be a scribal error, especially given the oddity of the expression "seal away the hearts of many" with its use of the adverb *away*.

Summary: Maintain in Alma 39:4 the corrected reading, "yea she did **steal** away the hearts of many"; Oliver Cowdery twice wrote *steal* as *seal* in 𝄞; the scribal slip is definitely *seal*, not *lead*; in theory, either *lead* or *steal* will work in this passage, while *seal* itself seems quite impossible.

■ **Alma 39:6**

for behold if ye deny the Holy Ghost
when [its once >% it once ₀ | it one ₁ | it once ABCEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST | once it D]
hath had place in you . . .

Here the 1841 British edition accidentally switched the word order, moving *once* before the subject pronoun *it*. But the subsequent LDS edition (in 1849) restored the original word order. Either order, "when **it once** hath had place in you" versus "when **once it** hath had place in you", is possible. The critical text will maintain the original order (which is extant in 𝄞), with *once* after *it*.

Summary: Maintain in Alma 39:6 the placement of *once* after the subject pronoun *it* ("when **it once** hath had place in you").

■ **Alma 39:6**

yea and whosoever murdereth against the light and knowledge of God
it is not easy for him to obtain **forgiveness**
yea I say unto you my son
that it is not easy for him to obtain **a forgiveness**

Joanne Case suggests (personal communication, 14 September 2004) that the indefinite article *a* in the second instance of "to obtain (a) forgiveness" might be in error; that is, as Joseph Smith dictated the text to Oliver Cowdery, an extra *a* was inserted. Of course, there is the possibility that the first instance may have originally read "to obtain **a** forgiveness" and that the *a* there was lost. In both cases, the original manuscript is extant, so the difference is found in the earliest source.

Elsewhere in the text, the noun *forgiveness* is never preceded by the indefinite article:

1 Nephi 7:21	that they would pray unto the Lord their God for **forgiveness**
Mosiah 4:2	that we may receive **forgiveness** of our sins
Moroni 6:8	but as oft as they repented and sought **forgiveness** . . .

The normal expression in modern English is without the *a*. However, there are instances in the history of English of *a forgiveness,* as in the following examples (accidentals simplified) taken from the online Oxford English Dictionary and from *Literature Online* <lion.chadwyck.com>:

Roger Boyle (1655)
　　and concluding it better not to discover her offense
　　than to obtain **a** forgiveness for it
　　she elected the first of these

Ann Radcliffe (1797)
>> to lament the hastiness of his temper
>> and to plead for **a** forgiveness from his irritated mother

James Froude (1879)
>> some were still sullen and refused to sue for **a** forgiveness

Given this evidence for *a forgiveness,* the critical text will retain the unique instance of "to obtain **a** forgiveness" in Alma 39:6. In the original text, there are a number of nouns which unexpectedly take the indefinite article *a*. For three examples, see under Alma 32:6.

Summary: Maintain in Alma 39:6 the unique occurrence of *a forgiveness,* the reading in ⵀ; elsewhere *forgiveness* occurs without any indefinite article, including one instance earlier in this same verse.

■ **Alma 39:9–10**

for except ye do this
ye can in no wise inherit the kingdom of God
(1) *O remember* **and** *take it upon you* **and** *cross yourself in these things*
(2) *and I command you* **to** *take it upon you* **to** *counsel your elder brothers in your undertakings*

As noted under 2 Nephi 5:9, this passage contains the only example in the text of "take it upon one(self)" where the complementary clause begins with *and* ("take it upon you **and** cross yourself") rather than *to,* as later in this passage ("take it upon you **to** counsel your elder brothers") and in four other places in the original text. Moreover, the *it* in the first instance sounds very strange since the reader may wonder what the *it* is specifically referring to here (surely not the taking of the kingdom of God upon oneself). If the second *and* is changed to *to,* then the *it* would act as an indefinite pronoun that would be complemented by an infinitive clause, "to cross yourself in these things".

The *and* preceding the first instance of the verb *take* ("and take it upon you") could be the source for Oliver Cowdery writing an *and* before *cross* rather than writing the expected *to.* Note that in the second instance of *take,* this verb is preceded by *to* ("I command you **to** take it upon you"), which may have prevented the replacement of the following *to* with *and.* We should also note here that ⵀ is not extant for "& cross yourself", so there is a possibility that ⵀ may have actually read "to cross yourself"; in other words, the error (if there is one) of replacing an original *to* with *and* could have entered the text as Oliver copied the text from ⵀ into ⵎ. Finally, there is evidence for the occasional mix-up of *to* and *and* in the early transmission of the text. For some examples, see the list under Mosiah 21:18. Thus there is evidence for emending *and* to *to* here in Alma 39:9.

Nonetheless, there is a similar expression with an expletive *it* for which its complement begins with *and* rather than *to,* namely, "go to it and <do something>". There is one example of this expression in the original text: "the servants did go to **it and** labor with their mights" (Jacob 5:72); for discussion of this expression, see under that passage. In any event, this example in Jacob 5:72 of *it* complemented by an *and*-initial clause suggests that here in Alma 39:9 the earliest reading, "take **it** upon you **and** cross yourself", is acceptable. Note further that the *and* in this reading has never been edited to *to,* so its occurrence may not be all that objectionable. The critical text will maintain the *and* here, even though there is a possibility that it may have read *to* in the original text.

Summary: Retain in Alma 39:9 the unusual *and*-initial clause following "take it upon you"; although the *and* may be an error for *to*, there is another example where the complement for an expletive *it* is an *and*-initial clause (namely, "the servants did go to **it and** labor with their mights" in Jacob 5:72).

■ **Alma 39:10**

and I command you to take it upon you to counsel
[01ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQS | *with* RT] *your elder brothers in your undertakings*

As discussed under Alma 37:37, the original text here lacks the preposition *with*. Even though the meaning requires *with* in modern English, this expression without an overt *with* appears to date from Early Modern English and will be retained in the critical text.

■ **Alma 39:11**

suffer not [*yourself* 1ABCEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST | *yourselves* D]
to be led away by any vain or foolish thing
suffer not [*that* 01ABCGHKPS | DEFIJLMNOQRT] *the devil*
[1ABCGHKPS | *to* DEFIJLMNOQRT] *lead away*
your [*heart* 1ABCEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST | *hearts* D] *again after those wicked harlots*
behold O my son how great iniquity ye brought upon the Zoramites
for when they saw your conduct
they would not believe [*in* 01ABCEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST | D] *my words*

In this passage we have three types of changes that were introduced into the 1841 British edition. The first and third of these types were never transmitted into the subsequent LDS edition, but the second one was. We consider each one in turn.

First, we have the change to the plural forms *yourselves* and *hearts,* as if Alma were speaking to more than one son: "suffer not **yourselves** to be led away . . . suffer not the devil to lead away your **hearts**" (the 1841 text). This plural reading was, of course, reversed in the following 1849 LDS edition.

Second, the 1841 typesetter changed the *that*-clause to an infinitive clause, thus leading to a change from "suffer not **that** the devil lead away your heart" to "suffer not the devil **to** lead away your hearts" (the 1841 text). This change in clausal construction seems to have been influenced by the use of the infinitive clause in the preceding sentence, which also begins with *suffer not* ("suffer not yourself **to** be led away by any vain or foolish thing"). So originally here in Alma 39:11 we have variation between the two clausal types. Elsewhere in the text, there are two more examples of the form "suffer not that S", where S is a finite clause:

Ether 3:3   and suffer not **that** they shall go forth across this raging deep
                   in darkness
Ether 8:23   and suffer not **that** these murderous combinations shall get above you

For these two examples, the finite verb of the *that*-clause is the modal *shall,* whereas in Alma 39:11 we have in the *that*-clause the infinitival (that is, subjunctive) form of the verb, *lead.* The critical text will restore the original text here in Alma 39:11: "suffer not that the devil **lead** away your heart again after those wicked harlots".

The third type of change in Alma 39:11 is the loss of the preposition *in* in the last clause, changing "they would not believe **in** my words" to "they would not believe my words". Elsewhere in the text, there are examples of both possibilities, with three occurrences of "believe **in** my words" and two of "believe my words":

1 Nephi 2:17	he believed **in** my words
Alma 17:29	that I may lead them to believe **in** my words
3 Nephi 21:11	whosoever will not believe **in** my words . . .
Ether 4:10	and he that believeth not my words believeth not my disciples
Ether 4:12	he that will not believe my words will not believe me

Either reading is possible, so we follow the earliest textual sources in Alma 39:11 and maintain the preposition *in* ("they would not believe **in** my words").

Summary: Restore the original text in Alma 39:11, with its finite *that*-clause after *suffer* ("suffer not **that** the devil lead away your heart again"); also maintain the singular number for *yourself* and *heart* as well as the preposition *in* (in the final clause, "they would not believe **in** my words").

■ **Alma 39:13**

that ye lead away the hearts **of no more** *to do wickedly*

Here "of no more" is a prepositional phrase that ends in a nominal *more* rather than in an adjectival *more* followed by an explicit noun (such as *more people*). 𝒪 is not extant for the words immediately following *no more;* but based on the length of the lacuna, some kind of supralinear insertion would have been required in 𝒪 if there had been a noun after *more.* 𝒫, the copy of 𝒪, reads "of no more", as do all the printed editions. Since this unusual reading can be understood, the critical text will maintain it.

Summary: Accept in Alma 39:13 the invariant reading of all the extant textual sources, "the hearts of no more"; the expected noun after *more* (which would have had the meaning 'people') is left unexpressed.

■ **Alma 39:13**

but rather return unto them
and acknowledge your faults
and [*repair/retain* 0|*retain* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQS| RT] *that wrong*
which ye have done

Here is an example of a strange use of *retain* that led the editors for the 1920 LDS edition to emend the text. For that edition, the word *retain* was deleted, which ended up making a minor shift in the meaning. The original verb *retain* could be interpreted to mean something like 'take back'. This meaning, for instance, is still found in the text in Alma 44:8, 12 (see the discussion under Alma 44:11). One could therefore interpret "retain that wrong" here in Alma 39:13 as somehow taking back a sin through the process of repentance—in other words, by taking back his sin, Corianton would somehow eliminate it.

The original manuscript reads quite strangely here. Oliver Cowdery seems to have written something that looks like *relain,* but the loop for the *l*-like character is very wide and the *l* almost looks like a capital *P.* In any event, this *l*-like character has been overwritten since its final ink flow is considerably heavier. But the most striking part of this letter is that it is crossed with what looks like an even darker ink stroke, yet this extra stroke is not actually a stroke of the pen but is an accidental ink blob! Elsewhere on the page there are numerous stray ink dots with the same darkness as this stroke-like blob; one of these dots appears just above in the previous line and two of them, one quite irregular and larger, appear just below in the following line. The second half of the page is full of these dark dots—and in fact, two of them look like small strokes, although they are not horizontal. Usually Oliver's crossing for the letter *t* is longer than the short one found here on this word. All in all, it appears that Oliver may have first written some other word than *retain* and that the accidental ink drop made a different letter look like a *t.*

These possibilities suggest that the actual word in the original manuscript is *repair.* The letter corresponding to the *p* was defectively written (perhaps because there is a stray fiber in the paper that seems to have interfered with writing the letter). But it is clear that the scribe in 𝒪 (here Oliver Cowdery) never intended to cross the ascender for this letter. Moreover, the final *n* in this word can also be interpreted as an *r,* especially since Oliver often wrote *n* and *r* indifferently. Consider, for instance, the word *robber* in Helaman 3:23; there the initial *r* was almost written like an *n* in 𝒫, with the result that the 1830 typesetter misread the word *robber* as *nobler,* thus the 1830 edition refers to Gaddianton the robber as Gaddianton the nobler! For some examples where a word-final *n* or *r* may have been mixed up, see the discussion under Mosiah 2:15–16 regarding *clear/clean.*

The decision to emend *retain* to *repair* here in Alma 39:13 is strikingly supported by the language in another passage that refers to people repairing the wrongs they have done:

> Helaman 5:17
>> and it came to pass that they did preach with great power
>> insomuch that they did confound many of those dissenters
>> which had gone over from the Nephites
>> insomuch that they came forth and did **confess** their sins
>> and were baptized unto repentance and immediately returned to the Nephites
>> to endeavor to **repair** unto them the wrongs which they had done

Notice in particular the specific reference to the confession of sins, which is equivalent to the acknowledgment of faults. We find the same reference to both confessing and repairing wrongs in another passage:

> Mosiah 27:35
>> and after they had traveled throughout all the land of Zarahemla
>> and among all the people which was under the reign of king Mosiah
>> zealously striving to **repair** all the injuries which they had done to the church
>> **confessing** all their sins and publishing all the things which they had seen

One could argue against the emendation to *repair* in Alma 39:13 by asking how one can repair a sexual sin. Yet there is a passage that refers to repairing murder:

Alma 27:8
> we will go down unto our brethren and we will be their slaves
> until we **repair** unto them the many murders and sins
> which we have committed against them

And in all these passages (as in Alma 39:13), the penitent sinners go directly to those whom they have sinned against. But perhaps the most important aspect of the emendation *repair* in Alma 39:13 is that it reminds us that repentance involves both acknowledgment (that is, confession) of sins as well as repairing the wrong (restitution).

Summary: Interpret the reading for Alma 39:13 as "repair that wrong which ye have done"; the reading in ⟨O⟩ is not fully clear, but the original word here appears to have been *repair,* which was misread as *retain* after the manuscript page was accidentally sprinkled with random ink dots prior to being copied into ⟨P⟩; the removal of *retain* from the 1920 LDS edition leads to the misleading notion that Corianton need only acknowledge his faults and that wrong which he had done.

■ **Alma 39:15**

behold I say unto you
that [*it* 01ABDEFIJLMNOPQRST | CGHK] *is him*
that surely shall come to take away the sins of the world

Here the 1840 edition accidentally omitted the subject pronoun *it*. This reading without the *it* continued in the 1858 Wright edition and the first two RLDS editions, but the 1908 RLDS restored the *it* to the RLDS text. The omission of the *it* forces readers to interpret the *that* as the subject pronoun and to assume that there was no subordinate conjunction. Such a reading is highly unusual, if not impossible, for the Book of Mormon text (there are no examples of "that is he" or "that is him"). Surprisingly, this misreading continued through several editions in the RLDS textual tradition before being corrected.

Summary: Maintain the subject pronoun *it* in Alma 39:15; the 1840 omission of the *it* is clearly an error.

■ **Alma 39:17–19**

(1) *is not a soul at this time as precious unto God*
    as a soul will be at the time of his coming
(2) *is it not as necessary that the plan of redemption should be made known*
    unto this people as well as unto their children
(3) [*is it* 01 | *Is it* ABCDEFGHIJKLNOPQRST | *It is* M] *not as easy at this time*
    for the Lord to send his angel to declare those glad tidings unto us . . .

In this passage we have three rhetorical yes-no questions. The typesetter for the 1905 LDS edition accidentally changed the last question into a declarative sentence ("it is not as easy at this time . . ."). As a declarative, the correct rhetorical response would be positive, not negative ("it is as easy at this time . . ."). The 1911 LDS edition, which derives from the 1905 edition, restored the original yes-no question.

Summary: Maintain the three yes-no questions in Alma 39:17–19; Alma's questions here are rhetorical and expect a positive answer ("a soul is at this time . . . it is as necessary . . . it is as easy at this time").

■ **Alma 39:19**

is it not as easy at this time for the Lord to send his angel
to declare [*those* 01 | *these* ᴀʙᴄᴅᴇꜰɢʜɪᴊᴋʟᴍɴᴏᴘǫʀsᴛ] *glad tidings unto us*
as unto our children or as after the time of his coming

Here we have one more example in the transmission of the text where *those* and *these* have been mixed up. In this instance, the 1830 typesetter substituted *these* for the *those* of the original manuscript. Earlier in the larger passage (in verse 16), Alma refers to "these glad tidings":

Alma 39:16
and now my son this was the ministry unto which ye were called
to declare **these** glad tidings unto this people

This preceding occurrence of "these glad tidings" is probably the source for the 1830 typesetter's error here in verse 19. Elsewhere in the text, there are two other occurrences of "these glad tidings" but none of "those glad tidings":

Alma 13:22   and he doth sound **these** glad tidings among all his people
Alma 13:23   for we have **these** glad tidings declared unto us

More generally, the text allows for both *those* and *these*. In each case, we follow the earliest textual sources, thus *those* here in Alma 39:19 (but *these* in Alma 39:16). For a list of cases where the 1830 typesetter mixed up *those* and *these,* see under Mosiah 28:1.

Summary: In accord with the reading of the two manuscripts, restore *those* in Alma 39:19 ("those glad tidings"), even though otherwise in the text we only have "these glad tidings" (three times).

Alma 40

◼ **Alma 40:2**

that this mortal does not put on [*immortality* 01ACDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST | *immorality* B]

Here the 1837 typesetter accidentally mis-set *immortality* as *immorality*. He made the same mistake in the next chapter:

> Alma 41:4
> mortality raised to [*immortality* 01ACDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST | *immorality* B]

We have another example of the same mistake, but this one is found in the 1892 RLDS edition:

> 3 Nephi 28:8
> but when I shall come in my glory
> ye shall be changed in the twinkling of an eye
> from mortality to [*Immortality* 1 | *immortality* ABCDEFGHIJLMNOPQRST |
>   *immorality* K]

In each case, of course, the error is an impossible reading. In fact, the word *moral* (and related words such as *morality, immoral,* and *immorality*) never occur in the Book of Mormon text, although one would think they could.

Summary: Maintain *immortality* in Alma 40:2, Alma 41:4, and 3 Nephi 28:8; there are no instances in the text of the word *immorality.*

◼ **Alma 40:3**

[NULL > *now* 1 | *Now* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *I unfold unto you a mystery*

Here Oliver Cowdery initially omitted the narrative connector *now* when he copied the text here from 𝓞 into 𝓟. Virtually immediately he supralinearly inserted the *now* in 𝓟 (there is no change in the level of ink flow). 𝓞 is not extant for the first part of this sentence, but there is room for the *now* in the lacuna. Alma frequently uses the narrative *now* in this part of the text. For instance, in his instructions to Corianton (Alma 39–42), there are a total of 22 occurrences of *now*-initial sentences (including this one in Alma 40:3), with 11 of them occurring in this chapter. There are also 22 sentences that begin with *and now* in Alma 39–42. Here in Alma 40:3, the critical text will follow the corrected reading in 𝓟.

Summary: Maintain in Alma 40:3 the sentence-initial *now,* the almost immediately corrected reading in 𝓟; Alma begins many sentences with *now* when speaking to Corianton.

■ **Alma 40:5**

now whether there shall be one time or a second time or a third time
that men shall come forth from the dead / *it mattereth not*

Here it would appear that there is a very large supralinear insertion in 𝒪 that involves most, if not all, of the relative clause "that men shall come forth from the dead". The transcript for 𝒪 in volume 1 of the critical text reads as follows for this passage:

Alma 40:4–6 (lines 6–8, page 302′ of 𝒪)

```
(                                 ) shall be one time or a second time or a third
  -ICH IS APPOINTED NOW WHETHER THERE

(                             )
 MEN SHALL COME FORTH FROM THE DEAD
(                        )r God Knoweth all these things & it suffiseth me to kno
 TIME THAT ^ IT MATTERETH NOT FO

(                        th)ere is a time appointed when all shall rise from the dead &
  -W THAT THIS IS THE CASE THAT
```

Basically, twice as much text as is possible is supposed to fit within the lacuna, which requires one to supralinearly insert about half of that missing text. One problem with the transcript's conjectured text for the lacuna is that it seems strange that Oliver Cowdery would have initially written inline the *that* in "or a third time **that** it mattereth not". One possibility, suggested by Don Brugger (personal communication), is that part of the inserted text itself might have been supralinearly inserted above the original supralinear insertion. One example of such multiple supralinearity is found in 𝒪 near the beginning of 2 Nephi:

2 Nephi 1:20 (line 4, page 48 of 𝒪)

```
                                                    my
                            keep <his>^ commandments
    shall prosper in the land but in as much as ye will not ^ ye shall be cut o(f )
                                                                  F
```

Another possibility worth considering is that there was no supralinear insertion at all, that the original text lacked the relative clause "that men shall come forth from the dead" (which means that there would have been only some minor crossout in the lacuna). Such a conjecture assumes that when Oliver copied from 𝒪 into 𝒫, he added this long relative clause. One could further propose that Oliver was prompted to make such an addition (set in italics below and listed as 2) by two similar relative clauses, a nearly identical one in verse 4 (listed below as 1) and a somewhat different one at the end of verse 5 (listed below as 3):

(1) behold there is a time appointed   that all shall come forth from the dead
(2) one time or a second time or a third time *that men shall come forth from the dead*
(3) that there is a time appointed   when all shall rise from the dead

The sentence at the beginning of verse 5 would read well enough without the long relative clause: "now whether there shall be one time or a second time or a third time / it mattereth not". But we have no evidence elsewhere in the text that Oliver ever created in his copywork such a long insertion, either intentionally or accidentally. Despite the difficulty in fitting the entire text within the lacuna, the critical text will accept the earliest extant reading, the one in 𝒫 with the relative clause "that men shall come forth from the dead".

Summary: Accept in Alma 40:5 the relative clause "that men shall come forth from the dead", which modifies "one time or a second time or a third time"; it appears that most, if not all, of this long relative clause was supralinearly inserted in what is now a lacuna in 𝒪.

■ **Alma 40:5**

and it sufficeth me to know that this is the case
that there is a time appointed
[*when* 0 | *that* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *all shall rise from the dead*

The Book of Mormon text allows various relative pronouns—*that, which,* and *when*—to refer to the noun *time*. And occasionally there has been some shifting between these relative pronouns. Here in Alma 40:5, the original manuscript reads *when;* there is no correcting *that* supralinearly inserted after the *when,* nor does *when* appear to be crossed out or erased. Oliver Cowdery simply replaced the *when* with *that* when he copied the text from 𝒪 into 𝒫; the *that* is consistent with nearby usage:

> Alma 40:4 (*that* is extant in 𝒪)
> behold there is a time appointed
> **that** all shall come forth from the dead

> Alma 40:5 (*that* is not extant in 𝒪)
> now whether there shall be one time or a second time or a third time
> **that** men shall come forth from the dead / it mattereth not

> Alma 40:9 (*that* is extant in 𝒪)
> therefore there is a time appointed unto men
> **that** they shall rise from the dead

Oliver's replacement of *when* with *that* could have been influenced by the use of *that* in the two preceding occurrences of "time that" (in Alma 40:4–5). A more immediate influence could have been the two preceding occurrences of *that* in the same sentence: "and it sufficeth me to know **that** this is the case **that** there is a time appointed that all shall rise from the dead" (the reading in 𝒫).

Even so, there are examples elsewhere in the text where the relative pronoun modifying *time* is *when,* including a nearby one in verse 10 of this chapter:

Alma 9:18	they shall come in a time **when** you know not
Alma 12:17	then is the time **when** their torments shall be as a lake of fire
Alma 40:10	and when the time cometh **when** all shall rise . . .
Helaman 12:2	and we may see at the very time **when** he doth prosper his people . . .

Consequently, there is no reason to reject the reading of the original manuscript here in Alma 40:5. For another example where "time when" was replaced by "time that", see under Alma 9:18.

Summary: In accord with the reading of the original manuscript, restore the relative pronoun *when* in Alma 40:5: "there is a time appointed **when** all shall rise from the dead".

■ **Alma 40:6**

[*&* 0 | 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *now there must needs be a space
betwixt the time of death and the time of the resurrection*

Here the original manuscript has an ampersand at the end of the line, but when copying into the printer's manuscript Oliver Cowdery accidentally missed this final word in a line of 𝒪. Oliver sometimes omitted small words at the ends of lines in his copywork; for some other examples, see the list under Alma 11:21.

As noted under Alma 40:3, there are 22 instances of *and now* in the original text for Alma's discourse with Corianton (Alma 39–42). There is nothing wrong with the *and* here in Alma 40:6; the critical text will restore it.

Summary: Restore the *and* at the beginning of Alma 40:6; as he copied the text from 𝒪 into 𝒫, Oliver Cowdery accidentally skipped the ampersand that occurred here at the end of a line in 𝒪.

■ **Alma 40:7**

*and now I would inquire what becometh of the souls of men
from* [*this* 0ABCEGHIJKLMNOPQRST | *the* > *this* 1F | *the* D] *time of death
to the time appointed for the resurrection*

There has been a persistent tendency in this sentence to change "from **this** time of death" to "from **the** time of death". This change has occurred three times in the history of the text: (1) when Oliver Cowdery initially copied this phrase into 𝒫, (2) when the type was set for the 1841 British edition, and (3) when the type was originally set for the 1852 LDS edition. In the first instance, Oliver corrected the initial *the* in 𝒫 to *this* by overwriting the *e* with an *i* and then inserting inline the *s;* there is no change in the level of ink flow for the correction, so it seems to be virtually immediate. In the third instance, prior to the second printing of the 1852 edition (also in that same year), the stereotyped plates were corrected by reference to the 1840 edition.

The original manuscript is basically extant for this phrase, and it reads "from **this** time of death". The apparent source for the change from *this* to *the* is the preceding sentence (in verse 6), where we get "**the** time of death and **the** time of the resurrection" (both *the*'s are extant in 𝒪):

> Alma 40:6–7
>> and now there must needs be a space
>> betwixt **the** time of death and **the** time of the resurrection
>> and now I would inquire what becometh of the souls of men
>> from **this** time of death to **the** time appointed for the resurrection

The critical text, of course, will maintain the original "from **this** time of death" in Alma 40:7.

Summary: Maintain in Alma 40:7 the determiner *this* before "time of death", the reading of the original manuscript.

■ **Alma 40:8**

all is as one day with God
and [01ABCDEFGIJLMNOPQRST | *the* HK] *time only is measured unto man*

> Here in Alma 40:8, the 1874 RLDS edition inserted the definite article *the* before *time*. Of course, this change produces a difficult reading, although one could interpret *the time* here as referring to the specific time between death and the resurrection. But we do not have a specific statement here; in this passage Alma is referring to time in general, thus the preceding statement "all is as one day with God". The 1908 RLDS edition restored the original reading here without the definite article *the* before *time*.

> *Summary:* Maintain in Alma 40:8 the occurrence of *time* without any definite article ("and time only is measured unto man").

■ **Alma 40:8**

all is as one day with God
and time only is measured unto [*man* 01 | *men* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]

> 𝒪 is extant here and reads *man,* as does 𝒫. The 1830 edition replaced the singular *man* with *men,* perhaps accidentally. This change is consistent with preceding and following uses of the plural *men,* and it may have been prompted by them:

> > Alma 40:8–9
> > now whether there is more than one time appointed for **men** to rise
> > > it mattereth not . . .
> > therefore there is a time appointed unto **men** that they shall rise from the dead

> In these two instances, the plural is appropriate since Alma is discussing the resurrection of different individuals, who will not necessarily be resurrected at the same time. On the other hand, the singular *man* in "and time only is measured unto **man**" works well since this is a general statement about time and mankind.

> It should also be pointed out that verse 10 reverts back to the singular *man.* This instance refers to the times of resurrection for mankind in general, so once more the singular *man* is used:

> > 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**

> We see a similar example later on in Alma's discourse with Corianton: "but behold it was appointed unto **man** to die" (Alma 42:6); again we have the meaning 'mankind'. Thus there is no reason to change the instance of *man* at the end of Alma 40:8 to *men;* the critical text will restore the singular *man.*

> There have been quite a few cases in the history of the text where *man* and *men* have been mixed up. For some examples, see under 1 Nephi 15:35.

Summary: Restore the singular *man* at the end of Alma 40:8 ("and time only is measured unto man"), the reading of both manuscripts; the singular is acceptable when the meaning is 'mankind'.

■ **Alma 40:9**

and there is a **space**
between the [*time* 01ABCDEFGIJLMNOPQRST | *space* HK] *of death and the resurrection*
and now concerning this **space** *of time . . .*

Here the 1874 RLDS edition introduced a difficult reading, substituting *space* for the correct *time:* "and there is a **space** between the **space** of death and the resurrection". This error was copied into the 1892 RLDS edition, but the 1908 RLDS edition restored the correct *time*. The error may have been prompted by the preceding *space* in "there is a space" or by the following *space* in "this space of time". Earlier in this passage there is an expression of the same idea: "and now there must needs be a **space** betwixt the **time** of death and the **time** of the resurrection" (Alma 40:6).

Summary: Maintain in Alma 40:9 the occurrence of *time* in the phrase "between the **time** of death and the resurrection".

■ **Alma 40:11**

now concerning the state of the soul
between death and [*the* 01ABCDEFIJLMNOPQRST | GHK] *resurrection*

Here the 1858 Wright edition omitted the definite article *the* before *resurrection*. This omission continued in the RLDS text until 1908. Other conjuncts of *death* and *resurrection* in this chapter all have *the* before *resurrection* (but, as expected, no *the* before *death*):

> Alma 40:6
>> and now there must needs be a space
>> betwixt the time of **death** and the time of **the resurrection**

> Alma 40:9
>> and there is a space between the time of **death** and **the resurrection**

> Alma 40:21
>> but this much I say that there is a space
>> between **death** and [*the* 01ABCDEFGIJLMNOPQRST | HK] **resurrection** of the body

The last one is interesting in that the 1874 RLDS edition, but not the 1858 Wright edition, omitted the definite article *the* before *resurrection*. See the discussion under Alma 40:21.

Summary: Maintain in Alma 40:11 the definite article *the* before *resurrection,* the reading of all the earliest sources.

■ **Alma 40:12**

and then shall it come to pass [*that* 01AIJLMNOPQRST | BCDEFGHK]
the spirits of those which are righteous are received into a state of happiness

The subordinate conjunction *that* appears to be necessary here, although it was omitted in the 1837 edition and not restored until the 1879 LDS edition and the 1908 RLDS edition. The tendency to omit the *that* after the very same clause ("and then shall it come to pass") is found in the following verse:

> Alma 40:13
>
> and then shall it come to pass
> [*the > that* 0 | *that* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] the spirits of the wicked . . .

In this second instance, Oliver Cowdery initially wrote *the* in O; but then he immediately corrected the *the* to *that* by overwriting the *e* with an *a* and writing the final *t* inline. Here in Alma 40:12–13, the critical text will, of course, retain both instances of "and then shall it come to pass **that** S" (where S stands for a finite clause).

Summary: Maintain in Alma 40:12–13 the subordinate conjunction *that* after "come to pass" in this future-tense expression with inverted modal ("and then shall it come to pass that . . .").

■ **Alma 40:12**

where they shall rest from all their troubles
and from all care and sorrow
[*&.C.* 0 | *.&C.* 1 | *&c.* ABCDEFGHIKLMNOQ | *etc.* JPS | RT]

The original text here has an instance of *etc.* that is necessary to the meaning—namely, in the state of paradise the righteous spirits will rest from everything: their troubles, cares, sorrows, and anything else (such as their labors, trials, afflictions, mourning, lamentation, grief, and pain). The *etc.* ensures that all the possibilities are covered. The 1920 LDS edition removed the *etc.,* as if it were unnecessary. The critical text will restore it. For a complete list of cases where *etc.* has been edited out of the text, see under ETC. in volume 3.

Summary: Restore in Alma 40:12 the *etc.* that the 1920 LDS edition deleted.

■ **Alma 40:13**

and then shall it come to pass that the spirits of the wicked—yea which are evil—
for behold they have no part nor portion of the Spirit of the Lord
for behold they [*chose* 01AFIJLMNOQRT | *choose* BCDEGHKPS] *evil works rather than good*
therefore the spirit of the devil did enter into them and take possession of their house
and these shall be cast out into outer darkness
there shall be weeping and wailing and gnashing of teeth

The two manuscripts read *chose*. However, the manuscript spelling could be a misspelling for *choose* since Oliver Cowdery typically spelled *choose* as *chose* in the manuscripts (see under the Words of Mormon 1:4–6 for a summary of the evidence). Here in Alma 40:13, the 1830 edition

reads *chose,* but the 1837 edition reads *choose.* This change from the past-tense *chose* to the present-tense *choose* may have been influenced by the use of the present tense in the preceding text: "the spirits of the wicked—yea which **are** evil—for behold they **have** no part nor portion of the Spirit of the Lord". The change in the 1837 edition may have been unintentional; it was not marked by Joseph Smith in 𝓟. The RLDS text has retained the present-tense *choose,* but the 1879 LDS edition restored the 1830 *chose,* undoubtedly because the past tense in "they **chose** evil works rather than good" works better with the following text: "therefore the spirit of the devil **did** enter into them and take possession of their house". The preceding present-tense *are* and *have* refer to the future state of the wicked, as is described later in this verse when Alma returns to describing what will happen to the spirits of the wicked, those who chose evil works in this life: "and these **shall be** cast out into outer darkness / there **shall be** weeping and wailing and gnashing of teeth".

Summary: Maintain the past-tense reading, *chose,* in Alma 40:13 since here Alma is referring to why the spirits of the wicked are evil: namely, they chose evil works in life.

■ **Alma 40:13**

and this because of their [*own* 01ABCDEFGIJLMNOPQRST | HK] *iniquity*

The 1874 RLDS edition omitted the *own* from "their own iniquity". The 1908 RLDS edition restored the word. This omission was probably accidental since elsewhere the 1874 edition did not delete *own.* For a complete discussion regarding both the omission and the insertion of *own* in the textual history, see under Alma 5:14.

Summary: Maintain in Alma 40:13 the occurrence of *own* in "because of their **own** iniquity", the reading of the earliest textual sources, including 𝓞.

■ **Alma 40:14**

now this is the state of the souls of the wicked
yea in darkness and a state of awful fearful looking for
[01ABDEFIJLMNOQRT |, CGHKPS]
[*of* 01ABCGHKPS | DEFIJLMNOQRT]
the fiery indignation of the wrath of God upon them

The original manuscript reads *for of;* both words are written rather faintly in 𝓞 (at least when compared with the other words in the line). It does not appear that the *of* is erased, although there is some slight ink smearing. The printer's manuscript and the first two printed editions also have *for of.* The expression "a state of awful fearful looking **for of** the fierce indignation of the wrath of God" is, to be sure, a difficult reading.

The 1840 edition attempted to deal with this difficult expression by placing a comma between the *for* and the *of.* And the RLDS textual tradition has continued with both words and the comma separating them. The idea behind this punctuation change is to make sure that *looking for* belongs together as the nominal gerundive form for the prepositional verb *look for.* In the Book of Mormon text, the nominal gerundive typically places an *of* between the adverbial element of a phrasal verb and its complement, as in these examples:

1 Nephi 14:1	unto the taking **away of** their stumbling blocks
1 Nephi 15:13	concerning the grafting **in of** the natural branches
2 Nephi 3:12	unto the confounding of false doctrines and laying **down of** contentions
2 Nephi 17:25	for the sending **forth of** oxen
2 Nephi 18:8	and the stretching **out of** his wings shall fill the breadth of thy land
2 Nephi 19:18	like the lifting **up of** smoke
Mosiah 20:23	and attributed the carrying **away of** their daughters to them
Alma 53:17	unto the laying **down of** their lives
3 Nephi 1:15	at the going **down of** the sun
3 Nephi 6:15	unto the stirring **up of** the people
3 Nephi 20:27	unto the pouring **out of** the Holy Ghost
Ether 12:3	even until the going **down of** the sun
Ether 12:33	even unto the laying **down of** thy life

Alma 40:14 therefore fits into this pattern: "a state of awful fearful looking **for of** the fiery indignation of the wrath of God".

The 1841 British edition (which was set from the 1837 edition) deleted the *of,* thus removing this difficult reading from the text; all subsequent LDS editions have followed this emendation. One could argue that the extra *of* here is an error resulting from the many occurrences of *of* in this passage: "now this is the state **of** the souls **of** the wicked yea in darkness and a state **of** awful fearful looking for *of* the fiery indignation **of** the wrath **of** God upon them". This error is supported by the following nearby example where Oliver Cowdery initially inserted in 𝓟 an extra *of*; 𝓞 is extant here and the *of* is lacking:

> Alma 37:19
>
> and now behold one purpose hath he fulfilled even to the restoration of many [0ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST | *of* > NULL 1] thousands of the Lamanites to the knowledge of the truth

And as in Alma 40:14, the surrounding text in Alma 37:19 contains a number of *of*'s that could have interfered in the correct transmission of the text: "**of** many *of* thousands **of** the Lamanites to the knowledge **of** the truth".

Despite the difficulty of the earliest reading in Alma 40:14, there is one very striking passage in the King James Bible that shows without a doubt that here the original Book of Mormon reading is no mistake:

> Hebrews 10:26–27
>
> for if we sin willfully after that we have received the knowledge of the truth there remaineth no more sacrifice for sins but a certain **fearful looking for of** judgment and **fiery indignation** which shall devour the adversaries

The parallelism with the Book of Mormon reading ("a state of awful **fearful looking for of** the **fiery indignation** of the wrath of God upon them") shows that the *of* is fully intended in the Book of Mormon text. Therefore the *of* will be restored in the critical text.

Summary: Restore in Alma 40:14 the *of* that separates the gerundive *looking for* and its following complement, "the fiery indignation of the wrath of God upon them"; Hebrews 10:27 provides conclusive evidence that the *of* (the reading in 𝄢) is correct.

■ **Alma 40:15**

yea I admit it may be termed a resurrection
the raising [1 | *of* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *the spirit or the soul*
and their consignation to happiness or misery

The original manuscript is not extant from the end of the word *resurrection* through the word *soul.* In this long lacuna, there is definitely space for the preposition *of,* but of course it could also be missing since the word *of* is so short. The printer's manuscript lacks the *of,* but the 1830 typesetter supplied it; all subsequent printed editions have maintained the *of,* as one would expect.

Theoretically, either reading is possible in the Book of Mormon text, as can be seen in the following pairs of contrasting examples (the first of each pair without the *of,* the second with it):

1 Nephi 17:32	unto the scattering them to destruction
3 Nephi 20:27	unto the scattering **of** my people
Moroni 8:25	unto the fulfilling the commandments
Moroni 8:29	unto the fulfilling **of** the prophecies

As discussed under 1 Nephi 17:32, the original text has a number of occurrences of the mixed gerundive noun phrase, "the <gerund> <complement>", where normally we expect the preposition *of* between the gerund and its complement. Nearly all of the examples without the *of* are found in prepositional phrases (often beginning with *unto*). However, there is one example where the construction occurs as an independent noun phrase:

Moroni 9:25
and may his sufferings and death
and **the shewing his body** unto our fathers
and his mercy and long-suffering
and the hope of his glory and of eternal life
rest in your mind forever

Thus "the raising the spirit or the soul" in Alma 40:15 is possible as an independent noun phrase, acting as an appositive to the preceding noun phrase, *a resurrection.*

In the history of the text, we have evidence for both the addition of the *of* as well as the loss of the *of* in this gerundive construction; I include in the following list the example from Alma 40:15 since in that instance the 1830 typesetter added the *of:*

□ *addition:*

1 Nephi 17:32 (added in the 1852 LDS edition)
he did make them mighty unto the driving out
[01ABCDEGHKPS | *of* FIJLMNOQRT] the children of the land

1 Nephi 17:32 (added in the 1907 LDS edition)
yea unto the scattering
[01ABCDEFGHIJKLMNPQRST | *of* O] them to destruction

Alma 40:15 (added in the 1830 edition)

yea I admit it may be termed a resurrection
the raising [1 | *of* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] the spirit or the soul
and their consignation to happiness or misery

Alma 55:19 (added in 𝔓 by Oliver Cowdery)

he did not delight in murder or bloodshed
but he delighted in the saving
[0 | *of* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] his people from destruction

Alma 56:13 (added in 𝔓 by Oliver Cowdery)

and now these are the cities
which the Lamanites have obtained possession of
by the shedding [0 | *of* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] the blood
of so many of our valiant men

□ *loss:*

Alma 40:14 (omitted in the 1841 British edition)

now this is the state of the souls of the wicked
yea in darkness and a state of awful fearful looking for
[*of* 01ABCGHKPS | DEFIJLMNOQRT] the fiery indignation of the wrath of God
upon them

Alma 62:45 (initially in 𝔓)

therefore Helaman and his brethren went forth
and did declare the word of God with much power
unto the convincing [*of* 0ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST | NULL >+ *of* 1] many
[0ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST | *of the* > NULL 1] people of their wickedness

In Alma 40:14 the *of* was omitted because *for of* is a difficult reading (see the discussion under that passage). The example in Alma 62:45 shows that Oliver Cowdery sometimes omitted the *of,* if only momentarily; there in the printer's manuscript, he initially wrote "unto the convincing many **of the** people of their wickedness". In this instance, Oliver not only omitted the *of* before *many,* he also added *of the* before *people.* It is possible that the competition between *many people* and *many of the people* led Oliver to momentarily omit the *of* before *many.* Obviously, the stronger tendency in the history of the text has been to add the *of,* given that modern English speakers expect the *of* when the gerund is preceded by the definite article *the.*

Here in Alma 40:15, there is some evidence in 𝔓 that 𝔒 may have read "the raising **of** the spirit or the soul". As Oliver Cowdery copied this passage from 𝔒 into 𝔓, he twice started to write the preposition *of,* not after the gerund *raising,* but after *spirit* and after *consignation.* The transcript of 𝔓 reads as follows:

Alma 40:15 (line 20, page 270 of 𝔓)

```
-ed a resurrection the raising the spirit o{f|r} the soul & their consignation <of> to
```

Here Oliver started to write *of* instead of *or;* then he caught himself and immediately overwrote the partially written *f* with an *r* (thus correcting *of* to *or*). This error may have prevented him from noticing that he had just omitted in 𝔓 the *of* after *raising* (assuming, of course, that the *of*

was there in ℧). The *of* reasserted itself when Oliver came to copying "their consignation **to** happiness or misery". There in 𝒫 he initially wrote *consignation of,* but then he immediately crossed out the *of* and wrote *to* inline. This perseverance of *of* in 𝒫 suggests that ℧ may very well have read "the raising **of** the spirit or the soul".

In opposition to this analysis of the intrusive *of*'s, one could argue that Oliver Cowdery did not expect "the spirit **or** the soul", but rather "the spirit **of** the soul" since elsewhere the text has 45 instances of "the spirit **of** the X", but none of "the spirit **or** the Y" (where *spirit* and Y are in the same conjunctive noun phrase). And having written *of* once (after *spirit*), Oliver wrote it a second time (after *consignation*). So the persistence of *of* when Oliver copied from ℧ into 𝒫 can be otherwise explained and may not provide evidence that ℧ read "the raising **of** the spirit or the soul".

There is no easy solution here. But since "the raising the spirit or the soul" is possible and it is the reading of the earliest extant source (the printer's manuscript), the critical text will restore this difficult reading. Nonetheless, the possibility remains that the original manuscript (and the original text) read "the raising **of** the spirit or the soul".

It should be noted here that if the *of* is accepted, there is a possible ambiguity for the gerund *raising* in "the raising of the spirit or the soul": namely, one could interpret this instance of *raise* as intransitive (the spirit or the soul rises to the spirit world), although clearly the spirit or the soul can be raised to the spirit world. From a textual point of view, it makes no difference in the English for Alma 40:15 whether *raising* in "the raising of the spirit or the soul" is assigned an intransitive or a transitive meaning, although in my opinion the transitive seems more natural. In the reading without the *of,* the transitive interpretation would be required. For further discussion of *raise* as an intransitive verb, see under 2 Nephi 3:24.

Summary: Restore in Alma 40:15 the earliest extant reading, the reading in 𝒫: "the raising the spirit or the soul"; despite its difficulty, this kind of gerundive construction is found elsewhere in the text; yet the possibility remains that ℧ (and the original text itself) read with the *of* in this passage (as "the raising **of** the spirit or the soul"); in that case, *raising* can take either a transitive or an intransitive meaning.

■ **Alma 40:17**

now we do not suppose that this first resurrection
which [*has been* > *is* 1|*is* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *spoken of in this manner*
can be the resurrection of the souls

Here we have a virtually immediate correction in 𝒫. Oliver Cowdery initially wrote *has been spoken;* then he crossed out the *has been* and supralinearly inserted *is*. There is no change in the level of ink flow for the correction. Oliver's error was probably prompted by the use of the perfect with the passive *spoken* in the two previous verses: "according to the words which **have been spoken** / and behold again it **hath been spoken** that . . ." (Alma 40:15–16). ℧ is not extant for the verb *is,* but there is room for only the short *is* in the lacuna (unless there is some supralinear insertion). Finally, either reading will work here, so the corrected reading in 𝒫 was undoubtedly the reading in ℧.

Summary: Retain in Alma 40:17 the corrected reading in 𝒫, the present-tense *is* ("which **is** spoken of in this manner").

■ **Alma 40:19**

now whether the souls and the bodies of those
[NULL > *of* 01 | *of* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *which have been spoken*
shall all be reunited at once
—the wicked as well as the righteous—
I do not say

Here in both manuscripts, Oliver Cowdery initially omitted the *of* that heads the relative clause. In each case, he supralinearly inserted the *of* and without any change in the level of ink flow. For the case in 𝓞, Oliver initially wrote a *t,* then crossed it out and supralinearly inserted the *of.* Perhaps he started to write *that* instead of *which* or to rewrite the preceding *those*. The supralinear *of* in 𝓞 appears to be an immediate correction. Obviously, Oliver tended to omit the initial *of* that headed this relative clause.

An almost identical example of this tendency to omit the initial *of* is found a few verses later in this chapter—and again in both manuscripts:

Alma 40:24

and now my son / this is the restoration
[NULL >+ *of* 0 | NULL > *of* 1 | *of* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
which has been spoken by the mouths of the prophets

In this instance, the corrected *of* in 𝓞 was written with somewhat heavier ink flow, but for the corrected *of* in 𝓟 there is no difference in the level of ink flow. Thus in this second instance, the correction in 𝓞 may have occurred later, perhaps when Oliver read back the text to Joseph Smith, or perhaps much later, when Oliver copied the text from 𝓞 into 𝓟. This correction in verse 24 is, in any event, in agreement with the invariant placement of the *of* at the beginning of an almost identical relative clause that occurs two verses earlier in the text:

Alma 40:22 (the *of* is extant in 𝓞)

yea this bringeth about the restoration of those things
of which have been spoken by the mouths of the prophets

One could argue that Oliver's correction in verse 24 was a conscious one based on the reading in verse 22.

As noted under 1 Nephi 10:16, the Book of Mormon text prefers *of* at the head of relative clauses when the verb is *speak*. More specifically, when we have the passive form *spoken,* we get a more evenly divided distribution for the placement of the *of;* I include in the following list the two cases here in Alma 40 where the *of* was initially omitted (each marked below with an asterisk):

▫ *at the beginning of the relative clause* (13 occurrences)

3 witness statement	**of** which hath been spoken
8 witness statement	**of** which hath been spoken
1 Nephi 22:6	**of** which are spoken
Alma 5:21	**of** whom it hath been spoken by our fathers
Alma 12:25	**of** which has been spoken
Alma 27:16	**of** which has been spoken

　　* Alma 40:19　　　　　**of** which have been spoken
　　　Alma 40:22　　　　　**of** which have been spoken by the mouths of the prophets
　　* Alma 40:24　　　　　**of** which has been spoken by the mouths of the prophets
　　　Alma 41:1　　　　　　**of** which has been spoken
　　　Helaman 16:16　　　　**of** which hath been spoken
　　　3 Nephi 26:14　　　　**of** whom hath been spoken
　　　Ether 13:15　　　　　**of** which hath been spoken

　□ *after the verb phrase in the relative clause* (9 times)

　　　Mosiah 2:32　　　　　which was spoken **of** by my father Mosiah
　　　Mosiah 4:8　　　　　　which hath been spoken **of**
　　　Mosiah 4:14　　　　　which hath been spoken **of** by our fathers
　　　Mosiah 27:30　　　　　which had been spoken **of** by our fathers
　　　Alma 12:24　　　　　　which has been spoken **of** by Amulek
　　　Alma 12:24　　　　　　which has been spoken **of** by us
　　　Alma 40:17　　　　　　which is spoken **of** in this manner
　　　Helaman 15:11　　　　which hath been spoken **of** by our fathers
　　　3 Nephi 2:7　　　　　　which was spoken **of** by the prophets

We note the strong tendency in these relative clauses to place the *of* after *spoken* when there is a following prepositional phrase (usually an agentive *by*-phrase) as well as the opposite tendency to place the *of* at the beginning of the relative clause when *spoken* is not followed by any prepositional phrase. But since there are exceptions to both tendencies (namely, Mosiah 4:8, Alma 5:21, and Alma 40:22, 24), we allow in each case the earliest textual sources to determine the placement of the *of*. Even if the insertion of the *of* in verse 24 is due to later editing on Oliver Cowdery's part, it was likely correct given the placement of the *of* in verse 22 (which reads almost identically).

　　David Calabro points out (personal communication) that the *of* may have originally been lacking in Alma 40:24 since the language there parallels the language of the King James Bible—and the biblical text lacks the initial *of*:

　　　Acts 3:21
　　　　until the times of restitution of all things
　　　　which God hath spoken by the mouth of all his holy prophets since the world began

　　　Alma 40:24 (initial reading in 𝓞)
　　　　this is the restoration
　　　　which has been spoken by the mouths of the prophets

However, the parallel language is actually not that close: in the biblical text, we get *restitution* rather than *restoration,* the use of the active rather than the passive in the relative clause, the singular *mouth* rather than the plural *mouths,* and the more complex noun phrase, "all his holy prophets since the world began", rather than the simpler "the prophets". If the issue is parallelism, then Alma 40:24 is closer to Alma 40:22, and in that instance the *of* is the firm reading in both manuscripts (repeated here for convenience):

Alma 40:22 (invariant *of* in 𝒪 and 𝒫)
> yea this bringeth about the restoration of those things
> **of** which have been spoken by the mouths of the prophets

There would be no reason to omit the simple function word *of* in verse 24 but leave it in verse 22.

And finally, we should note that there is firm evidence that Oliver Cowdery had difficulty elsewhere in the manuscripts with writing down the initial *of* at the head of relative clauses, including other cases where the verb was *speak:*

1 Nephi 12:16
> yea even the river
> [*of* 0ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST | NULL > *of* 1] which he spake

Alma 57:27
> now this was the faith of these
> [*of* 0ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST | NULL > *of* 1] which I have spoken

For both of these cases, Oliver initially omitted the *of* in 𝒫. For two possible cases where he appears to have failed to supply the *of* in 𝒫, see the discussion under Alma 13:14 and Helaman 16:16.

Summary: Accept in Alma 40:19 and in Alma 40:24 the *of* at the beginning of the relative clauses "**of** which have been spoken" and "**of** which has been spoken by the mouths of the prophets"; the reading in verse 24 is supported by the virtually identical but invariant language in verse 22: "**of** which have been spoken by the mouths of the prophets"; the reading in verse 19, with *of* at the beginning of the relative clause, is strongly supported by usage elsewhere in the text.

■ **Alma 40:19**

now whether the souls and the bodies of those
of [*which* 0A | *which* >js *who* 1 | *whom* BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
[*have* 01ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQS | *has* RT] *been spoken*
shall all be reunited at once
—the wicked as well as the righteous—
I do not say

This passage has undergone two grammatical changes. In his editing for the 1837 edition, Joseph Smith interpreted the *which* as referring to people, and so he changed the *which* to *who*. The 1837 edition ended up setting the correct object form, *whom:* "those of whom have been spoken". The 1920 LDS edition ended up changing the plural *have* to the singular *has.*

This relative clause construction is found five other times in Alma's discourse with Corianton:

Alma 40:15
> the raising the spirit or the soul
> and their consignation to happiness or misery
> according to the words which **have** been spoken

Alma 40:17
> now we do not suppose that this first resurrection
> which **is** spoken of in this manner
> can be the resurrection of the souls
> and their consignation to happiness or misery

Alma 40:22

> yea this bringeth about the restoration of those things
> of which [*have* 01ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQS | *has* RT] been spoken
>   by the mouths of the prophets

Alma 40:24

> this is the restoration
> of which **has** been spoken by the mouths of the prophets

Alma 41:1

> I have somewhat to say concerning the restoration
> of which **has** been spoken

In four of these other cases, the antecedent for the relative pronoun *which* is clear: *the words* in Alma 40:15, *this first resurrection* in Alma 40:17, and *the restoration* in Alma 40:24 and Alma 41:1. But in Alma 40:19 and Alma 40:22, the antecedent is unclear. Here in verse 19, the antecedent could be either *those* or the conjoined plural nouns *the souls and the bodies.* But either antecedent is plural, which argues that *have* should be maintained no matter whether the antecedent is *those* or *the souls and the bodies.* If the antecedent is *those,* then the grammatical emendation of *which* to *whom* is, of course, appropriate in the standard text. But *has* is impossible under any interpretation. David Calabro proposes (personal communication) that some sense of *it,* ellipted here, might have influenced the choice of *has* in the editing for the 1920 edition, as if the text had read "those of whom **it** has been spoken". Without the *it,* the use of *has* seems very odd here. The *have* also seems awkward, but it is not ungrammatical; we can see this if we place the *of* at the end of the relative clause, as if the original text had read "those which have been spoken of".

In the second instance of possible ambiguity, Alma 40:22, we have the initial noun phrase, the singular *the restoration;* if this is the antecedent for *which,* then the grammatical change to *has* is perfectly acceptable. The change in the 1920 LDS edition of *have* to *has* is clearly based on interpreting *the restoration* rather than *those things* as the antecedent for *which.* In accord with usage in the earliest text of the Book of Mormon, it is possible that the antecedent is the singular *the restoration* and that at the same time the verb form in the relative clause is determined by the nearest noun phrase, *those things.* In other words, subject-verb agreement is sometimes based on proximity to the nearest noun phrase, as in the following two examples from the earliest text:

1 Nephi 13:23

> the book which thou beholdest is a record of **the Jews**
> which [*contain* 0 | *contains* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] the covenants
>   of the Lord

Alma 21:17

> yea they did convince many of their sins
> and of the [*tradition* 1ABCDEGPS | *traditions* FHIJKLMNOQRT] of **their fathers**
> which **were** not correct

See the discussion under these two passages for this kind of nonstandard subject-verb agreement based on the nearest preceding noun phrase.

One wonders if the anomalous 1920 change in verse 19 of *have* to *has* was simply a mechanical change. Having changed *have* to *has* in verse 22, the 1920 editors decided to change the preceding

instance in verse 19 of *have* to *has,* but without changing the *whom* to *which* or even considering, it would seem, what the antecedent was for the singular *has.* This strange change of *have* to *has* in verse 19 must have been intended since it was marked in the 1920 committee copy (as was the change in verse 22). The critical text will, of course, restore the earliest readings in verses 19 and 22 (*which* in verse 19 and *have* in both verses).

Summary: Restore in Alma 40:19 the original relative pronoun *which* and its plural verb form *have;* the antecedent here is either the plural *those* (referring to people) or the conjunctive plural noun phrase *the souls and the bodies;* similarly, in Alma 40:22 the original plural *have* should be restored even if the antecedent is the singular *the restoration* rather than the plural *those things* since the controlling factor here in determining subject-verb agreement is proximity.

■ **Alma 40:19**

let it suffice that I say that they all come forth
[01|; ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
or in other words
[*that* 0| 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *their resurrection cometh to pass*
before the resurrection of those which die after the resurrection of Christ

While copying from 𝒪 into 𝒫, Oliver Cowdery omitted the subordinate conjunction *that* at the beginning of the conjoined clause that is introduced by "or in other words". The relatedness of this conjoined clause with the preceding clause, "that they all come forth", is improved by restoring the *that* and also by placing (in the standard printed text) a comma before "or in other words" instead of the 1830 semicolon. A similar example of this kind of construction, again with a repeated *that* after "or in other words", is found earlier in this chapter:

> Alma 40:2
> behold I say unto you
> **that** there is no resurrection
> or I would say in other words
> **that** this mortal does not put on immortality
> —this corruption does not put on incorruption—
> until after the coming of Christ

Summary: In accord with the reading of the original manuscript, restore in Alma 40:19 the *that* after "or in other words"; in the standard edition, the 1830 semicolon before "or in other words" should be replaced with a comma.

■ **Alma 40:21**

but this much I say
[*that* 01BCEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST| *That* A| D]
there is a space between death and the resurrection of the body

Here the subordinate conjunction *that* was accidentally omitted in the 1841 British edition; the subsequent LDS edition (1849) restored the *that.* Either reading is theoretically possible (see, for

instance, the discussion under 2 Nephi 30:2 as well as more generally under THAT in volume 3). In each case, we follow the earliest textual sources, thus "this much I say **that** there is . . ." here in Alma 40:21.

Summary: Maintain in Alma 40:21 the subordinate conjunction *that* after the verb *say:* "but this much I say **that** there is a space between death and the resurrection of the body".

■ **Alma 40:21**

but this much I say that there is a space
between death and [*the* 01ABCDEFGIJLMNOPQRST | HK] *resurrection of the body*

Here the 1874 RLDS edition omitted the repeated *the* before *resurrection*. This change may have been prompted by the reading earlier in verse 11 where the 1858 Wright edition accidentally omitted the *the* before *resurrection*. The 1874 RLDS edition derives, at least in part, from the Wright edition; the 1874 compositor, having set "between death and resurrection of the body" in verse 11, may have been led to set the same here in verse 21. In any event, the 1908 RLDS edition restored the correct reading with the *the* before *resurrection* in both verses 11 and 21.

Summary: Maintain the occurrence of *the* before *resurrection* in Alma 40:21 ("there is a space between death and **the** resurrection of the body").

■ **Alma 40:22**

yea this bringeth about the restoration of those things of which have been spoken
by the [*mouth > mouths* 0 | *mouths* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *of the prophets*

Here Oliver Cowdery initially wrote the singular *mouth;* then virtually immediately he corrected it to the plural by inserting the *s* inline (the level of ink flow for the *s* is unchanged). The plural usage here is supported by a nearby instance of the same expression, one that is extant in 𝓞 and invariant in all the textual sources:

> Alma 40:24
> this is the restoration of which has been spoken
> by the **mouths** of the prophets

Yet elsewhere in the Book of Mormon, we have only the singular *mouth* in this expression:

1 Nephi 3:20	which have been spoken by the **mouth** of all the holy prophets
2 Nephi 9:2	he hath spoken unto the Jews by the **mouth** of his holy prophets
Mosiah 18:19	and which had been spoken by the **mouth** of the holy prophets
3 Nephi 1:13	which I have caused to be spoken by the **mouth** of my holy prophets
Ether 15:3	which had been spoken by the **mouth** of all the prophets

We note that the two instances of the expression here in Alma 40 are the simplest ones ("by the mouths of the prophets"); the five other instances contain other words (such as *all, holy,* and the possessive pronouns *his* and *my*).

In the King James Bible, we find only instances of the singular *mouth;* in each case, the original language (Hebrew or Greek) supports the singular:

1 Kings 22:22	and I will be a lying spirit in the **mouth** of all his prophets
1 Kings 22:23	the LORD hath put a lying spirit in the **mouth** of all these thy prophets
2 Chronicles 18:21	I will go out and be a lying spirit in the **mouth** of all his prophets
2 Chronicles 18:22	the LORD hath put a lying spirit in the **mouth** of these thy prophets
Zechariah 8:9	ye that hear in these days these words by the **mouth** of the prophets
Luke 1:70	as he spake by the **mouth** of his holy prophets
Acts 3:18	which God before had shewed by the **mouth** of all his prophets
Acts 3:21	which God hath spoken by the **mouth** of all his holy prophets

On the other hand, the current LDS version of the Doctrine and Covenants has three instances of the singular and five of the plural:

D&C 27:6	the restoration of all things spoken by the **mouth** of all the holy prophets
D&C 42:39	that which I spake by the **mouths** of my prophets
D&C 58:8	the **mouths** of the prophets shall not fail
D&C 84:2	as he has spoken by the **mouth** of his prophets
D&C 86:10	the restoration of all things spoken by the **mouths** of all the holy prophets
D&C 109:23	that which thou hast spoken by the **mouths** of the prophets
D&C 109:41	that which thou hast spoken by the **mouths** of thy prophets
D&C 109:45	thou hast spoken by the **mouth** of thy prophets terrible things

Two of these, D&C 27:6 and D&C 86:10, are identical in phraseology except for the number of the word *mouth*. (For all eight of these instances of *mouth(s)* in the Doctrine and Covenants, there is no change in grammatical number when compared with the earliest available sources.)

There are other examples in the Book of Mormon text that involve variation in the grammatical number for parts of the body; see, for instance, the discussion under 2 Nephi 13:8–9 for *tongue(s),* under 2 Nephi 23:18 for *eye(s),* and under 2 Nephi 27:25 for *heart(s).* For each case involving parts of the body, the critical text will follow the earliest textual sources. The Book of Mormon allows for variation in number for *mouth(s);* thus the critical text will follow the earliest textual sources in Alma 40, with its two instances of "by the **mouths** of the prophets".

Summary: Accept in Alma 40:22 "by the **mouths** of the prophets", the corrected reading in the original manuscript, especially because the same plural expression occurs nearby in Alma 40:24.

■ **Alma 40:23**

yea and every limb and joint shall be restored to its body
yea even a hair of [*their heads* 01 | *the head* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *shall not be lost*

Here the 1830 typesetter replaced the plural *their heads* with the singular *the head*. He may have been influenced by the use of the singular *its body* in the previous clause ("yea and every limb and joint shall be restored to **its body**"). Perhaps he reasoned that a single hair could not be assigned to more than one head. Yet he did not make this change earlier in the text, in Alma 11:44, where it reads "and even there shall not so much as a hair of **their heads** be lost". In that case, there was no preceding clause in the passage to emphasize the singular number. Of course, there is really no problem at all with this usage in Alma 11:44 or in the original text for Alma 40:23. The meaning is that not a hair from any of their heads will be lost.

Summary: Restore the original text for Alma 40:23 (the reading of both manuscripts), which assigns a single hair to *their heads;* this same usage is found in Alma 11:44.

■ **Alma 40:23**

but all things shall be restored
to [*its* 0A | *its >*js *their* 1 | *their* BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *proper and perfect frame*

Here in his editing for the 1837 edition, Joseph Smith changed the singular *its* to the plural *their,* to make the possessive pronoun agree with the preceding plural, *all things*. But the use of *it* to refer to *all things* is characteristic of the original text and will be restored in the critical text; for a list of examples, see the discussion under Alma 11:41. Also see the nearby discussion under Alma 41:4.

Summary: Restore in Alma 40:23 the singular possessive *its:* "all things shall be restored to **its** proper and perfect frame"; such mixtures in grammatical number are found elsewhere in the text.

■ **Alma 40:24**

and now my son / this is the restoration
[NULL >+ *of* 0 | NULL > *of* 1 | *of* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *which has been spoken*
by the mouths of the prophets

Here the critical text will accept the corrected reading in 𝒪 and 𝒫, namely, the *of* at the beginning of the relative clause, "**of** which has been spoken". For discussion, see under Alma 40:19.

■ **Alma 40:26**

for they die as to **things** *pertaining to* **things** *of righteousness*

Paul Thomas (personal communication) has suggested that in Alma 40:26 there seems to be an unnecessary repetition of the plural word *things;* perhaps the text should read something like "for they die as to things pertaining to righteousness". However, such repetition of *things* is found elsewhere in the text:

1 Nephi 22:3

> wherefore the things of which I have read
> are **things** pertaining to **things** both temporal and spiritual

An example with the same basic phraseology as in Alma 40:26, "pertaining (un)to things of righteousness", is found in a revelation of Joseph Smith's dating from May 1829:

Book of Commandments 10:7 (Doctrine and Covenants 11:14)

> and then shall you know—or by this shall you know—
> all **things** whatsoever you desire of me
> which is pertaining unto **things** of righteousness
> in faith believing in me that you shall receive

There is no need to emend Alma 40:26; the repetition of the word *things* is fully intended.

Summary: Accept in Alma 40:26 as well as in 1 Nephi 22:3 the repetitious occurrence of *things* in the phrase "things pertaining to things" (the reading in 𝓞 for both cases).

■ **Alma 40:26**

and they drink the [*drugs* 01 | *dregs* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *of a bitter cup*

Sometimes Oliver Cowdery (or perhaps even Joseph Smith in his reading off of the text) replaced unfamiliar words with familiar ones that sound alike and semantically work, more or less. For a list of examples, see the discussion regarding "the pleasing bar of God" under Jacob 6:13.

Here in Alma 40:26, the infrequent word *dregs* was misheard (or perhaps misread) as the much more frequent word *drugs*. The 1830 typesetter caught this error since he knew that with the noun *cup* the expected word was *dregs,* not *drugs*. The correct *dregs* is, in fact, found twice elsewhere in the Book of Mormon, namely, in two quotations from the King James Bible:

2 Nephi 8:17 (Isaiah 51:17)

> awake awake stand up O Jerusalem
> which hast drunk at the hand of the Lord the cup of his fury
> thou hast drunken the **dregs** of the **cup** of trembling wrung out

2 Nephi 8:22 (Isaiah 51:22)

> behold I have taken out of thine hand the **cup** of trembling
> the **dregs** of the **cup** of my fury

The text is invariant for both instances of *dregs* in 2 Nephi 8 (although 𝓞 is not extant for these two occurrences of *dregs*). The word *drug* is not otherwise found in any of the scriptures. The critical text will accept the 1830 emendation of *drugs* to *dregs* here in Alma 40:26.

Summary: Accept in Alma 40:26 the 1830 typesetter's decision to emend *drugs* (the reading of both manuscripts) to *dregs;* either Oliver Cowdery or Joseph Smith in the early transmission of the text replaced the less frequent *dregs* with the more frequent *drugs*.

Alma 41

■ **Alma 41:1**

for behold some have [*arested* 0 | *arested* >js *wrestid* 1 | *arrested* A |
wrested BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *the scriptures*
and have gone far astray because of this thing

As discussed under Alma 13:20, the original text read *wrested* here in Alma 41:1, but the word was
misinterpreted as *arrested* (either by Joseph Smith when he dictated the text or by Oliver Cowdery
when he wrote it down in 𝒪). The 1830 edition continued with *arrested*, but Joseph emended the
word to *wrested* in his editing for the 1837 edition.

■ **Alma 41:2–3**

I say unto thee my son that the plan of restoration

(1) *is* [*requisites* >% *requisite* 0 | *requisites* 1 | *requisite* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
with the justice of God

(2) *for it is* [*requisites* >% *requisite* 0 | *requisite* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
that all things should be restored to their proper order

(3) *behold it is* [*requisites* >% *requisite* 0 | *requisite* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *and just*
according to the power and resurrection of Christ
that the soul of man should be restored to its body
and that every part of the body should be restored to itself

(4) *and it is also* [*requisite* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *with the justice of God*
that men should be judged according to their works

Here we have four occurrences of *requisite*. The first three cases are extant in 𝒪; the fourth is not.
In the three extant cases, Oliver Cowdery initially wrote the word as *requisites;* then in every case
he immediately corrected *requisites* to *requisite* by erasing the final *s*. There are two other occur-
rences of *requisite* in the Book of Mormon text (in Mosiah 4:27 and Alma 61:12); the original
manuscript is not extant in these two instances—or at least sufficiently extant to determine if
requisites initially occurred in 𝒪. In the transcript of 𝒪 for Alma 41:3 and Alma 61:12, I presumed
that Oliver Cowdery wrote *requisites* initially, then erased the final *s*. Here in Alma 41:2–3, the
evidence suggests that the tendency to incorrectly add the *s* to *requisite* was probably Oliver
Cowdery's, given that when he copied the first example in Alma 41:2 from 𝒪 into 𝒫, he once more
wrote *requisites,* and this time he did not erase the final *s*.

For all six instances of *requisite* in the text, the word acts as a predicate adjective, never as a
noun, which means that the plural noun form *requisites* is quite unacceptable in these six cases.

But independently of the Book of Mormon, the more frequent form for the word, as a noun, is the plural *requisites,* not the singular *requisite.* For example, the Oxford English Dictionary under the noun *requisite* lists five citations, dating from 1602 through 1880, and every one of these citations is in the plural. It appears that the plural noun form *requisites* interfered with Oliver Cowdery's ability to take down Joseph Smith's dictation of the adjective *requisite,* and even once when Oliver copied the adjective from 𝓞 into 𝓟.

Summary: Maintain in Alma 41:2–3 and elsewhere in the text the non-*s* form for *requisite;* Oliver Cowdery apparently had difficulty with this word and tended to write it incorrectly as *requisites.*

■ **Alma 41:2–3**

behold it is requisite and just according to the power and resurrection of Christ
that the soul of man should be restored to its body
and that every part of the body should be restored to itself
and it is [*also* 0| 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *requisite with the justice of God*
that men should be judged according to their works

Here at the end of a line in 𝓞, there is an *also* that Oliver Cowdery accidentally omitted when he copied the text from 𝓞 into 𝓟. Oliver occasionally had difficulty reading the text near the gutters of 𝓞 since the folded sheets of the gathering were stitched together when he did his copywork. Eight lines later on this page of 𝓞, Oliver omitted in his copywork another word, *to,* that was at the end of a line; see the discussion under Alma 41:5.

The *also* nicely distinguishes between the twofold nature of God's justice. Verse 2 describes the universal restoration of the soul to the physical body while verse 3 describes the individual judgment of each person according to their works.

Summary: In accord with the reading of the original manuscript, restore the word *also* near the beginning of Alma 41:3 ("and it is **also** requisite with the justice of God that . . .").

■ **Alma 41:3**

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

Here in the original manuscript, Oliver Cowdery initially skipped an *and.* Virtually immediately he supralinearly inserted an ampersand; there is no change in the level of ink flow. The text definitely reads better with the *and* separating these two conjoined clauses in the larger subordinate *if*-clause. The critical text will accept the *and* as the original reading.

Summary: Maintain in Alma 41:3 the corrected reading in 𝓞 with the *and* separating the second clause from the first clause in the larger *if*-clause.

■ **Alma 41:4**

and if [*his* >+ *their* o | *their* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *works are evil*
they shall be restored unto [*him* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQS | *them* RT] *for evil*
therefore all things shall be restored
to [*its* >+ *their* o | *their* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *proper order*
every thing to its natural frame

Here in Alma 41:4, Oliver Cowdery corrected ○ in an attempt to eliminate two conflicts in gram-
matical number. The ink flow for both corrections is uneven and distinctly different from the ink
flow for the inline text; overall the ink flow for the corrections is sharper and somewhat heavier. Both
corrections replace a singular possessive pronoun with the plural *their,* but for different reasons.

For the first change, Oliver Cowdery replaced *his* with *their* in the *if*-clause, probably because
the preceding verse consistently refers to mankind in the plural:

> Alma 41:3
> and it is also requisite with the justice of God
> that **men** should be judged according to **their** works
> and if **their** works were good in this life and the desires of **their** hearts were good
> that **they** should also at the last day be restored unto that which is good

One reason for the original singular *his* in the *if*-clause in verse 4 is that the plural *they* in that
verse does not refer to mankind but to *works:* "if his **works** are evil / **they** shall be restored unto
him for evil". Finally, although Oliver changed *his* to *their* in ○, he did not notice the contradiction
with the following *him* in his emended reading ("if **their** works are evil / they shall be restored
unto **him** for evil"). But the editors for the 1920 LDS edition did, and they corrected the *him* to
them. One could argue that the *him,* the reading in ○, was a mishearing based on the phonetic
similarity of *them* and *him,* both pronounced /əm/ in casual speech. See the general discussion
under 1 Nephi 10:18–19 for possible mix-ups in the early textual transmission of these two pro-
nouns. Here in Alma 41:4, the earliest reading with *his* and *him* will work. Such switches in gram-
matical number for pronominal reference in generic statements can be found elsewhere in the
text, as explained under 1 Nephi 10:18–19. The critical text will restore the singular pronouns *his*
and *him* here in Alma 41:4 since the correction of *his* to *their* in ○ appears to be secondary.

For the second emendation here in ○, Oliver Cowdery replaced *its* with *their* because of the
preceding plural *all things;* in other words, "all things shall be restored to **its** proper order" was
replaced by "all things shall be restored to **their** proper order". One could argue that Oliver origi-
nally wrote *its* here in ○ because the following text restates the same idea but in the singular:
"every thing to **its** natural frame". Not only is Oliver's emendation of *its* to *their* supported by
grammaticality, but earlier in verse 2 he had just made this same change in ○:

> Alma 41:2
> for it is requisite that all things should be restored
> to [*its* >% *their* o | NULL > *their* 1 | *their* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] proper order

Oliver's correction in verse 2 was immediate: the *its* was initially erased, then crossed out, and the
their was supralinearly inserted. Nonetheless, the original text in verse 2 appears to have actually
read *their* (in accord with standard grammar). For this earlier occurrence, Oliver may have been

prompted to write *its* because that is what he had written down five verses earlier, near the end of Alma 40: "but **all things** shall be restored to **its** proper and perfect frame" (Alma 40:23). Only later in the textual history was this earlier instance of *its* emended to *their* (by Joseph Smith for the 1837 edition). Another possible reason, one could argue, for Oliver writing *its* initially in 𝓞 for Alma 41:2 was because of the preceding occurrence of *it* in that verse ("for **it** is requisite that all things should be restored to **its** proper order"), even though that *it* is existential.

There is clear evidence in the earliest text of cases where the singular pronoun *it* refers to *all things* (for a list of five other examples, see under Alma 11:41). Of course, the immediately corrected reading in Alma 41:2 shows that *their* can also refer to *all things*. And there are other examples in the earliest text where plural pronoun forms are used to refer to *all things,* as in the following example:

> 1 Nephi 14:26
> and also others which have been / to them hath he shown **all things**
> and they have written **them** and **they** are sealed up to come forth in **their** purity

Thus either singular or plural pronouns can be used to refer to the plural *all things*. The critical text will in each of these cases follow the earliest textual sources. Here in Alma 41:4, the critical text will accept the singular pronoun *its* in "therefore all things shall be restored to **its** proper order". The correction in 𝓞 of *its* to *their* appears to be secondary.

Summary: Restore the three original singular pronominal forms in Alma 41:4: "and if **his** works are evil / they shall be restored unto **him** for evil / therefore all things shall be restored to **its** proper order"; usage elsewhere in the text supports the possibility of these singulars; moreover, the corrections in 𝓞 of both *his* and *its* to *their* appear to have been done later, the result of conscious editing on the part of Oliver Cowdery.

■ **Alma 41:4**

mortality raised to [*immortality* 01ACDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST | *immorality* B]

This 1837 typo, which replaces *immortality* with the impossible *immorality,* is discussed under Alma 40:2.

■ **Alma 41:4**

raised to endless happiness to inherit the kingdom of God
or [*to* 01ABCDEGHIJKLMNOPQRST | NULL > *to* F] *endless misery to inherit the kingdom of the devil*

Here in the first printing of the 1852 LDS edition, the repeated preposition *to* was accidentally omitted. The *to* was restored in the second printing, probably by reference to the 1840 edition. The critical text will, of course, retain the repeated preposition here in Alma 41:4 since it is the reading of the earliest textual sources, including both manuscripts.

Summary: Maintain in Alma 41:4 the use of the repeated *to* in "raised to endless happiness . . . or **to** endless misery".

■ **Alma 41:4**

the one on [01ABCDEFGIJLMNOQRT | *the* HKPS] *one hand*
the other on the other

The first RLDS edition (1874) inserted the definite article *the* before *one hand,* thus increasing the parallelism in this coordinated structure ("on **the** one hand . . . on **the** other"). The original manuscript is extant here, and there is no sign of a *the* before *one hand*. Still, one might wonder if early on in the transmission of the text a *the* was accidentally omitted as Joseph Smith dictated the text to Oliver Cowdery. Elsewhere in the text, we have three instances of "on **the** one hand . . . on **the** other (hand)", where the definite article *the* is repeated:

1 Nephi 14:7	either on **the** one hand or on **the** other
Alma 32:20	it is on **the** one hand even as it is on **the** other
3 Nephi 26:5	the one on **the** one hand and the other on **the** other hand

But there is one other conjunctive example where the (first) *hand* is not preceded by the definite article (as here in the earliest text for Alma 41:4):

| Alma 52:31 | by the men of Moroni **on one hand** |
| | and the men of Lehi on the other |

This last example of "on one hand" is extant in the original manuscript, so we have two firm cases in 𝄂 where the definite article is lacking before the (first) *hand*. The example from Alma 52:31 shows no variation in the textual history, which implies that the 1874 RLDS insertion of the intrusive *the* in Alma 41:4 was unintended.

Summary: Maintain in Alma 41:4 (and Alma 52:31) the occurrence of "on one hand" without any *the* before *hand;* either reading, with or without the *the,* is theoretically possible, so in each case we follow the earliest textual sources.

■ **Alma 41:5**

the one [*restored* 0 | *raised* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *to happiness*
according to his desires of happiness
or to good according to his desires of good

Here in verse 5, Oliver Cowdery miscopied the original manuscript's *restored* as *raised*. Except for the *ed* at the end of the word, *restored* is extant in 𝄂. The two words *restored* and *raised* are visually similar; moreover, the error was probably prompted by the two occurrences of *raised* in the last half of the preceding verse, especially the second occurrence because of its reference to happiness:

Alma 41:4
mortality **raised** to immortality / corruption to incorruption
raised to endless happiness

On the other hand, the preceding text in Alma 41 consistently has *restored,* not *raised:*

Alma 41:2–4

 that all things should be **restored** to their proper order . . .
 that the soul of man should be **restored** to its body
 and that every part of the body should be **restored** to itself . . .
 that they should also at the last day be **restored** unto that which is good
 and if his works are evil / they shall be **restored** unto him for evil
 therefore all things shall be **restored** to its proper order

Here in Alma 41:5, the critical text will follow the reading in 𝒪, *restored*.

Summary: Restore in Alma 41:5 the reading of the original manuscript, "the one **restored** to happiness".

■ **Alma 41:5**

the one restored **to** *happiness according to his desires of happiness*
or [*to* 0| 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *good according to his desires of good*
and the other **to** *evil according to his desires of evil*

Once more we have a small word, the preposition *to,* at the end of a line in 𝒪 that Oliver Cowdery accidentally dropped when he copied from 𝒪 into 𝒫. The *to* was obscured because of the narrow gutters for this gathering of sheets. (For another example of such an omission at the end of a line on this page of 𝒪, see under Alma 41:2–3.) Nearby we have a similar example of *to* being repeated in a prepositional phrase conjoined by *or* with a previous prepositional phrase:

Alma 41:4

 raised **to** endless happiness to inherit the kingdom of God
 or **to** endless misery to inherit the kingdom of the devil

The critical text will restore the repeated *to* in Alma 41:5.

Summary: Restore in Alma 41:5 the repeated preposition *to* in "or **to** good according to his desires of good"; Oliver Cowdery accidentally omitted this *to* when he copied the text from 𝒪 into 𝒫.

■ **Alma 41:6**

even so [*shall he* 01CGHKPS| *he shall* ABDEFIJLMNOQRT] *be rewarded unto righteousness*

Here the 1830 typesetter switched the order of the modal verb *shall* and the subject *he*. This secondary word order, *he shall,* has persisted in the LDS textual tradition. The 1840 edition restored the original word order, *shall he,* but probably unintentionally; as a result, the original word order has been retained in the RLDS textual tradition. The critical text will restore the word order found in the two manuscripts, *shall he.*

 In theory, either word order is possible after *even so,* although elsewhere in the text all examples except one (marked below with an asterisk) have *shall* before the subject (as originally here in Alma 41:6):

2 Nephi 27:3	yea even so **shall the multitude** of all the nations be that fight against mount Zion
Mosiah 5:14	even so **shall** it be among you
* Mosiah 15:7	yea even so **he shall** be led crucified and slain
Alma 41:5	even so **shall he** have his reward of evil
3 Nephi 5:25	even so **shall the covenant** . . . be fulfilled in his own due time
3 Nephi 18:16	even so **shall ye** pray in my church
3 Nephi 18:25	even so **shall ye** do unto the world

The word order for the nearby example from Alma 41:5 (which was not changed) argues that the 1830 change in Alma 41:6 was accidental.

Summary: Restore the original verb-first word order in Alma 41:6: "even so **shall he** be rewarded" (as earlier in Alma 41:5: "even so **shall he** have his reward of evil").

■ **Alma 41:9**

do not risk one more offense against your God
upon [*those* 01ABCEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST | *these* D] *points of doctrine*
which [*ye* 01ABCDGHIJKLMNOPQRST | *we* E | *we > ye* F]
[*hath* 0A | *hath >*js *have* 1 | *have* BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *hitherto risked to commit sin*

Here the early British editions allowed two minor typos to enter the text, *these* in place of *those* in the 1841 British edition and *we* instead of *ye* in the 1849 LDS edition. The first typo was reversed in the 1849 edition, while the 1849 typo of *we* rather than *ye* was reversed in the second printing of the 1852 edition. In the first case, either *those* or *these* will work; the critical text will follow the earliest reading, *those.* In the second case, *we* does not work at all since Corianton is the only one (at least in this discourse of Alma's) who has "risked to commit sin".

Interestingly, the earliest text here in Alma 41:9 reads *ye hath.* In the original text, *hath* frequently occurs with third person plural subjects, but there are also a few cases where it occurs with the second person subject pronoun *ye;* besides this case in Alma 41:9, we have the following examples:

Mosiah 2:31	I would that ye should do as **ye hath** hitherto done
Mosiah 4:24	**ye** that have not and yet **hath** sufficient
Alma 61:9	and now in your epistle **ye hath** censured me
Helaman 13:21	**ye** have set your hearts upon them and **hath** not hearkened unto the words of him who gave them unto you

In all instances of original *ye hath,* the *hath* was emended to *have* in the editing for the 1837 edition. For further discussion of the use of *hath* in the original text, see under INFLECTIONAL ENDINGS in volume 3. This example of *ye hath* suggests that the occurrence of *ye doth,* found nearby in Alma 41:15, is the original reading; see the discussion under that passage.

Summary: Maintain in Alma 41:9 the occurrence of *those* and *ye,* the reading of the original manuscript; the use of *hath* with subject *ye* will be restored, despite its infrequency in the original text.

■ **Alma 41:13**

good for that which **is** *good*
righteous for that which [0 | *is* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *righteous*
just for that which **is** *just*
merciful for that which **is** *merciful*

𝓞 is extant here, and it reads Hebraistically for the second of four examples of "which (is) <adjective>"—that is, without the linking verb *is*. The odds are that the original text had the *is* in the second case and that Oliver Cowdery accidentally omitted it when he took down Joseph Smith's dictation for Alma 41:13. The Hebraistic omission of the linking verb in the Book of Mormon appears to be restricted to biblical quotes in the text. For discussion, see under 2 Nephi 15:25; also see under HEBRAISMS in volume 3.

Accidental omissions of *is* elsewhere in the text can lead to these Hebrew-like readings. Another example for which Oliver Cowdery is the one responsible for the omission, albeit only momentarily, can be found in Ether 2:15, where Oliver initially wrote in 𝓟 "and **this my thoughts** upon the land which I shall give you for your inheritance"; virtually immediately, he caught his error and supralinearly inserted the *is* after *this*. (In his editing for the 1837 edition, Joseph Smith grammatically emended the *is* to *are*.) In this case, it is quite possible that the preceding *this,* which ends in *is,* led Oliver to initially omit the linking verb *is*. For an example where scribe 2 of 𝓟 omitted the linking verb *is,* see under Alma 11:44; for an example where the 1830 typesetter made this error, see under 3 Nephi 12:35. Thus there are a few occasional omissions of the linking verb *is,* but these all appear to be errors except for those found in quotations from Isaiah. The critical text will assume as much here in Alma 41:13 and maintain the *is* that Oliver supplied when he copied the text from 𝓞 into 𝓟.

Summary: Maintain in Alma 41:13 the linking verb *is* for all four instances of "which is <adjective>"; the one case where the *is* is missing in 𝓞 ("righteous for that which righteous") appears to be simply an early scribal error on Oliver Cowdery's part.

■ **Alma 41:14**

therefore my [*Sons* > *Son* > *Sons* 0 | *Son* 1 | *son* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
see that ye are merciful unto your brethren

Here in the original manuscript, Oliver Cowdery started to write *Sons,* but he aborted the plural *s,* thus initially rejecting the plural *sons*. But then he apparently decided to accept the plural since he added inline a complete *s*. Obviously, Alma is speaking here to only one son, Corianton. The initial *s* of the following word, *see,* made it difficult for Oliver to hear the difference between "my son see" and "my sons see". When he came to copying the text from 𝓞 into 𝓟, he decided that "my son see" must be the correct reading, so he wrote down *Son* in 𝓟. The error in 𝓞 is an excellent example showing that 𝓞 was a dictated manuscript and not visually copied from some other text. See volume 3 for an extensive listing of errors in 𝓞 that show 𝓞 was dictated.

Summary: Accept in Alma 41:14 the occurrence of the singular *my son,* the reading in 𝓟; the reading in 𝓞, *my sons,* is a mishearing caused by the following word, *see* (which begins with an *s*).

■ **Alma 41:15**

for that which ye [NULL >? *doth*/*do* 0 | *doth* >js *do* 1 | *doth* A | *do* BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
 send out
shall return unto you again and be restored

𝒪 is partially extant here. It is clear that there was some supralinear insertion after *ye* since one can see the insert mark. But whatever was supralinearly inserted is not extant. There are two possibilities for the corrected reading in 𝒪, *doth* or *do*. Of course, the initial text in 𝒪, without any helping verb, would work very well ("for that which ye send out"), but the insert mark shows there was some correction in 𝒪. And there is independent evidence that Oliver Cowdery sometimes omitted the auxiliary *do* verb; in the two following cases, Oliver initially omitted the *do* when he copied the text from 𝒪 into 𝒫:

> Alma 54:21
>> behold we know not such a being
>> neither [*do* 0ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST | NULL >+ *do* 1] ye

> 3 Nephi 3:2
>> yea ye do stand well / as if ye were supported by the hand of a god
>> in the defense of your liberty and your property and your country
>> or that which ye [NULL >+ *do* 1 | *do* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] call so

In the first instance, 𝒪 is extant and reads "neither **do** ye". In the second instance, both 𝒫 and the 1830 edition are firsthand copies of 𝒪, so 𝒪 very probably read "or that which ye **do** call so"— that is, with the helping verb *do*. So it is very possible that Oliver could have initially omitted the helping verb *do* (as either *doth* or *do*) in Alma 41:15.

There is a slight possibility here in Alma 41:15 that whatever was supralinearly inserted in 𝒪 was later crossed out. But 𝒫 reads *ye doth*, which supports some supralinear insertion in 𝒪, and probably *doth* instead of *do*. Of course, *ye doth* is ungrammatical and was therefore emended to *ye do* by Joseph Smith in his editing for the 1837 edition.

There is some evidence elsewhere in the manuscripts that *ye doth* could be the original reading here in Alma 41:15. As explained nearby under Alma 41:9, the earliest text had a few instances of *ye hath* rather than the standard *ye have;* such readings provide parallel support for *ye doth* rather than the standard *ye do*. But there is no direct evidence in the earliest text for *ye doth* except here in Alma 41:15. There are, however, instances of *doth* with third person plural subjects (see the discussion under 2 Nephi 4:18), just like there are instances of *hath* with third person plural subjects.

In the current text, there is an example of "ye . . . doeth" (here the *do* verb is a main verb rather than a helping verb; thus we have *doeth* rather than *doth*):

> 2 Nephi 27:4
>> for behold all ye that [*do* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPS | *doeth* QRT] iniquity
>> stay yourselves and wonder

As explained under that passage, the original "ye . . . do" will be restored in the critical text. But in the earliest extant text, there is actually one case of "I . . . doth":

Mosiah 2:19

and behold also if **I** who ye call your king
who has spent his days in your services
and yet hath been in the service of God
[*doth* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQS | *do* RT] merit any thanks from you
O how had you ought to thank your Heavenly King

To be sure, the occurrence of "I . . . doth" in Mosiah 2:19 is hardly noticeable because the *doth* is far away from the *I* and there are numerous third person nouns intervening between the *I* and the *doth*—namely, *king, days, services, service,* and *God*. Since *I doth* is possible, *ye doth* is also possible; here in Alma 41:15 the earliest extant text baldly reads *ye doth* (that is, there are no intervening words between the *ye* and the *doth*).

There is some evidence in Earlier Modern English for *ye doth,* as in the following two examples (accidentals regularized) found on *Literature Online* <lion.chadwyck.com>:

R. Wever (about 1565)

those things which **ye doth** plainly deny

Thomas Bell (1608)

then doubtless **ye doth** not keep it

Since *ye doth* is possible, the critical text will here in Alma 41:15 follow the earliest extant reading, the reading in 𝓅 (namely, *ye doth*). For a complete discussion of the *-(e)th* ending for other than third person singular verbs, see under INFLECTIONAL ENDINGS in volume 3.

Summary: Restore in Alma 41:15 the instance of *ye doth,* the reading in 𝓅 and apparently the corrected reading in 𝒪 (although that correction could have been *ye do,* the grammatically emended reading for this passage).

Alma 42

■ **Alma 42:2**

after the Lord God sent our first parents forth
from the garden of Eden to till the ground from whence
[*he was* 0A | *he was* >js *they were* 1 | *they were* BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *taken . . .*

The earlier part of this clause refers to "our first parents", namely, Adam and Eve. But in the later part, the language directly quotes its biblical source:

Alma 42:2	*Genesis 3:23*
the Lord God sent **our first parents**	the LORD God sent **him**
forth from the garden of Eden	forth from the garden of Eden
to till the ground	to till the ground
from whence **he** was taken	from whence **he** was taken

Yet the larger biblical passage, although specifically mentioning only "the man", is clearly applicable to both Adam and Eve: "behold **the man** is become as one of us . . . lest **he** put forth **his** hand . . . so he drove out **the man**" (Genesis 3:22, 24). But as David Calabro points out (personal communication), in the creation account in Genesis only Adam is specifically referred to as being taken out of the ground: "and the LORD God formed man *of* the dust of the ground" (Genesis 2:7); Eve, on the other hand, is described as being created from a rib taken from the man: "and the rib which the LORD God had taken from man made he a woman" (Genesis 2:22). So the use of the singular *he* in Alma 42:2 is actually appropriate.

As noted under 2 Nephi 2:22, Adam and Eve can be referred to in the same Book of Mormon passage as both *he* and *they*. Here in Alma 42:2, we have one more instance of this switching in grammatical number. In his editing of this passage for the 1837 edition, Joseph Smith emended the singular *he was* to the plural *they were;* this change is consistent with the plural language found one other place in the text: "**they** were driven out from the garden of Eden to till the earth" (2 Nephi 2:19). The critical text will, of course, restore the original singular *he was* in Alma 42:2; despite its difficulty, the switch in number from plural to singular is fully intended.

Summary: Restore in Alma 42:2 the original *he was* despite its conflict in number with the preceding "our first parents".

■ **Alma 42:2**

yea he [*drove* 0 | *drew* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *out the man*

Here the text is based on the corresponding reading in the King James Bible: "so he **drove** out the man" (Genesis 3:24). When Oliver Cowdery copied the text here from 𝒪 into 𝒫, he misread *drove* as *drew*. This reading has persisted in all the printed editions of the Book of Mormon. The critical text will restore the original, correct *drove*. The use of the verb *drive* here is supported by one other reference in the text to Adam and Eve being forced out of the garden of Eden: "and after that Adam and Eve had partaken of the forbidden fruit / they were **driven** out from the garden of Eden to till the earth" (2 Nephi 2:19).

Summary: In accord with the reading of the original manuscript, and in agreement with the corresponding King James language, restore the verb *drove* in Alma 42:2: "yea he **drove** out the man".

■ **Alma 42:2**

and he placed at the east end of the garden of Eden
cherubims and [NULL >- *a* 0 | 1 | *a* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *flaming sword*

Except for the extra *end*, the reading here agrees precisely with 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

In the original manuscript, Oliver Cowdery initially omitted the indefinite article *a* before *flaming sword*. Later, with very light ink flow, Oliver supralinearly inserted the *a*. Multispectral imaging of this passage in 𝒪 clearly shows a supralinearly inserted indefinite article *a*. But when Oliver copied the text here into 𝒫, he once more omitted the *a;* perhaps he missed it because it had been inserted so weakly in 𝒪. The 1830 edition has the *a*, either because the typesetter consulted his King James Bible or because the *a* was supplied when this gathering for the 1830 edition (the 22nd signature) was proofed against 𝒪. The *a* in 𝒪 itself was apparently not added during the proofing of the 1830 signature since ink rather than pencil was used for this particular insertion in 𝒪. There are specific cases in this part of the text where 𝒪 was corrected to agree with the 1830 text, but these emendations were done in pencil. See the nearby discussion under Alma 42:31.

The occurrence of the *a* is supported by the parallel reference to this event earlier in the book of Alma:

> Alma 12:21
> God placed cherubims and **a** flaming sword on the east of the garden of Eden

The critical text will accept the occurrence of *a* in "cherubims and **a** flaming sword", the corrected reading in 𝒪 for Alma 42:2 and the earliest extant reading in 𝒫 for Alma 12:21.

Summary: Accept in Alma 42:2 the occurrence of *a* in "cherubims and **a** flaming sword", the corrected reading in 𝒪 as well as the language of Genesis 3:24.

■ **Alma 42:2–3**

and he placed at the east end of the garden of Eden
[*Cherubims* 0A | *Cherubims* >js *Cherubim* 1 | *Cherubim* BCDEFGHIJKLMNQ | *cherubim* OPRST]
and a flaming sword which turned every way to keep the tree of life . . .
the Lord God placed [*Cherubims* >js *Cherubim* 1 | *Cherubims* A | *Cherubim* BCDEFGHIJKLMNQ |
   cherubim OPRST] *and the flaming sword*
that he should not partake of the fruit

> Here the original text, in accord with the King James translation, has two instances of *cherubims.* Joseph Smith edited this double plural to its Hebraic form, *cherubim.* As explained under Alma 12:21, the critical text will restore the original *cherubims.*

■ **Alma 42:3**

now we see that the man [*had* 01ABCDEFGIJLMNOPQRST | *hath* HK]
[*became/become* 0 | *became* 1ABD | *become* CEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *as God*
knowing good and evil

> Here in the original manuscript, the past participle apparently reads *became* rather than the standard *become,* although the *a* vowel looks somewhat like an *o.* Oliver Cowdery, here the scribe for both 𝒪 and 𝒫, copied this past participle into 𝒫 as *became.* As explained under 1 Nephi 17:43, the original text of the Book of Mormon allowed such verb phrases as "had became" (as well as "had become"). For a complete discussion, see under PAST PARTICIPLE in volume 3. Here in Alma 42:3, the nonstandard "had became" was grammatically emended to "had become" in the 1840 edition and (probably independently) in the 1849 LDS edition.
>
> One could argue that the original text itself read "had become" since the corresponding King James passage has *become:* "behold the man **is** become as one of us / to know good and evil" (Genesis 3:22). This argument is not particularly strong, in my opinion, since the King James language uses the archaic *be* verb rather than *have* as the perfect auxiliary for the verb *become* (that is, "is/was become" rather than "hath/had become"); moreover, the parallel Book of Mormon language is only paraphrastic of the biblical phrase:

Alma 42:3	*Genesis 3:22*
now we see that	behold
the man had became	**the man** *is* become
as God	**as** one of us
knowing **good and evil**	to know **good and evil**

> The 1874 RLDS edition replaced the past-tense "had become" with the present-tense "hath become". This change in tense does not work well within the larger past-tense context. The 1892 RLDS edition continued the incorrect *hath,* but the 1908 RLDS edition restored the original *had.*

Summary: Restore the original use of the past participial form *became* whenever it is supported by the earliest textual sources, as apparently here in Alma 42:3; also maintain the past-tense auxiliary verb form *had.*

■ **Alma 42:3**

now we see **that** *the man had became as God / knowing good and evil*
and lest he should put forth his hand and take also of the tree of life and eat and live forever
[*that* 01A | BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *the Lord God placed cherubims and the flaming sword*
that he should not partake of the fruit

The original text here has three occurrences of the subordinate conjunction *that*. The last one ("that he should not partake of the fruit") heads a resultive clause. But the first two *that*-clauses are conjoined complements and act together as the direct object for the verb *see; skipping the intervening subordinate *lest*-clause in this passage, the text reads as follows:

now we see **that** the man had became as God / knowing good and evil
and . . . **that** the Lord God placed cherubims and the flaming sword . . .

The deletion of the second *that* was probably intended since its inclusion leads to a difficult reading when preceded by the *lest*-clause. Nonetheless, in his editing for the 1837 edition, Joseph Smith did not cross out this *that* in 𝓟. The critical text will restore the second *that* in Alma 42:3.

Summary: Restore the original second *that* in Alma 42:3; the *that*-clause here serves conjunctively as part of the direct object for the main verb *see* at the beginning of the sentence.

■ **Alma 42:3**

the Lord God placed cherubims
and [*the* 01ABCDEFIJLMNOPQRST | *a* GHK] *flaming sword*
that he should not partake of the fruit

Here in verse 3, the 1858 Wright edition replaced the definite article *the* in the phrase "cherubims and **the** flaming sword" with the indefinite *a* ("cherubims and **a** flaming sword"). The typesetter was probably influenced by the language found in the preceding verse ("cherubims and **a** flaming sword"), which is also the language of the King James Bible (see the discussion above under Alma 42:2). But since verse 2 has already mentioned the flaming sword, the use of *the* here in verse 3 is perfectly acceptable. The 1908 RLDS edition restored the correct *the* to the RLDS text.

Summary: Maintain in Alma 42:3 the definite article *the* in the phrase "cherubims and **the** flaming sword", the reading of the original manuscript; the previous reference in verse 2 to the flaming sword allows the use of the definite article in verse 3.

■ **Alma 42:4**

and thus we see that there was a time granted
unto [*men* > *man* 0 | *man* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *to repent*

Oliver Cowdery initially wrote the plural *men* in 𝓞, then virtually immediately corrected it to *man* by overwriting the *en* with *an* (there is no change in the level of ink flow). The use of the singular *man* is common in the Book of Mormon text whenever *man* is equivalent to 'mankind'.

See, for instance, the nearby discussion under Alma 40:8. In fact, here in Alma 42, we have one passage containing several instances of *man* with the meaning 'mankind' that are consistently referred to with plural pronouns:

> Alma 42:6
>> but behold it was appointed unto **man** to die
>> therefore as **they** were cut off from the tree of life
>> therefore **they** should be cut off from the face of the earth
>> and **man** became lost forever
>> yea **they** became fallen **man**

Here in Alma 42:4, either the singular *man* or the plural *men* will work in theory; thus we accept the corrected reading in ℧, the singular *man* with the meaning 'mankind'.

Summary: Accept in Alma 42:4 the corrected *man* in ℧: "there was a time granted unto **man** to repent"; the correction in ℧ was virtually immediate.

■ **Alma 42:5**

for behold if Adam had put forth his hand immediately
and [*partook* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQS | *partaken* RT] *of the tree of life*
he would have lived forever

Here in the earliest extant text, the verb form *partook* reads as the past participle for *partake*, probably not as the simple past-tense form (the text is equivalent to "if Adam had . . . partook of the tree of life"). The original text permitted conjunctive constructions like this one (see the discussion under 1 Nephi 5:8). For discussion of the past participial form *partook,* see under 1 Nephi 8:25. Here in Alma 42:5, the 1920 LDS edition replaced the nonstandard *partook* with the standard *partaken.* The critical text will restore the original *partook.*

Summary: Restore in Alma 42:5 the original *partook,* here the past participial form of the verb *partake.*

■ **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

The repeated *therefore* in this verse was removed by Joseph Smith in his editing for the second edition (1837). As discussed under 2 Nephi 5:21, this kind of repetition occurred in the original text (and is retained in some cases in the current text). The critical text will restore such instances of repeated *therefore.* For a more complicated case, see below under verse 9.

■ **Alma 42:7**

and now [*we* 01ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPS | *ye* QRT] *see by this*
that our first parents were cut off both temporally and spiritually from the presence of the Lord
and thus **we** *see / they became subjects to follow after their own will*

> In the 1911 LDS edition, the original *we* near the beginning of the verse was accidentally replaced
> by *ye*. The LDS text has continued with this reading. Although *ye* works, *we* is correct, as we can
> see later on in this verse when the text uses the *we* once more ("and thus we see").
>
> Also note here that there is no subordinate conjunction *that* after the second occurrence of
> the verb *see* ("and thus we see / they became subjects to follow after their own will"). The preced-
> ing *see* does have the *that* ("and now we see by this **that** our first parents were cut off"). As dis-
> cussed under Alma 27:2, *that* is optional for finite clauses complementing the verb *see*. For a
> more general discussion, see under THAT in volume 3.

Summary: Restore the original pronoun *we* near the beginning of Alma 42:7 ("and now **we** see by
this that our first parents were cut off"); maintain the later occurrence in this verse of *we see* that
lacks the subordinate conjunction *that* ("and thus we see / they became subjects to follow after their
own will").

■ **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 | BCDEFGHIJKLMNOQRT] *it was expedient*
that mankind should be reclaimed from this spiritual death

> The original text sometimes permitted the repetition of *therefore*. Earlier in this chapter, in verse 6,
> Joseph Smith removed the repeated *therefore* in his editing for the 1837 edition. There he crossed
> out the second *therefore* in 𝓟. But here in verse 9, he did not cross out the repeated *therefore* in 𝓟.
> Nonetheless, it was omitted in the 1837 edition (it was probably crossed out in the copy of the
> 1830 edition that served as the copytext for the 1837 edition). The 1908 RLDS edition restored the
> repeated *therefore* here in verse 9 since it was not crossed out in 𝓟, but that edition did not restore
> it in verse 6 since it was crossed out there in 𝓟. To be sure, the repeated *therefore* seems less irritat-
> ing here in verse 9 because of the long intervening text between the two *therefore*'s, unlike the
> earlier case in verse 6 where the two *therefore*'s are quite close to each other ("**therefore** as they
> were cut off from the tree of life / **therefore** they should be cut off from the face of the earth").
> As explained under 2 Nephi 5:21, the critical text will restore such instances of the repeated *there-
> fore,* despite their redundancy.

Summary: Restore the repeated *therefore* in Alma 42:9 as well as earlier in Alma 42:6; the original text
allowed this kind of redundancy.

■ **Alma 42:10**

[*therefore* 01ABCDEFG| HK|*Therefore* IJLMNOPQRST]
as they had [*become* 01ABCDEFGIJLMNOQRT|*been* HKPS] *carnal sensual and devilish by nature*
this probationary state became a state for them to prepare

The 1874 RLDS edition introduced two changes here. First, the *therefore* at the beginning of the
verse was omitted, perhaps unintentionally. Second, the verb phrase *had become* was replaced with
had been. Although probably accidental, this innovative reading (replacing the dynamic *become*
with the static *be* verb) implies an inherently sinful nature: "as they had been carnal sensual and
devilish by nature". To the contrary, Alma is arguing here in Alma 42 that man became carnal,
sensual, and devilish by nature as a result of the fall (when man partook of the forbidden fruit).
The incorrect *been* has been retained up through the current RLDS edition (1953), even though
the 1908 RLDS edition was in general revised according to the reading of the printer's manuscript.

Summary: Maintain in Alma 42:10 the sentence-initial *therefore* and the use of *become* rather than
been; both *therefore* and *become* are extant in 𝓞; moreover, *become* describes much more accurately
Alma's argument that only as a result of the fall did man become carnal, sensual, and devilish by nature.

■ **Alma 42:10**

this **probationary** *state became a state for them to prepare*
it became a [*preparatory* 0ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST|*probationary* 1] *state*

When Oliver Cowdery copied this passage from 𝓞 into 𝓟, he accidentally misread *preparatory* as
probationary (replacing "a preparatory state" with "a probationary state"). The source for his
error was undoubtedly the *probationary* that occurred just before in the phrase "this probationary
state". The 1830 edition ended up with the correct "a preparatory state", perhaps because of how
the text reads later in verse 13 ("this probationary state / yea this preparatory state"). Another
possibility is that the 1830 compositor originally set verse 10 as it was in 𝓟 ("it became a proba-
tionary state"), but then he later corrected the typesetting to read "it became a preparatory state"
after this particular 1830 signature (the 22nd) had been proofed against 𝓞 (for the evidence of
this, see the discussion below under Alma 42:31).

A few verses later, Oliver Cowdery made the same error in 𝓟 of miswriting *preparatory* as
probationary:

Alma 42:13

only on conditions of repentance of men in **this probationary state**

□ *yea this preparatory state*　　　01ᶜ²ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST
□ NULL　　　1*
□ *yea* **this probationary state**　　　1ᶜ¹

As before, Oliver was prompted by an earlier occurrence of "this probationary state", but in this
case he caught his error and corrected it in 𝓟. (Initially, Oliver accidentally skipped the whole
phrase "yea this preparatory state", probably because of its visual similarity with the preceding

"in this probationary state".) In both cases (verses 10 and 13), the critical text will maintain the original reading (as found in ℴ).

Summary: Maintain the two instances, in Alma 42:10, 13, of *probationary state* followed by *preparatory state;* in these two cases, Oliver Cowdery had some difficulty in maintaining the occurrence of *preparatory* in his copywork.

■ **Alma 42:13**

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

As explained under Mosiah 19:15, the original text consistently refers to *conditions,* not *condition.* In this instance, the 1858 Wright edition replaced the plural with the singular (the expected usage in modern English). The 1908 RLDS edition restored the correct plural in the RLDS text.

■ **Alma 42:15**

and now the plan of mercy could not be brought about
except an atonement should be made
therefore God himself atoneth for the sins of the world
to bring about the plan of mercy
to appease the demands of justice
that God might be a **perfect just** *God and a merciful God also*

The word *perfect* is not extant in the original manuscript, but spacing between extant fragments indicates that a couple more letters could have been there. That possibility suggests two emendations here in Alma 42:15: (1) "a perfect**ly** just God", and (2) "a perfect **&** just God". One could argue that as Oliver Cowdery was copying the text from ℴ into 𝒫, he either accidentally dropped the *ly* at the end of *perfect* or he skipped the ampersand. Of course, the reading in 𝒫 of *perfect just* can be interpreted as a case of asyndetic coordination of two adjectives. The 1830 compositor placed a comma between the two words, thus treating each one as an adjective; all the subsequent editions have followed this conjunctive interpretation of *perfect just.*

The reading of the current text does seem rather strange. First of all, there is nothing to suggest in the larger passage that God's perfection is at issue. Secondly, if the original text actually reads "a perfectly just God", then there is a balanced chiasmus here in Alma 42:15:

> a   to bring about the plan of **mercy**
> b   to appease the demands of **justice**
> b′   that God might be a perfectly **just** God
> a′   and a **merciful** God also

In other words, the atonement allows God to be both "perfectly just" and "merciful".

From a stylistic point of view, there are no other examples in the text of *perfect* being used as in "a perfect just God". We do have examples of the adverbial *perfectly* modifying a following adjective:

| Mosiah 8:10 | and they are of brass and of copper and are **perfectly** sound |
| Alma 27:27 | for they were **perfectly** honest and upright in all things |

These two examples show quite clearly that "a perfectly just God" is a possible emendation. On the other hand, there is an example of *perfect* conjoined with another adjective but, we should note, with a separating *and:*

| Alma 40:23 | but all things shall be restored to its **proper and perfect** frame |

This latter example supports the emendation "a perfect and just God".

There is some minor evidence in the manuscripts for the scribes having difficulty with the adverbial *-ly* ending, as in these two examples in 𝒫 where Oliver Cowdery was the scribe:

1 Nephi 19:2 (momentary loss of *-ly* in 𝒫)
  wherefore the things which transpired before that I made these plates
  are of a truth more [*particually* 0 | *particular* >% *particularly* 1 |
    particularly ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] made mention
  upon the first plates

Alma 26:17 (momentary addition of *-ly* in 𝒫)
  who could have supposed that our God would have been
  so [*mercifully* >% *merciful* 0 | *merciful* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
  as to have snatched us from our awful sinful and polluted state

And there is considerable evidence that the scribes sometimes omitted *and* (typically written as an ampersand). For some examples of Oliver's occasional omission of *and,* see the joint discussion under 1 Nephi 17:39–40 and 1 Nephi 17:40. So there is manuscript evidence for the possible loss of the *-ly* ending or of an ampersand here in Alma 42:15.

One final possibility worth considering is that *perfect* is actually an adverb form but without the *-ly* ending. Such adverbial forms can be referred to as bare adverbs; Merriam-Webster's Dictionary of English Usage refers to them as flat adverbs (see the discussion under that name). In general, the original Book of Mormon text allows for the bare adverb, as in the following examples from the earliest sources:

2 Nephi 25:20	I have spoken **plain**
2 Nephi 26:27	but he hath given it **free** for all men
2 Nephi 33:5	and it speaketh **harsh** against sin
Mosiah 17:8	all the words which thou hast spoken **evil** concerning me
Helaman 7:5	that they might the more **easy** commit adultery
3 Nephi 10:16	because they testified **particular** concerning us

But all these adverbs modify a verb rather than an adjective. The only obvious case in the original text of the bare adverb modifying an adjective is the ubiquitous *exceeding,* as in 1 Nephi 2:16: "I Nephi / being exceeding young". The 1920 and 1981 LDS editions have grammatically emended the many examples of adverbial *exceeding* to *exceedingly* (for discussion, see under 1 Nephi 2:16 as well as under EXCEEDING in volume 3). There is only one other case where an adjective has been interpreted as a bare adverb (namely, in the LDS text since 1920):

Alma 51:11

Amalickiah had gathered together

a [*wonderful* 01ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQS | *wonderfully* RT] great army

For discussion of the evidence that *wonderful* in Alma 51:11 may actually be an adjective, not an adverb, see under that passage. Given usage elsewhere in the Book of Mormon text, there is little evidence, apart from *exceeding,* that *perfect* in Alma 42:15 should be interpreted as a bare adverb.

There are a few instances of *perfect just* on *Literature Online* <lion.chadwyck.com> which suggest the possibility that *perfect just* itself is correct and that it means 'perfectly just'. The following two examples of *perfect just* come from the late 1800s and seem to mean 'perfectly just' (here accidentals are left unchanged):

Samuel Ferguson (1880)

Goodness there cannot be

That is not perfect-just.

William Alexander (1886)

'This is the music of the perfect just.'

Of course, these examples considerably postdate the Book of Mormon. But they should make us hesitate before emending *perfect just.* We should also note that the lacuna in 𝓞 is sufficiently large that we cannot insist that the additional space must have been filled by the very short *ly* or *&.* Nor can we confidently exclude even the asyndetic reading for *perfect just* (that is, with the meaning 'perfect and just'). In fact, one important fact to consider is that for this part of the text the 1830 signature was proofed against 𝓞, from Alma 41:8 through Alma 46:30 (see the discussion under Alma 42:31), and in this instance the 1830 edition ended up reading *perfect just,* which suggests that 𝓞 itself read this way (but, of course, a minor difference like this could have been missed in proofing). In any event, the safest solution here in Alma 42:15 will be to retain *perfect just,* the reading of all the printed editions as well as the earliest extant source, the printer's manuscript.

Summary: Maintain in Alma 42:15 the difficult reading "a perfect just God"; although this reading is difficult, it could represent the original reading, with either the bare adverbial meaning 'a perfectly just God' or the conjunctive meaning 'a perfect and just God'.

■ **Alma 42:15 – 16**

that God might be a perfect just God and a merciful God
[*also* 01BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST | A]
[0 | NULL >jg . 1 |. ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
[01BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST | *Also* A]
[01BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST |, A]
[*now* 01A | *Now* BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
repentance could not come unto men except there were a punishment

As discussed under 2 Nephi 3:18, there are a few cases in the text where it is not obvious whether *also* should end the preceding sentence or begin the following sentence. The question here in

Alma 42:15−16 is whether *also* should be at the end of verse 15 ("that God might be a perfect just God and a merciful God **also**") or at the beginning of verse 16 ("**also** now repentance could not come unto men except there were a punishment"). The two manuscripts did not have any original punctuation here, so we cannot tell from the original hands in the manuscripts where the break came in Alma 42:15−16. The 1830 compositor, as he was marking with pencil the punctuation in 𝓟, placed a period before the *also*. He also set the 1830 edition this way (including capitalizing the *a* of *also,* of course). But in the 1837 edition, the *also* was shifted to the end of verse 15, after *God* (and correspondingly, the *n* of the *now* was capitalized).

This correction is probably right because there are no sentences elsewhere in the text that begin with "also now". And there are at least two examples of *also* coming at the end of a conjoined phrase at the end of a sentence:

> Alma 9:33
> > and it came to pass that Amulek went and stood forth
> > and began to preach unto them **also**
> > and now the words of Amulek are not all written

> Alma 32:23
> > and now he imparteth his word by angels unto men
> > yea not only men but women **also**
> > now this is not all

Summary: Accept the 1837 decision to shift the *also* from the beginning of verse 16 to the end of verse 15 ("that God might be a perfect just God and a merciful God **also**").

■ **Alma 42:16**

except there were a punishment
which also was [*as* 01ABCGHKPS| DEFIJLMNOQRT] *eternal as the life of the soul*

The typesetter for the 1841 British edition accidentally deleted the *as* before *eternal*. Yet the *as* was kept in virtually the same expression later on in the verse, where the reference is to the plan of happiness: "which was **as** eternal also as the life of the soul" (the only difference is the placement of the word *also*). The critical text will therefore restore the *as* in the first occurrence of this expression in the verse ("which also was **as** eternal as the life of the soul").

Summary: In accord with the earliest textual sources (including 𝓞), restore the *as* before *eternal* in Alma 42:16 so that "which was **as** eternal as the life of the soul" occurs twice in the verse (ignoring here the *also* and its placement in the clause).

■ **Alma 42:16–17**

now repentance could not come unto men
except there were a punishment
which also was as eternal as the life of the soul
[0ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST | NULL >jg ; 1]
should be
[1 |, ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
affixed opposite to the plan of happiness
which was as eternal also as the life of the soul
now how could a man repent except he should sin

Originally the 1830 compositor, when supplying the punctuation in the printer's manuscript, decided that *should be* needed to be considered part of the following predicate ("**should be** affixed opposite to the plan of happiness"), not at the end of the preceding clause ("which also was as eternal as the life of the soul **should be**"). The compositor marked his decision by placing in pencil a semicolon before *should be* in 𝓟. But when he finally ended up actually setting the type for this passage, he did not put any punctuation before *should be*. Instead, he placed a comma after the *should be,* thus indicating his final decision that *should be* belonged to the preceding clause. All of the printed editions of the Book of Mormon have followed this textual decision.

At the end of the verse, the same clause (except for the position of the *also*) is repeated—and without the *should be:* "which was as eternal also as the life of the soul". This ending to verse 16 definitely suggests that the *should be* belongs with "affixed opposite to the plan of happiness". Moreover, the reading "as eternal as the life of the soul should be", earlier in the verse, doesn't really make any sense: why would the text say that the life of the soul **should be** eternal when it **is** eternal? In other words, there should be semantic agreement for the two instances of "which was as eternal as the life of the soul" (ignoring the *also*).

The problem, of course, with putting *should be* with the following clause is that the resulting construction seems ungrammatical: "except there were a punishment . . . should be affixed opposite to the plan of happiness". Several possible emendations suggest themselves:

 □ adding the subordinate conjunction *that:*
  "except there were a punishment . . . **that** should be affixed"

 □ omitting the existential *there were:*
  "except a punishment . . . should be affixed"

 □ omitting the finite verb phrase *should be:*
  "except there were a punishment . . . affixed"

Yet actually the Book of Mormon text has other examples like the original text here in Alma 42:16. In the following two examples, there is a modal verb (just like *should* in Alma 42:16); and although there is a different negative connector (*save it were* or *short of*), it functions just like *except there were:*

 1 Nephi 18:20
  and there was nothing
  save it were the power of God which threatened them with destruction
  could soften their hearts

Enos 1:23

> I say there was nothing
> **short of** these things and exceeding great plainness of speech
> **would** keep them from going down speedily to destruction

The critical text will therefore maintain the similar construction here in the book of Alma:

Alma 42:16

> except **there were** a punishment
> which also was as eternal as the life of the soul
> **should** be affixed opposite to the plan of happiness
> which was as eternal also as the life of the soul

Summary: In Alma 42:16 place the comma at the end of the relative clause "which also was as eternal as the life of the soul", not after *should be;* this revised reading is clearly the intended reading since the life of the soul **is** eternal rather than **should be** eternal.

■ **Alma 42:17**

how could there be **a** *law*
save there was [*a* 01ABCGHIJKLMNOPQRST | DEF] *punishment*

The 1841 British edition omitted the *a* before *punishment*. The *a* was restored to the LDS text in the 1879 edition. The *a* is expected given the contrastive parallelism in this sentence between "a law" and "a punishment". Subsequent verses in this chapter show the same conjoining of "a law" and "a punishment":

Alma 42:18 now there was **a** punishment affixed and **a** just law given
Alma 42:22 but there is **a** law given and **a** punishment affixed

Summary: Maintain the indefinite article *a* before *punishment* in Alma 42:17 and elsewhere in this chapter.

■ **Alma 42:19**

now if there was no law given
—if a man murdered / *he* **should** *die—*
would *he be afraid he* [*should* 1ABCGHKPS | *would* DEFIJLMNOQRT] *die*
if he should murder

The typesetter for the 1841 British edition accidentally replaced *should* with *would* here in Alma 42:19. He was probably influenced by the preceding *would* in "would he be afraid". The original manuscript is not extant here, but the printer's manuscript reads *should,* as do the first three editions (1830, 1837, and 1840). Further note that in the original text the later "he should die" is identical with the earlier "he should die" that occurs just prior to "would he be afraid". There are numerous passages elsewhere in the text where *would* occurs in the main clause and *should* in the dependent clause, as in 1 Nephi 10:6: "wherefore all mankind was in a lost and in a fallen state and ever **would** be / save they **should** rely on this Redeemer". The critical text will restore the original modal *should* here in Alma 42:19 ("would he be afraid he **should** die if he should murder").

Summary: Restore in Alma 42:19 the original *should* in "would he be afraid he **should** die if he should murder"; the current LDS reading, "would he be afraid he **would** die if he should murder", derives from an 1841 typo influenced by the preceding occurrence of *would*.

■ **Alma 42:20**

and also if there was no law given against sin
men would not be afraid [*to* 01ABCDEFHIJKLMNOPQRST | *of* G] *sin*

The 1858 Wright edition accidentally replaced the infinitival *to* with the preposition *of,* thus giving "afraid **of** sin" instead of the correct "afraid **to** sin". Given the context, the *to* clearly works better. The 1874 RLDS edition ignored this typo in the 1858 Wright edition and set the correct *to* of the earlier 1840 edition.

Summary: Maintain in Alma 42:20 the infinitival marker *to* ("men would not be afraid **to** sin"), the reading of all the earliest textual sources (including the original manuscript).

■ **Alma 42:22**

but there is **a** *law given and* **a** *punishment affixed*
and [01ABCGHKPS | *a* DEFIJLMNOQRT] *repentance granted*
which repentance mercy claimeth

Here is another typo by the typesetter for the 1841 British edition; this error has persisted in the LDS text. The intrusive *a* before *repentance* was probably influenced by the preceding *a*'s in "**a** law given and **a** punishment affixed". In other places in the text where we get *repentance* occurring with the verb *grant,* there is no determiner for the noun *repentance:*

Alma 13:30	and may the Lord grant unto you **repentance**
Mormon 3:3	it was the Lord that had spared them and granted unto them a chance for **repentance**

In fact, the indefinite article *a* never occurs as the determiner for *repentance* in the original text. Elsewhere *repentance* occurs as a noncount noun. It usually takes no determiner at all (as originally here in Alma 42:22 and 87 other times in the text). There are cases where *repentance* takes a determiner, but it is never *a:*

their	5 times
your	3 times
the	2 times
no	1 time

And since *repentance* is noncount, it never occurs in the plural (as *repentances*). Thus the occurrence of "a repentance" in the current LDS text for Alma 42:22 is textually unacceptable.

Summary: Restore in Alma 42:22 the original text without any determiner for *repentance;* the word *repentance* consistently functions as a noncount noun in the text; thus the intrusive *a* before *repentance* in the LDS text creates an exception.

■ **Alma 42:22**

if not so
the [*works* 01ABCEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST | *words* D] *of justice would be destroyed*

The typesetter for the 1841 British edition misread *works* as *words*. The subsequent LDS edition (1849) restored the correct *works*. For a list of mix-ups between *word(s)* and *work(s),* see under Alma 12:12–14. There are no instances in the original text of "the word(s) of justice", but there are three more of "the work(s) of justice":

Alma 12:32	for the **works** of justice could not be destroyed
Alma 42:13	except it should destroy the **work** of justice
Alma 42:13	now the **work** of justice could not be destroyed

The critical text will maintain "the works of justice" here in Alma 42:22. (For an example where the current text has an instance of "the word of justice", an error for "the sword of justice", see under 1 Nephi 12:18.)

Summary: Maintain in Alma 42:22 *works,* the reading in all the earliest textual sources ("the **works** of justice would be destroyed").

■ **Alma 42:22**

and God would cease to be [01ABCDEFGHIJKLMOPQRST | *a* N] *God*

The 1906 LDS edition added the indefinite article *a* before *God;* but because this edition never served as the copytext for any subsequent LDS edition, this error was never transmitted. The phrase *a God* is found elsewhere in the text, but only in existential expressions (such as whether there is a God or not). But this is not the issue here in Alma's discourse, so *a God* does not really work in this passage. Moreover, the following verse supports the use of *God* without *a:* "but God ceaseth not to be **God**" (not "but God ceaseth not to be **a** God").

Summary: Maintain *God* without any determiner in Alma 42:22: "and God would cease to be **God**".

■ **Alma 42:23**

but God ceaseth not **to be** *God*
and mercy claimeth [*the* 01ABCFGHIJKLMNOPQRST | *to be* DE] *penitent*

The typesetter for the 1841 British edition accidentally set *the* as *to be,* a perseverance of the immediately preceding *to be* in "God ceaseth not **to be** God". What is rather surprising here is that this typo was copied into the subsequent 1849 LDS edition. The 1852 LDS edition restored the original *the* to the LDS text.

Summary: Maintain in Alma 42:23 the original text for the clause "and mercy claimeth **the** penitent".

■ **Alma 42:23**

and the atonement **bringeth** *to pass the resurrection of the dead*
and the resurrection of the dead [*bringeth* 0ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST | *bringing* 1]
back men into the presence of God

> The original manuscript is extant here and reads "and the resurrection of the dead **bringeth** back men into the presence of God". When Oliver Cowdery copied the text into 𝓟, he accidentally wrote *bringing* instead of *bringeth*. The correct reading was restored in the 1830 edition, perhaps because *bringing* didn't work very well and in the preceding clause the verb was *bringeth* ("and the atonement **bringeth** to pass the resurrection of the dead"). Another possibility is that the correction was made when the 1830 sheet for this passage (the 22nd signature) was proofed against 𝓞. For the evidence of this possibility, see the discussion under Alma 42:31.

Summary: Maintain the original two occurrences of *bringeth* in Alma 42:23, not the *bringing* in 𝓟 for the second occurrence of the verb *bring* in the verse.

■ **Alma 42:24**

for behold justice exerciseth all [*his* 01ABCEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST | d] *demands*
and also mercy claimeth all which is **her** *own*

> Here the 1841 British edition omitted the determiner *his* before *demands*. The occurrence of "all demands" is definitely unexpected. The subsequent LDS edition (in 1849) restored the *his*. The *his* is necessary since the masculine pronoun refers to the demands of justice while the feminine *her* refers to mercy ("and also mercy claimeth all which is **her** own"). For two others examples of contrastive *his* and *her,* referring respectively to the sun and to the moon, see the discussion under 2 Nephi 23:10 and Helaman 14:20 (both of these involve textual variation between *his* and *her*).

Summary: Maintain in Alma 42:24 the *his* in the phrase "all his demands".

■ **Alma 42:24**

for behold justice exerciseth all his demands
and also mercy claimeth all which **is** *her own*

> Paul Thomas (personal communication) has proposed that the singular *is* in "mercy claimeth all which **is** her own" be edited to the plural *are* ("mercy claimeth all which **are** her own"). One notes that the parallel preceding clause has a plural direct object ("all his demands"). By switching the *is* to *are,* we would provide a semantically plural interpretation to the direct object *all* in the second clause ("all which are her own"). David Calabro points out (personal communication) that a plural interpretation for *all* should be interpreted as meaning 'all persons' rather than 'all things'. Note that the following clause specifically refers to those who will be saved: "and thus none but the truly penitent are saved" (Alma 42:24). Also note the language earlier in verse 23 ("and mercy claimeth the penitent') with its reference to persons, "the penitent". The grammatical emendation of *is* to *are* also implies that the *which* should be changed to *who* ("and also mercy claimeth all **who are** her own") so that the reference to persons would be made clear in the standard text.

Yet the Book of Mormon text definitely allows the singular verb form in similar expressions; see, for instance, the discussion under 1 Nephi 17:30 regarding the phrase "and doing **all things** for them which **was** expedient". Of course, here in Alma 42:24 there is no overt plural noun like *people* (or *things*), so the use of the singular *is* is technically not even ungrammatical. And even with the singular *is,* the *all* can still be interpreted as referring to people (or things). The King James Bible has examples of this usage involving things, such as "and all that in them is" (Exodus 20:11 and Acts 4:24); for discussion of this particular phrase in the Book of Mormon, see under 2 Nephi 2:14.

Summary: Maintain in Alma 42:24 the original, but somewhat awkward, expression "all which **is** her own"; here *all* is a plural that refers to persons.

■ **Alma 42:25**

□ *what do ye suppose that mercy can rob justice*   01*

□ *what? Do ye suppose that mercy can rob justice?*   1ᶜ

□ *What, do ye suppose that mercy can rob justice?*   ABCDEFGHKPRST

□ *What! do ye suppose that mercy can rob justice?*   IJLMOQ

□ *What! do ye suppose that mercy can rob justice;*   N

Ross Geddes (personal communication, 17 August 2004) suggests that the punctuation is incorrect here in Alma 42:25. There are no occurrences of *what* (or any other interrogative pronoun) as an isolated interrogative anywhere in the text. Geddes proposes that the text be repunctuated as "What do ye suppose? that mercy can rob justice?" It seems like either interpretation could work here. In fact, there are no examples elsewhere in the text of either expression, neither "what?" nor "what do ye suppose?" (or similar *wh-*questions).

More generally, there are 18 other occurrences in the original text of "do ye suppose", and only one of these is a *wh-*question: "and **how** do ye suppose that I know of their surety" (Alma 5:45). All the rest are yes-no questions. Moreover, all cases of "do ye suppose" have a *that-*clause as a complement to the verb *suppose,* not as an appositive to a preceding *wh-*interrogative pronoun. This consistency supports treating "do ye suppose that S" (where S is a finite clause) as a single sentence here in Alma 42:25. The critical text will therefore support the interpretation that John Gilbert, the 1830 typesetter, provided (namely, "What? Do ye suppose that mercy can rob justice?").

Summary: Treat the *what* in Alma 42:25 as an isolated *wh-*interrogative, followed by a yes-no question (that is, "What? Do ye suppose that mercy can rob justice?"); nonetheless, the alternative interpretation remains a possibility: "What do ye suppose? that mercy can rob justice?"

■ **Alma 42:26**

and thus cometh about the salvation
[NULL > & 01 | *and* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *the redemption of men*

Here in both manuscripts, Oliver Cowdery initially omitted the second occurrence of *and* but then virtually immediately inserted the & (in neither case is there any difference in the level of ink flow for the supralinear &). Elsewhere, collocates of *salvation* and *redemption* are connected by *and:*

Omni 1:26

I would that ye should come unto Christ which is the Holy One of Israel
and partake of his **salvation** and the power of his **redemption**

Alma 26:36

for this is my life and my light
my joy and my **salvation** and my **redemption** from everlasting woe

David Calabro points out (personal communication) that there are asyndetic noun phrase conjuncts in the Book of Mormon, as in Mosiah 7:27: "Christ was the God / the Father of all things". A similar example, also referring to deity, is the phrase "the Son / the Only Begotten of the Father", the emended text in Alma 5:48 and Alma 13:9 (see the discussion under Alma 5:48). But an asyndetic construction of the form "the salvation / the redemption of men" seems unlikely.

Summary: Maintain in Alma 42:26 the *and* between *the salvation* and *the redemption,* the virtually immediately corrected reading in both manuscripts.

■ **Alma 42:26**

and thus cometh about the salvation
and [the 01ABCDEFGHIJLMNOQRT | KPS] *redemption of men*

In the 1892 RLDS edition, the repeated *the* in this sentence was accidentally omitted; the RLDS text has maintained the shorter reading, despite the fact that the printer's manuscript has the repeated *the*. Such repetition is characteristic of the original text; see the discussion under CON-JUNCTIVE REPETITION in volume 3.

Summary: Maintain in Alma 42:26 the repeated *the* in "the salvation and **the** redemption of men".

■ **Alma 42:29**

*and [*NULL > *now* 0 | *now* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *my son*
I desire that . . .

Here in the original manuscript, Oliver Cowdery initially omitted the *now* but then virtually immediately inserted it supralinearly (there is no difference in the level of ink flow). Since either reading is theoretically possible, the critical text will follow the corrected reading in 𝓞, a decision supported by the fact that in Alma's discourses to his three sons, he uses "and now my son" 22 times but never "and my son".

Summary: Maintain in Alma 42:29 the corrected reading in 𝓞, "and **now** my son"; such usage is prominent in Alma's discourses to his sons.

■ **Alma 42:30**

do not endeavor to excuse yourself in the least point because of your sins
    by denying the justice of God
but *do you let the justice of God and his mercy and his long-suffering have full sway in your heart*
[*but* 01ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQS | *and* RT] *let it bring you down to the dust in humility*

Apparently the editors for the 1920 LDS edition did not like the conjunction *but* reversing a previous *but,* so they changed the second *but* here in Alma 42:30 to *and* (the change is marked in the 1920 committee copy). It is possible that the second *but* was originally an *and* that was accidentally replaced by *but* when Joseph Smith dictated the text to Oliver Cowdery (both *but*'s are extant in 𝒪). There is evidence that Oliver Cowdery sometimes mixed up *but* and *and* in 𝒪 and in 𝒫; see the list of examples under 1 Nephi 8:20 (in the discussion regarding *straight* versus *strait*).

Yet the original text has other examples where a *but*-initial clause follows a previous *but;* in the following examples, the second *but* is basically equivalent to 'and' and could, in fact, be emended to *and* without changing the meaning:

> Mosiah 7:25
>> for if this people had not fallen into transgression
>> the Lord would not have suffered that this great evil should come upon them
>> **but** behold they would not hearken unto his words
>> **but** there arose contentions among them
>> even so much that they did shed blood among themselves

> Ether 9:28–29
>> yea even there should be a great famine
>> in the which they should be destroyed if they did not repent
>> **but** the people believed not the words of the prophets
>> **but** they cast them out

In these examples, the second *but* extends the scope of negation. For a similar example where *but* extends the scope of negation, see under Alma 43:20.

Since the Book of Mormon text allows a repeated *but* to have the meaning 'and', the critical text will restore the repeated *but* here in Alma 42:30 ("**but** let it bring you down to the dust in humility").

Summary: Restore the original conjunctive repetition of *but* in Alma 42:30; occasionally the original text has instances where the repeated *but* means simply 'and' (that is, without reversing the previous *but*).

■ **Alma 42:30**

but let it bring you down [*to* 1ABCDEFGIJLMNOPQRST | *in* HK] *the dust* **in** *humility*

Here the 1874 RLDS edition accidentally replaced the preposition *to* with *in,* perhaps in anticipation of the following phrase, "**in** humility". Another possible influence is that the typesetter may have expected "let it bring you down **in** the dust", as in these two passages:

> 1 Nephi 22:23   it is they which must be brought low **in** the dust
> 2 Nephi 26:15   and after that they shall have been brought down low **in** the dust . . .

Here in Alma 42:30, the 1908 RLDS edition restored the original preposition *to*. The critical text will follow the earliest extant reading, "but let it bring you down **to** the dust in humility" (the reading in 𝒫).

Summary: Accept in Alma 42:30 the use of the preposition *to* in "but let it bring you down **to** the dust", the reading of the earliest textual sources.

■ **Alma 42:31**

and now
[01D | *O* ABCEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
my [NULL >p *O* 0| 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *son*
ye are called of God to preach the word unto this people

For this gathering of leaves in the 1830 edition (namely, for the 22nd signature, pages 337–352, covering Alma 41:8–46:30), the printed edition was set from 𝒫 but proofed (and thus corrected) against 𝒪. Throughout this part of the text, the printer's manuscript, not the original manuscript, contains the compositor's punctuation marks (covering Alma 42:6–43:29, Alma 46:3–6, and Alma 46:21–27, for about six of the 16 pages in the signature). More extensively, 𝒫 contains the compositor's small impressions or cuts that he typically used to show where he was in his typesetting after he had filled his composing stick with 11–13 lines of type (for these marks, see the discussion on pages 17–18 of volume 2 of the critical text). There is no doubt that the 1830 edition was originally set from 𝒫 for the 22nd signature (see under Alma 43:23 for a conclusive example). But at the same time, there is also conclusive evidence that the 22nd signature for the 1830 edition was proofed against 𝒪 instead of 𝒫, a mixture of manuscript usage found nowhere else in the printing of the 1830 edition. Here I list three clear examples from the 22nd signature for this proofing against 𝒪. In each case, Oliver Cowdery made a substantial transmission error when he copied the text from 𝒪 into 𝒫, yet the 1830 edition ends up agreeing with the reading in 𝒪, not 𝒫, but without there being anything noticeably wrong with the reading in 𝒫 that could have led the compositor to consciously emend the text:

Alma 43:17 (*commander* replaced by *captain* in 𝒫)
and he was only twenty and five years old when he was appointed
chief [*Commander* 0A | *captain* 1BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
over the armies of the Nephites

Alma 43:23 (*desiring him* omitted in 𝒫)
and Moroni also knowing of the prophecies of Alma sent certain men unto him
[*desireing him* 0 | 1 | *desiring him* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
that he should inquire of the Lord whither the armies of the Nephites should go

Alma 45:13 (*the people of Nephi* replaced by *the people of the Nephites* in 𝒫)
behold the time very soon cometh that those
which are now or the seed of those which are now numbered among
□ *the people Nephites*   0*
□ *the people of Nephi*   0ᶜABCDEFGHIJKLMNOQRT
□ *the Nephites*   1*
□ *the people of the Nephites*   1ᶜPS
shall no more be numbered among the people of Nephi

On the other hand, the preceding and subsequent 1830 signatures (the 21st and the 23rd) show no sign of proofing against 𝒪. For those adjacent signatures, whenever Oliver made unrecoverable errors when he copied from 𝒪 into 𝒫, the 1830 edition retains the acceptable reading in 𝒫:

> Alma 41:5 (in the 21st signature)
>
> the one [*restored* 0 | *raised* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] to happiness
> according to his desires of happiness

> Alma 46:31 (in the 23rd signature)
>
> and it came to pass that he took his army and marched out
> [*with his tents* 0T | 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRS] into the wilderness

In his proofing against 𝒪 for this section of the text (from Alma 41:8 through Alma 46:30), Oliver Cowdery sometimes went further than he should have: in a few cases, he changed 𝒪 itself to make it agree with the 1830 reading! Here in Alma 42:31, we have the first example of this anachronistic emendation of 𝒪. Here the original manuscript originally read "and now my son", and Oliver copied this phrase without alteration into 𝒫. But when the 1830 compositor set the type from 𝒫 for this phrase, he inserted the word *O*, giving "and now O my son". When Oliver came to proof this 1830 signature (number 22) against 𝒪, he noticed the difference between 𝒪 and the 1830 text; but instead of having the 1830 compositor remove the intrusive word *O*, Oliver added the *O* to the original manuscript! Even more amazing, he ended up inserting the *O* in the wrong place, between *my* and *Son*. In other words, he ended up changing the original manuscript to read "and now my O son", an impossible reading. Another indication of the secondary nature of the word *O* is the fact that Oliver's supralinear *O* was written in pencil, not ink, which argues that this correction was made in the print shop (see the discussion under Alma 10:28). And if the correction was made in the print shop, this would mean that in order to proof the 22nd signature, the original manuscript (presumably the large gathering of 96 pages that contains this part of the text) was brought to the print shop after the type had already been set from the printer's manuscript. This possible use of 𝒪 in the print shop foreshadows the use of 𝒪 later on in the print shop to set the type from Helaman 13 to the end of Mormon. Yet it is also possible that Oliver took home this 1830 proof sheet (the 22nd signature) and there proofed it against 𝒪 with pencil. Since the proof sheet would have normally been marked up with pencil in the print shop, Oliver may have used pencil at home to mark up that proof sheet and at the same time make a few minor emendations in 𝒪 with pencil.

There are three other cases where Oliver Cowdery marked up 𝒪 as he proofed the 22nd signature; in each case, Oliver used a pencil to make these emendations:

> Alma 43:6 (*then* is emended to *than*)
>
> and now as the Amlicites were of a more wicked and a murderous disposition
> [*then* >p *than* 0 | *than* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] the Lamanites were . . .

> Alma 43:44 (*hand* emended to *hands*)
>
> and many of the Nephites were slain
> by their [*hand* >p *hands* 0 | *hand* 1 | *hands* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]

Alma 46:24 (*Sons* is emended to either *Son* or *Son's*)

> even as this remnant of garment
> of my [*Sons* >p *Son* / *Sons* >p *Son's* 0 | *Son* > *Sons* 1 | *sons* ABCDEG |
>   *son's* FHIJKLMNOPQ | *son* RT | *son's* > *son* S] hath been preserved . . .

In the last case, the 1830 edition was not corrected to read either *son* or *son's*. See under each of these three passages for further discussion.

As far as Alma 42:31 is concerned, either reading (with or without the word *O*) is theoretically possible. Elsewhere in the original text there are 25 occurrences of "and now my son" (of which 21 are found here in Alma's discourses to his three sons). But there is one example of "and now O my son", namely, in Alma 36:3 at the beginning of Alma's discourse to Helaman: "and now O my son Helaman / behold thou art in thy youth". More generally, there are nine other instances of "and now O <noun phrase as a term of address>", as in the following types:

2 Nephi 15:3	and now O inhabitants of Jerusalem and men of Judah
Mosiah 4:30	and now O man
Alma 18:3	and now O king
Helaman 11:16	and now O Lord
Mormon 9:15	and now O all ye that have imagined up unto yourselves a god which can do no miracles

So in each case of "and now (O) my son", we let the earliest textual sources determine whether the word *O* is there. Here in Alma 42:31, the original text clearly read without the *O*. It should also be noted that the 1841 British edition omitted the *O* here, but this seems to have been unintentional.

Summary: Remove the intrusive *O* inserted by the 1830 compositor near the beginning of Alma 42:31, thus restoring the original phrase "and now my son".

■ **Alma 42:31**

and may God grant unto [NULL >– *you* 0 | *you* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
[*ye* >% *yea* 0 | 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *even according to my words*

Here in the original manuscript, Oliver Cowdery initially wrote *unto ye*. He ended up immediately correcting the *ye* to *yea* and supralinearly inserting *you*. The correction of *ye* to *yea* was immediate since it involves erasure of the *y*, overwriting the *e* with a *y*, and finally writing inline the last two letters of *yea*. On the other hand, the supralinearly inserted *you* was written with considerably weaker ink flow. It is clear from 𝒪 that Oliver intended to correct *unto ye* to *unto you yea*. But when Oliver copied the text from 𝒪 into 𝒫, he omitted the *yea,* thus giving the current reading "and may God grant **unto you** even according to my words". The critical text will restore the originally intended *yea* ("and may God grant **unto you yea** even according to my words").

There are three other cases in the original text of *yea* with similar phraseology (namely, an immediately preceding *you* and a following phrase headed by *even*); and in two of these cases, the *yea* has also been lost from the text:

Alma 54:9 (*yea* lost when copying from 𝒪 into 𝒫)

> behold ye will pull down the wrath of that God whom you have rejected
> upon [NULL >– *you* 0 | *you* > *ye* > *you* 1 | *you* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
> [*yea* 0 | 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] **even** to your utter destruction

3 Nephi 3:8 (*yea* lost when setting the type for the 1830 edition)

> and they shall not stay their hand and shall spare not
> but shall slay you and shall let fall the sword upon **you**
> [*yea* 1PS | ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOQRT] **even** until ye shall become extinct

Ether 8:23 (no loss of the *yea*)

> yea even the work of destruction come upon **you**
> **yea even** the sword of the justice of the eternal God shall fall upon you

Summary: Restore in Alma 42:31 the original *yea* that Oliver Cowdery omitted when he copied from 𝒪 into 𝒫; the corrected reading in 𝒪 has the *yea:* "and may God grant unto you **yea** even according to my words".

- **Alma 42:31**

and may God grant unto you
yea even according to my [*words* / *word* 0 | *word* 1 | *words* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]

The original manuscript is highly fragmented here near *words,* and it is difficult to determine whether 𝒪 originally read *words* or *word*. The printer's manuscript clearly has the singular *word,* but the 1830 edition ended up with the plural *words,* which is what all subsequent editions have followed. Theoretically, either reading works.

There is considerable evidence that Oliver Cowdery tended to write *my word* in place of *my words,* but not the other way around (although more generally *word* and *words* were occasionally mixed up by Oliver):

1 Nephi 16:24 (error in copying from 𝒪 into 𝒫)

> for they had humbled themselves
> because of my [*words* OT | *word* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRS]

2 Nephi 29:2 (initial error in 𝒫)

> and my [*word* > *words* 1 | *words* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] shall hiss forth
> unto the ends of the earth

Mosiah 4:4 (initial error in 𝒫)

> that ye may hear and understand the remainder
> of my [*word* > *words* 1 | *words* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
> which I shall speak unto you

Mosiah 22:4 (initial error in 𝒫)

> or if thou hast hitherto listened
> to my [*word* >+ *words* 1 | *words* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] in any degree

Alma 37:20 (initial error in both 𝓞 and 𝓟)
that ye be diligent in fulfilling
all my [*word >+ words* 0 | *word > words* 1 | *words* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]

Here is another example where Oliver initially wrote *word* in a phrase of the form "according to one's word(s)":

Helaman 9:15 (initial error in 𝓟)
and behold he was dead
according to the [*word > words* 1 | *words* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] of Nephi

Thus it is quite possible that in Alma 42:31 Oliver accidentally copied "according to my **words**" as "according to my **word**".

It is also possible that the 1830 typesetter could have changed *word* to *words* on his own, as he did in the following examples involving *his* and *thy* (on a par with *my*):

1 Nephi 17:22 (𝓞 and 𝓟ᶜ both read *word*)
and our father hath judged them and hath led us away because we would hearken
unto his [*word* 0GHKPS | *words > word* 1 | *words* ABCDEFIJLMNOQRT]

Helaman 11:16 (𝓟 reads *word;* 𝓞 is not extant here)
and if so O Lord thou canst bless them
according to thy [*word* 1 | *words* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
which thou hast said

Elsewhere in the text, we have examples of both "according to one's **word**" and "according to one's **words**". There are 30 clear examples in the original text that take the singular *word,* and 27 of these refer to the word of the Lord. And the other three are closely associated with the Lord:

1 Nephi 12:19	according to the word of the angel
1 Nephi 14:27	according to the word of the angel
Helaman 10:5	all things shall be done unto thee according to thy word

In the last example, the Lord is speaking to Nephi. In contrast to these cases with the singular number, there are 36 clear examples in the original text of "according to one's word(s)" that take the plural *words,* including five more of the form "according to my **words**". And most of these plural examples (31 of them) refer to a human (usually a prophet) or to Christ; but there are three that refer to the words of an angel (1 Nephi 19:8, 1 Nephi 19:10, and 2 Nephi 6:9) and two that refer to the words of the Lord (Jacob 5:12 and Mormon 4:12). So internal evidence favors the occurrence of *words* in Alma 42:31 ("according to my words") since a human is speaking to another human (Alma to his son Corianton).

There are three cases that involve textual variation in the number for *words* in the phrase "according to the word(s) of X"; in the first case the correction in 𝓟 from *word* to *words* is virtually immediate, while in the two other cases the 1830 edition is set from 𝓞, not 𝓟, so in theory 𝓞 may have read as either *words* or *word:*

Helaman 9:15
and behold he was dead according to
the [*word > words* 1 | *words* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] of Nephi

3 Nephi 29:7
>   for he that doeth this shall become like unto the son of perdition
>   for whom there was no mercy according to
>   the [*words* 1|*word* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] of Christ

Mormon 2:17
>   and behold I had gone according to
>   the [*words* >js *word* 1|*word* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] of Ammaron
>   and taken the plates of Nephi

In all these cases, internal evidence supports the plural *words,* the reading in 𝒫 (the corrected reading in 𝒫 for the first case); for discussion, see under each of these three passages.

There is one additional factor that could explain why the 1830 edition reads *words* in Alma 42:31 while the copytext (the printer's manuscript) reads *word,* namely, the 22nd signature for the 1830 edition was proofed against the original manuscript (see the preceding discussion regarding the insertion of the word *O* in the original manuscript).

Ultimately, it is difficult to decide here in Alma 42:31 whether the original text read *words* or *word.* But since internal evidence favors the plural *words* in the phrase "according to one's word(s)" when referring to the words of a human (in distinction to the word of the Lord), the critical text will accept the plural *words* as the probable reading of the original text in Alma 42:31, although *word* remains a possibility.

Summary: Accept in Alma 42:31 the reading of the 1830 edition, "according to my **words**"; for most instances of this phrase, the text supports the plural *words* rather than *word* when referring to the words of a human rather than to the word of the Lord; the 1830 edition was here proofed against 𝒪, which suggests that 𝒪 itself read *words* and that Oliver Cowdery miswrote *words* as *word* when he copied the text from 𝒪 into 𝒫 (a common enough error on his part).

Alma 43

■ **Alma 43:3**

and now I return to an account of the wars
between the Nephites and [*the* 01ABDEFIJLMNOPQRST | CGHK] *Lamanites*

As discussed under Enos 1:24, the determiner *the* is always repeated in the conjunctive phrase "the Nephites and **the** Lamanites". Here in Alma 43:3 the repeated *the* was omitted in the 1840 edition, probably unintentionally. The 1908 RLDS edition restored it to the RLDS text. The critical text will maintain the repeated *the* here. For additional discussion, see under CONJUNCTIVE REPETITION in volume 3.

Summary: Maintain in Alma 43:3 the repeated *the* in the phrase "the Nephites and **the** Lamanites", the earliest reading; in the original text, the definite article is always repeated in this expression.

■ **Alma 43:5**

and they came into the land of [*Antionum* 0BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST | *Antionam* 1A]

The name *Antionum* was here misspelled as *Antionam* in 𝓟 and in the 1830 edition. The correct *Antionum* was restored in the 1837 edition. The name occurs five times in the text; the name is fully extant in 𝓞 for three of the occurrences and reads *Antionum* (including here in Alma 43:5), while in 𝓟 the name is always spelled *Antionum* except here in Alma 43:5. The critical text will accept *Antionum* as the correct spelling. Similarly, the name *Cumorah* was misspelled in the earliest extant sources as *Camorah* (once by scribe 2 in 𝓟 and always in the 1830 edition); see the discussion under Mormon 6:2. As exemplified by the spellings for the name *Zoram*, Oliver Cowdery's *u*'s and *a*'s often looked alike (see the discussion under 1 Nephi 4:35).

Summary: In accord with the earliest textual sources, maintain the spelling *Antionum.*

■ **Alma 43:5**

and they came into the land of Antionum
which [*was* 01ABCGHKPS | *is* DEFIJLMNOQRT] *the land of the Zoramites*

As explained under Alma 8:18, the Book of Mormon consistently uses past-tense verb forms to describe geographical location whenever the narrative as a whole is in the past tense. In this passage, the 1841 British edition replaced the original *was* with *is;* the LDS text has continued with this present-tense reading up through the current edition. The critical text will restore the original *was.*

Summary: Restore the original past-tense *was* here in Alma 43:5 since geographical location is characteristically referred to in the past tense in the Book of Mormon whenever the narrative itself is in the past tense.

■ **Alma 43:6**

and now as the Amlicites were of
a more wicked and [*a* 01ABCG | DEFHIJKLMNOPQRST] *murderous disposition*
than the Lamanites were . . .

Here the 1841 British edition and the 1874 RLDS edition independently, it would appear, removed the repeated *a* before *murderous disposition*. This change appears to be accidental. Typically in English, we do not repeat the indefinite article in conjuncts of nouns, but this kind of repetition is characteristic of the Book of Mormon. Elsewhere in the original text, where *wicked* is conjoined with another adjective, the indefinite article is always repeated:

Mosiah 1:13	and become **a** wicked and **an** adulterous people
Mosiah 27:8	he became **a** very wicked and **an** idolatrous man
Alma 31:24	they were **a** wicked and **a** perverse people

For a general discussion, see under CONJUNCTIVE REPETITION in volume 3. The critical text will restore the repeated *a* here in Alma 43:6.

Summary: Restore in Alma 43:6 the repeated indefinite article *a* in "a more wicked and **a** murderous disposition".

■ **Alma 43:6**

and now as the Amlicites were of a more wicked and a murderous disposition
[*then* >p *than* 0 | *than* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *the Lamanites were*
in and of themselves . . .

Although the change of *then* to *than* in this passage is not a substantive change, it represents editing on the part of Oliver Cowdery. Here he proofed the 1830 signature (number 22) against 𝒪. In this case, he decided to correct 𝒪 itself to agree with what the compositor had set, thus correcting in pencil the spelling of *then* by overwriting the *e* with an *a*. Oliver made a number of changes in pencil in 𝒪 for this part of the text (signature 22 covers Alma 41:8–46:30), although this emendation in 𝒪 is the only nonsubstantive one. For a list of these secondary changes in 𝒪, see under Alma 42:31.

For this particular instance of *than,* Oliver correctly wrote *than* in 𝒫. The critical text will follow the standard spelling; for discussion regarding the spelling *then* in place of the standard *than,* see under 1 Nephi 4:1 as well as more generally under THAN in volume 3.

Summary: Follow the standard spelling *than* even though it was occasionally spelled *then* in the manuscripts.

■ **Alma 43:6**

therefore [*Zerahemnah* 01ABCDEFGHIJKLMNPQRST | *Zarahemnah* O] *appointed chief captains*

For 11 of its 17 occurrences (including the first occurrence in Alma 43:5), the name *Zerahemnah* is spelled without variation. But there is a tendency to misspell the name under the influence of the very similar place-name *Zarahemla.* In the textual history, there are seven instances of spelling variation for the name *Zerahemnah;* the variants are all isolated and were never transmitted into any subsequent edition:

MISSPELLING	LOCATION	TEXTUAL SOURCES
Z**a**rahemnah	Alma 43:6	1907 LDS
	Alma 43:20	1852 LDS
	Alma 44:10	℗*
	Alma 44:12	1841 British
Zerahem**l**ah	Alma 44:12	℗*
Zerahemna	Alma 44:12	1849 LDS
	Alma 44:16	1849 LDS

Each misspelling shows in a different way the influence of *Zarahemla* (*e* to *a, n* to *l,* or loss of final *h*). The last misspelling, *Zerahemna,* occurs twice but only in the 1849 LDS edition. *Zerahemnah* is twice misspelled in ℗ but is corrected both times. The critical text will, of course, maintain the spelling *Zerahemnah.*

Summary: Maintain the spelling *Zerahemnah* in Alma 43–44; the manuscripts consistently support this spelling, despite the tendency to misspell the name under the influence of the very similar *Zarahemla.*

■ **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
[*of* >% NULL O | 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *over the Lamanites*
and they were all [*the* 01ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQS | RT] *Amlicites*
    and [*the* 01ABCDPS | EFGHIJKLMNOQRT] *Zoramites*

The original text here had a conjunctive noun phrase where the definite article *the* was repeated: "the Amlicites and the Zoramites". The repeated *the* was omitted, probably unintentionally, in the 1849 LDS edition and in the 1858 Wright edition, giving "the Amlicites and Zoramites". Other conjuncts of *Amlicites* and *Zoramites* repeat the determiner, providing there is one:

| Alma 43:20 | yea all were naked save it were **the** Zoramites and **the** Amlicites |
| Alma 43:44 | and they were inspired by **the** Zoramites and **the** Amlicites |

The 1908 RLDS edition restored the repeated *the* in Alma 43:6 to the RLDS text. There is one case in the original text, also in this chapter, for which there is no determiner at all: "and all those which had dissented from the Nephites which were Amlicites and Zoramites" (Alma 43:13).

The more serious issue here in Alma 43:6 is whether the last clause is semantically appropriate. In the earliest text, this clause reads "they were all **the** Amlicites and **the** Zoramites", which implies that every Amlicite and Zoramite was appointed to be a chief captain. The obvious meaning is that every chief captain was an Amlicite or a Zoramite. In order to alleviate this semantic difficulty, the editors for the 1920 LDS edition removed the remaining (first) *the* from this conjunctive phrase, giving "they were all Amlicites and Zoramites" (the 1849 LDS edition had already removed the repeated *the*). The 1920 change was intentional since it was marked in the 1920 committee copy.

This emendation seems to be correct from a semantic point of view. But textually, if "they were all Amlicites and Zoramites" was the original text in Alma 43:6, one wonders how two *the*'s could have been accidentally inserted into the text during its early transmission. Since both *the*'s are extant in 𝔒, the double insertion must have occurred during the dictation of the text. But that possibility seems rather remote; there are no other examples in the history of the Book of Mormon text of this kind of double insertion of *the* in conjunctive constructions.

An alternative emendation would be to insert an *of* between *all* and "the Amlicites and the Zoramites". In other words, the original text may have read "they were all **of** the Amlicites and the Zoramites". The *of* here is used in a partitive sense and could be thought of as equivalent to 'from' (thus "they were all from the Amlicites and the Zoramites"). Admittedly, this is an unusual reading (which may have contributed, of course, to the loss of the *of* during the transmission of the text).

In support of this emendation, I note first of all that the expression "to be **of** <some group of people>" is quite frequent in the Book of Mormon text. We have the following representative examples of this partitive phraseology:

1 Nephi 5:18	and people which **were of** his seed
1 Nephi 12:9	for ye **are of** the house of Israel
1 Nephi 21:1	all ye . . . which **are of** my people
Alma 5:39	and ye **are of** his fold
Alma 14:15	because they **were of** thy faith
Alma 14:18	and teachers which **were of** the profession of Nehor
Alma 27:27	the people which **were of** the church of God
3 Nephi 21:11	my people which **are of** the covenant
Moroni 7:3	you that **are of** the church

The only difference is that in none of these other examples does the word *all* appear before the *of*-phrase, but that is probably what made "they were all of the Amlicites and the Zoramites" a difficult reading and thus prone to the loss of the *of*.

There is indirect support in 𝔒 for an original *of* here in Alma 43:6: namely, in the preceding clause, Oliver Cowdery started to write "Zerahemnah appointed chief captains **of** . . .", as if he were intending to write "Zerahemnah appointed chief captains **of** the Amlicites and the Zoramites". Oliver immediately caught this error and erased the intrusive *of*, then continued inline with the prepositional phrase "over the Lamanites". This extra *of* could very well have been the result of anticipating the occurrence of the proposed *of* in the following clause, "they were all **of** the Amlicites and the Zoramites".

We can also find considerable evidence in the manuscripts for Oliver Cowdery omitting the preposition *of* (usually only momentarily), as in these examples involving *of*-initial prepositional phrases:

PASSAGE	ORIGINAL TEXT	SOURCE WITH OMISSION
Alma 29:7	unto all the ends **of** the earth	𝓞*
Alma 34:16	in the arms **of** safety	𝓟*
Alma 43:38	from the more vital parts **of** the body	𝓞*
Alma 57:8	or with a part **of** our strong force	𝓞*
Alma 61:3	and also those **of** my people	𝓟*
Moroni 9:25	and the hope **of** his glory	𝓟*

Here in Alma 43:6, the reading "they were all the Amlicites and the Zoramites" does seem impossible. The most plausible emendation is that the original text read "they were all **of** the Amlicites and the Zoramites".

Paul Huntzinger suggests (personal communication, 22 April 2004) another way to interpret this difficult clause. He proposes that there is an intentional ellipsis at the end of the last clause, namely, "of a more wicked and a murderous disposition" (the phrase found near the beginning of the passage). In other words, the text actually intends to say that "and they were—all the Amlicites and the Zoramites—of a more wicked and a murderous disposition". Such an interpretation would mean that "all the Amlicites and the Zoramites" acts parenthetically as a displaced appositive noun phrase explicating *they*.

There are a couple problems with this proposal. First, we find no evidence of this kind of ellipsis elsewhere in the textual history (either intentional or by accident). Second, the sense of the passage is that Mormon is trying to explain why all the chief captains were Amlicites and Zoramites. He is not trying to explain a second time the disposition of the Amlicites—and for the first time, the disposition of the Zoramites. Note that earlier in the passage the reference is only to the Amlicites as being "of a more wicked and a murderous disposition", not to both the Amlicites and the Zoramites.

Summary: Emend Alma 43:6 by placing the preposition *of* between *all* and "the Amlicites and the Zoramites", thus giving "they were all **of** the Amlicites and the Zoramites"; this emendation is partially supported by usage elsewhere in the text as well as by an earlier intrusive *of* in 𝓞; the correct reading also restores the two original instances of the definite article *the* in this conjunctive structure.

■ **Alma 43:8**

[& 01| ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *this he done*
that he might usurp great power over them

Here the 1830 typesetter accidentally omitted the clause-initial *and*. Elsewhere in the text "this he did" or "this they did" (with sometimes *done* rather than *did* in the original text) is always preceded by a connector of some sort, either the conjunction *and* (11 times) or the transitional *now* (once):

Jacob 7:2	**and** this he done that he might overthrow the doctrine of Christ
Mosiah 7:22	**and** all this he done for the sole purpose of . . .

Mosiah 21:17	**and** this they did because of the greatness of their number
Mosiah 22:1	**and** this they did that they might have the voice of the people
Mosiah 28:12	**and** this he done because of the great anxiety of his people
Mosiah 29:41	**and** this they done throughout all the land
Alma 1:16	**and** this they did for the sake of riches and honor
Alma 2:10	**and** this he done that he might subject them to him
Alma 4:19	**and** this he did that he himself might go forth among his people
Alma 17:7	**and** this they done that they might provide food for themselves
Alma 24:18	**and** this they did / vouching and covenanting with God that . . .
Alma 43:7	**now** this he done that he might preserve their hatred

There is also one example of "this they did do", and it too is preceded by *and:*

| 3 Nephi 11:15 | **and** this they did do / going forth one by one |

Without the transitional element, the clause in the current text for Alma 43:8 begins too abruptly for the characteristically connected style of the Book of Mormon. The critical text will restore the original *and* here. (For discussion of the simple past-tense form *done,* see under Jacob 5:10 or, more generally, under PAST TENSE in volume 3.)

Summary: Restore in Alma 43:8 the conjunction *and* before "this he done", the reading in the manuscripts.

- **Alma 43:8**

and this he done that he might usurp great power over them
and also that he might gain power over the Nephites by bringing them into bondage
[.&C. 0 | .&c. >jg .&c. 1 | &c. ABCDEFGHIKLMNOQ | *etc.* JPS | RT]

The *etc.* here at the end of this verse was removed from the LDS text in the 1920 LDS edition. Yet there is a purpose in the *etc.* here: it allows for other ways for Zerahemnah to gain power over the Nephites, as in the ways described by the following passage:

Alma 50:22
 and those who were faithful in keeping the commandments of the Lord
  were delivered at all times
 whilst thousands of their wicked brethren have been consigned to **bondage**
 or to **perish** by the sword
 or to **dwindle** in unbelief and **mingle** with the Lamanites

Another purpose of the *etc.* could be to specify the nature of the bondage, including hard labor, taxes, and physical abuse:

1 Nephi 17:25
 now ye know that the children of Israel were in **bondage**
 and ye know that they were **laden with tasks** which were grievous to be borne

Mosiah 7:15
 for behold we are in **bondage** to the Lamanites
 and are **taxed with a tax** which is grievous to be borne

Mosiah 12:2
> it shall come to pass that this generation because of their iniquities
> shall be brought into **bondage** and shall be **smitten on the cheek**

The critical text will restore the *etc.* here in Alma 43:8. For a complete discussion regarding the editing out of *etc.,* see under ETC. in volume 3.

Summary: Restore in Alma 43:8 the original *etc.*; its purpose here is to allow for various aspects of bondage or other forms of oppression.

■ **Alma 43:9**

and now [*the design of* 01ABCEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST | D] *the Nephites*
[01ABCEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST | , D]
[*were* 0A | *were* >js *was* 1 | *was* BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *to support their lands*
and their houses and their wives and their children
that they might preserve them from the hands of their enemies

Here we appear to have an example of subject-verb agreement that is determined by proximity rather than semantics, namely, the verb form for *be* takes the plural form *were* because the nearest noun, *Nephites,* is in the plural ("and now the design of **the Nephites were** to support their lands"). This kind of subject-verb disagreement based on proximity was fairly common in the original text. For discussion, see under 1 Nephi 13:23; for a more general discussion, see under SUBJECT-VERB AGREEMENT in volume 3. Joseph Smith, in his editing for the 1837 edition, changed the plural *were* here in Alma 43:9 to the singular *was.*

Of course, one could argue that the original text actually read "and now the **designs** of the Nephites **were** to support their lands"—that is, *designs* instead of *design.* Note in particular that the two preceding verses have the plural *designs:*

| Alma 43:7 | to the accomplishment of his **designs** |
| Alma 43:8 | his **designs** were to stir up the Lamanites to anger |

But as explained under Alma 10:17, either singular *design* or plural *designs* is possible. Moreover, there is a strong tendency to use *design* rather than *designs* when there is more than one person (the statistics here are based on the earliest readings):

▫ the **design** of more than one person:
    "their design"   Alma 10:17, Alma 52:2, Helaman 4:19,
                           3 Nephi 4:22, 3 Nephi 4:24, Mormon 1:12
    "the design of the Nephites"   Alma 43:9

▫ the **designs** of more than one person:
    "our designs"   Alma 57:12

Thus the reference to "the design of the Nephites", with its singular *design,* is expected. On the other hand, with only one person, the possibility of either *design* or *designs* is about the same:

□ the **design** of one person:

"his design" Alma 48:3, Helaman 2:9

"the design of Moroni" Alma 55:16

□ the **designs** of one person:

"his designs" Alma 43:7, Alma 43:8, Alma 47:16,
Alma 48:2, Alma 52:17

Textually, there is only one example of variation in number for the word *design(s),* namely, in Alma 10:17 where the 1830 typesetter replaced *design* with *designs* (see the discussion under that passage). The scribes themselves never varied the number for *design(s).* Although it is possible that *design* here in Alma 43:9 is an error for *designs,* the earliest text supports *design.* The singular *design* is expected with a group of people, and proximity seems to have determined the choice of *were* after *Nephites.* The critical text will therefore maintain the earliest reading ("and now the **design** of the Nephites **were** to support their lands"), despite its nonstandard subject-verb agreement.

We should briefly note here the reading in the 1841 British edition where the phrase "the design of" was accidentally omitted, giving the impossible "and now the Nephites was to support their lands". In fact, the 1841 typesetter placed a comma after *the Nephites.* The source for his error of omission here is found in the previous line in his copytext, the 1837 edition; the 1841 typesetter momentarily let his eye stray up one line where the text correctly reads *the Nephites* followed by a comma:

Alma 43:8–9 (1837 typesetting, with bolding added)

gain power over **the Nephites,** by bringing them into bondage, &c. And now the design of **the Nephites** was to support their lands, and their houses, and their

This distraction caused him to omit "the design of" and to add a comma after *the Nephites* in the next line. The following LDS edition (1849) restored the phrase "the design of" and removed the extraneous comma.

Summary: Maintain in Alma 43:9 the reading of the earliest text, "the design of the Nephites were"; despite the subject-verb disagreement, the singular *design* is expected and the use of *were* in proximity to the plural *Nephites* is possible in the original text.

■ **Alma 43:9**

[*&* > NULL 0| 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
yea [*&* 01|*and* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *also their liberty*

Initially in the original manuscript, Oliver Cowdery started to write "and also their liberty". But after writing the ampersand for the *and,* he crossed it out, then wrote inline *yea &* followed by the rest of the text. His correction was therefore immediate. He seems to have been influenced by the lack of *yea* in the preceding text:

Alma 43:9

> that they might preserve them from the hands of their enemies
> **and also** that they might preserve their rights and their privileges

Since either reading, with or without the *yea*, is possible for the following *that*-clause, there would have been no motivation for Oliver to have consciously inserted the *yea*. The critical text will follow the corrected reading in 𝄞.

Summary: Maintain in Alma 43:9 the corrected reading in 𝄞, "**yea** and also their liberty".

■ **Alma 43:10**

for they knew that if they should fall into the hands of the Lamanites
that [*whosoever* 1ABCEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST | *whomsoever* D] *should worship God*
in spirit and in truth / the true and the living God
the Lamanites would destroy

In noun clauses headed by a *wh*-word such as *who(m)soever,* standard English grammar determines the case for the *wh*-word by its role within the noun clause, not by the role of the noun clause within the sentence. Here in Alma 43:10, *whosoever* is correct according to standard grammar because it serves as the subject in the noun clause ("whosoever should worship God"). But within the sentence, the noun clause serves as the direct object (inverting the word order, we have "the Lamanites would destroy whosoever should worship God"). The typesetter for the 1841 British edition replaced *whosoever* with *whomsoever,* perhaps because he noticed that the noun clause was the direct object. This change was rejected in the following LDS edition (1849). As noted in the discussion under Alma 3:17 and elsewhere, the critical text will follow the earliest textual sources in determining the case for *wh*-words rather than follow (when forced to) the sometimes arcane rules of prescriptive grammar for determining case. Here in Alma 43:10, the earliest reading happens to be in accord with those rules.

Summary: Maintain the subject form *whosoever* in Alma 43:10 since this is the reading of the earliest textual sources.

■ **Alma 43:12**

therefore they gave them
[*lands* 01ABCDEFGIJLMNOPQRST | *land* HK] *for their inheritance*

Here the 1874 RLDS edition replaced the plural *lands* with the singular *land,* perhaps unintentionally. As discussed under 2 Nephi 9:2, either singular or plural is possible in this context. There are 13 other examples that use the plural *lands* in referring to one's inheritance, including one more with the verb *give:* "and they did nourish them and did clothe them and did give unto them **lands** for their inheritance" (Alma 35:9). Here in Alma 43:12, the 1908 RLDS edition restored the original plural to the RLDS text.

Summary: Maintain in Alma 43:12 the original plural *lands* in the expression "lands for their inheritance".

■ **Alma 43:13**

and thus the Nephites were compelled alone to withstand against the Lamanites
which were a [compounds 0 | compound 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] of Laman
    and Lemuel and the sons of Ishmael
and all those which had dissented from the Nephites

In the original manuscript, *compound* ends in an *s* that shows no sign of erasure. Nonetheless, this appears to be an error on Oliver Cowdery's part. We have other evidence of Oliver accidentally adding an *s* to a word, as in the following clear examples:

PASSAGE	MANUSCRIPT READING	SOURCE
1 Nephi 22:17	unto the **destructions** of their enemies	℗*
Alma 21:5	there arose an **Amalekites**	℗
Alma 22:29	round about on the wilderness **sides**	℗
Alma 30:47	thy **souls** should be lost	℗*
Alma 41:2	the plan . . . is **requisites** with . . .	℗*
Alma 47:1	to go to **battles**	℗*
Alma 50:32	he would obtain **possessions** of . . .	℗*
Alma 51:4	there arose a warm **disputes**	℗
Alma 51:21	and the **prides** of those people	℗*

I have not been able to find evidence on the online Oxford English Dictionary or on *Literature Online* <lion.chadwyck.com> for such usage as "a compounds of X and Y". The phrase "a compounds of X and Y" occasionally occurs on <google.com>, but these instances all appear to be typos, simple slips as here in Alma 43:13. When Oliver copied the text from ℗ into ℗, he substituted the expected *compound;* the critical text will follow this emendation.

Summary: Maintain in Alma 43:13 the expression "a compound of X and Y"; the plural *compounds,* the reading in ℗, is probably a simple scribal error; occasionally in the manuscripts, Oliver Cowdery accidentally added a word-final *s* to nouns and adjectives.

■ **Alma 43:13–14**

and thus the Nephites were compelled alone to withstand against the Lamanites
which were a compound of Laman and Lemuel and the sons of Ishmael
and all those which had [desented >jg dissented 1 | dissented ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
    from the Nephites
which were Amlicites and Zoramites
and the [desendants 01 | descendants ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] of the priests of Noah
now those [desenters 0 | desendants 1 | descendants ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
were as numerous nearly as were the Nephites

At the beginning of Alma 43:14, the original manuscript reads *desenters,* which Oliver Cowdery miscopied into the printer's manuscript as *desendants;* in other words, he ended up replacing *dissenters* with *descendants.* This mistake (a visual error) was facilitated by the similar spelling Oliver used for both these words. Notice that earlier in this verse Oliver wrote *dissented* as *desented*

in 𝔓 (but which the 1830 typesetter respelled in 𝔓 as *dissented*). Moreover, at the end of verse 13, Oliver spelled *descendants* as *desendants* in both manuscripts. The proximity of this last instance prompted the error at the beginning of verse 14.

Here we have a clear example where the current text states a highly improbable increase in population. It is at most only a couple of generations since the priests of Noah (the Amulonites) got their start, yet the current text states that by this time their descendants were nearly as numerous as the Nephites! On the other hand, the original manuscript makes perfectly good sense when it claims that there had been so many dissenters over the years that now these Nephite dissenters had become nearly as populous as the remaining Nephites. The original, correct reading thus shows how precarious the situation had become for the Nephites.

Summary: Restore in Alma 43:14 the reading of the original manuscript: "now those **dissenters** were as numerous nearly as were the Nephites"; here the text is referring to the total number of Nephite dissenters, which includes the descendants of king Noah's priests.

■ **Alma 43:15**

behold the armies of the Nephites were prepared to meet them
in the land [*of* 01ABCDEFHIJKLMNOPQRST | G] *Jershon*

Here the 1858 Wright edition omitted the *of* in the phrase "the land of Jershon". As discussed under Alma 27:22–24, either reading is possible. We therefore follow the earliest textual sources in determining whether the *of* should be here in Alma 43:15.

Summary: Maintain in Alma 43:15 the *of* in "the land of Jershon" since this is the reading of the earliest textual sources (including 𝒪).

■ **Alma 43:16**

now the leader of the Nephites or the man which had been appointed
to be [*the* 01ABCDEFGIJLMNOPQRST | HK] *chief captain over the Nephites . . .*

Here the 1874 RLDS edition removed the definite article *the* from before *chief captain,* which is what we expect in English. Such usage is normal in the Book of Mormon text:

Alma 4:17	and he was appointed chief judge
Alma 16:5	he that had been appointed chief captain over the armies of the Nephites
Alma 43:17	he was appointed chief commander over the armies of the Nephites
Alma 49:16	Moroni had appointed Lehi to be chief captain over the men of that city
Alma 50:39	he was appointed chief judge and governor over the people
Alma 52:3	the brother of Amalickiah was appointed king over the people

But the definite article is still possible:

Mosiah 29:42	Alma was appointed to be **the** chief judge

Here in Alma 43:16, the 1908 RLDS edition restored the *the* to the RLDS text. For each case of this construction, the critical text will follow the earliest extant reading.

Summary: Maintain in Alma 43:16 the definite article *the* before *chief captain,* the reading of the earliest textual sources (including ☉); although not frequent, this usage can be found elsewhere in the text.

■ **Alma 43:17**

and Moroni took all the command
and the [*goverments* 01 | *governments* ABCGHKPS | *government* DEFIJLMNOQRT] *of their wars*

Both manuscripts as well as the early editions and the RLDS textual tradition have the plural *governments,* which is unexpected in current English. The 1841 British edition replaced the plural with the expected singular, and the LDS text continues to have the singular *government.* One could argue that here Oliver Cowdery accidentally added a plural *s* in ☉, just as he apparently did nearby for the word *compound* (see under Alma 43:13).

On the other hand, the plural *governments* is found in one other place in the text:

Helaman 5:2
for as their laws and their [*goverment* > *goverments* 1 |
governments ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] were established
by the voice of the people . . .

☉ is not extant for this second occurrence, but it probably read in the plural (as it does here in Alma 43:17). When Oliver Cowdery copied the text from ☉ into 𝓟 in the Helaman passage, he initially wrote the expected singular, *government* (spelled as *goverment,* according to normal pronunciation). Virtually immediately Oliver corrected the number by inserting inline the plural *s* (there is no difference in the level of ink flow for the *s*). Since the plural is the difficult reading, ☉ probably read in the plural in Helaman 5:2. And there the plural has been maintained in the text, perhaps because it is conjoined with the plural *laws* ("their laws and their governments"). Here in Alma 43:17, *governments* is conjoined with the singular noun *command,* which may help explain the replacement of *governments* with *government.* But the plural definitely appears to be intended in both Alma 43:17 and Helaman 5:2 and will be followed in the critical text.

The Oxford English Dictionary lists the following relevant definition (3a) under *government:* 'the office or function of governing or ruling; authority to govern'. This definition clearly applies to Helaman 5:2 ("their laws and their governments"). Then the OED adds a more specific definition, one marked as obsolete: "the command of an army or fortress" (with at least one citation, from James Tyrrell in 1700: "he was persuaded to accept the government of Dover castle"). It is this restricted sense of *government* under definition 3a which is apparently being used in Alma 43:17: there were multiple armies and fortresses as well as multiple wars that Moroni had the government of, so the plural phraseology "the governments of their wars" can apply to Moroni.

Summary: Restore in Alma 43:17 the plural *governments,* the reading of all the earliest sources (including ☉); Helaman 5:2 provides additional support for the use of the plural *governments* in the Book of Mormon text.

■ **Alma 43:17**

and he was only twenty and five years old
when he was appointed chief [*Commander* 0A | *captain* 1BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
over the armies of the Nephites

Here we have one of the clearest examples showing that the 16-page signature (number 22) for the 1830 edition was proofed against 𝓞 rather than against 𝓟. The original manuscript is extant here and reads *commander* (the initial *c* is capitalized). When Oliver Cowdery copied from 𝓞 into 𝓟, he replaced *commander* with *captain,* probably accidentally. He was undoubtedly influenced by the two occurrences of *chief captain* in the preceding verse, both in reference to Moroni:

> Alma 43:16
> now the leader of the Nephites or the man which had been appointed
> to be the **chief captain** over the Nephites
> —now the **chief captain** took the command of all the armies of the Nephites—
> and his name was Moroni

For a summary of the evidence that the 1830 edition was here proofed against 𝓞, see the discussion under Alma 42:31.

For the 1837 edition, the incorrect reading in 𝓟, *chief captain,* was restored to the text. This change was the result of the fact that 𝓟 rather than 𝓞 was used as the reference text for the 1837 edition. All subsequent editions have followed this reading. Elsewhere in the text, *chief captain* (as a singular) occurs eight times (including the two instances in verse 16). But *chief commander* is also found elsewhere in the text:

> Alma 46:11   Moroni which was the **chief commander** of the armies of the Nephites
> Alma 47:19   the Lamanites appointed Amalickiah to be their leader
> and their **chief commander**

So there is nothing wrong with the use of *chief commander* in Alma 43:17, especially since this same title is used once more in Alma 46:11 to refer to Moroni. The critical text will restore in Alma 43:17 the reading of the original manuscript, *chief commander.*

Summary: In accord with the reading in 𝓞, restore *chief commander* in Alma 43:17.

■ **Alma 43:20**

now the army of Zerahemnah was not prepared with any such thing
they had [NULL > *only* 01 | *only* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *their swords and their scimitars*
their bows and their arrows
their stones and their slings
[*but* 01ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQS | *and* RT] *they were naked*
save it were a skin which was girded about their loins

In both manuscripts, Oliver Cowdery initially omitted the *only;* and in both instances, he virtually immediately supplied the *only* by supralinear insertion (there is no change in the level of ink flow in either case). There would have been no motivation to consciously emend the text here by

adding *only* since there is nothing unusual about the initially written text. Elsewhere in the manuscripts, Oliver occasionally omitted *only:*

> Alma 57:2 (initially omitted in 𝓟)
>
> and that we would [*only* 0ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST | NULL > *only* 1]
> deliver up our prisoners on exchange
>
> Alma 58:22 (initially omitted in both 𝓞 and 𝓟)
>
> now this was done because the Lamanites did suffer their whole army
> save a few guards [*to* > NULL 0 | 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
> [*only* 0ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST | NULL >+ *only* 1]
> to be led away into the wilderness

In the second example, after writing "save a few guards" in 𝓞, Oliver started to write "to be led away into the wilderness"; that is, he wrote "save a few guards to", then immediately crossed out the *to* and wrote inline "only to be led away into the wilderness". And when Oliver copied the text from 𝓞 into 𝓟, he once more initially omitted the *only*. This time he made the correction sometime later by supralinearly inserting the *only* and with somewhat heavier ink flow; he probably caught this error when he proofed 𝓟 against 𝓞. But the important point of the example in Alma 58:22 is that Oliver twice omitted the *only,* initially in both 𝓞 and 𝓟. Thus we have firm support for the possibility of omitting *only* in both manuscripts for Alma 43:20.

This passage compares the battle preparations between the Nephites and the Lamanites. Both have the same kinds of weapons, but the Nephites have protective armor and clothing (as described in verses 18–19). On the other hand, the Lamanites are virtually naked. The original text uses *but* in this passage when making this comparison: "**but** they were naked save it were a skin which was girded about their loins". In the 1920 LDS edition, this *but* was emended to *and,* undoubtedly because the *only* earlier in the verse already implies that they will be lacking the protective armor and clothing. Nonetheless, the use of the redundant *but* is intended here and will be restored in the critical text. For a nearby example of this same kind of editing of *but* to *and* in the 1920 edition, see under Alma 42:30. In both passages, the *but* does not reverse a previously implied negative (either another *but* or an *only*) but acts to continue the scope of the negation. In these two cases, we have a kind of multiple negation, which otherwise occurred quite frequently in the text of the Book of Mormon; for further discussion, see under NEGATION in volume 3.

Summary: Restore the original *but* in Alma 43:20; even though there is a preceding *only,* the scope of the implied negation of the *only* is continued by the use of the *but.*

■ **Alma 43:21**

therefore they were exceeding [*fraid* 01BCDG | *afraid* AEFHIJKLMNOPQRST]
of the armies of the Nephites

The original text shows variation between *afraid* and nonstandard *fraid*. The standard *afraid* is found in every passage (seven of them) that quotes from the book of Isaiah (the King James Bible consistently has *afraid,* never *fraid*):

2 Nephi 8:7 (Isaiah 51:7)	neither be ye afraid of their revilings
2 Nephi 8:12 (Isaiah 51:12)	that thou shouldst be afraid of man
2 Nephi 18:12 (Isaiah 8:12)	neither fear ye their fear nor be afraid
2 Nephi 20:24 (Isaiah 10:24)	be not afraid of the Assyrian
2 Nephi 20:29 (Isaiah 10:29)	Ramah is afraid
2 Nephi 22:2 (Isaiah 12:2)	I will trust and not be afraid
2 Nephi 23:8 (Isaiah 13:8)	and they shall be afraid

In all these examples, the expression is of the general form "be afraid".

In nonbiblical passages in the Book of Mormon, there are four instances of *fraid* in the earliest text and two of the standard *afraid:*

Alma 42:19
would he [*fear >% be a fraid* 0 | *be afraid* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]

Alma 42:20
men would not be [*afraid* 0ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST | *afrade* 1] to sin

Alma 43:21
they were exceeding [*fraid* 01BCDG | *afraid* AEFHIJKLMNOPQRST]
of the armies of the Nephites

Alma 47:2
they were exceeding [*fraid* 01ABCDGHKPS | *afraid* EFIJLMNOQRT]

Alma 58:24
they were exceeding [*fraid* 01ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQS | *afraid* RT]

Helaman 4:3
the Lamanites were exceeding [*fraid* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQS | *afraid* RT]

Note that the two cases of *afraid* are of the general form "be afraid" (just like the seven cases in the biblical quotes), but the four cases of original *fraid* occur in the more specific expression "be **exceeding** fraid". Thus there is a systematic difference in the usage for *afraid* and *fraid* in the original text.

The emendation of *fraid* to *afraid* has been very unsystematic in the printed editions; I list here which editions made the change to *afraid:*

Alma 43:21	1830, 1849 LDS, 1874 RLDS
Alma 47:2	1849 LDS
Alma 58:24	1920 LDS
Helaman 4:3	1920 LDS

Except for the first case, the RLDS text retains the original *fraid,* while the LDS text now has only *afraid.* Note, in particular, that for Alma 43:21 the 1837 edition reverted to the original *fraid*, a restoration of the reading in 𝓟, which implies that Joseph Smith, the editor for the 1837 edition, did not consider *fraid* as nonstandard. Of course, in the 1800s the form *fraid* was very common in colloquial and nonstandard speech, as it is even today. The critical text will restore the four instances of original *fraid* in the Book of Mormon text.

The Oxford English Dictionary, under *frayed,* lists examples of *fraid* from about 1300 on, including these examples from Early Modern English:

> John Berners (1523)
>
> > all the country was **so fraid** that every man drew to the fortresses

> John Heywood (1546)
>
> > he shall let fall all and be **more fraid** than hurt

> Edward Topsell (1608)
>
> > the ape is **as fraid** thereof as it is of the snail

In these examples, *fraid* is modified by a preceding adverbial element (*so, more,* or *as*), which seems to have favored the omission of the initial *a* in *fraid.* One could argue that we have a similar kind of preceding adverbial, namely *exceeding,* in the four Book of Mormon instances of *fraid.* In the nine original cases of *afraid,* there is no preceding adverbial that modifies *afraid,* thus allowing more readily the initial unstressed *a* of *afraid.*

Summary: Restore the four original instances of *fraid,* all in the expression "<plural subject> were exceeding fraid": Alma 43:21, Alma 47:2, Alma 58:24, and Helaman 4:3; otherwise, the text has *afraid* (nine times), all without any preceding *exceeding.*

■ **Alma 43:22–23**

for they did not suppose that the armies of Moroni would know
[*whither* 01ABDEFHIJKLMNOPQRST | *whether* CG] *they had gone . . .*
and Moroni also knowing of the prophecies of Alma sent certain men unto him
desiring him that he should inquire of the Lord
[*whither* 1ABDEFIJLMNOPQRST | *whether* CGHK] *the armies of the Nephites should go*
to defend themselves against the Lamanites

> As explained under 1 Nephi 22:4, for certain instances of *whither* and *whether* there has been some confusion over which word is intended. Here in Alma 43:22–23, the context clearly indicates that *whither,* meaning 'where to', is the correct reading: Moroni has decided that he will confront the attacking Lamanites; he only wants to know where they are going to attack. Nonetheless, for both these examples of *whither,* the 1840 edition replaced *whither* with *whether* (and the 1858 Wright edition, set from the 1840 edition, continued these two instances of *whether*). In the 1874 RLDS edition, the correct *whither* was restored for the first instance, in verse 22, but the incorrect *whether* was continued in verse 23. In the 1908 RLDS edition, the correct *whither* in the second instance was finally restored to the RLDS text.

Summary: Maintain *whither* both times in Alma 43:22–23 since the context clearly indicates that the issue is where the Lamanites are going to attack.

■ **Alma 43:23**

and Moroni also knowing of the prophecies of Alma sent certain men unto him
[*desireing him* 0 | 1 | *desiring him* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
that he should inquire of the Lord whither the armies of the Nephites should go

When Oliver Cowdery copied the text here from 𝒪 into 𝒫, he accidentally omitted *desiring him*. His eye seems to have skipped from the first *him* ("unto him") to the second one ("desiring him"). But the 1830 edition reads *desiring him,* a clear indication that the 1830 edition was here proofed against 𝒪, not 𝒫 (as discussed more comprehensively under Alma 42:31). The 22nd signature for the 1830 edition was, however, set from 𝒫. In fact, there is proof in that manuscript that the 1830 edition was originally set to read "unto him that he should inquire". When the compositor filled up his composing stick with type (from 11 to 13 lines of type), he would typically make a small cut in his copytext (here the printer's manuscript) to show where he currently was in his typesetting. In Alma 43:23, this small cut in 𝒫 occurs after *that he should* (which is missing the words *desiring him*). But the actual printed 1830 edition ends the line with *desiring him.* This shows that originally the compositor strictly followed the printer's manuscript (that is, his 12th line of type originally read "prophecies of Alma, sent certain men unto him that he should"), but in the process of proofing against the original manuscript it was discovered that *desiring him* needed to be added, so the words *that he should* were shifted downward into the next line (and at least some of the remaining lines in the paragraph also had to be shifted). In order to represent the position in 𝒫 of this particular cut mark, I insert a check mark (√) into the two lines as set in the 1830 edition:

   □ 1830 edition, as originally set from 𝒫

   prophecies of Alma, sent certain men unto him that he should √
   inquire of the Lord whither the armies of the Nephites should

   □ 1830 edition, after proofing against 𝒪

   prophecies of Alma, sent certain men unto him, desiring him
   that he should √ inquire of the Lord whither the armies of Ne-

For further discussion regarding these cut marks in 𝒫, see pages 17–18 of volume 2 of the critical text (also see page 17 of volume 1).

Summary: Maintain in Alma 43:23 the participial phrase *desiring him,* the reading of the original manuscript.

■ **Alma 43:24**

and Alma informed the [*messengers* 1ABCDEFGIJLMNOQRT | *messenger* HKPS] *of Moroni*
that the armies of the Lamanites were marching round about in the wilderness

The 1874 RLDS edition accidentally changed the plural *messengers* to the singular *messenger;* this incorrect reading has persisted in the RLDS text. The surrounding sentences, listed as 1 and 3 below, clearly show that the plural listed under 2 is correct:

Alma 43:23–24

(1) and Moroni also knowing of the prophecies of Alma sent **certain men** unto him . . .

(2) and Alma informed **the messengers** of Moroni that . . .

(3) and **those messengers** went and delivered the message unto Moroni

Summary: Maintain in Alma 43:24 the plural *messengers,* the reading in the earliest textual sources (including ᗉ); the nearby text consistently refers to the messengers in the plural.

■ **Alma 43:24**

and Alma informed the messengers of Moroni
that the armies of the Lamanites were marching
[*around > round* ᗉ | *round* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *about in the wilderness*

Here Oliver Cowdery initially wrote *around about* in ᗉ, but virtually immediately he corrected the *around* to *round* by crossing out the *a* (there is no change in the level of ink flow). As discussed under 1 Nephi 8:13, in most instances the phrase *around about* seems to have been due to Joseph Smith.

■ **Alma 43:24**

that they might commence an **attackt**
upon the [*more weak* 01ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQS | *weaker* RT] *part of the people*

The word *attack* always appears in extant portions of ᗉ with an extra *t* at the end of the word, spelled as either *attackt* or *attact.* And in most cases, Oliver Cowdery copied the word as *attackt* into ᗭ. The 1830 typesetter consistently removed this dialectal form from the text. As explained under Alma 49:10, the critical text will systematically restore the dialectal *attackt* to the text, although it is possible that this form of the word is a result of dialectal overlay (that is, Joseph Smith could have consistently misread the word *attack* as *attackt.*

Originally this passage here in Alma 43:24 had the nonstandard comparative form, *more weak.* The 1920 LDS edition replaced *more weak* with *weaker.* Elsewhere in the text, there are no other examples of *weaker* or *more weak,* but there are three examples of the superlative *weakest* (yet none of *most weak*). Thus the 1920 change to *weaker* is consistent with the superlative usage in the text, *weakest.*

There are two other places where the original text uses the periphrastic *more* or *most* for comparison, but both instances have been edited, again in the 1920 LDS edition, to the appropriate inflectional form, ending in either *-er* or *-est:*

Alma 49:20

a body of their [*most strong* 01ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQS | *strongest* RT] men

3 Nephi 5:9

and a [*more short* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQS | *shorter* RT] but a true account
was given by Nephi

When we consider the rest of the text for the adjective *strong,* we find six instances of *stronger* and three of *strongest* in the original text but none of *strong* with *more* or *most,* so once more the change to the inflectional form *strongest* is consistent with usage elsewhere in the text. On the other hand, there are no more occurrences in the text of the comparative or superlative for the adjective *short.* Of course, the 1920 change from *more short* to *shorter* was based not on usage elsewhere in the text but on modern English usage.

There are other cases in the Book of Mormon of periphrastic comparison where modern readers might expect inflectional comparison, yet none of these have been edited:

1 Nephi 17:34	our fathers would have been **more choice** than they
Alma 38:8	I was three days and three nights in the **most bitter** pain
Alma 44:5	and by all that is **most dear** unto us
Helaman 3:34	which did cause the **more humble** part of the people to suffer . . .
Mormon 9:31	that ye may learn to be **more wise** than that which we have been

All of the examples, both edited and unedited, show that the original Book of Mormon text had a stronger tendency towards the periphrastic *more* and *most* than what we might expect in modern English. In each case, the critical text will follow the earliest textual sources in determining the appropriate type of comparison, thus *more weak* in Alma 43:24, *most strong* in Alma 49:20, and *more short* in 3 Nephi 5:9 (as well as in other instances, listed above, that have never been edited). For further discussion, see under COMPARISON OF ADJECTIVES in volume 3.

Summary: Restore all original instances of the periphrastic comparative that have been edited to the corresponding inflectional comparative (namely, *more weak* in Alma 43:24, *most strong* in Alma 49:20, and *more short* in 3 Nephi 5:9).

■ **Alma 43:25**

now Moroni leaving a part of his army in the land of Jershon
lest by any means a part of the Lamanites should come
into [*that* 1ABCDEFHIJKLMNOPQRST | *the* G] *land and take possession of the city . . .*

The 1858 Wright edition replaced "into **that** land" with "into **the** land", perhaps because of the preceding "**the** land of Jershon" or the following "**the** city". The 1874 RLDS edition restored the original *that,* the reading of the 1840 edition (the 1874 RLDS edition derives from both the 1840 edition and the 1858 Wright edition). Either reading is theoretically possible, so we follow the earliest extant source (in this case 𝓟).

Summary: Maintain in Alma 43:25 the determiner *that* in the phrase "into **that** land".

■ **Alma 43:25**

now Moroni leaving a part of his army in the land of Jershon
lest by any means a part of the Lamanites should come into that land and take possession of the city
[*& Moroni* 0 | *& Moroni* >js NULL 1 | *and Moroni* A | BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
took the remainder part of his army and marched over into the land of Manti

In this sentence, the original subject, *Moroni,* is immediately followed by a present participial clause ("leaving a part of his army in the land of Jershon") plus a subordinate *lest*-clause ("lest by any means a part of the Lamanites should come into that land and take possession of the city"). When the text finally provides the predicate for *Moroni,* we get a Hebrew-like connector, *and,* and a repetition of the original subject (thus "**and Moroni** took the remainder part of his army and marched over into the land of Manti"). In his editing here for the 1837 edition, Joseph Smith removed the non-English use of *and* as well as the repeated subject, *Moroni.* A similar instance of this kind of construction (connective *and* and a repeated subject) is found earlier in the text:

> 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* >js *& Ammon he* 1 | *and Ammon* A |
>   *he* BCDEFGHIJKLMNOQRT | *He* PS] fell upon his knees

In that instance, Joseph removed the *and* but replaced the repeated name *Ammon* with the subject pronoun *he* (thus maintaining a form of the redundancy). For both Alma 19:14 and Alma 43:25, the critical text will restore the Hebrew-like *and* and the repeated name. For further discussion of this use of *and,* see under HEBRAISMS in volume 3.

Summary: Restore in Alma 43:25 the connective *and* and the repeated subject, *Moroni;* such usage can be found elsewhere in the original text of the Book of Mormon.

■ **Alma 43:25**

now Moroni leaving **a part** *of his army in the land of Jershon*
lest by any means a part of the Lamanites should come into that land and take possession of the city
and Moroni took the [*remainder part / remaining part* 0 |
   remainder part 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQS | *remaining part* RT] *of his army*
and marched over into the land of Manti

The original manuscript is fragmented here where the printer's manuscript reads *remainder part.* Most of this noun phrase is found on one fairly large fragment, and the most plausible word seems to be *remainder* followed by the descender of the *p* for the following word, *part.* Yet it is possible that the original manuscript actually reads *remaining part.* The *d* is definitely there, although only partially extant. It is clear that 𝓞 does not read *remaining part.* The alternative reading *remaining part* is theoretically possible because in Oliver Cowdery's hand the final *e* in

remainder could be an undotted *i* with a loop and the *r* could be an *n;* and because of the fragmented nature of the extant leaf, the descender of the *p* could actually be the descender of a *g*. Nonetheless, the more likely possibility is that the actual word is *remainder,* especially since a scribal error like *remainding,* it seems to me, would be quite implausible.

When we look at other places in the text where we have *part,* we find five cases where the text first refers to a part of something (either "a part" or "the more part"), then later refers to the remainder of that something but without repeating the word *part:*

> Alma 43:31–32
>> therefore he divided his army and brought **a part** over into the valley
>> and concealed them on the east and on the south of the hill Riplah
>> and **the remainder** he concealed in the west valley on the west of the river Sidon
>> and so down into the borders of the land Manti

> Alma 52:26
>> and thus Moroni had obtained a possession of the city Mulek with **a part** of his army
>> while he marched with **the remainder** to meet the Lamanites

> Alma 56:33
>> Antipus did march forth with **a part** of his army
>> leaving **the remainder** to maintain the city

> Alma 56:57
>> therefore we sent them to the land of Zarahemla
>> and **a part** of those men which were not slain of Antipus with them
>> and **the remainder** I took and joined them to my stripling Ammonites

> Helaman 15:6
>> **the more part** of them are doing this
>> and they are striving with unwearied diligence
>> that they may bring **the remainder** of their brethren to the knowledge of the truth

These five examples show that the expected form in Alma 43:25 is simply *the remainder,* not *the remainder part*. Nonetheless, it does appear that the word *part* was in the original manuscript. Only part of the *p* is extant (presuming the word is not *remainding*), but spacing between extant fragments indicates that *part* was most probably there. And, of course, the phrase *remainder part* is the reading in 𝓟. Nonetheless, if *remainder part* is an error, perhaps the best emendation would be to drop the word *part* rather than change *remainder* to *remaining* (the emendation adopted by the editors for the 1920 LDS edition).

Except for the case here in Alma 43:25, the noun *remainder* is always a head noun (57 times) and never premodifies another noun. It turns out that there are two occurrences of *remaining,* but these act as a postmodifying past participle (not as a premodifying adjectival participle):

> Alma 60:27 yea if there be even a spark of freedom **remaining**
>
> Helaman 16:10 and the more part of the people **remaining** in their pride

Of particular importance here is the fact that *remainder part* can be found in textual sources from Early Modern English and from the 1830s. We have the following example from an early

17th-century translation of Seneca's epistles (found on *Literature Online* <lion.chadwyck.com>); the accidentals are here regularized:

> Thomas Lodge (1614)
>> how worthy a thing it is to consummate a man's life before death
>> than to expect security in **the remainder part** of his time
>> placed in the possession of a blessed life which is not made more blessed if longer

And from <morrisonspensions.org>, we have the following examples found in pension applications made during the 1830s from Revolutionary War veterans and sworn before justices of the peace in Montgomery county, New York state (original spellings and capitalization are here retained, but punctuation is ignored):

> Richard Loucks (2 August 1834)
>> a true and faithful soldier
>> for and during **the remainder part** of the Revolutionary War
>> to the full and Conclusion thereof

> George Saltsman (16 May 1836)
>> and that Claimant has been a faithful Soldier from the time he was enrolled
>> and for and during **the remainder Part** of the said War
>> to the final Conclusion thereof

> Conrad Kitts (16 May 1836)
>> and that he hath rendered good and faithful services to the United States
>> for and during **the remainder part** of the aforesaid Revolutionary War
>> to final conclusion thereof

The phrase *the remainder part* appears to be a set expression since the same general phraseology is repeated in these applications, with only minor variation: "for and during the remainder part of the Revolutionary War to the final conclusion thereof". Quite clearly, the phrase *the remainder part* is possible in Alma 43:25; the critical text will restore this unique instance of that phrase in the original text.

Summary: Restore the earliest text in Alma 43:25 with its phrase *the remainder part* (the reading in 𝓟 and the apparent reading in 𝓞); although an unusual phrase today (except in technical language, as in mathematics), this expression can be found in Early Modern English as well as in legal language contemporary with the Book of Mormon translation.

■ **Alma 43:30**

and he also knowing that it was the only desire of the Nephites to preserve their lands
[& 0| 1PS|*and* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOQRT] *their liberty and their church*
therefore he thought it no sin that he should defend them by stratagem

The original manuscript is extant here, and there is an *and* (written as an ampersand) between *their lands* and *their liberty* (thus we have a series of *and*'s: "their lands **and** their liberty **and** their church"). The printer's manuscript, on the other hand, is lacking the first of these *and*'s, but the

1830 edition has it. Since either reading is theoretically possible, it is likely that the *and* was restored to the text when the 1830 signature (the 22nd) was proofed against 𝒪 (see the discussion under Alma 42:31). The 1908 RLDS edition removed the *and* here because it is not found in 𝒫, the source for making most of the substantive corrections in the 1908 RLDS edition.

Summary: Maintain in Alma 43:30 the original *and* that conjoined *their lands* and *their liberty*.

■ **Alma 43:32**

and so down into the borders of the land [01ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRT | *of* s] *Manti*

As discussed under Alma 27:22–24, the original text allows for the phrase "the land X" (that is, without any *of*). Although the *of* was added here in the 1953 RLDS edition, the critical text will maintain the earliest reading, "the land Manti". Elsewhere, the text has only "the land **of** Manti" (nine times), so this example without the *of* is unique for the phrase "the land (of) Manti".

Summary: Maintain in Alma 43:32 the unique instance of "the land Manti", the reading of the earliest textual source, the original manuscript.

■ **Alma 43:35**

and it came to pass that as the Lamanites **had passed** *the hill Riplah*
and [*came* 0ART | *came* >js *come* 1 | *come* BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQS] *into the valley*
and **began** *to cross the river Sidon*
the army which was concealed on the south of the hill
which was led by a man whose name was Lehi
and he led his army forth and encircled the Lamanites about on the east in their rear

Here the earliest text (as found in 𝒪) reads "as the Lamanites had passed the hill Riplah and **came** into the valley and **began** to cross the river Sidon". In his editing for the 1837 edition, Joseph Smith emended *came* to *come,* which has been the reading in the printed editions until the 1920 LDS edition restored the original *came* to the LDS text. Here one can, in theory at least, interpret the original *came* as either the simple past-tense form ("and [they] came into the valley") or the past participial form *came* ("and [they had] came into the valley"). Although the latter usage is non-standard, the original text had perfective verb phrases like "had came" (see the discussion under 1 Nephi 5:1, 4). In fact, one could interpret the following instance of *began* as actually the past participle for the verb *begin* (that is, "and [they had] began to cross the river Sidon", equivalent to "and [they had] begun to cross the river Sidon"). There is also evidence in the text for "had began" (see the discussion under Jacob 2:12).

In this passage, the critical text will restore the original *came* and maintain the *began,* but without textually resolving whether *came* and *began* are simple past-tense forms or past participles (or a past participle followed by a simple past-tense form, as in Joseph Smith's editing for the 1837 edition). Any of these interpretations is theoretically possible. For some discussion, see the analysis under 1 Nephi 1:14 of "when my father **had read** and **saw** many great and marvelous

things". For a specific example of "and began" that may stand for "and [had] began", see the discussion under Jacob 5:17 for "and it **had sprang** forth and **began** to bear fruit". Also see the example in Alma 42:5 of "if Adam **had put forth** his hand immediately and **partook** of the tree of life".

Summary: Restore in Alma 43:35 the original *came,* despite its possible ambiguity: "as the Lamanites had passed the hill Riplah and **came** into the valley and began to cross the river Sidon".

■ **Alma 43:35**

and it came to pass that as the Lamanites had passed the hill Riplah
and came into the valley and began to cross the river Sidon
the army **which** *was concealed on the south of the hill*
[*whose* > NULL 0 | 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
[*who* 0A | *who* >js *which* 1 | *which* BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *was led*
by a man **whose** *name was Lehi*
[01 |; ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQS |, RT]
and he led his army forth and encircled the Lamanites about on the east in their rear

We first note here that this passage contains a sentence fragment: the noun phrase *the army,* followed by a series of relative clauses, is never completed. Instead, after describing the position of this other army and who its leader was, the text starts over, so to speak, with an independent clause ("and he led his army forth and encircled the Lamanites about on the east in their rear"). The preceding relative clauses have never been altered to eliminate the fragment. This construction appears to be fully intended and will be retained in the critical text.

A more substantive question in this passage is whether *who* is the appropriate relative pronoun to refer to *army* ("the army . . . **who** was led by a man whose name was Lehi"). Notice that the preceding relative clause has *which,* not *who:* "the army **which** was concealed on the south of the hill". Before writing the *who* in ⊙, Oliver Cowdery initially wrote *whose,* an error in anticipation of the following *whose* ("by a man **whose** name was Lehi"). Oliver immediately caught this error and crossed out the *whose,* then continued by writing inline *who.* It is possible that this *who* was an error for *which;* having just written *whose,* Oliver could have just crossed out the *se* of *whose* to get *who.* Instead, his intention could have been to write *which,* so he crossed out the entire *whose;* but because he had just written *whose,* he ended up writing *who.*

Except for this one case in Alma 43:35, the earliest text always uses the relative pronoun *which,* never *who,* to refer to an army or to armies (14 times):

Mosiah 23:30	the armies of the Lamanites **which** had followed after the people of king Limhi
Alma 43:35	the army **which** was concealed on the south of the hill
Alma 46:31	his armies **which** had gathered themselves together and armed themselves
Alma 47:3	that part of his army **which** was obedient unto his commands
Alma 47:30	the army **which** pursued after them
Alma 50:12	his armies **which** did increase daily
Alma 50:35	the army **which** was sent by Moroni

Alma 50:35   the army . . . **which** was led by a man whose name was Teancum

Alma 52:20   the army of the Lamanites **which** protected the city of Mulek

Alma 52:24   a part of his army **which** were with him

Alma 52:27   a small army **which** had been left to protect the city Bountiful

Alma 57:7   the army **which** was placed to protect the city Cumeni

Ether 15:15   they were all gathered together
           every one to the army **which** he would

Moroni 9:17   the army **which** is with me

In three of these cases, Joseph Smith emended the *which* to *who* (although Joseph changed his mind in the last of the three cases):

> Alma 46:31
>
> therefore Moroni thought it was expedient that he should take his armies
> [*which* 0A | *that* > *which* >js *who* 1 | *who* BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
> had gathered **themselves** together and armed **themselves**

> Alma 52:24
>
> behold Moroni commanded that a part of his army
> [*which* 0A | *which* >js *who* 1 | *who* BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] **were** with him
> should march forth into the city

> Alma 52:27
>
> and then they were met by Lehi and a small army
> [*which* 0ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST | *which* >js *who* >js *which* 1]
> had been left to protect the city Bountiful

In the two emendations that were kept, there are plural elements (set above in bold) that indicate that the individuals in the army are being considered, and thus the grammatical change to *who* is acceptable. But here in Alma 43:35 there are no plural elements to justify the use of *who*. (For further discussion of the possibility of treating an army as a unit or as a group of individuals, see under Mosiah 23:25.)

Of particular importance here is the striking similarity between the language of Alma 43:35 and Alma 50:35; in both cases, *army* is followed by two asyndetically conjoined relative clauses and, most importantly, the two instances of the second relative clause are perfectly parallel, providing we emend *who* to *which* in Alma 43:35:

Alma 43:35 (*who* emended to *which*)	Alma 50:35
the army	the army
which was concealed on the south of the hill	**which** was sent by Moroni
which was led by a man	**which** was led by a man
whose name was Lehi	**whose** name was Teancum

Since the *who* in 𝓞 for Alma 43:35 is readily explainable as a repeated error in anticipation of the following *whose,* the critical text will accept Joseph Smith's emendation of *who* to *which* in this passage as the reading of the original text.

Summary: Follow Joseph Smith's emendation of *who* to *which* in Alma 43:35 ("the army . . . **which** was led by a man whose name was Lehi"), which precisely parallels the construction in Alma 50:35: "the army . . . **which** was led by a man whose name was Teancum"; the *who* in Ⓞ for Alma 43:35 can be explained as the result of twice anticipating the following *whose;* the two relative clauses that modify *army* in this passage form a sentence fragment that has never been emended (and will be retained in the critical text).

■ **Alma 43:36**

and it came to pass that the Lamanites
when they saw the Nephites coming upon them in their rear
[NULL > *they* >+ NULL 0│ 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *turned them about*
and began to contend with the army of Lehi

Here in the original manuscript, Oliver Cowdery initially wrote the predicate "turned them about" after the *when*-clause. This predicate completes the original subject, *the Lamanites,* which precedes the *when*-clause. But virtually immediately, Oliver supralinearly inserted the repeated subject *they* in Ⓞ (there is no change in the level of ink flow for the pronoun *they*). Yet at some later time, Oliver crossed out both the insert mark and the supralinear *they.* The ink for the two crossouts is very much darker and heavier in flow. The ink is so distinctive that this correction does not look like it took place when Oliver read the text back to Joseph Smith; instead, it seems that here Oliver later decided to implement a grammatical change on his own. Perhaps the fact that he had earlier inserted the *they* made him think that this *they* was unnecessary. Later in this account of Zerahemnah's invasion into Nephite territory, there are two more examples of the repeated subject, both following an intervening *when*-clause (as originally here in Alma 43:36):

> Alma 43:54
> now Moroni when he saw their terror
> [*he* 0A│*he* >js NULL 1│ BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] commanded his men
> that they should stop shedding their blood

> Alma 44:19
> now Zerahemnah when he saw that they were all about to be destroyed
> [*he* >js NULL 1│*he* A│ BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] cried mightily unto Moroni

Oliver did not remove these two instances of the repeated subject, the pronoun *he.* He probably did not notice them since he did not initially omit them when he took down Joseph's dictation. Thus in these two cases, the repeated subject was allowed to stand in the manuscripts as well as in the 1830 edition; finally, in his editing for the 1837 edition, Joseph removed the repeated pronominal subject *he* in these two later instances. The critical text will restore these two instances of the repeated subject as well as the one here in Alma 43:36 for which the repeated subject was initially omitted but then virtually immediately added; its later deletion appears to be secondary. For further discussion of this structure, see under SUBJECT REPETITION in volume 3.

Summary: Restore the repeated subject, the pronoun *they,* in Alma 43:36; although initially omitted in Ⓞ, the pronoun was almost immediately supplied by Oliver Cowdery; only later did he consciously

decide to remove this instance of the repeated subject in ○; he left unchanged two nearby instances of the same construction, in Alma 43:54 and Alma 44:19; Joseph Smith later removed these two instances of the repeated subject, but the critical text will restore them.

■ **Alma 43:38**

while on the other hand there was now and then a man fell among the Nephites
by their [*wounds* 0 | *swords* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *and the loss of blood*

The original manuscript reads *wounds,* but Oliver Cowdery misread the word as *swords* when he copied the text from ○ into 𝒫. In the original text, the possessive pronoun *their* refers, of course, to the immediately preceding noun *Nephites.* This makes perfectly good sense. But when the text reads *swords,* the *their* must now be interpreted as referring not to the nearest noun *(Nephites),* but to *Lamanites,* which is found at some distance in the preceding verse after a long sequence of references to the Nephites. In the following, I mark the references to the Lamanites with an L and the references to the Nephites with an N:

> Alma 43:37–38 (the original text)
> > and the work of death commenced on both sides
> L but it was more dreadful on the part of **the Lamanites**
> L for **their nakedness** was exposed
> N to the heavy blows of **the Nephites**
> N with **their swords** and **their scimitars**
> > which brought death almost at every stroke
> N while on the other hand there was now and then a man fell among **the Nephites**
> N by **their wounds** and the loss of blood

Oliver was undoubtedly prompted to write the incorrect *their swords* in verse 38 because of the earlier *their swords* in verse 37 ("with their swords and their scimitars"), but that instance of *their swords* refers to the Nephites' swords. Of course, one cannot interpret the incorrect *their swords* in verse 38 as referring to the Nephites' own swords since there is no question of suicide in this passage.

Summary: Restore *wounds,* the reading of the original manuscript, in Alma 43:38: "there was now and then a man fell among the Nephites by their **wounds** and the loss of blood".

■ **Alma 43:38**

they being shielded from the more vital **parts** *of the body*
> □ *or the more vital* **parts** *of the body*   01ᶜABCDEFIJLMNOPQRST
> □ NULL   1*
> □ *or the more vital* **part** *of the body*   GHK

being shielded from the strokes of the Lamanites . . .

When Oliver Cowdery initially copied the text here from ○ into 𝒫, he skipped the nearly identical phrase "or the more vital parts of the body". Virtually immediately, he caught his error and

inserted supralinearly this long noun phrase in 𝓟 (there is no difference in the level of ink flow). 𝓞 is sufficiently extant here to show that Oliver's correction in 𝓟 was very likely the reading in 𝓞.

Here the 1858 Wright edition accidentally changed the plural *parts* to the singular *part*. The 1908 RLDS edition restored the plural to the RLDS text. The plural is obviously correct, given its occurrence in the immediately preceding attempt of Mormon to describe the advantage the Nephites had over the Lamanites ("they being shielded from the more vital **parts** of the body"), which Mormon revised by means of an *or*-corrective ("or the more vital **parts** of the body being shielded from the strokes of the Lamanites"). The only other reference in the text to parts of the body is semantically plural but singular in form: "and that **every part** of the body should be restored to itself" (Alma 41:2). The critical text will maintain the plural *parts* here in Alma 43:38.

Summary: Maintain in Alma 43:38 the plural *parts* in "the more vital parts of the body", which occurs twice in this passage.

■ **Alma 43:39**

and it came to pass that the Lamanites became frightened
because of the great [*destruction* 01ABCDEGHIJKLMNOPQRST | *destructions > destruction* F]
among them

In its first printing, the 1852 LDS edition introduced the plural *destructions* ("the Lamanites became frightened because of the great **destructions** among them"). This error was corrected in the second printing, perhaps as a result of checking the text against the 1840 edition. The plural *destructions* is theoretically possible, but usage elsewhere in the text shows that the plural here in Alma 43:39 is inappropriate (see the discussion under 1 Nephi 15:5).

Summary: Maintain the singular *destruction* in Alma 43:39, the reading of the earliest textual sources (including 𝓞).

■ **Alma 43:39**

even until they began to flee
[*toward > towards* 0 | *towards* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *the river Sidon*

As discussed under 1 Nephi 5:22, the critical text will choose between *towards* and *toward* on the basis of the earliest textual sources. In this instance, Oliver Cowdery initially wrote "toward the River Sidon" in 𝓞, then virtually immediately corrected *toward* to *towards* by inserting inline the word-final *s* (there is no change in the level of ink flow). The critical text will therefore accept the form *towards* in this case. In general, *towards* is much more frequent in the text than *toward*.

In a nearby passage, once more Oliver Cowdery initially wrote *toward* but then immediately corrected it to *towards,* this time in 𝓟; here 𝓞 is extant and reads *towards:*

> Alma 43:42
> the Lamanites did flee again before them
> [*towards* 0ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST | *toward > towards* 1] the land of Manti

That correction in 𝑃 for verse 42 is like the one here in 𝑂 for verse 39: the word-final *s* is inserted inline in 𝑃 (although at the end of a line); there is no change in the level of ink flow. Thus we have another virtually immediate correction of *toward* to *towards* and further evidence of Oliver's tendency to write *toward* in place of *towards*.

Summary: Maintain the form *towards* in Alma 43:39, the corrected reading in 𝑂; similarly, *towards* will be maintained in Alma 43:42.

■ **Alma 43:40**

> *and they were driven by Lehi*
> *into the* [*water > waters* 1 | *waters* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *of Sidon*
> *and they crossed the waters of Sidon*
> *and Lehi retained his armies*
> *upon the* [*banks >% bank* 1 | *bank* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *of the river Sidon*
> *that they should not cross*

As discussed under Alma 17:26, Oliver Cowdery sometimes wrote *waters* in the singular (as *water*). Evidence throughout the text argues that there are only instances of "the waters of X" in the original text, never "the water of X". Here in 𝑃 for Alma 43:40 (𝑂 is not extant for the word), Oliver initially wrote "water of Sidon" but then virtually immediately inserted the plural *s* inline; there is no change in the level of ink flow for this correction, just like in the examples of *toward(s)* discussed above.

Later in this passage, Oliver also initially wrote *bank* as the plural *banks* in 𝑃. In this instance, he erased the plural *s* (thus the correction was immediate). Either *bank* or *banks* is theoretically possible. The singular number is also consistent with other occurrences of riverbanks in the Book of Mormon. When referring to rivers rather than fortifications, there is only one occurrence in the text of the plural *banks*, and this is in 2 Nephi 18:7: "and he shall come up over all his channels and go over all his **banks**" (a quote from Isaiah 8:7 in the King James Bible). Otherwise, we have only the singular *bank* when referring to rivers:

1 Nephi 8:19	along the **bank** of the river
Alma 2:34	or rather the **bank** which was on the west of the river Sidon
Alma 3:3	upon the **bank** of the river Sidon
Alma 43:27	near the **bank** of the river Sidon
Alma 43:40	upon the **bank** of the river Sidon
Alma 43:51	upon the **bank** by the river Sidon

It seems that here in Alma 43:40 the earlier plural, *waters,* may have prompted Oliver to accidentally write *banks* in 𝑃. A similar pluralization tendency, but in 𝑂, is found in the next verse:

> Alma 43:41
>> Moroni and his army met the army of the Lamanites in the valley
>> on the other [*sides >% side* 0 | *side* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
>>> of the river Sidon

Once more Oliver immediately caught his error and erased the plural *s* from *sides* to give the correct *side* (the immediately preceding *other* forces the singular *side*). For additional discussion of the tendency to replace *side* with *sides*, see under Alma 22:29.

Summary: Accept in Alma 43:40 Oliver Cowdery's corrections in 𝓟 of *water* to *waters* and *banks* to *bank;* also accept in Alma 43:41 his correction in 𝓞 of *sides* to *side*.

■ **Alma 43:41**

and it came to pass that Moroni and his army met
[*the army of* 0 | 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *the Lamanites*
in the valley on the other side of the river Sidon

> While copying the text from 𝓞 into 𝓟, Oliver Cowdery accidentally omitted "the army of". All the printed editions lack this instance of "the army of". In this case, either reading will work. The critical text will restore the reading of the original manuscript.
>
> This error is interesting in that the original "the army of" should have been restored in the 1830 edition since we know that the 1830 signature for this part of the text, the 22nd, was proofed against 𝓞 (see the discussion under Alma 42:31). It seems that the proximity of two instances of the word *army* ("Moroni and his **army** met the **army** of the Lamanites") facilitated the loss of "the army of", not only in copying from 𝓞 into 𝓟 but also when the 1830 signature was proofed against 𝓞.

Summary: Restore "the army of" in Alma 43:41, the reading in 𝓞: "Moroni and his army met **the army of** the Lamanites".

■ **Alma 43:41**

and **it came to pass that Moroni and his army** *met the army of the Lamanites*
in the valley on the other side of the river Sidon

> □ *and* **it came to pass that Moroni and his army**   01*A
> □ *and*   1ᶜBCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST

began to fall upon them

> Here Joseph Smith, in his editing for the 1837 edition, decided to delete not only the repetition of "it came to pass that" in this verse but also the repeated subject noun phrase, "Moroni and his army". The critical text will restore both repetitions since this is clearly the earliest reading (in both manuscripts as well as in the 1830 edition). Joseph also deleted the subsequent instance of "it came to pass" (in the next verse):

> > Alma 43:42
> >
> > □ *and it came to pass that*   01*A
> > □ *and*   1ᶜBCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST
> >
> > the Lamanites did flee again before them

> Sometimes Joseph removed multiple occurrences of "it came to pass that" when they appeared close together in the text. See the example discussed under Alma 8:18–19 as well as other examples listed under COME TO PASS in volume 3.

Summary: Restore the original instances of "it came to pass that" in Alma 43:41–42 that Joseph Smith deleted in his editing for the 1837 edition; also restore in Alma 43:41 the repeated subject, "Moroni and his army", which Joseph also deleted.

■ **Alma 43:42**

the Lamanites did flee again before them
[*towards* 0ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST | *toward > towards* 1] *the land of Manti*

As discussed under 1 Nephi 5:22, the original *towards* will be maintained here in Alma 43:42. For discussion regarding this particular instance, see nearby under Alma 43:39.

■ **Alma 43:43**

yea never had the Lamanites been known
to [*have fought* 0A | *have fought >*js *to fight* 1 | *fight* BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
with such exceeding great strength and courage

Here in his editing for the 1837 edition, Joseph Smith replaced *have fought* with *fight,* although there seems to be nothing wrong here with the original use of the perfect *have fought.* A nearly parallel instance of this usage is found later in the book of Alma, but in that instance Joseph did not remove the perfective infinitive: "yea never was men known to **have fought** with such miraculous strength" (Alma 56:56). Perhaps the difference is that here in Alma 43:43 the main clause already has a perfective verb phrase ("never **had** the Lamanites **been known** to . . ."). In any event, the critical text will restore the original text in Alma 43:43; there is nothing wrong with this usage.

Summary: Restore in Alma 43:43 the original reading with its perfect infinitive: "never had the Lamanites been known to **have fought** with such exceeding great strength and courage".

■ **Alma 43:44**

and many of the Nephites were slain
by their [*hand >*p *hands* 0 | *hand* 1 | *hands* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]

As discussed under Alma 42:31, the 1830 signature (the 22nd) was proofed against 𝒪 rather than 𝒫 (although that signature was set from 𝒫). Both manuscripts originally read with the singular *hand* ("slain by their **hand**"), but the 1830 typesetter changed the singular to the plural. He probably expected the plural because of the plural possessive pronoun *their.* When Oliver Cowdery proofed the 1830 signature against 𝒪, he accepted the 1830 reading, the plural *hands,* and emended 𝒪 to agree by inserting the plural ending—and in pencil, an indication that the change probably occurred in the print shop. (For the use of pencil in the manuscripts, see the discussion under Alma 10:28.) In theory, either singular *hand* or plural *hands* will work here in Alma 43:44. Elsewhere in the text, there are examples of both singular and plural for the phrase "slain by the hand(s) of <plural noun>":

Alma 25:4	and they were slain by the **hands** of the Nephites
Alma 43:46	ye shall not suffer yourselves to be slain by the **hands** of your enemies
Alma 51:11	because of the many thousands which had been slain by the **hand** of the Nephites

In fact, the plural instance in Alma 43:46, only a couple of verses away from the singular instance here in Alma 43:44, was probably the source for making the change in the 1830 edition from *hand* to *hands*. The critical text will restore in Alma 43:44 the singular *hand,* the original reading in both manuscripts.

Summary: Restore the original singular *hand* in Alma 43:44: "and many of the Nephites were slain by their **hand**".

■ **Alma 43:45**

but they were fighting for their homes and their liberties
their wives and their children and their all
yea for their **rites** *of worship and their church*

One wonders here if the word *rites* (extant in 𝓞) might be a mistake for the homophone *rights,* especially since Oliver Cowdery frequently spelled *right(s)* as *rite(s)* in the manuscripts. In order to deal with this issue, we first consider the manuscript spellings for all cases of the noun *right,* excluding those instances that refer to the right hand (as in Alma 58:17: "now Gid and his men was on the right"). Similarly, we exclude all adjective uses of *right.* (None of these examples of adjectival *right* or nominal *right* with the meaning 'right hand' have ever been misspelled in the text as *rite.*) In the following list of cases where *right* and *rite* could have been mixed up (at least in theory), those written in Oliver Cowdery's hand are given in bold:

	VERSE	PROPOSED ORIGINAL TEXT	𝓞	𝓟
1	2 Nephi 20:2	take away the *right* from the poor	——	**right**
2	Mosiah 29:8	no *right* to destroy my son	——	wright
3	Mosiah 29:8	neither . . . any *right* to destroy another	——	wright
4	Mosiah 29:9	his *right* to the kingdom	——	right
5	Mosiah 29:32	his *rights* and privileges alike	——	wrights
6	Alma 2:4	their *rights* and the privileges of their church	——	rights
7	Alma 17 preface	their *rights* to the kingdom	——	**rights**
8	Alma 30:27	their *rights* and privileges	**rights**	rights
9	Alma 43:9	their *rights* and their privileges	**rights**	rights
10	Alma 43:26	their *rights* and their liberties	**rights**	rights
11	Alma 43:45	their *rights* of worship and their church	**Rites**	rites
12	Alma 43:47	their *rights* and their religion	**Rites**	rites > **rights**
13	Alma 44:5	by our faith by our religion and by our *rights* of worship and by our church	**Rites**	rites
14	Alma 46:20	their *rights* and their religion	(**r**)	**rights**
15	Alma 48:13	his *rights* and his country and his religion	——	**rights**

	VERSE	PROPOSED ORIGINAL TEXT	𝒪	𝒫
16	Alma 51:6	their *rights* and the privileges of their religion	**rites**	**rights**
17	Alma 54:17	their *right* to the government	**rite**	**right**
18	Alma 54:24	their *rights* to the government	**rights**	**rights**
19	Alma 55:28	their *rights* and their privileges	**rites**	**rights**
20	Alma 61:9	the *rights* and the liberty of my people	——	**rights**
21	Helaman 1:13	according to his *right*	——	**right**
22	3 Nephi 2:12	to maintain their *rights* and the privileges of their church and of their worship	——	**rights** >+ **rites**
23	3 Nephi 3:2	your *right* and liberty	——	**right**
24	3 Nephi 3:10	their *rights* and government	——	**rights**
25	3 Nephi 3:10	their *rights* of government	——	**rights**
26	3 Nephi 6:30	the *rights* of their country	——	**rights**
27	Moroni 7:27	his *rights* of mercy	——	**rights**

In extant portions of the original manuscript, all the spellings are Oliver Cowdery's, and they are almost equally distributed between *right(s)* and *rite(s)*, with four of the former and six of the latter. For the first three extant spellings (listed above as cases 8–10), Oliver used the spelling *rights*, which seems to be the correct word in these three cases since *rights* is conjoined with the semantically related *privileges* or *liberties*. But when the subject turns to religion, worship, or the church, Oliver seems to have consciously switched to the spelling *rites* in 𝒪 (cases 11–13, 16); he may have also used that spelling for the two nonextant cases (14–15) since they too are conjoined with the word *religion*. But the following extant examples of *rite(s)* do not follow these collocations: we get a mixture for the two cases of "their right(s) to the government" (17–18) in Alma 54 (the first is spelled *rite,* but the second is spelled *rights*). And in the next case (19), the conjoined noun is *privileges,* but now Oliver uses the spelling *rites* instead of the *rights* that he used in earlier cases (8–9). So if Oliver started out trying to follow some kind of semantic distinction between the two words, he did not maintain it.

When we turn to Oliver Cowdery's spellings in the printer's manuscript, we find that he frequently replaced the *rites* of 𝒪 with *rights* in 𝒫. In three cases (16–17, 19), the change was made without any correction in 𝒫; that is, he simply wrote *right(s)* in 𝒫 rather than the *rite(s)* of 𝒪. In one case (12), he started to write *rites* (the reading in 𝒪), but then he immediately corrected the *rites* to *rights* (he never finished writing the *rites* in 𝒫 since he left the *t* uncrossed; he immediately overwrote the *tes* with *gh* and then finished the word by writing *ts* inline). But there is one complicated case (22), where Oliver initially wrote *rights* in 𝒫 but then somewhat later corrected *rights* by crossing it out and supralinearly inserting *rites* (the level of ink flow is somewhat heavier for the correction).

The 1830 compositor basically set the reading of his copytext. When 𝒫 was his copytext, he usually set the reading of 𝒫; for three cases (2–3, 5) of *wright(s),* Hyrum Smith's misspelling of *right(s),* the compositor set the obviously correct *right(s).* In five cases (22–26), the 1830 edition was set from 𝒪 rather than 𝒫. In all those cases, the 1830 edition reads *right(s),* including the one case (22) where Oliver Cowdery corrected 𝒫 from *rights* to *rites*. In all, the 1830 edition ended up with only two cases of *rites* (11, 13).

All subsequent editions of the Book of Mormon have followed the 1830 readings for *right(s)* and *rite(s)* except for the one case in 3 Nephi 2:12. Since in that case the printer's manuscript was corrected to *rites,* the 1908 RLDS edition (for which 𝒫 was used to correct the text) adopted that reading for the RLDS text. Thus the RLDS text ends up with three cases of *rites* (11, 13, 22). The LDS text continues with the two 1830 cases of *rites* (11, 13). Those two readings are the only ones that specifically refer to "rites of worship"; each also collocates with the word *church.* The third case of *rites* (22), restricted to the RLDS text, also collocates with the words *church* and *worship:*

> 3 Nephi 2:12 (the current RLDS text)
> yea and also to maintain their **rites**
> and their privileges of their **church** and of their **worship**
> and their freedom and their liberty

(The earliest text here reads "and **their** privileges of their church and of their worship". For discussion of why *their privileges* is probably an error for *the privileges,* see the discussion under 3 Nephi 2:12.) In general, *rites* has been maintained in the text when it collocates with *worship* and *church.* Quite obviously, *rights* would work perfectly well in 3 Nephi 2:12 since there are so many other cases (5–6, 8–9, 16, 19) where *rights* is directly conjoined with *privileges.*

There remains the question of whether *rites* should be continued in the two LDS cases, namely, in the set phrase "rites of worship" (11, 13). In the first case, there is no problem with stating that the Nephites could fight "for their rights of worship and their church":

> Alma 43:45 (as emended)
> but they were fighting for their homes and their liberties
> their wives and their children and their all
> yea for their **rights** of worship and their church

In the second case, Moroni commands Zerahemnah to surrender, and with that command Moroni provides reasons for why this command should be taken seriously:

> Alma 44:5 (as emended)
> and now Zerahemnah I command you in the name of that all-powerful God
> who hath strengthened our arms that we have gained power over you
> by our faith by our religion and by our **rights** of worship and by our church
> and by the sacred support which we owe to our wives and our children
> and by that liberty which binds us to our lands and our country
> yea and also by the maintenance of the sacred word of God
>   to which we owe all our happiness
> and by all that is most dear unto us

Here Moroni lists all the important reasons why the Nephites are fighting to maintain their free society, one that protects family, country, homestead, and freedom of religion (including their faith, the church, and the scriptures). In particular, they are fighting to protect their rights of worship.

For Alma 44:5, the reader can easily misinterpret the series of *by*-phrases as an explanation for why the Nephites have gained power over Zerahemnah and his army: "we have gained power over you by our faith by our religion and by our rights of worship and by our church" and so on. But as David Calabro points out (personal communication), this long series of *by*-phrases refers to the earlier "I command you in the name of that all-powerful God", not "we have gained power

over you". Here Moroni is emphasizing the seriousness of the command he had just given Zerahemnah: it is not just a military command, it is a command backed by everything that the Nephites hold most dear. Calabro also notes that this interpretation is directly supported by the language of the very next verse (which gives Zerahemnah and his men another good reason for obeying Moroni's command):

> Alma 44:6
>> yea and this is not all :
>> **I command you by** all the desires which ye have for life
>> that ye deliver up your weapons of war unto us
>> and we will seek not your blood but we will spare your lives
>> if ye will go your way and come not again to war against us

In verse 5, the 1830 compositor placed no punctuation after the resultive clause "that we have gained power over you"; the 1920 LDS edition placed a comma after this clause, but that is probably insufficient to prevent the reader from misinterpreting the meaning of this passage. One possibility is to place dashes around the parenthetical part of this sentence in order to strengthen the connection between "I command you" and the following series of *by*-phrases:

> Alma 44:5
>> and now Zerahemnah **I command you** in the name of that all-powerful God
>> —who hath strengthened our arms that we have gained power over you—
>> **by** our faith by our religion and by our rights of worship and by our church . . .

The evidence in 𝓞 indicates that the individual scribes were responsible for determining the spelling for ordinary English words as they took down Joseph Smith's dictation. There is at most only one example in all the extant parts of 𝓞 where Joseph might have helped the scribe with the spelling of an English word (namely, the spelling of *genealogy* in 1 Nephi 5:16); for discussion of this issue, see pages 76–79 in Royal Skousen, "Translating the Book of Mormon: Evidence from the Original Manuscript", in Noel B. Reynolds (editor), *Book of Mormon Authorship Revisited: The Evidence for Ancient Origins,* 61–93 (Provo, Utah: FARMS, 1997). On the other hand, there is abundant evidence in the manuscripts that the scribes corrected for the spelling of unfamiliar Book of Mormon names (but not, it should be noted, for the spelling of recognizable biblical names). As an example of correcting the spelling of Book of Mormon names in 𝓞, see the discussion under 1 Nephi 19:10 regarding the name *Zenoch*.

More specifically, we can find no evidence in 𝓞 that the spellings of homophones in English were ever controlled for. Besides the case of *right* versus *rite,* the scribes apparently had to decide on their own how to spell the following homophones (each case is discussed under the designated scripture reference):

/bɛr/	present *bear* versus past *bare*	three-witness statement
/swɛr/	present *swear* versus past *sware*	Ether 8:14
/streit/	*straight* versus *strait*	1 Nephi 8:20
/trævəl/	*travel* versus *travail*	2 Nephi 29:4

The manuscript spellings for homophones are generally mixed up and do not always correspond to their appropriate meanings. And like *rite* versus *right,* none of these homophonic spellings are

ever corrected in Ⓞ. (It should be pointed out that there are corrections in Ⓞ regarding *him* versus *them*. Joseph Smith, like English speakers in general, often pronounced both of these as /əm/, but this is a question of casual pronunciation rather than full homophonic merger. For further discussion of this case, see under 1 Nephi 10:18–19.)

In general, evidence from spelling corrections in Ⓞ (and the lack of it in certain cases) argues that it was Oliver Cowdery rather than Joseph Smith who decided to write *rite(s)* in Ⓞ, beginning here at Alma 43:45. And of course, when Oliver copied the text from Ⓞ into Ⓟ, he made additional decisions on whether to maintain *rite(s)* or replace it with *right(s)*.

The idea that the two instances of *rites* in the phrase "rites of worship" should be emended to *rights* was first proposed by Stan Larson on page 565 of his article "Conjectural Emendation and the Text of the Book of Mormon", *Brigham Young University Studies* 18/4 (1978): 563–569. In support of this emendation, Larson points out that Alma 43:9 shows that the Nephites were fighting so "that they might preserve their **rights** and their privileges / yea and also their liberty that they might **worship** God according to their desires".

Summary: Emend *rites* in Alma 43:45 and in Alma 44:5 (the two remaining instances of the manuscript spelling *rite* in the LDS text) to its homophone *rights;* in both these passages, the narrative is referring to the Nephite struggle to preserve their freedom to worship ("their rights of worship", not "their rites of worship"); for the same reason, in 3 Nephi 2:12 the instance of *rites* in the RLDS text should be emended to *rights;* Oliver Cowdery is responsible for introducing the word *rite(s)* into Ⓞ; he apparently thought the word was *rite(s)* when nearby words also referred to worship, the church, religion, and faith.

■ **Alma 43:46**

and they were doing that which they felt
[*it* 0A|*it* >js NULL 1| BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *was the duty*
which they owed to their God

Here Joseph Smith deleted the pronoun *it* in his editing for the 1837 edition. One could view his editing as the result of treating "they felt" as parenthetical, as if the direct object complement for "they were doing" was "that which was the duty which they owed to their God". Under this interpretation, the *it* unnecessarily restates the subject relative pronoun *which*.

The original text had a few other examples of redundant *it* that have been removed from the standard text:

1 Nephi 22:23 (*it* deleted and *is* emended to *are*)
yea in fine all they which belong to the kingdom of the devil
it is they which need fear and tremble and quake

2 Nephi 5:9 (*it* deleted)
and all they which were with me
did take **it** upon them to call themselves the people of Nephi

3 Nephi 27:28 (*it* deleted)
whatsoever things ye shall ask the Father in my name
it shall be given unto you

The first two deletions of *it* were made by Joseph Smith in his editing for the 1837 edition; the third one was made in the 1920 LDS edition. Although nonstandard in written English, the original repetition of the *it* in these examples (as well as in Alma 43:46) facilitates our processing of the text. The critical text will restore each redundant *it,* including the one here in Alma 43:46. The other examples are individually discussed in their own place.

Summary: Restore the redundant *it* in Alma 43:46 ("they were doing that which they felt **it** was the duty which they owed to their God").

■ **Alma 43:47**

therefore for this cause [*was >+ were* 0 | *was > were* 1 | *were* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *the Nephites contending with the Lamanites to defend themselves*

Here in both 𝒪 and 𝒫, Oliver Cowdery initially wrote *was* instead of *were.* He was probably influenced by the immediately preceding singular *cause.* As discussed under Mosiah 10:14, there is extensive evidence that Oliver Cowdery tended to miswrite *was* in place of *were,* even sometimes making the error first in 𝒪, correcting it there, but then making the same error when he copied the text into 𝒫. Here in Alma 43:47, the ink flow for the correction of *was* to *were* was made with somewhat heavier ink flow. One possibility is that Oliver made this correction after reading the text back to Joseph Smith. On the other hand, the correction in 𝒫 is virtually immediate since there is no change in the level of ink flow. Thus one could also argue that the correction in 𝒪 was done when Oliver copied the text from 𝒪 into 𝒫, correcting 𝒫 first, then 𝒪.

Under Mosiah 10:14, I argued that evidence throughout the manuscript shows that Oliver Cowdery sometimes accidentally wrote *was* in place of *were* but that there was no independent evidence that he consciously emended *was* to *were.* In that discussion, I missed noting the difference in ink flow for the passage in Alma 46:33 (namely, the ink flow for the correction in 𝒪 is somewhat heavier). Consequently, there are at least two places where one could argue for conscious editing of *was* to *were* by Oliver, here in Alma 43:47 and in Alma 46:33. Nonetheless, there are numerous instances in the earliest text of the singular *was* being used with plural subjects, obvious instances of nonstandard subject-verb agreement that Oliver never corrected (see, for instance, the examples listed under 1 Nephi 4:4).

Summary: Accept in Alma 43:47 the plural *were,* the corrected reading in both manuscripts: "for this cause **were** the Nephites contending with the Lamanites".

■ **Alma 43:47**

therefore for this cause were the Nephites contending with the Lamanites to defend themselves and their families and their lands their country and their rights and their religion

One wonders here if there isn't an *and* missing before "their country". All the other conjunctive noun phrases in this sentence have an *and* before *their.* The original manuscript is not extant here.

Moreover, the lacuna in 𝓞 is long enough that one can't determine whether there was an ampersand in the original manuscript.

Elsewhere, there are a few conjunctive phrases where the *and* is not repeated for some of the conjuncts:

Alma 43:26 to defend their lands and their country / their rights and their liberties

Alma 48:10 to support their liberty / their lands / their wives and their children and their peace

Alma 48:13 to defend his people / his rights and his country and his religion

In all three of these cases, 𝓞 is extant and shows no ampersand where we might expect it. The critical text will therefore follow the earliest textual sources in determining whether the *and* actually occurs between these kinds of conjuncts. For a similar example, see the discussion under Mosiah 22:8, where the earliest text reads "we will depart with our women and our children / our flocks and our herds into the wilderness".

Summary: Accept cases like Alma 43:47 where not every conjoined noun phrase has an initial *and* (thus "to defend themselves and their families and their lands / their country and their rights and their religion"); in each case like this, we follow the earliest textual sources.

■ **Alma 43:48**

and it came to pass that
[NULL > *when* 1 | *when* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *the men of Moroni*
 saw the fierceness and the anger of the Lamanites
they were about to shrink and flee from them

𝓞 is not extant here, but there is clearly room for the subordinate conjunction *when* in the lacuna. When Oliver Cowdery copied from 𝓞 into 𝓟, he initially omitted the *when* (probably because he had started to write a new line in 𝓟). Virtually immediately Oliver supralinearly inserted the *when* (there is no change in the level of the ink flow for the correction). The *when* seems necessary here.

Summary: Accept in Alma 43:48 the corrected reading in 𝓟 with the inserted *when* ("and it came to pass that **when** the men of Moroni saw the fierceness and the anger of the Lamanites . . .").

■ **Alma 43:50**

and they began to stand against the Lamanites with power
and in [*the* 1PS | *that* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOQRT] *selfsame hour*
that they cried unto the Lord for their freedom
the Lamanites began to flee before them

The original manuscript is not extant here. The printer's manuscript reads "in **the** selfsame hour", which the 1830 compositor set as "in **that** selfsame hour". The 1908 RLDS edition restored the reading in 𝓟. It is possible here that 𝓞 read "in **that** selfsame hour" and that the 1830 compositor corrected the text after the 22nd signature had been proofed against 𝓞 (for this possibility, see

the discussion under Alma 42:31). But it is also possible that 𝓞 read "in **the** selfsame hour" and that the 1830 textual change was missed during proofing.

Elsewhere the text has examples of both "the selfsame X" and "that selfsame X". There are three other occurrences with *the:*

Jacob 2:21	and for **the** selfsame end hath he created them
Alma 19:33	and they did all declare unto the people **the** selfsame thing
Alma 31:22	they did offer up every man **the** selfsame prayer unto God

There is one example with *that;* in that instance, the expression deals with time and is followed by a relative clause headed by *that* (like here in Alma 43:50):

Alma 24:4
  and the king died in **that** selfsame year
  that the Lamanites began to make preparations for war against the people of God

Since we cannot determine how 𝓞 actually read here in Alma 43:50, the critical text will follow the earliest extant text, the reading in 𝓟: "in **the** selfsame hour that they cried unto the Lord for their freedom".

Summary: In accord with the reading of the printer's manuscript (here the earliest extant source), restore in Alma 43:50 the definite article *the* in the phrase "in **the** selfsame hour".

■ **Alma 43:53**

therefore when **Zerahemnah** *saw the men of Lehi on the east of the river Sidon*
and the armies of Moroni on the west of the river Sidon
that **they** *were encircled about by the Nephites*
they *were struck with terror*

Greg Wright (personal communication, 16 November 2002) suggests that after *Zerahemnah* the text is missing the conjoined phrase "and his men". Later in the sentence, there are two occurrences of the plural pronoun *they,* both of which refer to Zerahemnah and his men. Perhaps the repetition of *men* in the proposed original text ("Zerahemnah and his **men** saw the **men** of Lehi") could have led to the loss of the conjoined phrase "and his men". 𝓞 is almost completely extant here; consequently, we can determine that 𝓞 read without the phrase "and his men". If the original text had the phrase, then its loss must have occurred as Joseph Smith dictated the text to Oliver Cowdery.

Nonetheless, sometimes the Book of Mormon text, as is common in English, uses the individual name of a military leader to stand for the army as a whole. In fact, sometimes the Book of Mormon text switches between the two possibilities within the same passage (as apparently here in Alma 43:53):

Alma 47:13 (Lehonti *and his army* will surround the other army)
  and it came to pass that when Lehonti had come down with his guards to Amalickiah
  that Amalickiah desired **him** to come down with **his army** in the nighttime
  and surround those men in their camps over whom the king had gave him command

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

Alma 55:16 (Moroni *and his men* went to the city and cast in the weapons)
> and **Moroni** had prepared **his men** with weapons of war
> and **he** went to the city Gid
> while the Lamanites were in a deep sleep and drunken
> and cast in the weapons of war in unto the prisoners

It is obvious in Alma 43:53 that Zerahemnah along with his men saw the men of Lehi and the armies of Moroni on both sides of the river Sidon. The text, like the example in Alma 55:16, assumes that the reader will mentally supply "and his men".

Summary: Accept in Alma 43:53 the difficult reading that literally refers to only Zerahemnah as seeing that Lehi and Moroni (and their men) have surrounded him (and his men); the reader is expected to recognize that Zerahemnah and his men all saw the same thing.

■ **Alma 43:54**

now Moroni when he saw their terror
[*he* 0A | *he* >js NULL 1 | BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *commanded his men*
that they should stop shedding their blood

As discussed under Alma 43:36, the original Book of Mormon text allows an earlier subject to be pronominally repeated after an intervening subordinate clause. In this instance, Joseph Smith removed the redundant *he* in his editing for the 1837 edition.

Alma 44

■ **Alma 44:5**

*I command you in the name of that all-powerful God
—who hath strengthened our arms that we have gained power over you—
by our faith
by our religion
and by our [Rites 0 | rites 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] of worship
and by our church*

As discussed under Alma 43:45, contextual evidence argues that *rites* here is an error for *rights*.

■ **Alma 44:5**

*by our faith
by our religion*
and *by our rights of worship*
and *by our church*
and *by the sacred support which we owe to our wives and our children*
[& 0 | 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *by that liberty which binds us to our lands and our country
yea* **and** *also by the maintenance of the sacred word of God to which we owe all our happiness*
and *by all that is most dear unto us*

At the very end of page 311′ of 𝒪, Oliver Cowdery wrote a short sublinear line of text, "wives &
our children &". The last ampersand was weakly written but is visible in the ultraviolet photo-
graphs for all but the lowest fourth of the letter. It is not surprising that when Oliver copied the
text from 𝒪 into 𝒫 he omitted this page-final ampersand. The *and* is not required here, although
it does make the series of prepositional phrases headed by *by* read more smoothly. Note, however,
that there is no *and* between the first two conjuncts, "by our faith" and "by our religion" (𝒪 is
extant there). As discussed under Alma 43:47, the original text permits variation in the use of *and*
between conjuncts.

Summary: Restore in Alma 44:5 the original *and* between the two long conjuncts, "by the sacred sup-
port which we owe to our wives and our children" and "by that liberty which binds us to our lands
and our country".

■ **Alma 44:7**

behold ye are
in our [hand > hands 1 | hands ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
and I will command my men that they shall fall upon you

The original manuscript is not extant here. In the printer's manuscript, Oliver Cowdery initially wrote *hand* at the end of a line, then inserted inline the plural *s* with no change in the level of ink flow. It is possible that the inserted *s* at the end of the line isn't actually a correction; instead, Oliver may have simply written *hand* and then directly added the *s* to *hand* after deciding he didn't want to hyphenate the word and write a single *s* at the beginning of the next line. But under either interpretation, the nature of the correction argues that here the original manuscript probably read in the plural as *hands.*

As discussed under Alma 5:4, the Book of Mormon text definitely prefers the plural *hands* in the phrase "in someone's hand(s)" when referring to either physical control or violence; nonetheless, in accord with biblical usage, the singular *hand* is possible, as in "therefore leftest thou them **in the hand of** their enemies" (Nehemiah 9:28). For the specific phrase when the main verb is *be,* the Book of Mormon has only the plural *hands* (when referring to either physical control or violence); although there are only two other examples, both are in this same chapter:

> Alma 44:1   ye know that ye are **in our hands**
> Alma 44:11   now as ye are **in our hands** / we will spill your blood

𝒪 is extant for both these examples, thus providing direct support in Alma 44:7 for "in our hands", the corrected reading in 𝒫.

Summary: Accept in Alma 44:7 the corrected plural reading in 𝒫, "ye are in our **hands**" (the reading of the earliest extant source).

■ **Alma 44:7**

*and then we **will** see who **shall** have power over this people*
yea we [will 01ABCDEFGIJLMNOQRT | shall HKPS] see
who [shall 1ABCDEFGIJLMNOQRT | will HKPS] be brought into bondage

The 1874 RLDS edition switched the placement of the modal verbs in the *yea*-clause for this passage, from "yea we **will** see who **shall** be brought into bondage" to "yea we **shall** see who **will** be brought into bondage". This change was probably unintentional. Not surprisingly, the original placement is found in the preceding main clause: "and then we **will** see who **shall** have power over this people". The RLDS text has continued with the secondary reading.

Summary: Maintain the original order of the modals in Alma 44:7, where *will* occurs before *shall* within both main clauses.

■ **Alma 44:8**

and now it came to pass that
when Zerahemnah [had >? NULL 0 | 1 | had ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] heard these sayings
he came forth and delivered up his sword and his scimitar and his bow into the hands of Moroni

Although the original manuscript is not extant for "(had) heard these sayings", there is definitely room in the original manuscript for the perfect auxiliary *had*. The printer's manuscript has no *had*, but the 1830 edition supplies it. As discussed under Alma 42:31, the 1830 edition was here proofed against 𝓞 rather than against 𝓟 (although 𝓟 was the copytext for the typesetting). The 1830 compositor could have originally set this passage without the *had* but then supplied it after the 22nd signature had been proofed against 𝓞. There is also the possibility that the compositor added the *had* on his own since in one instance, but only one, we have evidence that he did precisely this:

> 1 Nephi 19:3
> and after that I [01 | had ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] made these plates . . .

Both manuscripts are extant for 1 Nephi 19:3, so there is no question that the 1830 compositor is responsible for the *had* in that passage.

Here in Alma 44, we have two additional examples of the perfective *had* in *when*-clauses; in both cases, 𝓞 is extant for the *had:*

> Alma 44:10
> and now when Zerahemnah **had made** an end of speaking these words
> Moroni returned the sword and the weapons of war

> Alma 44:12
> and now when Moroni **had said** these words
> Zerahemnah retained his sword

But as noted in the discussion under 1 Nephi 19:3, either reading (with or without the perfective *had*) is in general possible.

As discussed under Alma 31:8–9, there is considerable evidence that Oliver Cowdery sometimes omitted the perfective *had* in subordinate clauses (there are six examples of this kind of error listed under Alma 31:8–9). It is also possible that Oliver Cowdery initially wrote *had heard* here in 𝓞 for Alma 44:8 and then crossed the *had* out, especially since there is substantial evidence that he tended to insert *had*, although there are no examples in extant portions of 𝓞, only in 𝓟 (namely, the six examples listed under Alma 31:8–9).

Given the frequency of corrections in both 𝓞 and the 1830 edition for the 22nd signature (covering Alma 41:8–46:30), especially in contrast to the infrequency of the 1830 compositor's independent additions of *had* to the text, the most probable textual transmission here in Alma 44:8 is that the 1830 compositor corrected his typesetting as a result of the proofing of the 1830 sheet against 𝓞, which means that 𝓞 read *had heard,* not *heard,* and that Oliver Cowdery omitted the *had* when he copied from 𝓞 into 𝓟. The critical text will follow the 1830 reading, "when Zerahemnah **had heard** these sayings".

There is a similar example of proofing against the 1830 edition in the next verse, namely, the loss in 𝓟 of *that* in "we believe **that** it is your cunning"; in that case, 𝓞 is extant and has the *that* (for discussion of this example, see under Alma 44:9).

Summary: Maintain in Alma 44:8 the *had* in "when Zerahemnah **had** heard these sayings"; the insertion of the *had* in the 1830 edition in Alma 44:8 was probably due to proofing against the original manuscript (which is no longer extant here, but spacing between extant fragments argues that *had* was in 𝒪).

■ **Alma 44:8**

behold here is our weapons of war
we will deliver them up unto you
[*&* 01 | *and* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQS | *but* RT] *we will not suffer ourselves*
to make an oath unto you which we know that we shall break

Here the 1920 LDS edition reversed the polarity of the conjunction by changing the *and* to *but.* There are three other instances in the 1920 edition where an original *but* was emended to *and.* Two are nearby, in Alma 42:30 and Alma 43:20, and the third is later on in the text, in Ether 6:23. For analysis, see the discussion under each of these passages. For a general list of variants involving *but* and *and,* see the discussion regarding *straight* versus *strait* under 1 Nephi 8:20. Since over half of those variants are the result of Oliver Cowdery's scribal errors, it is possible that the *and* here in Alma 44:8 is an error for *but.* The ampersand is extant in 𝒪, so the error (if it is one) would have occurred as Joseph Smith dictated the passage to Oliver.

The Book of Mormon text has, of course, many instances of *but.* At the same time, it has many examples of connective *and* where polarity is reversed, cases where modern English readers expect *but.* Here are a few examples:

Jacob 5:65
and as they begin to grow
ye shall clear away the branches which bring forth bitter fruit
according to the strength of the good and the size thereof
and ye shall not clear away the bad thereof all at once

Mosiah 2:8
and it came to pass that he began to speak to his people from the tower
and they could not all hear his words because of the greatness of the multitude

Alma 22:6
if ye will repent / ye shall be saved
and if ye will not repent / ye shall be cast off at the last day

Alma 54:3
now the Lamanites had taken many women and children
and there was not a woman nor a child among all the prisoners of Moroni
or the prisoners which Moroni had taken

Helaman 6:19
and it was they which did murder the chief judge Cezoram and his son
while in the judgment seat
and behold they were not found

3 Nephi 11:8
    and the eyes of the whole multitude was turned upon him
    and they durst not open their mouths / even one to another

Mormon 5:7
    and they whose flight were swifter than the Lamanites did escape
    and they whose flight did not exceed the Lamanites were swept down and destroyed

Ether 6:26
    and it came to pass that they chose all the brothers of Pagag
    and they would not

Moroni 1:2–3
    and because of their hatred
    they put to death every Nephite that will not deny the Christ
    and I Moroni will not deny the Christ
    wherefore I wander whithersoever I can for the safety of mine own life

Such usage is prevalent in the biblical text, as in these examples from the King James Bible:

Genesis 2:25
    and they were both naked / the man and the wife
    and were not ashamed

Matthew 1:19
    then Joseph her husband
    being a just *man*
    and not willing to make her a public example
    was minded to put her away privily

In both the Hebrew and Greek originals, the conjunction *and* can reverse polarity. For the Hebrew usage, see the discussion under "disjunctive *waw*" (pages 650–652) in Bruce K. Waltke and Michael O'Connor, *An Introduction to Biblical Hebrew Syntax* (Winona Lake, Indiana: Eisenbrauns, 1990), where the authors state: "If the disjunctive *waw* is used in a situation with *continuity of setting*, the clause it introduces may *contrast* with the preceding" (page 651). They give as an example the following case that the King James Bible translated as *but* (the Hebrew literally reads with a *waw*, the conjunctive clitic generally used to mean 'and'):

Genesis 2:16–17
    and the LORD God commanded the man saying
    of every tree of the garden thou mayest freely eat
    but of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil
    thou shalt not eat of it

For the Greek usage, see the discussion under *καί* (page 227) in Friedrich Blass and Albert Debrunner, *A Greek Grammar of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature*, translated and revised by Robert W. Funk (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1961). There the authors note: "*Kaí* can be used even where there is actual contrast"; they cite the following example from the Sermon on the Mount where the conjunction *yet* was used by the King James translators (the Greek literally reads *kai,* the word generally used to mean 'and'):

Matthew 6:26

> behold the fowls of the air
> for they sow not neither do they reap nor gather into barns
> **yet** your Heavenly Father feedeth them

The biblical style, like the Book of Mormon style, frequently uses the general *and* to connect independent clauses, especially in narrative. And as in the original Hebrew and Greek (as well as frequently in the literally translated King James Bible), the conjunction *and* in the Book of Mormon sometimes reverses polarity. The critical text will therefore restore the original instance of *and* in Alma 44:8 but with the understanding that it means 'but'.

Summary: Restore in Alma 44:8 the original *and* with its meaning 'but'; such usage is prevalent in the Book of Mormon text as well as in the King James Bible (and even more so in the original Hebrew and Greek biblical styles).

■ **Alma 44:8**

and we will not suffer ourselves to **take** *an oath unto you*
which we know that we shall break and also our children
but take our weapons of war and suffer that we may depart into the wilderness

One might wonder here if the verb *take* in "take an oath unto you" is a mistake for *make* (that is, "make an oath unto you"). ℧ is not extant for the verb here, but it could have read *make*. Another possibility is that Oliver Cowdery misheard Joseph Smith's dictated *make* as *take*. Generally, the text has examples of both "make an oath" and "take an oath". We have the following examples without any complementary prepositional phrase (four with *make* and three with *take*):

Mosiah 6:3	in remembrance of the oath which they had **made**
Alma 49:13	yea their chief captains came forward and **took** an oath that . . .
Alma 53:11	for they had **taken** an oath that . . .
Alma 53:14	for they were about to break the oath which they had **made**
Alma 56:8	because of the fulfilling the oath which they had **taken**
3 Nephi 4:12	notwithstanding . . . the oaths which Giddianhi had **made**
Mormon 5:1	I . . . did repent of the oath which I had **made**

But if the verb is complemented by a prepositional phrase, the verb is *make* and the preposition is *unto* (except, of course, for the one case of "take an oath unto you" here in Alma 44:8):

1 Nephi 4:35	yea and he also **made** an oath **unto** us that . . .
1 Nephi 4:37	when Zoram had **made** an oath **unto** us / our fears did cease
Mosiah 19:25	the king of the Lamanites **made** an oath **unto** them that . . .
Mosiah 19:26	Limhi . . . **made** oath **unto** the king of the Lamanites
Mosiah 20:14	my people have not broken the oath that I **made unto** you
Mosiah 20:14	why should ye break the oath which ye **made unto** my people
Mosiah 20:22	and we fulfill the oath which we have **made unto** him
Mosiah 21:3	because of the oath which their king had **made unto** Limhi

In the Book of Mormon text, the phrase "to take an oath" never otherwise takes a complementary prepositional phrase.

When we consider the transcript for 𝓞, we find a very likely explanation for why 𝓟 reads "and we will not suffer ourselves to **take** an oath unto you". Although 𝓞 is not extant for the crucial word *take,* there is good reason to think that 𝓞 actually read *make* (that is, "and we will not suffer ourselves to **make** an oath unto you"). Right below, in the next line of 𝓞, we have an extant occurrence of *take* (in "but take our weapons of war"), and this seems to have led Oliver Cowdery to miscopy the preceding *make* as *take.* In volume 1 of the critical text, I assumed that in line 14 on this page of 𝓞 the text read *take* (bolding added to the transcript):

Alma 44:8 (lines 13–15, page 312′ of 𝓞)

```
(                          l)iver them up unto you & we will not suffer our
  WEOPONS OF WAR WE WILL DE

(              ) [   ] oa(th        u) which we know that we shall brake & also our
  -SELVES TO TAKE    AN         UNTO YO

(        b)ut take our (w   po)ns of war & suffer that we may depart into the wild
  CHILDREN              EO
```

The conjectured reading with *take* is, of course, strictly based on the reading in 𝓟. But more likely, the original manuscript read as follows (here I fill in the lacuna with the appropriate lower-case text and again add the bolding):

□ reconstructed 𝓞 for Alma 44:8

```
13  weopons of war we will deliver them up unto you & we will not suffer our

14  -selves to make an oath unto you which we know that we will brake & also our

15  children but take our weopons of war & suffer that we may depart into the wild
```

In other words, as Oliver copied the text from 𝓞 into 𝓟, his eye accidentally glanced down from line 14 to 15 where the correct *take* in line 15 led him to replace the correct *make* in line 14 with the visually similar *take,* thus creating the difficult reading "and we will not suffer ourselves to **take** an oath unto you". The critical text will therefore emend the text here, replacing *take* with *make:* "and we will not suffer ourselves to **make** an oath unto you".

Summary: Emend Alma 44:8 to read "and we will not suffer ourselves to **make** an oath unto you"; one possibility is that 𝓞 read this way, but while copying from 𝓞 into 𝓟 Oliver Cowdery accidentally replaced *make* with *take* since right below in the next line of 𝓞 was the word *take* ("but **take** our weapons of war"); not only is the reading "**take** an oath unto you" difficult, but there is no support for this kind of phraseology elsewhere in the Book of Mormon.

■ **Alma 44:9**

but we believe [*that* 0ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST| 1] *it is your cunning that hath preserved you from our swords*

The subordinate conjunction *that* is extant in 𝓞 but missing in 𝓟; nonetheless, the 1830 edition has the *that,* most probably because for this section of the text the 1830 edition was proofed

against ℧, not ℗ (see the general discussion under Alma 42:31). For more on the textual preservation of minor words in this part of the text, see the nearby discussion under Alma 44:8 regarding *had*. Also see the discussion under Alma 19:9 regarding the occurrence of the subordinate conjunction *that* after the verb *believe*.

Summary: Maintain in Alma 44:9 the subordinate conjunction *that* after *believe,* the reading in ℧ ("but we believe **that** it is your cunning that hath preserved you").

■ **Alma 44:11**

now I cannot [*retain* 01ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRS | *recall* RT] *the words which I have spoken*

Here we have an instance in the original text where the verb *retain* means 'take back', not 'keep' (the most common meaning in English). The editors for the 1920 LDS edition replaced *retain* with *recall.* Although this substituted verb has a second meaning (namely, 'recollect or remember'), usage elsewhere in the Book of Mormon supports using the verb *recall* for 'take back' rather than 'recollect'; in all cases, the reference is to one's words:

Mosiah 17:8	unless thou wilt **recall** all the words which thou hast spoken evil concerning me
Mosiah 17:9	I will not **recall** the words which I have spoken unto you concerning this people
Mosiah 17:10	and I will not **recall** my words
Mosiah 29:9	and if my son should turn again to his pride and vain things he would **recall** the things which he had said

There are two other instances of the verb *retain* in the larger passage, Alma 44:8–12. For the first instance of *retain* (in verse 8), the text starts out by saying that Zerahemnah "**came** forth and **delivered** up his sword and his scimitar and his bow into the hands of Moroni" (Alma 44:8). In the following speech to Moroni, however, Zerahemnah speaks as if he is still in the process of handing over his weapons to Moroni, which means that here *retain* can be interpreted as meaning 'keep', although 'take back' is also possible:

> Alma 44:8
> behold here **is** our weapons of war
> we **will** deliver them up unto you
> and we will not suffer ourselves to make an oath unto you
> which we know that we shall break and also our children
> but **take** our weapons of war
> and suffer that we may depart into the wilderness
> otherwise we will **retain** our swords
> and we will perish or conquer

Nonetheless, the weapons were clearly handed over since the text says so, not only at the beginning of verse 8 ("he **came** forth and **delivered** up his sword and his scimitar and his bow into the hands of Moroni") but also after Zerahemnah's speech, where we have Moroni's response:

Alma 44:10
   and now when Zerahemnah had made an end of speaking these words
   Moroni **returned** the sword and the weapons of war
     which he **had received**
   unto Zerahemnah

And after a brief speech by Moroni, Zerahemnah takes back his sword and immediately attacks Moroni:

Alma 44:12
   and now when Moroni **had said** these words
   Zerahemnah **retained** his sword
   and he was angry with Moroni
   and he rushed forward that he might slay Moroni

Thus in verses 11 and 12 we have two instances where *retain* definitely means 'take back'; and the earlier instance in verse 8 may also mean 'take back', although within Zerahemnah's speech the meaning 'keep' seems to work better. The critical text will, of course, maintain all three instances of *retain* since they are all intended here and do not appear to be errors for any other verb.

The meaning 'take back' for *retain* is not listed in the Oxford English Dictionary, although etymologically its Latin source, *re+tenēre* (that is, *retinēre*), could be interpreted as meaning 'take again' or 'take back' (see the discussion under the prefix *re-* in the OED). Yet even in Latin itself, the verb *retinēre* never appears to have had the meaning 'take back', but rather 'hold or keep back'. See the definitions for *retinēre* in Charlton T. Lewis and Charles Short, *A Latin Dictionary* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002 [1879]). Nonetheless, the verb *retain* sometimes has the meaning 'take back' in the Book of Mormon text, not only here in Alma 44 but also seven times from Alma 58 through Helaman 4, where it has been emended to *regain* in the LDS text. For discussion, see under Alma 58:3; other cases where *retain* seems to mean 'take back' are discussed under that passage. Also see the discussion under Alma 54:10 for an instance of *retain* that was momentarily replaced by *retake* in 𝓟. The critical text will, of course, maintain all the original instances of the verb *retain,* despite the occasional deviance from the expected meanings in English. For one case of *retain* that is apparently an error for *repair,* see under Alma 39:13. Also see the discussion under Alma 37:27 for one instance of *retain* that has been replaced by *keep.*

Summary: Restore the original use of *retain* in Alma 44:11, despite its meaning 'take back'; also maintain the two other uses of *retain* in this passage (in verses 8 and 12); the original text has quite a few instances where *retain* has the meaning 'take back'.

■ **Alma 44:11**

or ye shall submit **to** *the conditions*
[*to* 01ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQS | RT] *which I have proposed*

Here the earliest extant sources (including 𝓞) read quite strangely; the *to* at the beginning of the relative clause seems unacceptable: "ye shall submit to the conditions **to** which I have proposed". One expects the text to say "ye shall submit to the conditions which I have proposed", which is

what the editors for the 1920 LDS edition emended the text to. Thus far I have not found any examples in any of the English language databases, both the historical ones and the general ones like <www.google.com>, to suggest that a reading like "conditions to which I have proposed" is possible.

What is possible is that this extra *to* was accidentally introduced into the text during dictation; the *to* might have been triggered by the preceding *to* in "submit **to** the conditions". In fact, there are a number of examples where a preceding preposition has accidentally been repeated by the scribe. Most examples involve the preposition *of,* but other prepositions are also repeated. In the following sampling from the manuscripts, Oliver Cowdery caught and removed his repeated preposition:

> 2 Nephi 25:26 (initial repetition of *to* in 𝓟)
>> that our children may know **to** what source
>> [*to* > NULL 1| ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] they may look
>> for a remission of their sins
>
> Alma 32:15 (initial repetition of *of* in 𝓞)
>> because **of** their exceeding [*of* > NULL 0| 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] poverty
>
> Alma 41:5 (initial repetition of *to* in 𝓞)
>> or **to** good according **to** his desires
>> [*to* > *of* 0| *of* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] good
>
> Helaman 5:41 (initial repetition of *in* in 𝓟)
>> even until ye shall have faith **in** Christ
>> [*in* > *which* 1| *which* A| *who* BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] was taught
>> unto you by Alma and Amulek and by Zeezrom
>
> Helaman 16:18 (initial repetition of *unto* in 𝓟)
>> why will he not shew himself **unto** us as well as **unto** they
>> which shall be [*unto* >+ *at* 1| *at* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] Jerusalem

The example in Helaman 5:41 shows the repetition of the preposition before a relative clause, just as I am proposing happened here in Alma 44:11 (but without correction). For an example of repeated *of* that has persisted for most of the history of the text, see the discussion regarding "the people of the king **of** Jacob" in 3 Nephi 9:9.

Thus there is some evidence that "ye shall submit to the conditions **to** which I have proposed" may be the result of scribal error on Oliver Cowdery's part. Since the occurrence of the extra *to* seems impossible, the critical text will accept the 1920 emendation that removed the *to* from before the relative pronoun *which*.

Summary: Accept in Alma 44:11 the 1920 LDS emendation that removed the extra *to* in "ye shall submit to the conditions **to** which I have proposed", giving "ye shall submit to the conditions which I have proposed"; the extra *to* appears to be the result of perseverance of the preceding *to* (in "submit **to** the conditions").

■ **Alma 44:12**

but as he raised his sword
behold one of Moroni's soldiers smote it even to the earth
[& as it >+ & 0 | & as it >+ it 1 | and it ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *brake by the hilt*
and he also smote Zerahemnah that he took off his scalp and it fell to the earth

Here in the original manuscript, Oliver Cowdery wrote "& as it brake by the hilt". Later, when he copied the text from 𝒪 into 𝒫, Oliver also wrote "& as it brake by the hilt" in 𝒫. At that time, he seems to have noticed that the *as* didn't make much sense given that this short *as*-clause is followed by a completely independent and semantically unrelated conjoined clause ("and he also smote Zerahemnah"). Even though 𝒪 itself read *as*, Oliver decided to remove it from both manuscripts, yet his correction in both cases was defective. In the printer's manuscript, he crossed out the preceding ampersand as well as the *as;* in the original manuscript, he crossed out the following *it* as well as the *as*. The 1830 typesetter, on the other hand, ended up with the correct *and it,* perhaps as a result of proofing the 1830 sheet against 𝒪 (see the discussion under Alma 42:31). The *it* is required; and without the *and,* the text reads awkwardly ("behold one of Moroni's soldiers smote it even to the earth / it brake by the hilt"). The critical text will accept the 1830 reading here ("and it brake by the hilt"), which was apparently what Oliver intended to correct the text to in both manuscripts. The extra *as* was probably prompted by the occurrence of *as* earlier in the passage ("but **as** he raised his sword").

One other aspect of 𝒪 shows that the crossout of *as it* took place later. Oliver Cowdery spilled several ink drops on 𝒪 when he made this crossout in 𝒪, and one of the drops fell on text that had already been written on the opposing page of the spread. The crossed-out *as it* is next to the gutter on the left-side page of the spread (the verso) while an extra drop of ink is next to the gutter on the corresponding right-side page of the spread (the recto) and partially covers the initial word of the preface to Alma 45 (namely, the upper part of the *Th* that begins "**Th**e account of the People of Nephi").

Summary: Accept in Alma 44:12 the 1830 typesetter's interpretation, "**and it** brake by the hilt", of Oliver Cowdery's improperly corrected readings in 𝒪 and 𝒫 (respectively "**and** brake by the hilt" and "**it** brake by the hilt"); the inclusion of *as* in this clause ("**and as it** brake by the hilt"), found originally in both manuscripts, seems to be an error caused by the use of *as* in the preceding text ("but **as** he raised his sword").

■ **Alma 44:12**

and it [brake 01 | broke ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *by the hilt*

As discussed under Alma 14:26, there are a number of instances of original *brake* that have been replaced by *broke* in the textual history. In this example, the 1830 typesetter was responsible for making the change. The critical text will restore the original *brake*.

Summary: Restore the original past-tense form *brake* in Alma 44:12 since this is how the two manuscripts read.

■ **Alma 44:13**

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 [01ABCDEFGIJLMNOQRT | *he* HKPS] *stretched it forth unto them*

The 1874 RLDS edition added the subject pronoun *he* to the last conjoined predicate in this passage, and the RLDS text has maintained this intrusive *he*. For the previous conjoined predicate, the sub- ject is also ellipted ("and laid it upon the point of his sword"). The critical text will maintain the earliest reading without the extra *he*. For another example where *he* was accidentally added in 𝒫 to a conjoined predicate (but only momentarily), see under Mosiah 3:19.

Summary: Maintain in Alma 44:13 the original series of conjoined predicates: "the soldier . . . took up the scalp . . . and laid it upon the point of his sword and stretched it forth unto them".

■ **Alma 44:13**

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] . . .

In this passage, the present participial *saying* is repeated in the earliest textual sources (including 𝒪). Elsewhere in the text, *saying* is never repeated like this. In most cases, a quote (direct or indirect) immediately follows *saying,* although in nine cases there is an intervening prepositional phrase headed by *unto* that describes who is being addressed:

1 Nephi 7:8	saying yea even unto Laman and unto Lemuel
Jacob 5:11	saying unto his servant
Alma 5:16	saying unto you
Alma 8:11	saying unto him
Helaman 8:1	saying unto the people
Helaman 9:20	saying unto him
3 Nephi 20:25	saying unto Abraham
3 Nephi 28:1	saying unto them
Ether 12:3	saying unto them

The example here in Alma 44:13 is the only one that has an additional prepositional phrase ("with a loud voice"). Perhaps this is the reason why the *saying* is repeated here.

Another possibility is that the first *saying* is an error for *crying*. There are 42 examples in the text where *saying* is preceded in the sentence by the verb *cry,* and in ten instances there is a reference to the voice:

1 Nephi 11:6	the Spirit **cried** with a loud **voice** saying . . .
Mosiah 4:2	and they all **cried** aloud with one **voice** saying . . .
Mosiah 5:2	and they all **cried** with one **voice** saying . . .
Alma 5:51	yea **crieth** unto me with a mighty **voice** saying . . .
Alma 13:21	and **cried** with a mighty **voice** saying . . .
Alma 19:29	and **cried** with a loud **voice** saying . . .
Alma 31:14	and **cry** with a loud **voice** saying . . .
Alma 46:19	and **crying** with a loud **voice** saying . . .
3 Nephi 4:28	and **did cry** with a loud **voice** saying . . .
3 Nephi 4:30	and **cry** again with one **voice** saying . . .

Also notice the nearly identical phraseology in Alma 46:19 ("waving the rent of his garment in the air . . . and **crying** with a loud **voice** saying . . ."). If there is an error in Alma 44:13, the most likely possibility is that early in the transmission of the text an original *crying* was replaced by *saying* in anticipation of the actual *saying* that followed the prepositional phrase "with a loud voice".

We should note that the difficulty here in Alma 44:13 is not the use of the verb *say* with the prepositional phrase "with a loud voice", since that phraseology is found elsewhere in the text:

> 1 Nephi 8:15
>> and I also **did say** unto them **with a loud voice**
>> that they should come unto me

There is nothing inherently wrong with the phraseology "to say with a loud voice". Ultimately, it is the repetition of the *saying* that makes Alma 44:13 a difficult reading.

There are four other Book of Mormon passages where *saying* is repeated, but in each of these cases the repeated *saying* is within a quote introduced by the first *saying* (the last one involves a quote within a quote):

> Mosiah 11:20
>> and it came to pass that there was a man among them whose name was Abinadi
>> and he went forth among them and began to prophesy **saying**
>> behold thus saith the Lord and thus hath he commanded me **saying** . . .

> Mosiah 12:1
>> and it came to pass that after the space of two years
>> that Abinadi came among them in disguise that they knew him not
>> and began again to prophesy among them **saying**
>> thus hath the Lord commanded me **saying** . . .

> Alma 7:9
>> but behold the Spirit hath said this much unto me **saying**
>> cry unto this people **saying** . . .

Alma 8:29
> and the word came to Alma **saying**
> go and also say unto my servant Amulek
> go forth and prophesy unto this people **saying** . . .

These examples are not instances of a redundant repetition of *saying*. It is also worth noting that the example in Alma 7:9 shows that we can get repetition of the verb *say* ("the Spirit hath **said** this much unto me **saying** . . ."). And there is another example in the text of "say . . . saying", although in that case there is an intervening participial phrase, "calling them by name":

3 Nephi 11:24
> and now behold these are the words which ye shall **say**
> calling them by name **saying** . . .

The biblical text (in the King James version) also has instances of "say . . . saying":

1 Samuel 26:6
> then answered David and **said** to Ahimelech the Hittite
>   and to Abishai the son of Zeruiah brother to Joab
> **saying** . . .

Jeremiah 44:20
> then Jeremiah **said** unto all the people
> to the men and to the women and to all the people which had given him *that* answer
> **saying** . . .

But there are no instances of "saying . . . saying" except as a quote within a quote, as in "and Reuben answered them **saying** : spake I not unto you **saying** . . ." (Genesis 42:22).

Of particular importance here is evidence in the Book of Mormon manuscripts that a verb could be replaced by the verb *say,* at least momentarily, in anticipation of the present participle *saying.* In the following example, scribe 3 of 𝓞 initially took down Joseph Smith's dictation by replacing *spake* with *said,* apparently because of the following *saying:*

1 Nephi 11:31
> and he [*said* >% *spake* 0 | *spake* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] unto me again
> saying : look

As described under 1 Nephi 7:1, "spake . . . saying" is the expected Book of Mormon expression whenever there is a following direct quote (as in 1 Nephi 11:31). In the original manuscript, the preceding verb *spake* was momentarily replaced by the simple past-tense form *said,* but the choice of the verb itself, not its form, was determined by the nearby *saying.* Similarly, one could argue that in Alma 44:13, the form of the verb *cry* was replaced by the corresponding form of the verb *say* (that is, *crying* was replaced by *saying*) in anticipation of the following *saying;* in this case, both verbs happen to take the same form, the present participle.

Since the completely redundant repetition of *saying* is never found elsewhere in the scriptures, the critical text will assume that there is some primitive error here in Alma 44:13. Based on usage elsewhere in the text, the most plausible emendation is that the first *saying* read *crying* in the original text. The critical text will accept this emendation.

Summary: Emend Alma 44:13 to read *crying* in place of the first *saying* (thus "**crying** unto them with a loud voice **saying** . . ."); usage elsewhere supports *crying,* especially one nearby case that reads "and **crying** with a loud voice **saying** . . ." (Alma 46:19).

■ **Alma 44:14**

so shall ye fall to the earth
except ye [NULL > *will* 1 | *will* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *deliver up your weapons of war*
and depart with a covenant of peace

> Here Oliver Cowdery initially wrote "except ye deliver up your weapons of war" in 𝔓, but virtually immediately he supralinearly inserted the modal verb *will* (there is no change in the level of ink flow). 𝔒 is not extant here, but spacing in the lacuna allows for a modal, probably *will,* although *shall* is another possibility. The modal forms *shall* and *shalt* are more frequent after *except* (occurring 18 times), but *will* and *wilt* also occur in the text (besides here in Alma 44:14): "except thou **wilt** grant unto me that . . ." (Alma 20:22) and "except ye **will** repent" (Helaman 7:19). There would have been no linguistic motivation for replacing *shall* with *will* here in Alma 44:14. Thus the critical text will accept *will* as the reading of the original text.

Summary: Accept in Alma 44:14 the virtually immediate correction in the printer's manuscript ("except ye **will** deliver up your weapons") as the original reading of the text.

■ **Alma 44:15**

now there were many
when they heard these words and saw the scalp which was upon the sword
[*they* >js *that* 1 | *they* A | *that* BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *were struck with fear*

> The subject pronoun *they* refers, of course, to the preceding *many.* Although such usage is redundant, it is quite frequent in the original text (see, for instance, the nearby discussion under Alma 43:36). In his editing for the 1837 edition, Joseph Smith not only removed the redundant *they* but added the relative pronoun *that,* giving "there were many . . . that were struck with fear". The critical text will restore the original reading here since this kind of redundancy is found in the original text.

Summary: Restore in Alma 44:15 the original redundant subject *they* and remove the extra relative pronoun *that* (thus "there were many—when they heard these words and saw the scalp which was upon the sword—**they** were struck with fear").

■ **Alma 44:17**

therefore he commanded his people
that they should fall upon them and **slay them**

  □ *and it came to pass that they began to* **slay them**   01ABCEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST
  □ NULL   D

yea and the Lamanites did contend with their swords

Here we have a large omission in the 1841 British edition, the result of the typesetter's eye skipping from the first *slay them* to the second one. The 1849 LDS edition restored the missing text. Of course, the critical text will follow the earliest reading.

Summary: Maintain in Alma 44:17 the clause that was accidentally omitted in the 1841 British edition, "and it came to pass that they began to slay them".

■ **Alma 44:17**

yea and the Lamanites did contend with their swords
and their [*mights* 01ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQS | *might* RT]

As discussed under Jacob 1:19, the critical text will restore all original instances of the plural *mights*.

■ **Alma 44:19**

now Zerahemnah when he saw that they were all about to be destroyed
[*he* >js NULL 1 | *he* A | BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *cried mightily unto Moroni*

As discussed under Alma 43:36, the redundant subject pronoun *he* will be restored here in Alma 44:19.

■ **Alma 44:19**

now Zerahemnah when he saw that they were all about to be destroyed
he cried mightily unto Moroni
promising that he would covenant
[01RT |, ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQS]
and also his people
[1EFIJLMNOQRT |, ABCDGHKPS] *with them*
if they would spare the remainder of their lives
that they never would come to war again against them

The phrase "and also his people" is semantically conjoined with the preceding *he* (referring to Zerahemnah). On the other hand, the final *with them* completes the verb *covenant*. (There are 23 occurrences in the text of the verb *covenant* being completed by a *with*-phrase.) In other words, the meaning of this passage is 'he and also his people would covenant with them'. A typical Hebraistic construction in the Book of Mormon is to shift a conjoined subject to the end of the predicate or after the verb phrase (as here in Alma 44:19). For further discussion of this syntactic construction, see the topic *delayed conjoined subject* under HEBRAISMS in volume 3.

The 1830 typesetter understood the parenthetical nature of "and also his people", so he placed commas around this conjoined noun phrase. Unfortunately, in the 1849 LDS edition, the second comma was accidentally dropped. For the 1920 LDS edition, the punctuation was made consistent by deleting the first comma as well. In order to prevent confusion, the commas (or perhaps dashes or parentheses) should be placed around "and also his people" in the LDS text (the RLDS text has maintained the 1830 commas).

Matt Empey (personal communication) has suggested one other possibility here: perhaps the *them* here is an error for *him*—that is, the subject *he* (referring to Zerahemnah) is conjoined with "and also his people with him", meaning 'and also all his people who were with him'. We already know that Oliver Cowdery sometimes had difficulty distinguishing between Joseph Smith's unstressed *him* and *them,* both pronounced as /əm/ in colloquial language (see the discussion under 1 Nephi 10:18−19). It is also possible that the verb *covenant* can occur without a *with*-phrase, but such usage is considerably less frequent than the 23 cases elsewhere in the text where the *with*-phrase is present. There are only four examples in the current text (but the original verb form in 2 Nephi 1:5 is actually *consecrated* rather than *covenanted*). The three original examples are found in Alma 50−53:

> Alma 50:36
>> and upon their covenanting to keep the peace
>> they were restored to the land of Morionton

> Alma 51:6
>> for the freemen had sworn or covenanted to maintain their rights
>> and the privileges of their religion by a free government

> Alma 53:17
>> yea even they covenanted that they never would give up their liberty

So it is possible that in Alma 44:19 the *with*-phrase may not complete the verb *covenant,* but instead may modify *his people.*

There are 12 instances in the text where the word *people* is immediately followed by a prepositional phrase headed by *with,* but all these examples are adverbial phrases that modify the verb, as in "and Coriantumr had taken all the people with him" (Ether 14:15). In the following example, one could interpret the prepositional phrase as postmodifying the noun *people,* but the more reasonable interpretation is that the prepositional phrase is adverbial and modifies the verb *behold:*

> Mormon 6:7
>> my people with their wives and their children did now behold
>> the armies of the Lamanites a marching towards them

But the usage is not redundant in Mormon 6:7, as it would be if we emended Alma 44:19 to read "and also his people with him". Thus the suggested emendation ("and also his people with him") would be quite unusual for the text in Alma 44:19, whereas the interpretation of *with them* as completing the verb *covenant* is expected even though the disjointed syntax is difficult to parse.

Summary: Restore in Alma 44:19 the parenthetical punctuation around "and also his people" to ensure that the prepositional phrase *with them* will be interpreted as an adverbial phrase completing the verb *covenant.*

■ **Alma 44:19**

that they [*never >+ never would* o | *never would* 1ABCDEFGIJLMNOPQRST | *would never* HK]
come to war again against them

In the original manuscript, Oliver Cowdery initially wrote "that they never come to war again against them". A little later, with somewhat heavier ink flow, he supralinearly inserted *would* after the *never*. Oliver probably corrected the text here after reading the text back to Joseph Smith.

The modal verb *would* seems necessary here, but one wonders whether the *would* should have been inserted before *never*. This switch in word order is actually found in the first two RLDS editions (1874 and 1892). The word order "would never come" does seem more natural in modern English, so one wonders if the correction in the original manuscript might have led to the wrong word order. Elsewhere in the text, there are four occurrences of the order "never would" and two of "would never" (the latter are each marked below with an asterisk):

*	1 Nephi 15:24	they **would never** perish
	Alma 24:18	that they **never would** use weapons again
*	Alma 48:17	yea the devil **would never** have no power
	Alma 53:11	that they **never would** shed blood more
	Alma 53:17	that they **never would** give up their liberty
	Helaman 15:15	that they **never would** again have dwindled in unbelief

Note that the four occurrences of "never would" are in subordinate *that*-clauses (just like originally in Alma 44:19), while the two occurrences of "would never" are in main clauses. Thus consistency argues for accepting the corrected reading in 𝕆 as the original reading for Alma 44:19.

Summary: Maintain in Alma 44:19 the word order in "they **never would** come" (based on the corrected reading in 𝕆).

■ **Alma 44:19–20**

that they never would come to war [*again* 01ABCDEFGHIJLMNOQRT | KPS] *against them
and it came to pass that Moroni caused that the work of death should cease*
[*again* 01ABCEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST | D] *among the people*

In this passage, there are two losses of the word *again*. In verse 19, the 1892 RLDS edition omitted the *again,* and this shorter reading has continued in the RLDS text. The loss was probably due to the eye skipping from *again* to the immediately following *against*. Since the Lamanites have already come to war, the next time would be a second time (thus the word *again*). Moreover, the same language occurs earlier in verse 11: "that ye will not return **again against** us to war". For another example where *again* was lost from the text when followed by *against,* see under 3 Nephi 2:18 (in that instance, it was probably the 1837 typesetter who omitted the *again*).

In Alma 44:20, the 1841 British edition accidentally omitted the *again*. The following LDS edition (1849) restored the word. This is the second time that Moroni has caused the fighting to stop (the first is described in Alma 43:54–44:1); once more the use of *again* is appropriate here.

Summary: Maintain the two instances of *again* in Alma 44:19–20; both are helpful in making the meaning clear.

■ **Alma 44:21**

now the number of their dead [*were* 01ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQS | *was* RT] *not numbered*
because of the greatness of the number
yea the number of their dead [*were* 01ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQS | *was* RT] *exceeding great*
both on the Nephites and on the Lamanites

In this passage, the 1920 LDS edition twice replaced the plural *were* with the singular *was* for the subject noun phrase "the number of their dead". In both cases, the text refers to the possibility of a specific count; thus the singular *was* is correct according to standard grammar. In the first case, one could consider the clause "the **number** of their dead were not **numbered**" as redundant because of the repetition of the word *number*. On the other hand, if one interpreted the meaning as 'the dead were not numbered', then the use of the plural *were* would be perfectly acceptable. But it is also possible to interpret the verb *number* as meaning 'calculate', with the result that the meaning here is 'the number of the dead was not calculated'. Under this interpretation, one could argue for grammatically emending the *were* to *was*. A virtually identical example of the use of the noun *number* with the verb *number* is found in Alma 3:1: "now the **number** of the slain **were** not **numbered** because of the greatness of their number" (as noted below, the 1920 edition did not emend this instance of the plural *were* to *was*).

For the second case of editing *were* to *was* here in Alma 44:21, we have a statement regarding the number of the dead—that it was "exceeding great". In this case, the original use of *were* seems to be based on proximity rather than meaning. Number agreement based on proximity can be found in the original text; see, for instance, the nearby discussion under Alma 40:19.

Under Mosiah 2:1–2, it was noted that the *be* verb could be either singular or plural in the specific phrase "there was/were a number (of X)". Similarly, the original text allows either singular *was* or plural *were* for the subject noun phrase "the number of X". In the following list of examples, the word *number* refers to a specific count, and in only one case (marked with an asterisk) does the original text have the singular *was*:

> Alma 3:1
>> now the number of the slain **were** not numbered
>> because of the greatness of their number

> 3 Nephi 12:1
>> now the number of them
>> which had been called and received power and authority to baptize
>> [*were* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQS | *was* RT] twelve

> * Ether 3:1
>> now the number of the vessels which had been prepared **was** eight

> Ether 6:20
>> now the number of the sons and the daughters of the brother of Jared
>> **were** twenty and two souls

> Ether 6:20
>> and the number of the sons and daughters of Jared **were** twelve

In only one of these other instances has the *were* been edited to *was* (namely, in 3 Nephi 12:1, and once more by the editors for the 1920 LDS edition). In other words, there are still examples in the text where proximity determines the grammatical number for the verb associated with the subject noun phrase "the number of X". The critical text will restore the three original instances of *were,* twice here in Alma 44:21 and once in 3 Nephi 12:1. In all three cases, the original plural *were* is the reading of the earliest textual sources.

Summary: Restore in Alma 44:21 the two original cases of *were* that have been edited to *was* for the subject phrase "the number of X" (here the noun *number* refers to an actual count); similarly, *were* will be restored in 3 Nephi 12:1.

■ **Alma 44:24**

and thus ended the record of Alma
which was [wrote 01ABDE | written CGHIJKLMNOPQRST | wrote > written F]
upon the plates of Nephi

Here we have an example of the simple past-tense form *wrote* acting as the past participle. This nonstandard usage was removed from this passage in the 1840 edition as well as in the second printing of the 1852 LDS edition (presumably by reference to the 1840 edition). There are five other examples of this dialectal usage in the original text, all of which have been removed from the LDS and RLDS texts. The use of the standard *written* is considerably more frequent in the origi-nal text. For a list of all six cases of original past participial *wrote,* see under PAST PARTICIPLE in volume 3. The critical text will restore all these instances of *wrote* since they are supported by the earliest textual sources. The dialectal use of the simple past-tense form as the past participle was very common in the original Book of Mormon text. See, for instance, the brief discussion under 1 Nephi 1:14 or the more general discussion under PAST PARTICIPLE in volume 3.

Summary: Restore the original past participial form *wrote* in Alma 44:24 since this is the reading of the earliest textual sources (including ⵔ); there are six examples (including this one) of past participial *wrote* instead of the standard *written* in the earliest text.

Alma 45

■ **Alma 45 preface**

The account of the people of Nephi
and their wars and dissensions in the days of Helaman
according to the record of Helaman which he kept in his days

Ross Geddes observes (personal communication, 23 August 2004) that the preface found here at the beginning of Alma 45 could have actually introduced the beginning of a "book of Helaman" rather than a continuation of the book of Alma. The preface doesn't mention Alma at all; in fact, Alma disappears from the narrative itself in Alma 45:18–19. Moreover, if we consider the preface at the beginning of the book of Alma itself, we notice that there is no mention of Helaman:

> Alma preface
>> The account of Alma who was the son of Alma
>> the first and chief judge over the people of Nephi
>> and also the high priest over the church
>> an account of the reign of the judges
>> and the wars and contentions among the people
>> and also an account of a war between the Nephites and the Lamanites
>> according to the record of Alma
>> the first and chief judge

The war referred to here is the one described in Alma 43–44, when Zerahemnah invaded the Nephite territory, not the more extensive war described in Alma 46–62, which began after Alma's departure and was a part of Helaman's record, not Alma's.

We also note that for the beginning of the book of Alma, the title was originally omitted by scribe 2 of 𝓟 (𝓞 is not extant here). It was supplied by Oliver Cowdery, apparently when he proofed 𝓟 against 𝓞 (see the discussion under "Alma Narrative Structure" in part 3 of this volume, at the beginning of the book of Alma). Similarly, one could propose that something like "the book of Helaman" was omitted here before the Alma 45 preface. However, 𝓞 is fully extant for the transition from Alma 44 to Alma 45, and there is no title preceding this preface. So if there was a title for a new book here, it must have been lost as Joseph Smith dictated the text to Oliver Cowdery. Such a proposal means that there would have actually been two books of Helaman, one here after Alma 44 and the other after Alma 63, yet there would have been no distinction between "the **first** book of Helaman" and "the **second** book of Helaman"; they would have both been called "the book of Helaman". This identity of book titles is theoretically possible since in the original text the Book of Mormon had four identically named books of Nephi. Each was called "the book of Nephi" and was originally unnumbered in the manuscripts (see the discussion under "1 Nephi Narrative Structure" in part 1 of this volume, at the beginning of 1 Nephi).

Ultimately, this suggested emendation regarding an earlier book of Helaman must be rejected since, as Geddes himself points out, the end of the current book of Alma sums up that entire book by identifying the three record keepers for Mormon's abridged book of Alma:

> Alma 63:17
>> and thus ended the account of Alma
>> and Helaman his son
>> and also Shiblon which was his son

Their records on the large plates of Nephi, as abridged by Mormon, cover the following chapters in the book of Alma:

RECORD KEEPER	1879 LDS CHAPTER SYSTEM	ORIGINAL CHAPTER SYSTEM
Alma	1−44	I−XX
Helaman	45−62	XXI−XXIX
Shiblon	63	XXX

There are numerous instances in the text where the initial record keeper in a book is followed by other record keepers yet there is only one book and it takes the name of that initial record keeper. Note, in particular, the book of Omni, which has four record keepers after Omni (namely, Amaron, Chemish, Abinadom, and Amaleki).

Summary: Continue with the inclusion of Mormon's abridgment of the records of Helaman and Shiblon as part of the larger book of Alma, despite the fact that Alma ceases to be the record keeper after Alma 44.

■ **Alma 45:2**

Alma **came** *unto his son Helaman*
and [*sayest* 0 | *sayeth* >js *said* 1 | *saith* A | *said* bcdefghijklmnopqrst] *unto him*
believest *thou the words which I spake unto thee*

As discussed under Alma 30:37, Oliver Cowdery seems to have mistakenly written *sayest* here in Alma 45:2 rather than *sayeth* (his typical spelling of *saith*). When Oliver took down the text in 𝒪, he was apparently influenced by the following *believest* (which is correct since its subject is *thou*). Oliver made the same error, replacing the ending *-eth* with *-est,* in Alma 30:37 (for other examples of this kind of anticipatory error, see under 1 Nephi 11:2). Here in Alma 45:2, Oliver changed *sayest* to *sayeth* when he copied the text from 𝒪 into 𝒫. The 1830 compositor set *sayeth* as *saith*.

In the original text, this sentence began with the past-tense *came* but was followed by the historical present-tense *saith*. Such mixture in tense was common in the original Book of Mormon text (as well as in the King James Bible); see the many examples listed under Jacob 5:75. In the 1837 edition, this instance of the historical present-tense *saith* was edited to the past-tense *said*. The critical text will restore *saith,* the probable reading of the original text here in Alma 45:2.

Summary: Accept in Alma 45:2 the historical present-tense form *saith,* Oliver Cowdery's emendation in 𝒫 (spelled as *sayeth*); the reading in 𝒪, *sayest,* is an error that most likely resulted from the following nearby occurrence of *believest*.

■ **Alma 45:2**

believest thou the words which I spake unto thee
concerning [*those*/*theese* 0 | *these* 1 | *those* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *records*
which have been kept

The original manuscript reads *those,* but the *o* was written as if it were two *e*'s (that is, the *o* was not closed). As a result, Oliver Cowdery copied *those* as *these* into the printer's manuscript. However, the 1830 edition restored *those,* probably because 𝒪 was used to proof the 1830 sheet (the 22nd signature) for this part of the text (see the discussion under Alma 42:31). The 1830 compositor probably set *these* originally but then restored the *those* after proofing.

Elsewhere in the text, we have ten examples of *these records;* there are also two other examples of *those records:*

> Alma 3:11
> whosoever would not believe in the tradition of the Lamanites
> but believed **those** records which were brought out of the land of Jerusalem . . .

> Alma 50:38
> he had refused Alma to take possession of **those** records and **those** things
> which were esteemed by Alma and his fathers to be most sacred

Both of these instances of *those records* are followed by a relative clause headed by *which,* while it turns out that none of the examples of *these records* is postmodified by a relative clause. This difference further supports the reading *those records* here in Alma 45:2, which has a following relative clause ("concerning those records which have been kept"). Yet this difference does not prove that *those records* is correct in Alma 45:2; there is nothing in English grammar to prevent *those records* from standing alone or *these records* from being followed by a relative clause. In fact, there is the instance of *these last records* in 1 Nephi 13:40, and it has a following relative clause: "these last records which thou hast seen among the Gentiles shall establish the truth of the first". As far as Alma 45:2 is concerned, either *these* or *those* is theoretically possible. The critical text will therefore follow the reading of 𝒪, "**those** records which have been kept".

Oliver Cowdery made this same scribal slip in the next chapter, but in that instance he correctly copied the original *those* into 𝒫:

> Alma 46:14
> for thus were all the true believers of Christ
> which belonged to the church of God
> called by [*those*/*theese* 0 | *those* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
> who did not belong to the church

In this case, the correct reading is *those,* as is exemplified by the two examples of *those who* found in the next verse: "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 46:15).

Summary: Accept the 1830 edition's correction of *these* (in the printer's manuscript) to *those* (the reading in the original manuscript); Oliver Cowdery's *those* in 𝒪 looks like *theese* and was thus misread as *these;* a similar example of this scribal slip is found in Alma 46:14.

■ **Alma 45:4**

[*believest* 1BCDEF | *Believest* AHIJKLMNOPQRST | *believe* G] *thou in Jesus Christ which shall come*

Here the 1858 Wright edition omitted the inflectional ending *-st* from the verb *believe,* probably unintentionally. See under 1 Nephi 14:8 for discussion of other cases, some in the earliest text, where the ending *-(e)st* is missing from verbs that have *thou* as the subject. The critical text will in each case follow the earliest textual sources in determining whether a verb should take the *-(e)st* ending when the subject is *thou.* Here in Alma 45:4, the 1874 RLDS edition restored the correct "believest thou", probably by reference to the 1840 edition.

Summary: Maintain in Alma 45:4 the reading of the earliest textual sources, "believest thou".

■ **Alma 45:7**

and he [*said* 0ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST | *sayeth* 1]
yea I will keep thy commandments with all my heart

The original manuscript clearly reads *said.* There is some noise surrounding the word *said;* moreover, the ascender for the *d* of *said* is smeared. Even so, there is no sign in 𝒪 that *said* was corrected to *sayeth* (or *saith*). When the text was copied from 𝒪 into 𝒫, *said* was changed to *saith* (spelled as *sayeth*). The historical present-tense *saith* is expected here in verse 7 because of the surrounding occurrences of *saith* in the original text:

Alma 45:2	Alma came unto his son Helaman and **saith** unto him
Alma 45:3	and Helaman **saith** unto him
Alma 45:4	and Alma **saith** again
Alma 45:5	and he **saith**
Alma 45:6	and Alma **saith** unto him again
Alma 45:8	then Alma **saith** unto him

Only in verse 7 do we have *said* in the earliest text (the original manuscript). The 1830 compositor, probably as a result of proofing against 𝒪, restored the original past-tense *said* here in verse 7, although he probably set *saith* originally.

This variation between *saith* and *said* was removed by Joseph Smith in his editing for the 1837 edition (five out of the six changes from *saith* to *said* are marked in 𝒫); thus in the current LDS and RLDS texts, this passage consistently reads as *said.* The critical text will, however, have *said* in verse 7 but *saith* in verses 2–6 and 8. Such mixtures in tense for narrative discourse can be found elsewhere in the text; for another narrative where the historical present-tense *saith* dominates but *said* still occurs, see the discussion under Alma 11:36.

Summary: Maintain in Alma 45:7 the unique instance of *said* in the earliest text; restore the six instances of original historical present-tense *saith* elsewhere in this narrative (in verses 2–6 and in verse 8).

■ **Alma 45:11**

yea **and** *then shall they see wars and pestilences*
yea [01ABCEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST | *and* D] *famine and bloodshed*

> Here the 1841 British edition added an extra *and,* undoubtedly because of the *yea and* in the previous clause. The 1849 LDS edition restored the original text without the *and.*

Summary: Maintain in Alma 45:11 the use of *yea* without *and* before "famine and bloodshed".

■ **Alma 45:11**

yea and then shall they see wars and pestilences
yea [*famine* / *famins* 0 | *famines* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
and [*blood shed* 0 | *bloodsheds* >% *bloodshed* 1 | *bloodshed* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]

> The original manuscript reads "famine and bloodshed", that is, as two conjoined singular nouns. The *e* at the end of *famine* is, however, defective and looks like an undotted *i* or a partially formed *s.* While copying to the printer's manuscript, Oliver Cowdery interpreted this defective *e* in 𝓞 as an *s;* that is, he read *famine* as *famins,* which he then copied into 𝓟 as *famines.*
>
> Oliver Cowdery also initially wrote the singular *bloodshed* as *bloodsheds* in 𝓟. But since 𝓞 has the singular reading *bloodshed* (spelled as two words, *blood shed*), Oliver erased the plural *s* in 𝓟, thus restoring the original singular *bloodshed.* For more on the variation in grammatical number for *bloodshed(s),* see under 2 Nephi 10:6.
>
> One might ask if the ill-formed *famine* in the original manuscript could actually be read as *famins,* a plural misspelling for *famines.* If it is, this spelling would be unique for all of Oliver Cowdery's spellings of *famine(s)* elsewhere in the two manuscripts. Scribe 3 of 𝓞 spelled *famine* as *fammin* in 1 Nephi 5:14 (that is, without a final *e*). Elsewhere in the extant portions of 𝓞, there are two other occurrences of *famine,* both written by Oliver Cowdery and spelled with the final *e* (in Alma 53:7 and Alma 62:39). In the printer's manuscript, we have 32 occurrences of *famine(s),* all but three in Oliver Cowdery's hand, and each is spelled correctly. So there is simply no independent evidence in the two manuscripts for Oliver ever misspelling *famine(s)* as *famin(s)*—in fact, he never misspells the word at all.
>
> There is evidence elsewhere in the text for both singular *famine* and plural *famines.* Excluding the case here in Alma 45:11, there are 29 instances of singular *famine* in the text. There are only two instances of plural *famines* in the text, and in each case *famines* occurs only as a conjunct with other plural nouns:

> 2 Nephi 10:6   destructions **famines** pestilences and bloodsheds shall come upon them
>
> Ether 11:7   there began to be wars and contentions in all the land
>   and also many **famines** and pestilences

> Thus internal evidence also supports the reading "famine and bloodshed" as the original reading here in Alma 45:11.

Summary: Restore the original singular *famine* in Alma 45:11 ("yea famine and bloodshed"); also maintain the original singular *bloodshed.*

■ **Alma 45:12**

yea I say unto you **that** *because they shall sin against so great light and knowledge*
yea I say unto you [NULL > *that* 0 | *that* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *from that day*
even the fourth generation shall not all pass away before this great iniquity shall come

Here in the original manuscript, Oliver Cowdery initially omitted the second instance of the sub-
ordinate conjunction *that*. Virtually immediately he supplied it (there is no difference in ink flow
for the supralinearly inserted *that*). The occurrence of *that* is very common after "I say unto
you"; in fact, there is an example earlier in this verse: "yea I say unto you **that** because they shall
sin against so great light and knowledge". But the *that* is not required in the text; we have, for
instance, examples like Alma 41:10: "behold I say unto you : wickedness never was happiness".
For each case of "I say unto you", the critical text will rely on the earliest textual sources in deter-
mining whether the *that* is there. Here in Alma 45:12, the critical text will follow the corrected
reading in 𝒪 ("yea I say unto you **that** from that day . . .").

Summary: Maintain in Alma 45:12 both instances of *that* following "yea I say unto you", the invari-
ant reading in 𝒪 for the first instance and the virtually immediately corrected reading in 𝒪 for the
second instance.

■ **Alma 45:13**

behold the time very soon cometh that those which are now
or the seed of those which are now numbered among

☐ *the people Nephites*   0*
☐ *the people of Nephi*   0ᶜABCDEFGHIJKLMNOQRT
☐ *the Nephites*   1*
☐ *the people of the Nephites*   1ᶜPS

shall no more be numbered among the people of Nephi

Here both manuscripts show considerable confusion between "the people of Nephi", "the Nephites",
and "the people of the Nephites". Oliver Cowdery initially wrote "the people Nephites" in the
original manuscript; then he corrected the phrase to "the people of Nephi" (by erasing the word
Nephites and overwriting it with *of Nephi*). The erasure shows that the correction was immediate.
In the printer's manuscript, Oliver initially wrote simply "the Nephites"; then he corrected the text
to "the people of the Nephites" by supralinearly inserting "the people of" (the correction was
virtually immediate since there is no difference in the level of ink flow). Yet the 1830 edition ended
up following the corrected reading in 𝒪, "the people of Nephi", undoubtedly because for this
part of the text the 1830 edition was proofed against 𝒪 (as discussed under Alma 42:31). Beginning
with the 1908 edition, the RLDS text has followed the reading of 𝒫. The critical text will follow
the corrected reading in 𝒪, "the people of Nephi".

The phrase "the people of Nephi" is much more frequent in the Book of Mormon than "the
people of the Nephites" (141 to 18). In fact, here in Alma 45:13, the sentence ends with a second
reference to "the people of Nephi":

Alma 45:13

    behold the time very soon cometh that those which are now
    or the seed of those which are now numbered among the people of Nephi
    shall no more be numbered among **the people of Nephi**

And earlier in this passage, we get another reference to "the people of Nephi":

Alma 45:11

    even until **the people of Nephi** shall become extinct

In fact, there are two instances where Oliver Cowdery initially wrote (or started to write) in 𝒪
the more common "the people of Nephi" in place of "the people of the Nephites", the opposite of
what occurred in Alma 45:13:

Helaman 3:22

    and it came to pass that
    the wars and contentions began to cease in a small degree among the people
    of [*Nephi* > *the Nephites* 1 | *the Nephites* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]

Helaman 7:1

    behold now it came to pass in the sixty and ninth year
    of the reign of the judges over the people
    of [*Neph* >+ *the Nephites* 1 | *the Nephites* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]

To be sure, "the people of the Nephites" is possible and definitely occurs in the earliest text (18 times,
as noted above). In each case, we follow the earliest textual sources, thus "the people of Nephi"
here in Alma 45:13 but "the people of the Nephites" in Helaman 3:22 and Helaman 7:1. For further
discussion of the last two instances, see under Helaman 3:22.

Summary: Maintain in Alma 45:13 the original reading, based on the immediately corrected text in
the original manuscript (namely, the more frequent "the people of **Nephi**").

■ **Alma 45:14**

but whosoever remaineth and is not destroyed
in that great and dreadful day
shall be numbered among the Lamanites
and shall become like unto them
[01A |, BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
all [01 |, ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *save it be a few*
which shall be called the disciples of the Lord

    The current text for Alma 45:14 has commas on both sides of *all,* which makes it difficult for a reader
to determine whether *all* belongs with the preceding prepositional phrase (as "unto them all") or
with the following subordinate clause (as "all save it be a few"). The 1830 typesetter interpreted the
all as belonging to the preceding *them* (since he placed a comma only after the *all*). But beginning
with the 1837 edition, commas have surrounded the *all,* thus making the reading here ambiguous.
    Elsewhere in the text, there is one example of the prepositional phrase "unto them all" where
the *all* belongs with *them* rather than with a following noun phrase, namely, in Helaman 10:17:

"even until he had declared it unto them all or sent it forth among all the people". On the other hand, elsewhere there are six examples of the expression "all save X" (where X stands for a noun phrase or a clause). Either reading is theoretically possible here in Alma 45:14, yet clearly the text is saying that all the Nephites who survive will become like the Lamanites, except for a few "disciples of the Lord". The *all* therefore belongs with the following clause ("all save it be a few"), and the extra comma after the *all* should be removed:

> Alma 45:14 (1830 punctuation minimally revised)
> but whosoever remaineth, and is not destroyed in that great and dreadful day,
> shall be numbered among the Lamanites, and shall become like unto them,
> **all** save it be a few, which shall be called the disciples of the Lord;

The same punctuation, with a comma preceding *all,* is found in four out of the six other cases of "all save X" (given here with the 1830 punctuation):

> Mosiah 19:18
> and it came to pass that they met the people in the wilderness,
> **all** save the king and his priests.

> Alma 58:31
> and our fathers, and our women, and our children, are returning to their homes,
> **all** save it be those which have been taken prisoners and carried off by the Lamanites.

> Helaman 3:23
> there was continual peace established in the land,
> **all** save it were the secret combinations
> which Gaddianton the robber had established,

> Helaman 16:15
> nevertheless, the people began to harden their hearts,
> **all** save it were the most believing part of them,

Two exceptions, each originally printed with a comma after *all,* read as follows (given here with the 1830 punctuation):

> Ether 6:27
> and it came to pass that neither would the sons of Jared,
> even **all**, save it were one;

> Ether 9:12
> and there began to be a war between the sons of Akish and Akish,
> which lasted for the space of many years;
> yea, unto the destruction of nearly all the people of the kingdom;
> yea, even **all**, save it were thirty souls,

The 1920 LDS edition omitted the comma after *all* in the first of these two cases but left it in the second. For the sake of consistency, the comma after the *all* in Ether 9:12 should also be removed. But for these two cases, we should note, the preceding *even* makes sure that the *all* belongs with the following *save*-clause. Similarly, the comma after *all* in Alma 45:14 should be removed since here too the *all* belongs with the *save*-clause.

Summary: Remove the comma after *all* in Alma 45:14 as well as in Ether 9:12 since the *all* clearly belongs with the following *save*-clause ("all save X"); this change is especially helpful in providing the correct interpretation for Alma 45:14.

■ **Alma 45:15**

and [*now* 01ABCEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST | D] *it came to pass that*
after Alma had said these things to Helaman
he blessed him

The 1841 British edition accidentally omitted the narrative connector *now* in this passage; the subsequent LDS edition (1849) restored it. Either reading is, of course, possible. There are a total of 105 instances in the original text of "and now it came to pass"—and many more without the *now*. So in each case, we follow the earliest textual sources. For other instances where the text has omitted the *now* in this context, see under Alma 8:1.

Summary: Maintain the original use of *now* in Alma 45:15 ("and **now** it came to pass that . . .").

■ **Alma 45:18**

as to his death
or [NULL >? *his* 0 | *his* 1A | BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *burial*
we know not of

Spacing between extant fragments of the original manuscript indicates that Oliver Cowdery probably wrote "or burial" initially in 𝒪 (that is, without any repeated *his*). But the printer's manuscript reads "or his burial". There are therefore two possibilities for the transmission of the text here:

(1) Oliver Cowdery missed the *his* when he initially wrote down the text in 𝒪, but then he corrected 𝒪 (perhaps immediately) by inserting the *his* supralinearly;

(2) there was no repeated *his* in 𝒪, but Oliver Cowdery accidentally added it when he copied the text into 𝒫.

There is independent evidence in 𝒫 that Oliver Cowdery could either omit or add the repeated *his,* at least temporarily:

> 3 Nephi 6:1 (*his* accidentally omitted)
> his flocks and [NULL > *his* 1 | *his* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] herds

> 3 Nephi 7:2 (*his* accidentally added)
> every man according to his family
> and his kindred and [*his* >+ NULL 1 | ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] friends

It should also be noted that in Alma 45:18 the 1830 sheet (the 22nd signature) was proofed against 𝒪, which argues that the *his* was in 𝒪, even if supralinearly inserted. Yet even in this situation we must keep in mind that an intrusive *his* added in 𝒫 and set in the 1830 edition could have been left unchanged despite proofing against 𝒪. Consider, for instance, the phrase "the army of" in Alma 43:41, which was lost in copying from 𝒪 into 𝒫 and thus omitted when this passage was

set for the 1830 edition. In this case, the phrase was not restored to the first edition, despite the proofing of the 1830 sheet against 𝒪.

Elsewhere in the text, when *death* is conjoined with another noun, the determiner *his* is typically not repeated:

> 2 Nephi 26:3   of his birth and also of **his death and resurrection**
> Alma 16:19   the coming of the Son of God / **his sufferings and death**
> Alma 45:19   we know nothing concerning **his death and burial**
> 3 Nephi 6:20   and they did testify boldly of **his death and sufferings**
> Moroni 9:25   and may **his sufferings and death** . . . rest in your mind forever

Here we have five examples, one of which is in the very next verse following Alma 45:18 (and refers to the same subject, Alma's death and burial). Nonetheless, all five of these examples involve the conjunction *and* rather than *or*. In two other cases involving *his* in noun phrase conjuncts conjoined by *or*, we get one case of repetition and one without:

> 1 Nephi 8:36   all the words of **his dream or vision**
> Ether 14:1   if a man should lay **his tool or his sword** upon the shelf

In the second case, the *or* is used to conjoin different objects ("his tool" versus "his sword"). In the first case, on the other hand, the *or* refers to a semantic equivalence between the words *dream* and *vision* ("his dream or vision"). This difference implies (although the evidence is meager) that in Alma 45:18, since "his death" is not equivalent to "his burial" and the conjunction is *or*, the *his* can be repeated. This semantic analysis thus supports the reading in 𝒫, "his death or **his** burial", but only weakly.

In any case, the 1837 edition omitted the repeated *his* in Alma 45:18. This change seems to be unintended. For another case where the 1837 edition accidentally omitted the repeated *his* (from the conjunctive phrase "all his gold and **his** silver"), see under Alma 15:16. In neither case was the 1837 deletion of the repeated *his* marked in 𝒫 by Joseph Smith. In any event, the fact that the 1837 edition omitted the repeated *his* here in Alma 45:18 supports the possibility that Oliver Cowdery initially omitted it in 𝒪. Since either reading is possible, we follow the earliest extant reading, namely, the one in 𝒫: "as to his death or **his** burial".

Summary: Restore the repeated *his* in Alma 45:18 ("as to his death or **his** burial"), the reading of the earliest extant source, the printer's manuscript.

■ **Alma 45:19**

and the saying went abroad in the church
that he was taken up by the Spirit
or buried by the hand of the Lord
even as Moses
but behold the [*Scripture* 1A | *scripture* BCDEFGHKPS | *scriptures* IJLMNOQRT] *saith*
the Lord took Moses unto himself

Here in Alma 45:19, the 1879 LDS edition changed the singular *scripture* to the plural *scriptures,* probably accidentally since the resulting "scriptures saith" is technically ungrammatical: *saith* is

supposed to take a third person singular subject, not the plural *scriptures*. But this argument has no force at all since verb forms ending in *-(e)th* frequently took plural subjects in the original text of the Book of Mormon. For the 1879 edition, one might expect the editor, Orson Pratt, to have been aware of the distinction. Perhaps the error was introduced by the 1879 typesetter.

The singular *scripture* is used a number of times in the Book of Mormon to refer to a single scriptural passage; in each case, the verb is *say* (in fact, the verb form is consistently *saith*). In the following four cases, I list the King James passage that most clearly matches the language of the corresponding Book of Mormon passage:

(1) Alma 12:21

> what does this **scripture** mean which **saith**
> that God placed cherubims and a flaming sword
> on the east of the garden of Eden

> > (1′) Genesis 3:24

> > > and he placed at the east of the garden of Eden
> > > cherubims and a flaming sword

(2) Alma 30:8

> for thus **saith** the **scripture**
> choose ye this day whom ye will serve

> > (2′) Joshua 24:15

> > > choose you this day whom ye will serve

(3) Mormon 8:20

> behold what the [*scriptures* >% *scripture* 1 | *Scripture* A |
>   *scripture* BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] **saith**
> man shall not smite neither shall he judge
> for judgment is mine / saith the Lord
> and vengeance is mine also and I will repay

> > (3′) Romans 12:19

> > > dearly beloved / avenge not yourselves
> > > but *rather* give place unto wrath
> > > for it is written : vengeance *is* mine
> > > I will repay / saith the Lord

(4) Ether 13:12

> and when these things come
> bringeth to pass the **scripture** which **saith**
> there are they which were first which shall be last
> and there are they which were last which shall be first

> > (4′) Luke 13:30

> > > and behold there are last which shall be first
> > > and there are first which shall be last

The example in Mormon 8:20 shows a tendency on the part of scribe 2 of 𝔓 to initially write the plural *scriptures;* in that instance, he immediately corrected the plural to the singular by erasing the final *s*. The 1830 edition, which is a firsthand copy of 𝒪 for this part of the text, also reads *scripture*. We can be quite sure that 𝒪 itself read in the singular for that passage.

It is worth noting that the two New Testament scriptures (referred to in Mormon 8:20 and in Ether 13:12) may each derive from some earlier, now unknown, scriptural source. In the case of Mormon 8:20, Paul's reference in Romans 12:19 to what is written may be a paraphrase of Deuteronomy 32:35: "to me *belongeth* vengeance and recompense". There is also the possibility that the specific language of Romans 12:19 and Mormon 8:20 actually derives from some earlier scriptural passage, now lost, that was related to the Deuteronomy passage. Similarly, David Calabro points out (personal communication) that Moroni's citation in Ether 13:12 may be a paraphrase of the earlier Nephite scripture in 1 Nephi 13:42: "and the last shall be first and the first shall be last". One could also argue that the specific language of Luke 13:30 and Ether 13:12 originated with some earlier, now unknown, scriptural source.

Here in Alma 45:19, the reference is to Moses's passing; this event is described in the following biblical passage:

> Deuteronomy 34:5–6
> so Moses the servant of the LORD died there in the land of Moab
>   according to the word of the LORD
> and he buried him in a valley in the land of Moab over against Beth Peor
> but no man knoweth of his sepulchre unto this day

This passage states that the Lord buried Moses, which agrees with the statement in Alma 45:19 that some thought Alma had been "buried by the hand of the Lord / even as Moses". But the phrase "even as Moses" may apply to the entire preceding conjunctive phrase "he was taken up by the Spirit or buried by hand of the Lord"; note that immediately afterwards the Book of Mormon writer (either Helaman or Mormon) tacitly assumes that Moses and Alma were received "in the spirit" (especially since the text uses the word *also*):

> Alma 45:19
> and we suppose that he hath **also** received Alma in the spirit unto himself
> therefore for this cause we know nothing concerning his death and burial

But the writer in Alma 45:19 refuses to speculate on whether Alma was physically "taken up by the Spirit" in a literal sense or even buried by the Lord. The possibility remains that the Book of Mormon writer is referring to a specific but unknown scripture that says, as Alma 45:19 does, that "the Lord took Moses unto himself".

The original Book of Mormon text also has one case where the plural *scriptures* occurs with the verb *say* (and once more with the verb form *saith,* at least originally); in that instance, Christ is speaking to his twelve Nephite disciples:

> 3 Nephi 27:5
> have they not read the **scriptures**
> which [*sayeth* >js *say* 1 | *saith* A | *say* BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
> ye must take upon you the name of Christ
> which is my name

Here the original manuscript is not extant, but both the 1830 edition and the printer's manuscript have the plural *scriptures*. Since both are firsthand copies of 𝓞 for this portion of the text (from Helaman 13 through the end of Mormon), we can assume that 𝓞 also read *scriptures* for this passage. However, the example in Mormon 8:20 shows that the scribe could have accidentally

written the plural *scriptures* in ○. Moreover, as explained earlier in this section, the fact that the earliest text has the form *saith* cannot be used as an argument against having a plural subject such as *scriptures*.

It turns out that this passage in 3 Nephi 27:5 is conceptually different from the five others that read "the scripture saith". There is no scriptural reference in the Bible that refers to "taking upon oneself the name of Christ", but there are numerous references in the Nephite scriptures that use this phraseology:

> 2 Nephi 31:13 (Nephi, son of Lehi)
> witnessing unto the Father that
> ye are willing to take upon you the name of Christ by baptism

> Mosiah 5:8 (king Benjamin)
> therefore I would that ye should take upon you the name of Christ

> Alma 34:38 (Amulek)
> that ye contend no more against the Holy Ghost but that ye receive it
> and take upon you the name of Christ

> Alma 46:18 (Moroni, the chief captain)
> surely God shall not suffer that
> we who are despised because we take upon us the name of Christ
> shall be trodden down and destroyed

Christ, the speaker in 3 Nephi 27:5, is thoroughly familiar with the Nephite scriptures; see 3 Nephi 23:6–13, in which Christ emphasizes the importance of Samuel's prophecy about the resurrection being included in the Nephite scriptures. Also note that 3 Nephi 23:14 refers to Jesus expounding to the Nephites "all the scriptures in one which **they** had written". Consequently, there is no reason that Christ would necessarily restrict himself in 3 Nephi 27:5 to referring to just biblical scriptures. Thus the use of the plural *scriptures* in 3 Nephi 27:5 is perfectly appropriate.

Summary: Restore the original singular *scripture* in Alma 45:19; elsewhere the text uses "scripture saith" whenever a single scriptural passage is referred to; on the other hand, the plural *scriptures* in 3 Nephi 27:5 is correct since in that case Christ is referring to the multiple passages in Nephite scripture where prophets have exhorted the people to take upon themselves the name of Christ.

■ **Alma 45:21**

for behold because of their wars with the Lamanites

□ *they had* **become exceeding dissenting**   0*

□ NULL   0ᶜ 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST

and the many little **dissensions** *and disturbances*
which had been among the people
it **became expedient** *that*
the word of God should be declared among them

Here in the original manuscript, Oliver Cowdery wrote a very strange clause, "they had become exceeding dissenting" (although the last word, seemingly spelled as *desenting,* is written quite

unclearly and unevenly). Oliver immediately crossed this whole clause out and then continued inline with the correct text, "and the many little dissensions and disturbances which had been among the people". His mistake was influenced, in part, by the following noun *dissensions;* perhaps the later use of *became expedient* ("it became expedient that . . .") led him to write the similar-sounding *become exceeding* in ◯. Ultimately, what we appear to have here is a case of Oliver starting to fall asleep as he took down Joseph's dictation (perhaps nodding off as he wrote, with very little control, the last word, *desenting*). His mind seems to have created an impossible clause, one that he crossed out as soon as he realized his scribal lapse.

Support for this interpretation can be found in the very next verse, where Joseph Smith had to take over for Oliver Cowdery. There Joseph ended up writing down 28 words in his own hand (given here in bold):

> Alma 45:22 (original accidentals in ◯ retained)
> therfore Helaman & his Brethren went forth
> to establish the church again in all the land
> **yea in every citty throughout all the land**
> **which was possessed by the people of Nephi**
> **and it came to pass that they did appoint priests and teachers**
> throughout all the land over all the churches

The reason Joseph wrote down this small portion of text may be because he had to finish writing down what he was viewing before he too could take a break (apparently the text he was viewing could cut off at the end of a phrase in the middle of a sentence). For this argument about the translation process (as well as another possible interpretation for why Joseph took over as scribe here), see pages 71–75 of Royal Skousen, "Translating the Book of Mormon: Evidence from the Original Manuscript", in *Book of Mormon Authorship Revisited: The Evidence for Ancient Origins,* edited by Noel B. Reynolds (Provo, Utah: FARMS, 1997), 61–93.

Summary: Accept in Alma 45:21 Oliver Cowdery's immediate deletion of the impossible clause "they had become exceeding dissenting"; this error was apparently the result of Oliver starting to fall asleep, which led Joseph Smith to take over briefly in the next verse, to get down what he, Joseph, had been viewing before he himself could take a break.

Alma 46

■ **Alma 46:3**

now the leader of those which were wroth against their brethren
was a large and [*a* 01ABDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST | c] *strong man*

> The 1840 edition accidentally, it would appear, dropped the repeated indefinite article *a*. Surprisingly, the 1858 Wright edition restored the repeated *a* (even though the 1840 edition served as the copytext for that edition). Perhaps the typesetter for the Wright edition had learned to expect the repeated *a*, especially given its occurrence elsewhere in the text (see the example under 1 Nephi 11:35 as well as the general discussion under CONJUNCTIVE REPETITION in volume 3).

Summary: Maintain in Alma 46:3 the repeated *a* in the conjunctive phrase "a large and **a** strong man", a distinctive characteristic of the Book of Mormon text.

■ **Alma 46:4**

and those people which **were** *wroth*
[*was >+ were* 0 | *were* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *also desirous that he should be their king*

> As discussed under Mosiah 10:14, Oliver Cowdery sometimes corrected nonstandard *was* to *were*, but apparently only when the actual text read that way. There isn't much evidence that he consciously emended nonstandard *was* to *were*. Here in Alma 46:4, he initially wrote *was* in ℗, but then he soon crossed out the *was* and supralinearly inserted the correct *were*. The supralinearly *were* is written with slightly heavier ink flow, while the crossout and insert mark have somewhat heavier ink flow. Oliver probably made the correction here when he read the text back to Joseph Smith, although the possibility remains that Oliver was prompted by the preceding *were* ("which were wroth") to emend the following *was* to *were*. For a similar example of *was* corrected to *were* in the manuscripts, see the nearby discussion under Alma 46:33.

Summary: Maintain the plural *were* in Alma 46:4, Oliver Cowdery's corrected reading in ℗: "and those people which were wroth **were** also desirous that he should be their king".

■ **Alma 46:4–5**

and they were seeking for power
[NULL >+ & 0 | & 1 | *And* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *they had been led*
by the flatteries of Amalickiah

> Here at the beginning of verse 5, Oliver Cowdery initially omitted the *and*. Somewhat later, perhaps when he read the text back to Joseph Smith, he supralinearly inserted the ampersand with somewhat

heavier ink flow; the insert mark itself has even heavier ink flow and appears to have been written very quickly since it looks more like an *x* than a caret. The *and* seems needed here, so conscious editing cannot be ruled out. There is, however, considerable evidence in this chapter that Oliver tended to omit the *and* in 𝓞. Later on in this chapter, there are two examples of sentence-initial *and* that Oliver momentarily omitted in 𝓞 (and supralinearly inserted almost immediately):

> Alma 46:35
>
> [NULL > & 0|& 1|*and* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] there was but few which denied the covenant of freedom

> Alma 46:40
>
> [NULL > & 0|& 1|*And* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] there were some who died with fevers

Summary: Accept in Alma 46:5 Oliver Cowdery's inserted *and* in 𝓞 as the reading of the original text.

■ **Alma 46:5**

and they had been led
by the [*flatteries* 0ABCDGHKLMNOPQRST|*flateries* 1|*flatterers* EFIJ] *of Amalickiah*
that if they would support him and establish him to be their king
that he would make them rulers over the people

Here in the 1849 LDS edition, the word *flatteries* was accidentally replaced by *flatterers*. Despite its difficulty, this typo continued in the LDS text until replaced by the correct reading in the 1902 LDS missionary edition and, independently, in the 1905 LDS missionary edition. Given the context, *flatteries* is obviously correct.

Summary: Maintain the original *flatteries* in Alma 46:5.

■ **Alma 46:5**

and they had been led by the flatteries
of [*Ameleckiah* >+ *Amalickiah* 0|*Amalickiah* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]

The correct spelling for this name is *Amalickiah,* extant in 𝓞 and written without variation two times earlier in this chapter, in verses 3–4 (the first two occurrences of the name in the text). The common misspelling *Ameleckiah* is the result of Joseph Smith pronouncing the name with stress on the first syllable (rather than on the second syllable, the English pronunciation used today). Because of Joseph's pronunciation, Oliver Cowdery never misspelled the initial *a* in the name, but he did tend to write the second and third vowels as *e*. Sometimes Oliver corrected his error, as here in verse 5 (the third occurrence of the name in the text); sometimes he did not. For a complete listing of the spellings of this name, see pages 79–82 of Royal Skousen, "Translating the Book of Mormon: The Evidence from the Original Manuscript", in *Book of Mormon Authorship Revisited: The Evidence for Ancient Origins,* edited by Noel B. Reynolds (Provo, Utah: FARMS, 1997), 61–93.

Summary: Amalickiah is the correct spelling for the name of the infamous Nephite dissenter; the first two occurrences of this name (in Alma 46:3–4) are spelled this way in 𝓞 and without variation.

■ **Alma 46:7**

notwithstanding their great victory which they had had over the Lamanites
and their great rejoicings which they had had because of
their [*deliveary* 1 | *deliverance* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *by the hand of the Lord*

For the word *deliverance/delivery,* the original manuscript is only partially extant (*deli,* the first four letters of the word, is found at the end of a line in ◎). Perhaps *delivery,* if that was the reading in ◎, was spelled as *deliveary* since the printer's manuscript reads *deliveary.* On the other hand, the 1830 edition reads *deliverance.* Here the 1830 compositor may have originally set *delivery* but then changed it to *deliverance* as a result of having the 1830 sheet (the 22nd signature) proofed against ◎ (see the discussion under Alma 42:31). Spacing between extant fragments of ◎ supports the longer *deliverance,* although *delivery* (or *deliveary*) could also fit here in the lacuna providing there was some minor correction in the line. When Oliver Cowdery copied the text from ◎ into 𝒫, he would have initially read *deli,* the first part of the word at the end of the line in ◎, which could have easily led him to misinterpret the word as *delivery* rather than the correct *deliverance.*

The printed editions have continued with the reading *deliverance.* Theoretically, either *delivery* or *deliverance* will work here in Alma 46:7. Elsewhere the text has occurrences of only *deliverance* (14 times); the word *delivery* occurs nowhere else in the textual history. The 1830 compositor could have been influenced by the lack of *delivery* elsewhere in the text, although we should keep in mind that there is nothing wrong with *delivery.* Moreover, there are no nearby preceding occurrences of *deliverance* that could have prompted the compositor to replace *delivery* with *deliverance;* the nearest preceding occurrence of *deliverance* is in the preface preceding Alma 17 ("their sufferings and deliverance"), 72 pages earlier in the compositor's copytext, the printer's manuscript. The word *deliverance* occurs quite frequently in the King James Bible (16 times); there is one occurrence of *delivery* in the King James Bible (in Isaiah 26:17), but for that occurrence *delivery* refers to the birth of a child.

Summary: The word *deliverance,* the reading in the 1830 edition for Alma 46:7, is probably the reading in the original text as well as in ◎, no longer extant; spacing in the lacuna and usage elsewhere in the Book of Mormon support *deliverance* rather than *delivery,* the reading in 𝒫; the fact that the end of the line in ◎ read *deli* could have led Oliver Cowdery to replace *deliverance* with *delivery* when he copied the text from ◎ into 𝒫; the 1830 edition ended up with *deliverance* most likely because for this part of the text the 1830 signature was proofed against ◎.

■ **Alma 46:7**

notwithstanding their great victory which they had had over the Lamanites
and their great rejoicings which they had had because of their deliverance
by the [*hands* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQS | *hand* RT] *of the Lord*

The original manuscript is not extant here for *hand(s).* The printer's manuscript has the plural *hands,* which was retained in the text until the 1920 LDS edition, when it was replaced by the singular *hand.* This emendation is in agreement with every other occurrence of "by the hand(s) of the Lord" in the Book of Mormon; excluding this case in Alma 46:7, there are 20 occurrences of "by

the hand of the Lord" but none of "by the hands of the Lord". Moreover, whenever "by the hands of X" does occur in the text (where X is not "the Lord"), X is always a plural and refers to people:

Alma 5:5	by the hands of the Lamanites
Alma 9:10	even by the hands of their own brethren
Alma 10:3	by the hands of his brethren
Alma 25:4	by the hands of the Nephites
Alma 43:46	by the hands of your enemies
Mormon 6:15	by the hands of those who slew them
Mormon 9:18	by the hands of the apostles

Thus "by the hands of the Lord" in Alma 46:7 is doubly exceptional. Finally, we should note that in "by the hand of X" (where X refers to people), X can be either singular or plural providing X does not refer to the Lord or to God; there are ten occurrences of singular X and eight of plural X.

Once more, there are two possibilities for the original manuscript: (1) the text read *hand,* but Oliver Cowdery accidentally copied it as *hands* into the printer's manuscript; or (2) the text in 𝓞 read *hands,* but this was nonetheless a mistake for *hand.* Either possibility is consistent with Oliver's tendency to accidentally add plural *s*'s. Since here the 1830 signature was proofed against 𝓞 (see under Alma 42:31), one could argue that 𝓞 read *hands* since the 1830 reading is *hands.* But one could also argue that 𝓞 read *hand* and that the minor difference between *hand* and *hands* was simply missed during proofing.

For a list of examples where *hand* and *hands* have been mixed up in the history of the text, see under Mosiah 16:1. Of particular interest here in Alma 46:7 is the following nearby error in 𝓞 where Oliver Cowdery initially wrote *hands* rather than *hand:*

> Alma 46:24
>> so shall a remnant of the seed of my son be preserved
>> by the [*hands* >% *hand* 0 | *hand* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] of God

This phrase, "by the hand of God", is essentially the same as the phrase here in Alma 46:7 ("by the hand of the Lord"). Thus we see that Oliver tended to accidentally replace *hand* with *hands* in phrases referring to "the hand of the Lord" or to "the hand of God". It doesn't matter much whether Oliver's error in Alma 46:7 occurred when he took down Joseph Smith's dictation (in 𝓞) or when he copied the text from 𝓞 into 𝓟. Textual consistency strongly argues that Alma 46:7 should read "by the **hand** of the Lord", in accord with the emendation in the 1920 LDS edition.

Summary: Accept the emendation in the 1920 LDS edition that replaced *hands* with *hand* in Alma 46:7; usage elsewhere in the text strongly supports the phraseology "by the hand of the Lord"; moreover, Oliver Cowdery made the same basic error in 𝓞 for Alma 46:24, but there he immediately caught his error.

■ **Alma 46:8**

and to be led away by the [*evil* 0ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST | *wicked* > *evil* 1] *one*

Only the ascender of the *l* in *evil* is extant in 𝓞, but since this ascender could also belong to a *d,* we have to consider the possibility that 𝓞 actually read *wicked.* The small lacuna in 𝓞, however,

argues against the longer *wicked.* And although Oliver Cowdery initially wrote *wicked* in 𝒫, he virtually immediately corrected it to *evil* (the level of ink flow for the supralinear *evil* and for the crossout of *wicked* are unchanged). Here the 1830 edition, proofed against 𝒪, reads *evil.* The critical text will therefore accept the corrected reading in 𝒫, "the evil one", as the original reading as well as the reading in 𝒪.

Elsewhere the text has six examples of "the evil one" but none of "the wicked one". On the other hand, the King James Bible has only "the wicked one" (four times). Here in Alma 46:8, Oliver Cowdery initially wrote "the wicked one" in 𝒫 probably because the following text has two instances of the morpheme *wicked:* "yea and we also see the great **wicked**ness one very **wicked** man can cause to take place among the children of men" (Alma 46:9). The critical text will therefore accept the corrected reading in 𝒫, "the evil one", as the reading of the original text as well as the reading in 𝒪.

Summary: Maintain in Alma 46:8 the corrected reading in 𝒫, "the evil one".

■ **Alma 46:9**

yea and we also see the great wickedness
one [NULL > *verry* 1 | *very* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *wicked man can cause*
to take place among the children of men

There is room in 𝒪, between extant fragments, for the adverb *very* (spelled presumably as *verry,* Oliver Cowdery's typical spelling for *very*). When he copied the text from 𝒪 into 𝒫, Oliver initially omitted the *very* in this passage; but then virtually immediately he supralinearly inserted it (spelled as *verry*) with no change in the level of ink flow. Either reading, with or without the *very,* is possible for the phrase "wicked man":

Jacob 7:23	and hearkened no more to the words of this wicked man
Omni 1:2	but behold I of myself am a wicked man
Mosiah 27:8	nevertheless he became a **very** wicked and an idolatrous man
Alma 2:4	he being a wicked man would deprive them of their rights
Alma 35:8	and the chief ruler of the Zoramites being a **very** wicked man . . .

The critical text will accept the corrected reading in 𝒫 for Alma 46:9: "one **very** wicked man".

Summary: Maintain in Alma 46:9 the corrected reading in 𝒫, "one **very** wicked man".

■ **Alma 46:10**

yea we see that Amalickiah
because he was a man
of cunning [*devises* 0 | *divises* 1 | *devices* ABCGHKPS | *device* DEFIJLMNOQRT]
and a man of many flattering words
that he led away the hearts of many people to do wickedly

The original text clearly had the plural *devices* here in Alma 46:10. In the 1841 British edition, the typesetter accidentally replaced the plural with the singular *device;* the LDS text has continued

with the singular *device* in this passage. Yet this change is inconsistent with the rest of the Book of Mormon text:

Alma 10:13	that by their cunning **devices** they might catch them in their words
Alma 11:21	now Zeezrom was a man which was expert in the **devices** of the devil
Alma 30:42	and he doth carry you about / working **devices** that he may destroy the children of God

In other words, the rest of the Book of Mormon text has only the plural form *devices,* just as the original text had here in Alma 46:10.

Summary: Restore the plural *devices* in Alma 46:10, the original reading; elsewhere the text has only the plural form for this word.

■ **Alma 46:10**

yea we see that Amalickiah
because he was a man of cunning devices and a man of many flattering words
that he led away the hearts of many people to do wickedly
yea and to seek to destroy the church of God and to destroy
the foundation [NULL > *or* > NULL 0| 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *of liberty*
which God had granted unto them
[*of* >% *or* 0| *or* 1ABCDEFGHJKLNPRST | *or* > *of* I | *of* MOQ] *which blessing God had sent*
upon the face of the land for the righteous' sake

Oliver Cowdery had some difficulty here in 𝒪 with *or* and *of*. After the word *foundation,* Oliver supralinearly inserted an *or,* then crossed it out. His decision to insert the *or* could have been caused by him having just heard Joseph Smith's dictation of the *or* that comes later on, just before *which blessing*. And when Oliver got to that *or,* he started to write *of* but then erased the partially written *f* and overwrote the word with *or*.

This second difficulty with *or* and *of* shows up later in the printing history of the Book of Mormon. When the 1879 stereotyped plates located in Salt Lake City started to deteriorate, portions of some pages were reset, including parts of Alma 46. Unfortunately, in the resetting for this verse, the correct *or* was set as *of,* and this reading was accidentally followed by some of the early 20th-century Book of Mormon editions (the 1905 Chicago edition, the 1907 vest-pocket edition, and the 1911 large-print Chicago edition). The editors for the 1920 LDS edition restored the correct *or* in this passage. (Adam Davis, a research assistant of mine from 1995–1997, did the basic research on these turn-of-the-century editions of the Book of Mormon, including the specific research on the reset portions of these 1879 stereotyped plates.)

The reading with *or* clearly makes better sense since the following relative clause ("which blessing God had sent upon the face of the land for the righteous' sake") is used to explain that God had not granted the foundation of liberty to the wicked, but he did it for the sake of the righteous (note the preceding relative clause, "which God had granted unto **them**", where the pronoun *them* could be misinterpreted as referring to those who were misled by Amalickiah, thus the need for the *or*-clause to explain who the *them* is referring to).

The construction "of which X", where X is a noun, occurs only once in the Book of Mormon text, and in that instance the prepositional phrase postmodifies *many,* which means that the "of which X" phrase does not begin the relative clause (instead, *many* does):

> 2 Nephi 4:14
> for I had spake many things unto them
> —and also my father before his death—
> **many of which sayings** are written upon mine other plates

On the other hand, there are 66 examples of the phrase "of which" in the original text, some of which do begin a relative clause:

> 1 Nephi 1:16
> and he also hath written many things
> which he prophesied and spake unto his children
> **of which** I shall not make a full account

But there is no example of a prepositional phrase construction of the form "of which X" initiating a relative clause (except in the incorrect form of Alma 46:10). Thus the incorrect phraseology "of which blessing" would be distinctly out of place in terms of Book of Mormon usage.

Summary: Maintain in Alma 46:10 the original reading, "**or** which blessing"; the *or* correctly represents the meaning here.

■ **Alma 46:12**

and it came to pass that he rent his coat
and he took a piece **thereof** *and wrote upon it . . .*
and he fastened it upon the end of a pole [*thereoff* 0 | *thereof* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRS | RT]

The word *thereof* occurred 160 times in the original text of the Book of Mormon. The word is also very prominent in the King James Bible, occurring there 908 times. The purpose of *thereof* after a noun is to refer to some antecedent noun. There are examples in the Book of Mormon text where *thereof* means 'of it', 'of them', and even 'of him':

1 Nephi 4:9	and I beheld **his sword** and I drew it forth from **the sheath thereof**
1 Nephi 18:15	and also **mine ankles** were much swollen
	and great was **the soreness thereof**
Ether 14:16	the brother of **Lib** did come against Coriantumr in the stead **thereof**

Here at the beginning of Alma 46:12, the *thereof* after *piece* refers to the preceding "his coat"—in other words, the reading is equivalent to "he took a piece of it" or, more specifically, "he took a piece of his coat". The problem later on in verse 12 is that the original *thereof* postmodifies *a pole* in the phrase "upon the end of a pole", but there is no preceding noun referent for *thereof.* It's as if the text were referring to "a pole of something". The *thereof* would have worked here if the text had read something like "he took a pole and he fastened the rent piece of his coat to the end thereof", where *thereof* would mean 'of the pole'. In fact, this basic usage is found in the very next verse: "and he took the pole which had on the end **thereof** his rent coat" (Alma 46:13). But

here in verse 12, "of a pole" immediately precedes the *thereof,* making the *thereof* seemingly unnecessary, so it was removed in the editing for the 1920 LDS edition.

One possible source for the extra *thereof* in Alma 46:12 is the *thereof* in the preceding sentence "and he took a piece **thereof** and wrote upon it". Oliver Cowdery—or perhaps Joseph Smith in his dictation—may have gotten used to the *thereof,* with the result that one of them accidentally added it after *pole.* Yet there is considerable evidence elsewhere in the text for seemingly vacuous or redundant uses of *thereof.* Here are five other unattached instances of *thereof* that were deleted in the editing for the 1920 LDS edition:

> Helaman 14:23
>> and there shall be many places which are now called valleys
>> which shall become mountains
>> whose heighth [*thereof* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQS | RT] is great

> 3 Nephi 8:10
>> and the earth was carried up upon the city of Moronihah
>> that in the place of the city [*thereof* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQS | RT]
>> there became a great mountain

> Ether 6:2
>> and he did put forth the stones into the vessels which were prepared
>> one in each end **thereof**
>> and behold they did give light
>> unto the vessels [*thereof* 01ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQS | RT]

> Ether 14:2
>> and every man kept the hilt
>> of his sword [*thereof* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQS | RT]
>> in his right hand in the defense of his property and his own life and . . .

> Ether 14:17
>> and he did overthrow many cites
>> and he did slay both men women and children
>> and he did burn the cities [*thereof* 01ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQS | RT]

In the first example, the *thereof* is redundant since the relative clause already has a possessive, namely, the relative pronoun *whose* ("**whose** heighth **thereof** is great"). In the four other cases, there is no obvious antecedent for the *thereof* (although in the last case "the cities thereof" could mean 'the cities of those men women and children'). In the case of Ether 6:2, there is a preceding *thereof* that could have prompted the following *thereof* (just like potentially here in Alma 46:12).

There are two other instances in the text of *thereof* for which there is no explicit antecedent. In one case, the text itself corrects the reading by means of a *yea*-clause:

> 3 Nephi 4:11
>> and the battle commenced in this the sixth month
>> and great and terrible was the battle **thereof**
>> yea great and terrible was the slaughter **thereof**

In this example, there is no distinguishing antecedent for the first *thereof.* In fact, it is a mistake that Mormon himself introduced into the text. He wanted to refer to the slaughter of the battle,

but he first referred to "the battle thereof" (that is, "the battle of the battle"), thus the need for his correcting *yea*-clause ("yea great and terrible was the slaughter thereof"). Thus the original text itself can have misuses of *thereof,* even if corrected. The critical text will therefore restore all the original instances of *thereof,* despite their redundancy or their lack of a distinct referent.

In the other case of *thereof* without an explicit antecedent, there is an actual referent (unlike the first *thereof* in 3 Nephi 4:11):

> Alma 30:18
> and thus he did preach unto them
> leading away the hearts of many
> causing them to lift up their heads in their wickedness
> yea leading away many women and also men to commit whoredoms
> telling them that when a man was dead
> that was the end **thereof**

In other words, "that was the end **of it**", the end of existence.

The 1920 LDS edition also eliminated four other instances of *thereof,* in Ether 2:20. In that one verse, the original *thereof*'s have the antecedent *barge* or *barges* (which is referred to somewhat earlier in the passage, in verse 18). The multiple, seemingly excessive, use of *thereof* in Ether 2:20 may have led to the removal of these four *thereof*'s. In other words, the issue in Ether 2:20 may have been stylistic rather than grammatical. See under that passage for discussion. For another example where *thereof* was removed, this time by Joseph Smith in his editing for the 1837 edition, see under Jacob 5:48.

Summary: Restore all six original instances of vacuous or redundant *thereof* that were removed from the text in the editing for the 1920 LDS edition (Alma 46:12, Helaman 14:23, 3 Nephi 8:10, Ether 6:2, Ether 14:2, and Ether 14:17); this kind of usage appears to have been fully intended.

■ **Alma 46:13**

and he fastened **on** *his headplate*
and [01ABCDEGHIJKLMNOPQRST | *on* > NULL F] *his breastplate*
and his [*shealds* 0 | *shields* 1ABCDEGHIJKLMNOPQRST | *shield* > *shields* F]
and girded on his armor about his loins

Here in the first printing of the 1852 LDS edition, there were two typos that were removed in the second printing, probably by reference to the 1840 edition. First, a repeated *on* was inserted before *his breastplate,* prompted undoubtedly by the *on* before the immediately preceding *his headplate.* Second, the plural *shields* was changed to *shield,* either because of the preceding singular *headplate* and *breastplate* or, more likely, because the 1852 typesetter expected Moroni to have but one shield.

Elsewhere in the Book of Mormon text, we have only plural uses of *shields,* and the reference is always to groups of warriors and not a single individual as here in Alma 46:13. Nonetheless, when we look at these other occurrences, we discover that a warrior, in full armor, would have had various shields protecting at least his head, chest, and arms:

> Alma 43:19   Moroni had prepared his people with breastplates and with **armshields**
> yea and also **shields to defend their heads**

Alma 43:21	but they were not armed with breastplates nor **shields**
Alma 43:38	they being **shielded** . . . by their breastplates and their **armshields** and their headplates
Alma 44:9	it is your breastplates and your **shields** that hath preserved you
Alma 49:6	they had also prepared themselves with **shields** and with breastplates
Alma 49:24	but they were **shielded** by their **shields** and their breastplates and their headplates
Helaman 1:14	and armed them . . . with headplates and with breastplates and with **all manner of shields of every kind**
3 Nephi 3:26	that they should be strong with armor and with **shields** and with bucklers
Ether 15:15	both men women and children . . . having **shields** and breastplates and headplates

There were breastplates, armshields, bucklers, and headplates. In Alma 43:19, headplates are virtually defined as "shields to defend their heads". In Helaman 1:14, we have a generic reference to "all manner of shields of every kind". It appears that there were different kinds of shields that an individual warrior could put on; thus the use of *shields* in Alma 46:13 is perfectly correct.

Summary: Maintain in Alma 46:13 the plural use of *shields* in reference to Moroni's armor since *shields* can refer to armshields, headplates, and "all manner of shields of every kind"; the preposition *on* is not repeated in the conjunctive prepositional phrase, "**on** his headplate and his breastplate and his shields".

■ **Alma 46:13**

and he fastened on his headplate and his breastplate and his shields
and girded on his armor about his loins
and he took the pole which had on the end thereof **his rent coat**
and he called it the title of liberty
and [NULL >+ *he* 0 | *he* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *bowed himself to the earth*
and he prayed mightily unto his God for the blessings of liberty to rest upon **his brethren**

The original manuscript has three supralinear insertions in this passage: "his rent coat" and "his brethren" (both set above in bold) and the subject pronoun *he*. Each of these insertions is written with somewhat heavier ink flow, which suggests that all three were added at the same time, probably at the time Oliver Cowdery read this passage back to Joseph Smith.

The *he* could have been missing from the original text (unlike the two longer insertions, which seem necessary). The immediately surrounding clauses also have the *he* ("and **he** took the pole . . . and **he** called it the title of liberty . . . and **he** prayed mightily"). Note, however, that earlier in this verse there is one conjoined predicate without the *he* ("and girded on his armor about his loins"). In that instance, the two conjoined predicates are closely associated ("and he **fastened** on his headplate and his breastplate and his shields / and **girded** on his armor about his loins"), whereas the conjoined predicates later on in the verse are semantically unrelated, thus making the initial reading less satisfactory ("and he called it the title of liberty and bowed himself to the earth"). The reference to bowing down belongs with the following predicate, which has

the *he* ("and he bowed himself to the earth and **he** prayed mightily . . ."). The critical text will therefore accept the inserted *he* before the conjoined predicate "bowed himself to the earth".

Summary: Accept in the original manuscript Oliver Cowdery's inserted *he* in the middle of Alma 46:13; the insertion appears to be a correction to the original text, probably made when Oliver Cowdery read the text back to Joseph Smith.

■ **Alma 46:13**

so long as there should [01ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRT | *be* s] *a band of Christians remain to possess the land*

Here the 1953 RLDS edition added the infinite verb form *be,* replacing "there should a band of Christians remain" with "there should **be** a band of Christians remain". This secondary reading appears to be grammatically wrong. There is a similar example of such an intrusive *be* in the LDS text, beginning with the 1905 LDS missionary edition:

> Ether 6:5
> and it came to pass that the Lord God caused that
> there should [1ABCDEFGHIJKLNOPS | *be* MQRT] a furious wind blow
> upon the face of the waters towards the promised land

The construction "there should NP <infinitive verb>" (where NP stands for a noun phrase) is a fairly common construction in the Book of Mormon text. Dispersed throughout the rest of the original text are seven more examples of this construction (of which five involve negation):

2 Nephi 25:18	for there should **not any come** save it should be a false Messiah
Mosiah 2:14	that there should **nothing come** upon you which was grievous
Mosiah 27:2	that there should **not any unbeliever persecute** any of those . . .
Alma 1:21	that there should **not any man belonging to the church arise and persecute** those that did not belong to the church
Alma 22:21	lest there should **some evil come** upon her
3 Nephi 26:16	that there should **not any man write** them
Moroni 8:4	that there should **disputations rise** among you

Thus there is no need to insert a *be* verb in either Alma 46:13 or Ether 6:5. In fact, it is wrong because the following verb takes the infinitive form. There are cases of this construction where *be* does occur as an auxiliary verb, but in all instances that verb is followed by a past-participial verb form (so that we end up with a passive construction):

1 Nephi 9:3	that there should **be** an account **engraven** of the ministry of my people
Jacob 3:5	and there should not **be** whoredoms **committed** among them
Jacob 7:12	if there should **be** no atonement **made**
Mosiah 10:1	that there should **be** weapons of war **made** of every kind
Mosiah 13:29	that there should **be** a law **given** to the children of Israel
Mosiah 29:7	if there should **be** another **appointed** in his stead
Alma 21:20	that there should **be** synagogues **built** in the land of Ishmael

Alma 50:2	that there should **be** . . . works of timbers **built** up
	to the heighth of a man
Alma 50:3	that there should **be** a frame of pickets **built** upon the timbers
Alma 59:9	that there should **be** men **sent** to the city of Nephihah
Helaman 11:28	that there should **be** a stop **put** to this work of destruction
3 Nephi 2:3	that there should **be** any more signs or wonders **given**
3 Nephi 3:14	that there should **be** armies . . . **placed** as guards round about

The last example has a long relative clause after *armies* and in the original text ends up repeating the verb phrase *should be;* see the discussion under 3 Nephi 3:14.

The intrusive *be* here in Alma 46:13 and in Ether 6:5 may be due to the influence of the construction "there **shall be** NP <infinitive verb>", which is found in the original text. For discussion of that construction, see under 2 Nephi 1:6 and Helaman 14:5.

Summary: The critical text will follow the original expression "there should NP <infinitive verb>" in Alma 46:13, Ether 6:5, and wherever else the earliest text supports it; there is no need for a *be* after *should* in any of these cases.

■ **Alma 46:17**

he [*gave* 01ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQS | *named* RT] *all the land which was south of the land Desolation—yea and in fine all the land both on the north and on the south—a chosen land and the land of liberty*

The editors for the 1920 LDS edition replaced the past-tense form *gave* with *named,* probably because the use of the verb *give* here seems inappropriate or misleading. However, this use of the verb *give* is not a mistake. Instead, the particular meaning of *give* here is no longer current in English. Diane DeFord Lillie, a student in my winter 1994 Book of Mormon textual criticism class, discovered that the Oxford English Dictionary lists a definition for *give* (namely, definition 25) that reads 'represent, describe, portray, report'. Identified in the OED as "now rare", this meaning has citations mostly from the 1600s, but there is one from the 19th century (here I regularize the spelling and ignore the punctuation):

William Shakespeare (1607)
more cruel to your good report than grateful to us
that **give** you truly

James Shirley (1631)
your brother **gave** you more desirous of the sport

Thomas Herbert (1634)
the land at twenty leagues' distance **gave** itself very high

Thomas Herbert (1638)
many other things **give** themselves noteworthy

Alfred Tennyson (1850)
what practice howso'er expert . . .
hath power to **give** thee as thou wert

So the original text for Alma 46:17 means that Moroni described the whole land as "a chosen land and the land of liberty". The verb *name,* on the other hand, implies an action on Moroni's part, as if Moroni himself declared that this land was a chosen land. Elsewhere in the Book of Mormon, it is clear that the Lord himself is responsible for this designation:

> 2 Nephi 1:6–7
>> wherefore I Lehi prophesy
>> according to the workings of the Spirit which is in me
>> that there shall be none come into this land
>> save they should be brought by the hand of the Lord
>> wherefore this land is consecrated unto him whom he shall bring
>> and if it so be that they shall serve him
>> according to the commandments which he hath given
>> it shall be **a land of liberty** unto them

> Ether 13:2
>> for behold they rejected all the words of Ether
>> for he truly told them of all things from the beginning of man
>> and how that after the waters had receded from off the face of this land
>> it became a choice land above all other lands
>> **a chosen land** of the Lord

A verb like *name* and others like *call* and *declare* involve an action on the part of the subject. Such verbs are called performatives (as with the verbs *pronounce* and *sentence* in the sentences "I now pronounce you man and wife" and "I sentence you to life imprisonment"). The verbs listed in the OED under definition 25 (*represent, describe, portray,* and *report*) generally do not involve such an overt act on the part of the speaker and therefore more accurately represent the original meaning of *give* here in Alma 46:17. The critical text will accept the original verb form *gave* in this passage.

Summary: Restore in Alma 46:17 the original past-tense verb form *gave*, which here means something like 'described' or 'portrayed', a nonperformative meaning that was prevalent in the 1600s.

■ **Alma 46:17**

yea and in fine all the land
both **on the** *north and* [*on the* 01ABCDEFGIJLMNOQRT | HKPS] *south*

The 1874 RLDS edition removed the repeated *on the* here in Alma 46:17, and the RLDS text has continued with this shortened reading. This change appears to be an error rather than due to editing. Elsewhere in the text, we always get conjunctive repetition whenever *north* and *south* are conjoined in a prepositional construction:

2 Nephi 29:11	and **in the** north and **in the** south
Mosiah 27:6	**on the** north and **on the** south
Helaman 1:31	neither **on the** north nor **on the** south
Helaman 6:9	both **in the land** south and **in the land** north
Helaman 6:12	both **in the** north and **in the** south

Helaman 6:12	both **in the** north and **in the** south
3 Nephi 1:17	both **in the land** north and **in the land** south
3 Nephi 6:2	both **on the** north and **on the** south
3 Nephi 20:13	and **from the** south and **from the** north

(There are two identical occurrences of the phrase in Helaman 6:12.) For other examples of this kind of repetition in the original text, see under CONJUNCTIVE REPETITION in volume 3.

Summary: Maintain in Alma 46:17 the repetition of the preposition and the determiner in the conjoining of *north* and *south* ("on the north and on the south").

■ **Alma 46:19**

he went forth among the people waving
the rent [1ABCDEFGHIJKLPS|NULL > *part* M|*part* NOQRT] *of his garment in the air*
that all might see the writing which he had wrote
upon the rent [1ABCDEFGHIJKLPS|NULL > *part* M|*part* NOQRT]
and crying with a loud voice saying . . .

The noun *rent* refers only to the tear itself, not to the torn portion. The Oxford English Dictionary gives no examples of the noun *rent* referring to the torn part itself. The 1906 LDS large-print edition thus emended the text here in Alma 46:19 to read "the rent part" in both instances. This change was followed in the third printing (in 1907) of the 1905 LDS missionary edition and the 1907 LDS vest-pocket edition as well as all subsequent LDS editions (1911, 1920, and 1981). A nearby passage provides support for selecting the word *part* to emend the text in Alma 46:19, namely, in Alma 46:24: "a **part** of the remnant of the coat of Joseph was preserved and had not decayed". Another possible emendation would be *piece,* as in Alma 46:12: "he rent his coat and he took a **piece** thereof and wrote upon it".

The critical text will maintain this use of *rent* as a noun (with the meaning 'rent part'), despite its difficulty. The original manuscript is not extant for these two occurrences of *rent,* but spacing considerations between extant portions of 𝓞 show that in both cases *part* could not have been in 𝓞 except by supralinear insertion. It is highly unlikely that Oliver Cowdery, when copying to the printer's manuscript, would have omitted both instances of a supralinearly inserted *part* (or even both instances of *part* written inline). The two original instances in Alma 46:19 of *rent* without *part* or *piece* appear to be fully intended.

John Tvedtnes has pointed out that the Hebrew verb for 'tear', namely *qāraʿ,* has a nominal form, *qeraʿ,* that means 'a torn piece of garment'; see page 51 of Tvedtnes's article "Hebraisms in the Book of Mormon: A Preliminary Survey", *Brigham Young University Studies* 11/1 (1970): 50–60. Literally, this Hebrew noun could be translated into English as simply *rent* (that is, without the expected *part* or *piece*). There are several instances of this usage in the Hebrew Bible; the word *piece* in the King James text could be literally translated as *rent:*

1 Kings 11:30 ("and rent it into twelve **rents**")
> and Ahijah caught the new garment that *was* on him
> and rent it *in* twelve **pieces**

1 Kings 11:31 ("take to thee ten **rents**")

> and he said to Jeroboam : take thee ten **pieces**
> for thus saith the LORD the God of Israel :
> behold I will rend the kingdom out of the hand of Solomon
> and will give ten tribes to thee

2 Kings 2:12 ("and rent them into two **rents**")

> and he took hold of his own clothes
> and rent them in two **pieces**

Note that each King James passage also uses the verb *rend,* the same verb used seven other times in Alma 46 to refer to the tearing of garments (see Alma 46:12–13 and Alma 46:21–23).

There is also some evidence in Early Modern English for the use of the noun *rent* with the meaning 'rent piece of cloth' (original accidentals retained):

Robert Baron (1649)

> Let desperate persons endure the thunder of warre,
> and the haile-shot of oft redoubled stroakes;
> then shew a **rent** scarse stained with (perhaps innocent) bloud,
> as a trophe, or a fragment of a torne banner;
> the meanest of her favours will make a goodlier show.

I owe this citation to Daine Stevens, a student in my winter 2007 course on textual criticism of the Book of Mormon. This passage can be found on *Literature Online* <lion.chadwyck.com>.

Summary: Restore in Alma 46:19 the original two occurrences of *rent* as a noun (that is, without an explicit noun such as *part* or *piece*); such usage, despite its unusualness, is fully intended and can be considered a literal Hebraism or an instance of language usage from Early Modern English.

■ **Alma 46:21**

and it came to pass that when Moroni had proclaimed these words
[NULL >+ *behold* 0 | *behold* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *the people came running together*

Oliver Cowdery initially omitted the word *behold* here in the original manuscript; somewhat later he supralinearly inserted it (the ink flow is slightly heavier), perhaps when he read the text back to Joseph Smith. Since either reading will work, there would have been no motivation for Oliver to consciously emend the text here. There are ten other examples of this kind of construction in the original text ("it came to pass that <*when*-clause> behold <main clause>"), as in 1 Nephi 7:18: "and it came to pass that when I had said these words / **behold** the bands were loosed from off my hands and feet". Here in Alma 46:21, the critical text will maintain the corrected reading in 𝓞.

Summary: Maintain in Alma 46:21 the corrected reading in 𝓞, "**behold** the people came running together".

■ **Alma 46:21**

behold the people came running together
with their [*armours* 1FILMNQ | *armors* > *armours* A | *armors* BCDEGJO | *armor* HKPRST]
    girded about their loins
rending their garments

The original manuscript is not extant for the ending of the word *armour(s);* only the first three letters, *arm,* are extant in 𝖮. We cannot tell if the word read in the singular or plural—or if the base word was spelled *armour* or *armor.* The spelling issue is readily solved since Oliver Cowdery always spelled the word as *armour* in the manuscripts. Once he initially spelled the word as *armor* in 𝖮, but this he corrected to *armour* almost immediately (in Alma 46:13, listed below).

As far as the grammatical number is concerned, here in Alma 46:21 the printer's manuscript has the plural *armours.* In current English we treat *armor* as a noncount noun, so the use of the plural seems unusual here in Alma 46:21. For this reason, both the LDS and RLDS texts have been edited to the singular *armor* (in 1874 for the RLDS text and in 1920 for the LDS text).

When we consider all instances of *armor(s)* in the text, we find that only here in Alma 46:21 is there any textual evidence for the plural *armors;* in the following list, there are four instances (including the plural one here in Alma 46:21) that refer to girding on armor, each one marked below with an asterisk:

* 1 Nephi 4:19
    and I did **gird** on his [*armour* 01ACEFHILMQ | *armor* BDGJKNOPRST]
    about my loins

  2 Nephi 1:23
    awake my sons
    put on the [*armour* 01EFILMNQ | *armor* ABCDGHJKOPRST] of righteousness

  Mosiah 21:7
    and they gathered themselves together again
    and put on their [*armour* 1ABCDEFILMNQ | *armor* GHJKOPRST]
    and went forth against the Lamanites

* Alma 3:5
    now the heads of the Lamanites were shorn and they were naked
    save it were a skin which was girded about their loins
    and also their [*armour* 1ABCDEFILMNQ | *armor* GHJKOPRST]
    which was **girded** about them

  Alma 43:21
    but they were not armed with breastplates nor shields
    therefore they were exceeding fraid of the armies of the Nephites
    because of their [*armour* 01ABCDEFILMNQ | *armor* GHJKOPRST]

* Alma 46:13
    and he fastened on his headplate and his breastplate and his shields
    and **girded** on his [*armor* > *armour* 0 | *armour* 1ABCDEFILMNQ |
      armor GHJKOPRST] about his loins

* Alma 46:21

> behold the people came running together
> with their [*armours* 1FILMNQ | *armors* > *armours* A | *armors* BCDEGJO |
>   *armor* HKPRST] **girded** about their loins
> rending their garments

3 Nephi 3:26

> and Gidgiddoni did cause that they should make weapons of war of every kind
> that they should be strong with [*armour* 1EFILMNQ | *armor* ABCDGHJKOPRST]
> and with shields and with bucklers

3 Nephi 4:7

> and they had headplates upon them
> and great and terrible was the appearance of the armies of Giddianhi
> because of their [*armour* 1AEFILMNQ | *armor* BCDGHJKOPRST]

More specifically, three of the four cases refer to girding armor "about one's loins"; the one in Alma 3:5 does not, although earlier that passage refers to "a skin which was girded about their loins". The exceptionality of *armors* for the earliest text in Alma 46:21 clearly suggests that *armors* could be an error for *armor*.

There are two basic possibilities for explaining why *armors* occurs in the earliest textual sources for Alma 46:21: (1) the original text read in the singular, as *armor,* but it was accidentally changed to *armors,* either when Oliver Cowdery took down Joseph Smith's dictation or when Oliver copied the text from 𝓞 into 𝓟; or (2) the original text read in the plural, as *armors,* and this plural form was faithfully transmitted throughout the manuscripts and early editions.

It should first be noted that there is no specific manuscript evidence that Oliver Cowdery or any of the other scribes ever mixed up the number for *armor.* This finding provides some support for *armors* as the original reading in Alma 46:21. Nonetheless, there are so many examples of Oliver mixing up the grammatical number for other nouns in the text that we cannot rely on the lack of variation in number for nine instances of *armor(s).* Moreover, one could argue that *armors* in Alma 46:21 was an error induced by the plurals *loins* and *garments* in this sentence ("with their **armors** girded about their **loins** / rending their **garments**"). But such a proposed error did not occur in the three other instances (each marked above with an asterisk) where *loins* occurs close to *armor.*

Another factor worth considering is that Alma 46:21 is in that portion of the text where the 1830 sheet (the 22nd signature) was set from 𝓟 but proofed against 𝓞 (see the discussion under Alma 42:31). Both 𝓟 and the 1830 edition here read *armours* (or *armors* originally in the 1830 edition until emended to *armours* in an in-press change), which argues that 𝓞 read in the plural. Of course, it is always possible that the lack of an *s* in 𝓞 could have been missed in proofing. See, for instance, the discussion below regarding verse 22 where an original *should* in the manuscripts was mis-set as *shall* in the 1830 edition but never corrected.

Historically, in Early Modern English there is evidence that *armor* was frequently used in the plural when referring to the armor of more than one person (or animal). We have the following examples in the plural under *armour,* definition 2 ('a suit of mail'), in the Oxford English Dictionary (here I retain the original accidentals):

William Caxton (1483)

He had . . . **armours** ynowe for to garnysshe with seuen thousand men.

[equivalent to "he had enough armor to furnish seven thousand men"]

William Brereton (1635)

Furnished with about sixty or seventy **armours** for horse.

Thus the plural *armors* is possible in Alma 46:21 since the reference is to more than one person. The plural reading is the earliest extant reading (in 𝒫); the critical text will therefore accept *armors*, despite its difficulty for modern English readers.

Summary: Restore the plural *armors* in Alma 46:21, the earliest extant reading (in 𝒫) as well as the reading of all the early editions; although a difficult reading, there is evidence from Early Modern English for such plural usage.

■ **Alma 46:21**

or in other words / if they should transgress the commandments of God
[*or* 01ABCDEFIJLMNOPQRST | GHK] *fall into transgression*
and be ashamed to take upon them the name of Christ . . .

The 1858 Wright edition accidentally deleted the coordinating conjunction *or,* giving a rather difficult (but not impossible) conjunctive structure, providing one interprets the resulting structure as a series of three predicates conjoined by *and* but explicitly expressed only before the last predicate:

Alma 46:21 (the 1858 Wright and early RLDS reading)

if they should transgress the commandments of God
fall into transgression
and be ashamed to take upon them the name of Christ . . .

Of course, this interpretation really won't work because "transgress the commandments of God" and "fall into transgression" are basically synonymous, as can be seen in Jarom 1:10: "if they did not keep the commandments but should fall into transgression / they should be destroyed from off the face of the land" (I owe this example to Don Brugger). Here in Alma 56:21, the original *or* provides an alternative way of expressing the first predicate. Despite the difficulty of the reading without the *or,* that shorter reading was copied into the 1874 RLDS edition and not removed from the RLDS text until 1908.

Summary: Maintain the *or* in Alma 46:21; this *or* is necessary since it allows for the following predicate to rephrase the preceding one: "if they should transgress the commandments of God **or** fall into transgression".

■ **Alma 46:22**

now this was the covenant which they [01ABCDEFGHIJKLMOPQRST | *had* N] *made
and they cast their garments at the feet of Moroni saying :
we covenant with our God that . . .*

The 1906 LDS edition added the perfective *had* to this verse. That edition was never used as a copytext, so the intrusive *had* was never added to any subsequent LDS edition. Either reading is theoretically possible, although the reading without the *had* works better in the larger context since the following text provides the actual words of the covenant (immediately after "we covenant with our God that . . ."). The 1906 error seems to have come from the preceding sentence (at the end of verse 21): "even as they **had** rent their garments". The critical text will follow the earliest textual sources, which lack the *had* in "now this was the covenant which they made".

Summary: Maintain in Alma 46:22 the original reading without the perfective *had* in the relative clause: "now this was the covenant which they made" (instead of "now this was the covenant which they **had** made").

■ **Alma 46:22**

*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* 01 | *shall* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *fall into transgression*

The 1830 edition replaced the modal *should* with *shall,* probably under the influence of the nearly parallel phraseology earlier in this verse:

> Alma 46:22
>> we covenant with our God that we shall be destroyed
>> even as our brethren in the land northward
>> if we **shall** fall into transgression

However, earlier in this passage (in the immediately preceding verse), we find *should* used with the phrase "fall into transgression":

> Alma 46:21
>> if they **should** transgress the commandments of God or **fall into transgression**
>> and be ashamed to take upon them the name of Christ
>> the Lord should rend them even as they had rent their garments

Note here that the occurrence of *should* (the first *should* in verse 21) extends to the following conjoined predicate ("if they should . . . fall into transgression"). In other words, we have more than one example in the original text of "**should** fall into transgression" within the larger passage.

It is worth noting here that this 1830 error was not caught when the 1830 sheet (the 22nd signature) was proofed against 𝓞 (as discussed under Alma 42:31). For another instance where the 1830 typesetter replaced *should* with *shall,* see under 2 Nephi 25:19; for other cases where *shall* and *should* have been mixed up in the history of the text, see under MODALS in volume 3.

Summary: Restore in Alma 46:22 the original *should* at the end of the verse ("if we **should** fall into transgression") while maintaining the *shall* earlier on in the verse ("if we **shall** fall into transgression"); in general, either reading is possible, so in each case we follow the earliest textual sources.

■ **Alma 46:23**

yea and now behold let us remember to keep the commandments of God
or our garments shall be rent by our brethren
and we be cast into [*Prisons* 0 | *prison* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
or be sold or be slain

The original manuscript here has the plural *prisons*. When Oliver Cowdery copied the text from 𝒪 into 𝒫, he accidentally replaced this plural with the singular, *prison*. All the printed editions have continued with the singular. Elsewhere the text has only the singular *prison* when the verb is *cast* (with 40 examples of either "cast in(to) prison" or "cast out of prison"). But all of these examples refer to cases where specific people were put in prison. Here in Alma 46:23, we have a general list of punishments. There are two other passages that include similar lists, and both of these read *prisons* in the original text:

> Alma 36:27
> yea God hath delivered me from [*prisons* 01 | *prison* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
> and from bonds and from death

> Alma 62:50
> yea they did remember how great things the Lord had done for them
> that he had delivered them from death and from bonds
> and from **prisons** and from all manner of afflictions

In these two cases, the verb is *deliver* rather than *cast,* but that is not the determining factor. The critical text will restore the original plural *prisons* here in Alma 46:23 as well as in Alma 36:27 (see the discussion under that passage).

Even when we have the phrase "cast into **prison**", the context can be plural; in such passages, the text may later refer to plural *prisons:*

> 3 Nephi 28:19
> and they were cast into **prison** by them who did not belong to the church
> and the **prisons** could not hold them
> for they were rent in twain

> 4 Nephi 1:30
> and they did cast them into **prison**
> but by the power of the word of God which was in them
> the **prisons** were rent in twain

These two examples show the strong tendency for the verb *cast* to take the singular *prison,* even when the context implies plurality. Still, there is one example in the earliest text where "cast into prisons" occurs (namely, here in Alma 46:23).

Even though the 1830 edition was proofed against 𝒪 for this part of the text, this passage retained the singular reading *prison,* the reading in 𝒫. Perhaps the phrase "cast into prison" was so highly expected that Oliver Cowdery, the proofreader, missed seeing the plural *s.* Or perhaps he thought the plural *prisons* was simply an error (yet he did not cross out the plural *s* in 𝒪).

Summary: In accord with the reading of the two manuscripts, restore the plural *prisons* in Alma 46:23; the original plural agrees with other examples where *prisons* is found in a general list of punishments (in Alma 36:27 and in Alma 62:50).

■ **Alma 46:24**

even as this remnant of garment
of my [*Sons* >p *Son* / *Sons* >p *Son's* o | *Son* > *Sons* 1 | *sons* ABCDEG | *son's* FHIJKLMNOPQ | son RT | *son's* > *son* S] *hath been preserved*
so shall a remnant of the seed of my [*Son* 1 | *son* ART | *sons* BCDEGHKPS | *son's* FIJLMNOQ]
be preserved by the hand of God

There has been considerable variation in the Book of Mormon text regarding the double genitive (that is, noun phrases of the form "X of Y's"). Sometimes the earliest text reads "X of Y's", and sometimes it reads "X of Y".

For this passage, the earliest text reads "this remnant of garment of my son's" (the original reading in 𝒪) and "a remnant of the seed of my son" (the reading in 𝒫 since 𝒪 is not extant here). For the first case, 𝒪 actually reads *Sons,* but this stands for the singular possessive *son's* rather than the plural *sons* (the son here is Joseph of Egypt). Oliver Cowdery initially copied this as *Son* into 𝒫, but then virtually immediately he inserted the possessive *s* inline (there is no change in the level of ink flow for the correcting *s*). Oliver typically wrote possessive noun forms without any apostrophe (see the discussion for the phrase "three days' journey" under the 1 Nephi preface in part 1 of volume 4). In most cases, the 1830 compositor was able to correctly interpret such cases of final *s* as possessives. But here in Alma 46:24, the compositor set *sons* without any apostrophe. Later, when Oliver was proofing the 1830 sheet (the 22nd signature) against 𝒪, he made a correction in pencil to the *Sons* in 𝒪. But it is not clear what Oliver intended here. He made a rather long vertical pencil stroke through the final *s* in *Sons* that can be interpreted as an attempt to either delete the plural *s* or to add an apostrophe. But whatever Oliver intended here, it was never implemented in the 1830 edition itself since it reads *sons,* which is what the compositor's copytext (the printer's manuscript) read.

For the second case, "a remnant of the seed of my son", 𝒪 is not extant but 𝒫 reads *Son,* which the 1830 compositor set as *son.* Unlike the preceding case of *sons,* there seems to have been no difficulty with this instance of *son* during the early transmission of the text, from dictation to the 1830 typesetting.

For all subsequent editions, there has been considerable variation. Not only have there been switches from "X of Y's" to "X of Y" and vice versa, there has also been mutual influence (or even contamination) between the two original instances of *son's/son.* The following chart summarizes the changes the text has undergone here, with shifts set in bold:

TEXTUAL SOURCES	"garment of my son's"	"seed of my son"
□ *manuscripts*		
𝒪*	Sons	——
𝒫	Son > Sons	Son
𝒪ᶜ (in pencil)	Son / Son's	——
□ *early editions*		
1830	sons	son
1837, 1840	sons	**sons**
□ *LDS textual tradition*		
1841, 1849	sons	sons
1852−1911	**son's**	**son's**
1920, 1981	**son**	**son**
□ *RLDS textual tradition*		
1858 Wright	sons	sons
1874−1953*	**son's**	sons
1853ᶜ	**son**	sons

The plural *sons* does not work at all, but it has been difficult to eradicate the plural reading from the text. The critical text will follow the earliest textual sources here, *son's* in the first case (by interpreting the *Sons* in 𝒪 as a possessive singular) and *son* in the second case.

Elsewhere the manuscripts show considerable variation between the two possibilities, "X of Y" and "X of Y's". Since either reading is theoretically possible, the critical text will in each case follow the earliest textual sources in deciding whether the Y should take the possessive *s* or not. Here I list all the other cases of textual variation involving the double genitive, with an asterisk indicating each case of original "X of Y's", the double genitive form:

Alma 19:16 ("a vision of her father")
on account of a remarkable vision
of her [*fathers* >% *father* 1 | *father* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]

Alma 46:33 ("the hands of Moroni")
and the remainder were delivered up into the hands
of [*Moronis* >% *Moroni* 0 | *Moroni* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]

* Alma 55:4 ("a descendant of Laman's")
that perhaps he might find a man which was a descendant
of [*Lamman* > *Lamam* > *Lamans* 0 | *Laman* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
among them

* Alma 62:6 ("that of Parhoron's")
and uniting his forces with that
of [*Pahorons* 1 | *Pahoran* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
they became exceeding strong

* Helaman 1:25 ("this march of Coriantumr's")
this march of [*Coriantumrs* 01 | *Coriantumr* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
through the center of the land

3 Nephi 4:8 ("the army of Giddianhi")
> when they saw the appearance of the army
> of [*Giddianhis* > *Giddianhi* 1 | *Giddianhi* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]

Except for here in Alma 46:24, the printed editions have uniformly favored the form "X of Y" instead of "X of Y's". But the earliest textual sources support the possessive form for Y in four cases, namely, the three listed above with asterisks as well as the first instance in Alma 46:24 ("this remnant of garment of my son's"). It is quite clear that Oliver Cowdery tended to accidentally add the possessive *s* (in half of the above six cases, the ones not marked with an asterisk), so we need to consider the possibility that the possessive *s* in the three other cases, the ones marked with an asterisk, as well as the one here in Alma 46:24 ("the remnant of garment of my son's"), may be accidental. See under each of those passages for the specific analysis.

There are no other phrases in the text that are similar to the first case of the genitive in Alma 46:24 ("the remnant of garment of my son's"), so it is difficult to tell whether *son's* here is a mistake for *son*. On the other hand, there is some evidence to support the use of the singular *son* in the second case of the genitive in Alma 46:24 ("a remnant of the seed of my **son**"), namely, in 2 Nephi 1:32: "the Lord hath consecrated this land for the security of thy seed with the seed of my **son**". As with other possible cases of the double genitive in the Book of Mormon, the critical text will accept in Alma 46:24 the earliest reading in the manuscripts, thus the double genitive in the first instance but not in the second:

Alma 46:24 (earliest extant reading)
> even as this remnant of garment of my **son's** hath been preserved
> so shall a remnant of the seed of my **son** be preserved by the hand of God

One final question here deals with the phrase "this remnant of garment of my son's", namely, the lack of a determiner for the word *garment*. Alison Coutts has suggested (personal communication) that in the original text this phrase read "this remnant of **the** garment of my son's", especially since earlier in this verse the text refers to "a part of the remnant of **the** coat of Joseph". Moreover, all other instances in the text of singular *garment* have a determiner, either *a* (five times) or *his* (three times). The three instances of "his garment" are all found nearby, including one at the end of verse 24: "even as the remnant of **his** garment". In other words, everywhere else the word *garment* functions as a count noun; thus one could argue that there should be some determiner for *garment* in "this remnant of garment of my son's". Despite these arguments, we can find evidence in English for *garment* as a noncount or mass noun, as in the phrase "this piece of garment" (similar to "this remnant of garment"), taken from <ezinearticles.com> in an article on the history of the T-shirt:

John Gibb (2006)
> **this piece of garment** allowed the skin to breathe
> and provided a cooling sensation when worn

The usage here is parallel to "this piece of clothing" (a phrase also used by Gibb in his online article). The critical text will therefore maintain in Alma 46:24 the use of *garment* without any determiner in "this remnant of garment of my son's".

Summary: Follow in Alma 46:24 the reading of the manuscripts in determining the appropriate form for the two occurrences of the word *son:* namely, *son's* in the first case ("this remnant of garment of my **son's**") and *son* in the second case ("a remnant of the seed of my **son**"); also maintain the use of *garment* without any determiner in the phrase "this remnant of garment of my son's" since in this instance *garment* is functioning as a noncount or mass noun.

■ **Alma 46:24**

so shall a remnant of the seed of my son be preserved
by the [*hands* >% *hand* ⓞ | *hand* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *of God*

> As discussed under Alma 46:7, there was a tendency for Oliver Cowdery to write the plural *hands* in the phrases "by the hand of the Lord" and "by the hand of God". Except for the one case of "by the hands of the Lord" in Alma 46:7, the earliest text consistently supports the singular *hand* in these two phrases, including here in Alma 46:24. In this instance, Oliver initially wrote the plural *hands* in 𝒪 but then immediately erased the plural *s*. Elsewhere in the text, there are three examples of "by the hand of God" but none of "by the hands of God":

> | Mosiah 1:5 | these things which have been kept and preserved by the **hand** of God |
> | Alma 9:9 | our father Lehi was brought out of Jerusalem by the **hand** of God |
> | 4 Nephi 1:16 | among all the people which had been created by the **hand** of God |

> For a list of cases where *hand* and *hands* have been mixed up in the text, see under Mosiah 16:1.

Summary: Maintain in Alma 46:24 the singular *hand,* the immediately corrected reading in 𝒪 ("by the **hand** of God").

■ **Alma 46:25**

nevertheless my soul hath joy in my son
because [01ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQS | *of* RT]
[*the* > *that* ⓞ | *that* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *part of his seed*
which shall be taken unto God

> The text of the original manuscript reads as a sentence fragment: "because that part of his seed which shall be taken unto God". The editors for the 1920 LDS edition resolved this difficulty by inserting an *of* after *because,* thereby deciding that the rest of the construction ("that part of his seed which shall be taken unto God") was a noun phrase. For this emendation, the *that* acts as the determiner for the noun *part.*

> In support of this conjecture, there is evidence in the manuscripts that Oliver Cowdery sometimes omitted the *of* after *because* (although only momentarily):

> Alma 33:11 (initial error in 𝒫)
>> and thou didst hear me
>> because [*of* 0ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST | NULL > *of* 1] mine afflictions
>>> and my sincerity

Alma 53:9 (initial error in ℗)
    and thus because of iniquity amongst themselves
    yea because [NULL > *of* 0 | *of* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] dissensions
        and intrigue among themselves
    they were placed in the most dangerous circumstances

Helaman 12:2 (initial error in ℗)
    and this because [NULL > *of* 1 | *of* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] their ease
        and their exceeding great prosperity

There is considerable independent evidence for the construction "that part of <noun phrase>" followed by a relative clause (usually headed by *which*):

Jacob 5:40	that part of the tree which brought forth good fruit
Alma 2:37	that part of the wilderness which was infested by wild and ravenous beasts
Alma 23:14	in that part of the land whithersoever they dwelt
Alma 47:3	of that part of his army which was obedient unto his commands
Alma 59:3	that part of the land which he had been so miraculously prospered in retaining
Helaman 1:7	that part of the people that were desirous that he should be their governor
Moroni 9:16	that part of the provisions which the Lamanites did not carry away

Moreover, we have examples of " because of that <noun>" followed by a relative clause:

1 Nephi 15:35	because of that justice of which I have spoken
Helaman 7:25	because of that great abomination which hath come among you
Helaman 7:26	because of that pride which ye have suffered to enter your hearts
Ether 11:15	because of that secret combination which was built up to get power and gain

Another possibility for the sentence fragment here in the earliest text for Alma 46:25 would be to remove the relative pronoun *which,* giving "because that part of his seed shall be taken unto God". In this reading, the *that* could be interpreted as either a subordinate conjunction or as a determiner. In the original text of the Book of Mormon (as also in the King James Bible), *because that* followed by a finite clause was very common. For the most part, Joseph Smith removed these instances of *that* after *because* in his editing for the 1837 edition (see the discussion under 1 Nephi 1:14 and more generally under SUBORDINATE CONJUNCTIONS in volume 3).

As far as the original manuscript is concerned, it is much more likely that Oliver Cowdery accidentally omitted the *of* instead of accidentally inserting the *which*. There are a couple dozen cases where Oliver omitted the *of* in the manuscripts, sometimes momentarily; see, for instance, the three examples listed above where Oliver momentarily dropped the *of* after *because*. In contrast, there is at most only one example in the entire text where Oliver, depending on the analysis, may have inserted a *which,* namely, in 4 Nephi 1:14 (where the earliest extant text reads as a sentence fragment: "and also many of that generation **which** had passed away"). Yet even in that case, the larger context suggests that the *which* is intended (see the discussion under 4 Nephi 1:14).

Thus the most reasonable conclusion is that the 1920 LDS emendation that supplied the *of* is probably the original text for Alma 46:25. The critical text will accept this emendation. For an interesting case where Joseph Smith, in his editing for the 1837 edition, replaced an instance of "because of <noun phrase> <relative clause>" with a *because*-clause, see under Ether 1:43 (there he deleted the *of* and the relative pronoun *which*).

Summary: Accept in Alma 46:25 the 1920 LDS emendation with its added *of* in "because **of** that part of his seed which shall be taken unto God"; scribal errors and usage elsewhere in the text strongly support this emendation.

■ **Alma 46:27**

and now who knoweth but what the remnant of the seed of Joseph
which shall perish as his garment
are those which have [*deserted >+ desented* 1 | *dissented* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *from us*

This example of variation raises a potential problem for the whole text. In the original and printer's manuscripts, Oliver Cowdery often spelled the verb *dissent* as *desent*. (Correspondingly, *dissenter* was sometimes spelled as *desenter;* similarly, *dissension* was sometimes spelled as *desension*.) Since Oliver Cowdery's *r*'s and *n*'s were sometimes indistinguishable, the verb spelled as *desent* could have been mixed up with another verb, *desert*. The original manuscript is not extant for the word *dissented* in Alma 46:27, but it was presumably spelled as *desented* given the spelling in the printer's manuscript. Oliver initially wrote *deserted* in 𝓟, but then he corrected the *r* to an *n* by overwriting. In this case, the correction in 𝓟 may have been made when Oliver proofed 𝓟 against 𝓞 since the ink flow for the overwritten *n* is somewhat heavier. The potential mix-up of *desert* and *desent* (that is, *dissent*) means that ultimately we may have to rely more on the semantics of the passage than on how the scribe wrote the *r* or the *n* or how the 1830 typesetter might have interpreted the scribal *r* or *n*. Despite this caveat, normally the scribes clearly distinguished between *desert* and *desent*.

Looking elsewhere in the text, we find that there are two semantically clear cases of the verb *desert* (neither of them are extant in 𝓞):

> 3 Nephi 4:1
> and it came to pass that in the latter end of the eighteenth year
> those armies of robbers had prepared for battle
> and began to come down and to sally forth from the hills . . .
> and began to take possession of all the lands
> which had been **deserted** by the Nephites

> 3 Nephi 4:2
> but behold there was no wild beasts nor game in those lands
> which had been **deserted** by the Nephites

There are also a couple of semantically clear references to Nephites "dissenting away unto" either the Lamanites or the Gaddianton robbers:

> The Words of Mormon 1:16
> there having been much contentions and many **dissensions** away unto the Lamanites

3 Nephi 3:11
> and now it came to pass when Lachoneus received this epistle
> he was exceedingly astonished because of the boldness of Giddianhi
> in demanding the possession of the land of the Nephites
> and also of threatening the people and avenging the wrongs of those
> that had received no wrong save it were they had wronged themselves
> by [*desenting* 1|*dissenting* ᴀʙᴄᴅᴇꜰɢʜɪᴊᴋʟᴍɴᴏᴘǫʀꜱᴛ] away
> unto those wicked and abominable robbers

There are four additional cases where the current LDS text has the verb *desert,* but the evidence (both scribal and semantic) suggests that in each case the verb should be *dissent.* The first one is very much like the last two examples:

Helaman 4:12
> and it was because of the pride of their hearts
> because of their exceeding riches
> 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
> making a mock of that which was sacred
> denying the spirit of prophecy and of revelation
> murdering plundering lying stealing
> committing adultery
> raising up in great **contentions**
> and [*desenting* 1|*deserting* ᴀʙᴄᴅᴇꜰɢʜɪᴊᴋʟᴍɴᴏᴘǫʀꜱᴛ] away
> into the land of Nephi among the Lamanites

𝒪 is not extant here, but 𝒫 clearly reads *desenting* (that is, with an *n*). The 1830 compositor probably misinterpreted *desenting* as *deserting* because he expected people to desert rather than dissent away into a land. Yet even here the text adds the phrase "among the Lamanites" (that is, these people became dissenters among the Lamanites). In addition, here the word *dissent* occurs with the noun *contention.* Elsewhere in the text, there are numerous examples where the noun *contention* occurs with *dissent* and *dissension,* but there are no examples of *contention* occurring with *desert* or *desertion* except secondarily in Helaman 4:12. Besides the example in the Words of Mormon 1:16 (cited above), we have these collocates of *contention* and *dissension:*

Jarom 1:13	after the manner of wars and contentions and dissensions
Alma 51:16	to put an end to such contentions and dissensions among the people
Alma 62:40	and there had been murders and contentions and dissensions and all manner of iniquity among the people of Nephi
Helaman preface	their wars and contentions and their dissensions
Helaman 3:3	there were much contentions and many dissensions
Helaman 3:14	and their wars and contentions and dissensions
Helaman 3:17	there had been great contentions and disturbances and wars and dissensions among the people of Nephi

Helaman 4:1   there were many dissensions in the church
                    and there was also a contention among the people
3 Nephi 2:18   and their many contentions and dissensions

Thus in Helaman 4:12 we expect "raising up in great contentions and **dissenting** away into the land of Nephi among the Lamanites".

There are also two earlier verses in Helaman 4 that explicitly refer to the people mentioned in verse 12 as dissenters:

Helaman 4:4
    there were **dissenters** which went up from the Nephites unto the Lamanites

Helaman 4:8
    and thus those **dissenters** of the Nephites
    with the help of a numerous army of the Lamanites
    had obtained all the possession of the Nephites
    which was in the land southward

Finally, there are three cases near the end of the Book of Mormon where the current LDS text has *desert,* yet *dissent* is apparently the correct reading. First, we have this example in Mormon:

Mormon 6:15
    and it came to pass that there were ten more
    which did fall by the sword with their ten thousand each
    yea even all my people save it were those twenty and four which were with me
    and also a few which had escaped into the south countries
    and a few which had [*deserted* 1PST | *dissented* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOQR] over
        unto the Lamanites
    had fallen

This example is found in that portion of the text (from Helaman 13 through the end of Mormon) where both 𝒫 and the 1830 edition are firsthand copies of 𝒪. Here 𝒫 is in the hand of scribe 2, and it definitely reads *deserted,* but this is probably a misinterpretation of what Oliver Cowdery wrote in 𝒪 (namely, *desented*). The 1830 compositor correctly interpreted *desented* as *dissented,* which is what he set in the 1830 edition. This reading of *dissented* was followed until the 1981 LDS edition, where the incorrect reading of the printer's manuscript was restored, undoubtedly based on the assumption that here the 1830 edition was set from 𝒫. Similarly, the 1908 RLDS edition replaced *dissented* with *deserted* in the RLDS text because 𝒫 read that way.

Although "deserted over unto the Lamanites" seems quite plausible in Mormon 6:15, the choice here at the end of the Nephite nation was not simply one of choosing one army over another (which is normally what we think of when we use the words *desert* and *desertion*). Nephites switching sides had to deny the Christ—in other words, they had to become dissenters. This is made clear by Moroni later on:

Moroni 1:2−3
    and because of their hatred they put to death
    every Nephite that will not deny the Christ
    and I Moroni will not deny the Christ
    wherefore I wander whithersoever I can for the safety of mine own life

The use of the word *dissent* in Mormon 6:15 is quite correct, even though it may sound strange to modern readers.

This same interpretation applies to the last two examples of *desert* in the current LDS text for which *dissent* should be restored:

> Moroni 9:24
> > we know that many of our brethren
> > have [*desented* 1 | *dissented* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRS | *deserted* T]
> >   over unto the Lamanites
> > and many more will also [*desent* 1 | *dissent* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRS | *desert* T]
> >   over unto them

Having decided that Mormon 6:15 should read *deserted,* the editors for the 1981 LDS edition extended that reading to the two instances of *dissent* in Moroni 9:24.

Ultimately, there are only two examples of the verb *desert* in the Book of Mormon text (in 3 Nephi 4:1–2), and they are the two that refer to lands being deserted. The Nephites do not desert over to the enemy; instead, they dissent over to the enemy. The critical text will therefore maintain the original instance of *dissent* here in Alma 46:27 and restore the original instances of *dissent* in Helaman 4:12, Mormon 6:15, and Moroni 9:24 (two times).

The suggestion to emend *deserting* in Helaman 4:12 to *dissenting* was earlier proposed on pages 568–569 in Stan Larson, "Conjectural Emendation and the Text of the Book of Mormon", *Brigham Young University Studies* 18/4 (1978): 563–569.

Summary: Maintain the verb *dissent* in Alma 46:27 ("those which have dissented from us"); in four other cases, the earliest textual sources support the verb *dissent* over *desert:* Helaman 4:12, Mormon 6:15, and Moroni 9:24 (two times); in the Book of Mormon, the verb *desert* is used only to refer to lands being deserted.

◼ **Alma 46:27**

yea and even [*it shall* 01ABDEFIJLMNOPQRST | *shall it* CGHK] *be us*

Here in the 1840 edition, the order of *it shall* was switched to *shall it.* Theoretically, the change could have been either a typo or the result of Joseph Smith's editing for the 1840 edition. The 1908 RLDS edition restored the original word order to the RLDS text.

Evidence elsewhere in the text argues that the 1840 change was unintentional since there are other examples of "and even <subject> <auxiliary verb>" (eight of them), yet none of these have ever undergone a shift in their word order like here in Alma 46:27:

Mosiah 2:14	and even **I myself have** labored with mine own hands
Mosiah 22:1	and even **they did** cause that all the people should gather themselves together
Mosiah 29:14	and even **I myself have** labored with all the power . . .
Alma 7:2	and even **I could** not have come now at this time
Alma 11:44	and even **there shall** not so much as a hair of their heads be lost
Alma 32:1	yea and even **they did** preach the word in their streets
Helaman 3:5	yea and even **they did** spread forth into all parts of the land

<div align="center">

Helaman 9:41   and even **he hath** brought unto our knowledge
the true murderer of our chief judge

</div>

Nor are there any examples in the text of "and even \<auxiliary verb\> \<subject\>". The critical text will therefore maintain the original word order in Alma 46:27 ("yea and even **it shall** be us").

Summary: Maintain in Alma 46:27 the original word order in "yea and even it shall be us", with the subject before the auxiliary word; this is the consistent word order after *and even* throughout the text; the change in word order for this passage in the 1840 edition was probably a typo and not the result of Joseph Smith's editing for that edition.

■ **Alma 46:27**

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

In prescriptive grammar, the subject complement, if a pronoun, is supposed to take the subject form rather than the object form. The editors for the 1920 LDS edition apparently recognized the so-called ungrammaticality of "it shall be us" but probably found the purportedly correct "it shall be we" sufficiently unnatural that it was decided to emend the *us* to the reflexive pronoun *ourselves* (which does not distinguish between subject and object forms).

There are only two examples in the original text of a reflexive pronominal subject acting as a subject complement:

<div align="center">

3 Nephi 5:20   and no one knew it save it were **himself**
Ether 13:21   otherwise they should be destroyed and all his household
save it were **himself**

</div>

Both of these examples differ from Alma 46:27 in that they involve the expression "save it were X", where the *it* is an expletive that fills the subject position. Nonetheless, if a nonreflexive pronoun were to be used in these two examples, prescriptive grammar would require the subject forms rather than the object forms, especially in formal language (thus "save it were he" in preference to "save it were him").

The critical text will restore the original object form *us* in Alma 46:27. For further discussion of examples like this, see under 2 Nephi 1:27 (which deals with the reading "it was not **him**" versus "it was not **he**"). Also see the general discussion under SUBJECT COMPLEMENT in volume 3.

Summary: Restore in Alma 46:27 the original object form *us* for the subject complement in "it shall be **us**"; as a grammatical emendation, the reflexive *ourselves* sounds better ("it shall be **ourselves**") than the subject form *we* ("it shall be **we**").

■ **Alma 46:28**

he went forth and also sent forth
in all [*the* 01ABCDEFGIJLMNOPQRST | HK] *parts of the land*
where there were dissensions

Here the 1874 RLDS edition omitted the definite article *the* before the word *parts;* the 1908 RLDS edition restored the original *the* (which is extant in ○). Either reading is acceptable, so we follow

the earliest textual sources. Elsewhere in the text, wherever there is a choice, we get examples of only "all parts", never "all **the** parts":

> Alma 13:23   we have these glad tidings declared unto us in **all parts** of our vineyard
>
> Alma 51:9   he was gathering together soldiers from **all parts** of his land
>
> Helaman 3:5   they did spread forth into **all parts** of the land

In any event, the critical text will maintain here in Alma 46:28 the definite article *the* in the phrase "in all **the** parts of the land".

Summary: Maintain in Alma 46:28 the definite article *the* before *parts* ("in all **the** parts of the land"), the reading in both manuscripts and all the early editions.

■ **Alma 46:29**

and he also saw that his people were doubtful
concerning the justice of the cause **in** *which they had undertaken*
[*to >% therefore* 0 | *therefore* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] . . .

One wonders here if the preposition *in* might have been accidentally added to the text during its dictation. ○ is extant here and reads "the cause **in** which they had undertaken". Elsewhere the verb *undertake* takes only a direct object as its complement, not a prepositional phrase headed by *in:*

> Alma 17:13   the work **which** they had undertaken
>
> Alma 17:14   for they had undertaken **to preach the word of God**
>
> Alma 17:16   the cause for which the sons of Mosiah had undertaken **the work**

When taking down Joseph Smith's dictation for Alma 46:29, Oliver Cowdery first thought that the direct object for the verb *undertake* was an infinitive clause; Oliver initially wrote the infinitival *to* after *undertaken,* but then he erased the *to* and wrote *therefore.* This error may have distracted him from realizing that he had incorrectly written the preposition *in* at the beginning of the relative clause.

An extra *in* could have entered the text here as a result of familiarity with the expression "the cause **in** which they had **engaged**", common enough in American English during the second half of the 1700s and the first half of the 1800s, especially when writing about the American War for Independence. A famous instance of this usage is found in the general orders of George Washington at Gulph Mills, Pennsylvania, on 17 December 1777, prior to entering winter quarters at Valley Forge: "and the sacred cause in which they are engaged". Many of the examples listed on *Literature Online* <lion.chadwyck.com> are in the perfect active, as in the following citations where the verb is *engage* (here I regularize the spelling and ignore other accidentals):

> Thomas Holcroft (1792): "the cause in which they have engaged more effectually"
>
> Judith Sargent Murray (1798): "a glorious cause in which we have engaged"
>
> Caroline Lamb (1816): "the desperate cause in which he had once so zealously engaged"
>
> William Alexander Caruthers (1834/35): "the cause in which he had engaged"
>
> William Ware (1841): "the cause in which he had engaged"

An alternative form of this expression that could have influenced the text in Alma 46:29 is "the cause in which they had **embarked**". This expression was common in the first half of the 19th century; *Literature Online* has the following citations where the verb *embark* is in the perfect active (once more I regularize the spellings and ignore other accidentals):

> Catharine Maria Sedgwick (1830): "a cause in which they have embarked"
> John Pendleton Kennedy (1835): "the cause in which Arthur Butler had embarked"
> John Pendleton Kennedy (1840): "the glorious cause in which we have embarked"
> Cornelius Mathews (1843): "the great cause in which they have embarked"

It is doubtful that the original text for Alma 46:29 actually read *engaged* or *embarked* instead of *undertaken,* especially since neither of these words otherwise occur in the Book of Mormon text. The more reasonable assumption is that the original verb phrase was "had undertaken" and that the *in* was accidentally added during the dictation of the text (by either Joseph Smith in his dictation or Oliver Cowdery as he wrote down the text). The reading in Alma 46:29 with the preposition *in* seems quite incorrect, so the critical text will assume that the *in* is secondary.

Summary: Remove in Alma 46:29 the *in* that heads the relative clause "which they had undertaken", thus emending the verse to read "the cause which they had undertaken"; the *in* was apparently inserted because of familiarity with two common expressions of the time, "the cause **in** which they had **engaged**" and "the cause **in** which they had **embarked**".

■ **Alma 46:29**

therefore fearing [*that* 1ABCDEFGIJLMNOPQRST | HK] *he should not gain the point . . .*

𝇋 is not extant here, but spacing in the lacuna has room for the subordinate conjunction *that.* This instance of *that* was omitted in the 1874 RLDS edition and restored in the 1908 RLDS edition. As discussed under Alma 20:23, the original text consistently has *that* after *fearing* in present participial clauses.

Summary: Maintain the subordinate conjunction *that* after *fearing* in Alma 46:29 ("fearing that he should not gain the point").

■ **Alma 46:29**

therefore fearing that he should not gain the point
[NULL >+ *he* 0 | NULL > *he* 1 | *he* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *took those of his people which would and departed into the land of Nephi*

For this sentence, 𝇋 seems to have originally lacked the subject pronoun *he* at the beginning of the main clause ("fearing that he should not gain the point / took those of his people which would and departed"). One possibility is that Oliver Cowdery noticed the missing *he* when he copied the text from 𝇋 into 𝒫, with the result that virtually immediately Oliver supralinearly inserted the pronoun *he* in 𝒫 and at the same time supralinearly inserted the *he* in 𝇋. The correction in 𝇋 is with somewhat heavier ink flow, but the one in 𝒫 is without any change in ink flow.

A second possibility is that Oliver corrected 𝒪 during the dictation process. Perhaps the missing *he* was caught when Oliver read the text back to Joseph Smith; yet when Oliver copied this passage into 𝒫, he once more skipped the *he* but this time corrected the error virtually immediately.

There is clear evidence in this part of 𝒪 that Oliver Cowdery sometimes omitted the subject pronoun *he* as he took down Joseph Smith's dictation. Besides the example here in Alma 46:29, there are four more in 𝒪; three of these appear to be virtually immediate corrections, without any difference in the level of ink flow (the one involving a heavier ink flow is marked with an asterisk):

> Alma 35:8–9
> > 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 came over from them into their land
> > and [NULL > *he* 0 | *he* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] breathed out
> > many threatenings against them

> Alma 42:17
> > now how could a man repent except he should sin
> > how could [NULL > *he* 0 | *he* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] sin
> > if there was no law

> * Alma 46:13
> > and he called it the title of liberty
> > and [NULL >+ *he* 0 | *he* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] bowed himself
> > > to the earth
> > and he prayed mightily unto his God

> Alma 48:7–8
> > Moroni on the other hand had been a preparing the minds of the people
> > to be faithful unto the Lord their God
> > yea [NULL > *he* 0 | *he* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] had been strengthening
> > the armies of the Nephites

There is also an instance in 𝒫, somewhat later in the text, where Oliver omitted the subject pronoun *he* in the main clause following a sentence-initial present participial clause:

> 3 Nephi 4:14
> > Giddianhi who had stood and fought with boldness was pursued as he fled
> > and being weary because of his much fighting
> > [NULL > *he* 1 | *he* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] was overtaken and slain

In this instance, the 1830 edition is a firsthand copy of 𝒪, and it has the *he;* the correction in 𝒫 is virtually immediate, so we can be confident that in 3 Nephi 4:14 the original manuscript had the subject pronoun *he.*

The most reasonable assumption in Alma 46:29 is that Oliver Cowdery omitted the *he,* this time in both manuscripts. Even if the *he* in 𝒪 was supplied when Oliver copied the text into 𝒫, he was most probably correct in his assumption that the *he* was there in the original text.

Summary: Accept in Alma 46:29 the subject pronoun *he* that Oliver Cowdery supralinearly inserted in both 𝒪 and 𝒫; although his inserted *he* in 𝒪 may be due to conscious editing, it does appear to be necessary.

■ **Alma 46:30**

therefore he thought to cut off the people of Amalickiah
or to take them and bring them back and put Amalickiah to death
yea for he knew [*that he* > NULL 0 | 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
that [*they* 01ABCEGHKPS | *he* DIJLMNOQRT | *they* > *he* F] *would stir up the Lamanites*
      to anger against them
and cause them to come down to battle against them
and this he knew that Amalickiah would do that he might obtain his purposes

There has been some tendency in the middle of this passage to replace the plural *they* with the singular *he*. The last part of the verse ("and this he knew that Amalickiah would do") suggests that the pronoun *he* should occur in the preceding portion of the verse. The replacement of *they* with *he* has occurred three times in the history of the text for this passage. The first time occurred when Oliver Cowdery wrote this passage down in the original manuscript. There he initially wrote *that he* followed by the initial *w* of *would*, but then he immediately crossed out the *that he* and erased the *w*, overwrote the *w* with the initial *th* of the *that*, then wrote inline the rest of the *that* followed by *they* and the remainder of the clause. In other words, the original text must have read "for he knew that **they** would stir up the Lamanites".

Later the compositor for the 1841 British edition accidentally set "that he would", but the earlier *they* was restored in the subsequent LDS edition (1849). In the 1852 LDS edition, the original plates continued with the *they,* but in the corrected plates for the second printing, the *they* was replaced by *he*. All subsequent LDS editions have continued with the singular pronoun *he,* but the RLDS editions have continued with the original plural pronoun *they*.

Despite this preference for singular reference elsewhere in this passage, there is really nothing wrong with the original *they*. Moroni is quite aware that both Amalickiah and his followers are fully capable of stirring up the Lamanites.

Summary: Restore the original plural pronoun *they* in Alma 46:30 since the immediate correction in the original manuscript clearly indicates that the original text read in the plural ("for he knew that **they** would stir up the Lamanites").

■ **Alma 46:30**

yea for he knew that they would stir up the Lamanites to anger against them
and [NULL >+ *cause them to* 0 | *cause them to* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
come down to battle against them

Initially in the original manuscript, Oliver Cowdery wrote "they would stir up the Lamanites to anger against them and come down to battle against them". Later Oliver supplied the phrase

"cause them to", supralinearly inserting it with somewhat heavier ink flow. Oliver's correction here probably occurred when he read back the text to Joseph Smith.

Summary: Accept in Alma 46:30 the corrected reading in ℗: "and **cause them to** come down to battle against them".

■ **Alma 46:30**

and cause them to come [*down* 0 | 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *to battle against them*

The original manuscript reads "come **down** to battle", although only the last two letters of *down* are extant in ℗. There is precisely room in the lacuna for the first two letters of *down*. In copying to the printer's manuscript, Oliver Cowdery accidentally omitted the adverb *down*.

The Lamanite territory is at a higher elevation than the Nephite territory to the north. The Lamanites, when they attack the Nephites, are characteristically referred to as "coming **down** to battle against the Nephites":

> The Words of Mormon 1:13
>> the armies of the Lamanites came **down** out of the land of Nephi
>> to battle against his people

> Alma 49:11
>> but behold Amalickiah did not come **down** himself to battle

> Alma 51:13
>> when the men which were called kingmen had heard
>> that the Lamanites were coming **down** to battle against them
>> they were glad in their hearts

> Helaman 1:15
>> and they came **down** again that they might pitch battle against the Nephites

> Helaman 4:5
>> and in the fifty and seventh year they did come **down** against the Nephites to battle

Thus the use of *down* in Alma 46:30 is expected.

Summary: In accord with the reading of the original manuscript, restore the adverb *down* in Alma 46:30 ("and cause them to come **down** to battle against them").

■ **Alma 46:31**

therefore Moroni thought it [*was* 01ABCDEFGIJLMNOPQRST | HK] *expedient that he should take his armies . . .*

In the 1874 RLDS edition, the verb *was* was omitted, probably unintentionally. The 1908 RLDS edition restored the *was*. Either reading, with or without the *was,* is possible in English. Elsewhere in the Book of Mormon text there is evidence for both possibilities:

Mosiah 1:9   therefore he thought it expedient that . . .

Mosiah 6:1   and now king Benjamin thought it **was** expedient . . . that . . .

Alma 31:5   therefore Alma thought it **was** expedient that . . .

In each case of "X thought it (was) expedient", the critical text will follow the earliest sources in determining whether the *was* should be there or not.

Summary: Maintain the linking verb *be* in Alma 46:31: "Moroni thought it **was** expedient that . . ." (the reading of the earliest textual sources, including 𝒪).

■ **Alma 46:31**

and it came to pass that he took his army
and marched out [*with his tents* 0T | 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRS] *into the wilderness*

The original manuscript has the phrase "with his tents". Oliver Cowdery accidentally omitted this phrase when he copied the text into the printer's manuscript. The 1981 LDS edition restored it. Here the 1830 signature (the 23rd, not the 22nd) was proofed against 𝒫, not 𝒪; thus the phrase was not restored at that time. (For the overall evidence that the 1830 edition was proofed against 𝒪 for the 22nd signature, see under Alma 42:31.)

One might wonder whether the pronoun *his* in "with his tents" is an error for *their*. Modern readers tend to interpret the *his* as referring to Moroni's own personal tents rather than all the tents of his army. But usage elsewhere in the Book of Mormon demonstrates that the singular *his* here is not only acceptable but expected—and, in fact, the reference is to the tents of Moroni's whole army, not Moroni's own personal tents. This singular possessive pronoun *his* occurs when the subject is a singular; when the subject is a plural, we get *their*:

Alma 51:32

Teancum and his men did pitch **their** tents in the borders of the land Bountiful
and **Amalickiah** did pitch **his** tents in the borders on the beach by the seashore

Ether 14:28

and **they** pitched **their** tents in the valley of Corihor
and **Coriantumr** pitched **his** tents in the valley of Shurr

Ether 15:8

wherefore when they came to these waters / **they** pitched **their** tents
and **Shiz** also pitched **his** tents near unto them

Thus the use of *his* in the phrase "with his tents" in Alma 46:31 is perfectly acceptable since the subject of the clause is the singular *he* (namely, Moroni).

Summary: Accept in Alma 46:31 the original reading with the phrase "with his tents"; the singular *his* in the phrase "with **his** tents" is in accord with Book of Mormon usage: namely, the subject of the clause is singular and under such conditions we consistently get the singular *his* in reference to *tents*.

■ **Alma 46:33**

and the remainder [*was* >+ *were* 0 | *was* > *were* 1 | *were* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *delivered up*
    into the hands of Moroni
and **were** *taken back into the land of Zarahemla*

Here Oliver Cowdery originally wrote "the remainder was" in both manuscripts. Both instances of *was* were corrected by crossing out the *was* and supralinearly inserting *were*. In the original manuscript, the correction is written with slightly heavier and uneven ink flow, which suggests that the correction in 𝓞 could be secondary. In the printer's manuscript, there is no change in the ink flow at all, which suggests that the correction in 𝓟 was virtually immediate. There are two possibilities here: (1) Oliver consciously decided to correct *was* to *were* as he was copying from 𝓞 into 𝓟, with the result that he made the change virtually immediately in 𝓟, then turned to 𝓞 to make the same change; (2) Oliver independently wrote *was* in both manuscripts, correcting it somewhat later in 𝓞 (perhaps when he read the text back to Joseph Smith) but virtually immediately in 𝓟.

Under Mosiah 10:14, I argued that evidence throughout the manuscript shows that Oliver Cowdery sometimes accidentally wrote *was* in place of *were* but that there was not much evidence that he consciously emended *was* to *were*. In that discussion, I missed noting the difference in ink flow for the passage here in Alma 46:33. Consequently, there are at least two places where one could argue for conscious editing of *was* to *were* by Oliver, in Alma 43:47 and here in Alma 46:33. Nonetheless, there are numerous instances in the earliest text of the singular *was* being used with plural subjects, obvious instances of nonstandard subject-verb agreement that Oliver never corrected (see the examples listed under 1 Nephi 4:4).

Here in Alma 46:33, one could propose that Oliver Cowdery decided to emend the *was* to *were* because of the *were* in the conjoined predicate that follows: "and **were** taken back into the land of Zarahemla". But elsewhere in the text, there are instances of conjoined predicates with mixed use of *was* and *were,* yet these were not corrected by Oliver (only later by Joseph Smith in his editing for the 1837 edition):

    Mosiah 7:7
       and they **were** surrounded by the king's guard
       and [*was* 1A | *were* BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] taken
       and [*was* 1A | *were* BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] bound
       and [*was* >js *were* 1 | *was* A | *were* BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] committed to prison

    Mosiah 18:26
       and the priests [*was* >js *were* 1 | *was* A | *were* BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
       not to depend upon the people for their support
       but for their labor they **were** to receive the grace of God

    Mosiah 24:15
       and now it came to pass that the burdens
       which [*was* >js *were* 1 | *was* A | *were* BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] laid
         upon Alma and his brethren
       were made light

Alma 21:21

and he did also declare unto them that they **were** a people
which [*was* >js *wre* 1 | *was* A | *were* BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] under him
and that they **were** a free people
that they **were** free from the oppressions of the king his father

In all these instances, Oliver was the scribe in 𝒫.

The use of the *were* for the noun *remainder* is consistent with usage elsewhere in the text, even when there is no intervening *of*-phrase (as in the first example listed below):

Alma 2:11 and the remainder **were** called Nephites or the people of God

Alma 51:20 and the remainder of those dissenters . . . **were** compelled
to hoist the title of liberty

Alma 57:20 and as the remainder of our army **were** about to give way

Alma 59:8 the remainder of the people of Nephihah **were** obliged to flee

3 Nephi 4:27 and the remainder of them **were** slain

Oliver Cowdery's tendency to write "the remainder was" in Alma 46:33 for both manuscripts may have been due to the fact that *remainder* is singular in form but plural in meaning (providing we are dealing with objects that can be counted). Nonetheless, he did not make this error when he wrote down Alma 2:11 in 𝒫 (𝒪 is not extant there): "the remainder **were** called Nephites".

Summary: Maintain in Alma 46:33 the use of the plural *were* with *remainder,* the corrected reading in both 𝒪 and 𝒫; the use of "the remainder were" is characteristic of the Book of Mormon text.

■ **Alma 46:34**

now Moroni being a man which was appointed
by the chief [*Judgees* >% *Judges* 0 | *Judges* 1AFIJLMNOQ | *judges* BCDEGHKPRST]
   and the voice of the people
therefore he had power to do according to his will with the armies of the Nephites

One wonders if the plural *chief judges* here is a mistake for the singular *chief judge*. There is evidence, to be sure, that Oliver Cowdery occasionally miswrote *chief judge* as *chief judges:*

Alma 30:29 (initial error in 𝒫)

that he might be brought before Alma
and the chief [*Judge* 0AFIJLMNOQ | *Judges* >% *Judge* 1 | *judge* BCDEGHKPRST]
which was governor over all the land

Helaman 1:21 (initial error in 𝒪)

Pacumeni which was
the chief [*Judges* >% *Judge* 0 | *Judge* 1ACFGIJLMNOQ | *judge* BDEHKPRST]
did flee before Coriantumr

Here in the original manuscript for Alma 46:34, Oliver Cowdery initially miswrote the noun as *Judgees,* a slip of the pen that ended up repeating the *e* vowel. Oliver erased the final *es,* then overwrote the erased *e* (the second one) with an *s.* But the fact that he wrote the *s* a second time argues that the plural reading was intended.

Since Moroni would have been in charge of all the armies of the Nephites, it seems as if the appointment might have been reserved for "the chief judge over all the land". There are 36 instances in the text of *chief judge* that refer to this supreme chief judge. Of course, each land also had its own chief judge ("the chief judge of the land"); there are eight instances of *chief judge* that refer to the chief judge over an individual land: six to the chief judge over the land of Ammonihah (in Alma 14:4–27) and two to the chief judge over the land of Gideon (in Alma 30:21, 29). Nonetheless, there are three other references to *chief judges* in the text (although these are found only later in the text):

Alma 62:47	and their judges and their chief judges were chosen
Helaman 11:8	and the people began to plead with their chief judges and their leaders
3 Nephi 6:21	and those which were angry were chiefly the chief judges

None of these passages refer to these chief judges as acting as a single body to make a decision (as in the current text for Alma 46:34). Still, these examples show that the plural usage is possible. In fact, in Alma 46:34, the reference to "the voice of the people" suggests that there was a national vote of approval for Moroni, which could imply that all the chief judges were involved, not only the chief judge over the entire Nephite nation but also the chief judges over the individual lands.

Summary: Accept the plural *chief judges* in Alma 46:34, the reading in ◉; the plural is acceptable since the whole Nephite nation was involved in the selection of Moroni as chief commander.

■ **Alma 46:34**

therefore he had power [*to do* ◐| 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *according to his will with the armies of the Nephites to establish and to exercise authority over them*

The original manuscript has the infinitive phrase *to do* at the end of a line. In copying from ◉ into ℘, Oliver Cowdery skipped this small phrase. The resulting reading does seem as if some verbal element is missing ("he had power according to his will with the armies of the Nephites"). Elsewhere in the text we have quite a few examples of "have power" followed by *to do:*

2 Nephi 1:10	having power given them **to do** all things by faith
Jacob 4:7	we have power **to do** these things
Mosiah 23:39	he should have no power **to do** anything contrary to the will of the king of the Lamanites
Alma 5:3	having power and authority from God **to do** these things
Alma 7:8	the Lord God hath power **to do** all things
Alma 19:4	thou hast power **to do** many mighty works in his name
Moroni 7:33	ye shall have power **to do** whatsoever thing is expedient in me

Thus the original reading in Alma 46:34 ("he had power **to do** according to his will") is what we expect, not the strange "he had power according to his will".

Summary: Restore in Alma 46:34 the infinitive phrase *to do* that Oliver Cowdery accidentally omitted as he copied the text from ◉ into ℘.

■ **Alma 46:35**

and it came to pass that [*whomsoever* 01ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRT | *whosoever* S]
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

According to prescriptive grammar, the word *who(m)soever* should take the appropriate case (subject or object form) according to its role within the *who(m)soever*-clause, not according to its role within the larger sentence. Here the *who(m)soever*-clause acts as the direct object for the main clause, but since the direct object is fronted ("whomsoever . . . he caused to be put to death"), its role within the sentence is not easily determinable. Except for the 1953 RLDS edition, the textual sources have consistently maintained the object form *whomsoever,* the reading of the two manuscripts. The 1953 edition replaced *whomsoever* with the subject form *whosoever,* perhaps because readers expect *whosoever* over *whomsoever* at the beginning of the sentence. Another possibility is that the editors for that edition decided here that the *who(m)soever*-word was acting as a subject within the *who(m)soever*-clause because "who(m)soever of the Amalickiahites" is the antecedent for the relative pronoun *that,* which acts as the subject in the relative clause "that would not enter into a covenant to support the cause of freedom".

For each case of *who(m)soever,* the critical text will follow the earliest reading and ignore the role of this word within the clause or the sentence. Thus here in Alma 46:35, the form is *whomsoever* (the reading of 𝓞 and 𝓟). For another complicated case like this one, see the discussion under Alma 3:17. Also see the more general discussion under PRONOUNS and under WHICH in volume 3.

Summary: Maintain in Alma 46:35 the object form *whomsoever* since this is the reading of the manuscripts (as well as all the editions except for the 1953 RLDS edition, which replaced *whomsoever* with *whosoever*); the critical text will ignore prescriptive emendations based on the role of *who(m)soever* within either the clause or the sentence.

■ **Alma 46:40**

because of the excellent qualities of the many plants and roots which God had prepared
to [*move* >+ *remove* 1 | *remove* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *the cause of diseases*

The original manuscript is not extant here. Based on spacing between extant portions of the original manuscript, the slightly longer *remove* fits better than *move,* but either is possible. As he was copying from 𝓞 into 𝓟, Oliver Cowdery wrote "to move the cause of diseases", then later corrected *move* to *remove* by supralinearly inserting the *re* with somewhat heavier ink flow. This correction was probably the result of proofing 𝓟 against 𝓞; the error *move* was probably due to the visual similarity between *move* and *remove*. The verb *remove* makes the best sense here in Alma 46:40 and should be retained. For another case where the Book of Mormon text seems to have replaced *remove* with *move,* see under 2 Nephi 20:13.

Summary: Accept in Alma 46:40 Oliver Cowdery's corrected reading in 𝓟, *remove,* rather than the initially written *move;* his correction appears to have been done while proofing 𝓟 against 𝓞 (which is not extant here for this part of the sentence).

■ **Alma 46:40**

to remove the cause of diseases

    □ *which was* **subsequent** *to man*   01*A

    □ *which was subject*   1ᶜ

    □ *to which men was subject*   BD

    □ *to which men were subject*   CEFGHIJKLMNOQRT

    □ *to which man was subject*   PS

by the nature of the climate

In this passage, the earliest extant text (in the manuscripts and the 1830 edition) read "to remove the cause of diseases which was **subsequent** to man by the nature of the climate". The meaning here is fairly clear: man was subject to these diseases because of the climate. Yet the Oxford English Dictionary lists no meaning for *subsequent* that seems to work here; the definitions listed there deal with time exclusively, never with cause or logical relationship. But there is a related adjective, *consequent,* that will work. The OED defines *consequent* as 'following as an effect or result' (definition 1a). *Literature Online* <lion.chadwyck.com> provides the following relevant example, found in notes to Alexander Pope's 1715 translation of the *Iliad* of Homer (original capitalization retained):

> And certainly Gods of human Shape cannot justly be esteemed or described otherwise, than as a celestial Race, superior only to mortal Men by greater Abilities, and a more extensive Degree of Wisdom and Strength, subject however to the necessary Inconveniencies **consequent** to corporeal Beings.

So one possibility is that the original text in Alma 46:40 actually read *consequent* ("to remove the cause of diseases which was **consequent** to man by the nature of the climate") and that because of the unfamiliarity of this word Joseph Smith or Oliver Cowdery replaced *consequent* with *subsequent* during the dictation of the text. There is, as one might imagine, not much evidence for this kind of transmission error in the text, especially since neither word occurs elsewhere in the text. Perhaps because the meaning of the infinitive clause would have suggested the phrase "be subject to", the initial syllable *con* in *consequent* could have been replaced with *sub,* the initial syllable of *subject,* giving *subsequent.*

Another possibility is that the word *subsequent,* despite the OED definitions, may have had a more general meaning here in Alma 46:40, one not restricted to the sequencing of events. We have already seen such a case with the verb *retain* as used in the Book of Mormon, with its meaning 'to take back' as well as 'to keep'. There are enough examples in the original text where *retain* means 'to take back' that we are forced to accept that meaning, despite the fact that it is not found in the OED (see the discussion under Alma 44:11). Similarly, *subsequent* may simply have a more general meaning in the Book of Mormon, one that refers not only to time but also to causal relationships. It should also be pointed out that the OED lists a third adjective that may be relevant here, namely, the base adjective *sequent,* which has either meaning, at least in Early Modern English: 'that succeeds or is subsequent in time or serial order' (definition 1b) and 'that follows as a result or a logical conclusion' (definition 2). The word *subsequent* may have had either of these meanings, so the occurrence of *subsequent* in the earliest reading in the Book of Mormon may not be an error for *consequent;* it may simply mean 'consequent'. It is worth noting that *consequent* itself

had the meaning 'subsequent' in Early Modern English; the OED (under definition 3 for the adjective *consequent*) lists citations with this (now obsolete) meaning from 1475 through 1742. Thus *subsequent* and *consequent* could have been used interchangeably in Early Modern English.

Because of its unusual use of the word *subsequent,* the Book of Mormon text has been emended to a semantically similar construction based on the verb phrase "be subject to". Of course, this change requires making *man* (or *men*) the subject of the clause. In his editing of 𝓟 for the 1837 edition, Joseph Smith replaced *subsequent* with *subject* and crossed out *to man,* but he neglected to insert *man* along with the preposition *to* at the front of the clause. As a result of Joseph's editing, 𝓟 reads "to remove the cause of diseases which was **subject** by the nature of the climate", which makes no sense. In the 1837 edition, the text ends up reading "to remove the cause of diseases **to** which **men** was subject by the nature of the climate"). But the singular *was* was not changed, thus allowing *men was,* a violation (at least in standard English) of subject-verb agreement. In the 1840 edition, the grammatical difficulty was eliminated by changing the *men was* to *men were* ("to remove the cause of diseases to which **men were** subject by the nature of the climate"). The 1908 RLDS edition took the opposite approach and restored the singular *man* ("to remove the cause of diseases to which **man was** subject by the nature of the climate").

The critical text will restore in Alma 46:40 the original phraseology with its use of the word *subsequent:* "to remove the cause of diseases which was subsequent to man by the nature of the climate". The understanding here is that *subsequent* means 'consequent'. The possibility remains that *subsequent* is actually an error for *consequent,* influenced by the common phrase "be subject to".

Summary: Despite its difficulty, restore in Alma 46:40 the original adjective *subsequent* as well as the nonstandard use of the singular *was* ("to remove the cause of diseases which **was subsequent** to man by the nature of the climate"); here the word *subsequent* apparently means 'consequent', although there is also a possibility that *subsequent* is an error for *consequent.*

■ **Alma 46:41**

but there were many who died with old age
and [those 01ABCDGHIJKLMNOPQRST | *these* EF] *who died in the faith of Christ*
are happy in him

The typesetter for the 1849 LDS edition accidentally replaced *those* with *these.* The subsequent LDS edition (1852) followed this reading, but the 1879 LDS edition restored the original *those.* In this context, *those* is the better reading; the determiner *these* implies that those who died "with old age" also died "in the faith of Christ", which was not necessarily the case. There are quite a few examples in the history of the text of mix-ups between *these* and *those;* for a list of examples, see under Mosiah 28:1.

Summary: Maintain the original reading with *those* in Alma 46:41: "and **those** who died in the faith of Christ are happy in him".

Alma 47

■ **Alma 47:1**

now we will return [*in* 1ABCDEFGIJLMNOPQRST | *to* HK] *our record*
to *Amalickiah and those which fled with him into the wilderness*

> The 1874 RLDS edition replaced the preposition *in* with *to* (giving "we will return **to** our record"); this error was probably due to the following *to* ("to Amalickiah"). The 1908 RLDS edition restored the correct *in.* There is no sense here of returning to the record as a whole, only to that part of the record that refers to Amalickiah.

> *Summary:* Maintain in Alma 47:1 the original reading with the preposition *in* ("we will return **in** our record to Amalickiah").

■ **Alma 47:1**

now we will return in our record to Amalickiah and those
(1) *which* [*were > fled* 0 | *had fled* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *with him into the wilderness for behold he* **had took** *those*
(2) *which* [*went >% were* 0 | *went* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *with him and* **went** *up into the land of Nephi among the Lamanites*

> Here in the original manuscript, Oliver Cowdery initially wrote "to Amalickiah and those which **were** with him". Almost immediately Oliver corrected the *were* to *fled* (there is no difference in the ink flow for the supralinearly inserted *fled*). The source for the *were* in the first relative clause (listed above as 1) seems to have been the relative clause (listed above as 2) in the following sentence: "for behold he had took those which **were** with him". When Oliver copied the first relative clause, "which **fled** with him into the wilderness", from 𝒪 into 𝒫, he accidentally added the perfect auxiliary *had* (giving "which **had fled** with him into the wilderness"). Here Oliver seems to have been influenced by the following perfect usage in "for behold he **had took** those". The critical text will restore the original simple past-tense *fled* in this first relative clause: "which **fled** with him into the wilderness".
>
> Yet another verb affected the transmission of the text for this passage. When Oliver Cowdery wrote the second relative clause in 𝒪, he once more let the following text influence him: instead of writing "which **were** with him", he initially wrote "which **went** with him", undoubtedly because of the *went* in the following conjoined predicate ("and **went** up into the land of Nephi among the Lamanites"). Multispectral imaging shows that Oliver initially wrote *went* ("which **went** with him"), then erased the *nt* and overwrote it with an *r,* and ended up writing the final *e* inline (giving "which **were** with him"). Nonetheless, the resulting overwritten word is not all that clear and could be misread as *went.* When Oliver copied this relative clause from 𝒪 into 𝒫, he once more

allowed himself to be influenced by the subsequent *went* in "and went up". Thus we end up with a somewhat redundant (although not impossible) reading in 𝔓: "he had took those which **went** with him and **went** up into the land of Nephi among the Lamanites". Elsewhere the text has a good number of examples of relative clauses where the predicate is of the form "to **be** with someone" (20 of them). But there are also examples of relative clauses where the predicate is of the form "to **go** with someone" (7 of them), such as Mosiah 21:30: "and they also did mourn for the death of Abinadi and also for the departure of Alma and the people that **went** with him". But when the predicate in the main clause refers to the movement of those mentioned in a preceding relative clause, that relative clause always has the verb *be* rather than *go*:

> Alma 17:12
>> the hearts of the sons of Mosiah and also those which **were** with them
>> took courage to **go** forth unto the Lamanites

> Alma 52:24
>> behold Moroni commanded that a part of his army which **were** with him
>> should **march** forth into the city and take possession of it

> Alma 55:21
>> and then he caused his men which **were** with him
>> to **withdraw** a pace from them and surround the armies of the Lamanites

> Alma 58:18
>> I caused that my men—those which **were** with me—
>> should **retreat** into the wilderness

The proposed original text for Alma 47:1 is consistent with this regularity:

> Alma 47:1 (proposed original text)
>> for behold he had took those which **were** with him
>> and **went** up into the land of Nephi among the Lamanites

The apparent correction here in 𝅧 of *went* to *were*, plus the preceding initial error in 𝅧 of "those which **were** with him" instead of "those which **fled** with him", argues that in the original text the second relative clause in Alma 47:1 read "which **were** with him".

Summary: Restore in Alma 47:1 the two corrected readings in 𝅧 for the verbs in the relative clauses: (1) *fled* instead of the initial *were* (or the *had fled* that Oliver Cowdery copied into 𝔓); and (2) *were* instead of the initial *went* (which Oliver reintroduced into the text when he copied from 𝅧 into 𝔓); the original text here read "now we will return in our record to Amalickiah and those which **fled** with him into the wilderness / for behold he had took those which **were** with him and went up into the land of Nephi among the Lamanites".

■ **Alma 47:1**

for behold he had [*took >+ taken* 0 | *taken* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *those which were with him and went up into the land of Nephi among the Lamanites*

> Here Oliver Cowdery initially wrote "he had **took** those" in 𝅧; later he replaced the nonstandard use of *took* with the standard *taken* for the past participial form. He crossed out the first *o*, overwrote

the second *o* with an *a,* and then inserted inline the *en* in the space between the earlier written *took* and *those*. The ink flow for the correction is heavier and broader than the ink flow for the original *took* (thus the quill was not as sharp as before), which strongly argues that the correction is secondary and was made considerably later and definitely not when Oliver read the text back to Joseph Smith during the dictation. The critical text will restore the original past-participial *took* in "he had took those".

There are two other instances (but in 𝔓 rather than 𝔒) where Oliver Cowdery replaced a simple past-tense form with the standard past participle: "whom I had **slew**" to "whom I had **slain**" in 1 Nephi 4:26 and "the wild branches have **grew**" to "the wild branches have **grown**" in Jacob 5:37. The one in 1 Nephi 4:26 is clearly the result of editing since 𝔒 is extant and reads "whom I had **slew**"; although 𝔒 is not extant for Jacob 5:37, the correction in 𝔓 is distinctly secondary. (For further discussion, see under each of these passages.)

Here in Alma 47:1, we apparently have a third example of this kind of editing by Oliver Cowdery. Yet for all other instances of past-participial *took* in the manuscripts, Oliver never emended this nonstandard verb form to *taken*. Four of these other instances were of the form "and took" (see the list under Alma 8:26). But in two cases, the perfect auxiliary *have* occurred right before *took* (just like here in Alma 47:1):

> Alma 55:8
>
> we have [*took* 01ABCDEFGHIJKLMP | *taken* NOQRST] of their wine
>
> Alma 62:16
>
> after they had [*took* 1ABDEP | *taken* CGHIJKLMNOQRST | *took* > *taken* F] them

Although this lack of editing on Oliver's part elsewhere in the manuscripts could be taken as evidence that the change to *taken* in 𝔒 for Alma 47:1 was a correction to the original text, the difference in the ink flow, especially the broader ink flow, argues that the change to *taken* occurred considerably later rather than during the dictation of the text.

Summary: Restore the original past-participial *took* in Alma 47:1; Oliver Cowdery's later correction in 𝔒 of *took* to the standard form *taken* appears to have been due to editing on his part.

■ **Alma 47:1**

for behold he had took those which were with him
and went up [*into* 1APS | *in* BCDEFGHIJKLMNOQRT] *the land of Nephi among the Lamanites*

Here the 1837 edition accidentally replaced the preposition *into* with *in*. The 1908 RLDS edition restored the original *into,* as will the critical text. As discussed under Mosiah 23:26, the Book of Mormon text generally prefers the preposition *into* over *in* when referring to motion, especially across geographical boundaries. In expressions of the form "to go in(to) a land", we never get *in* in the earliest text, only *into* (17 times, including here in Alma 47:1).

For another example of the change from *into* to *in* (and once more in the 1837 edition), see the nearby discussion under Alma 47:29.

Summary: Restore the preposition *into* in Alma 47:1: "and went up **into** the land of Nephi"; usage elsewhere in the text consistently supports *into* over *in* for the expression "to go in(to) a land".

■ **Alma 47:1**

that they should gather themselves together

    ☐ NULL   1*

    ☐ *again to go* **up** *to battle*   1ᶜ¹

    ☐ *again to go to battle*   1ᶜ²ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST

against the Nephites

When Oliver Cowdery copied this passage from 𝒪 into 𝒫, he initially missed the phrase "again to go to battle", possibly because his eye skipped from the *again* to the visually similar *against* that follows (suggested by David Calabro, personal communication). Virtually immediately, Oliver caught his error and supralinearly inserted the missing phrase in 𝒫 except that he added the word *up,* writing "again to go **up** to battle" (all of these words are written without any change in the level of ink flow). But later, probably when he proofed 𝒫 against 𝒪, Oliver crossed out the extra *up* (the crossout of the *up* is with heavier ink flow). 𝒪 is not extant here for "again to go (up) to", but there is no room for the *up* in the lacuna except by supralinear insertion.

Elsewhere the Book of Mormon text allows either "go to battle" or "go **up** to battle", with 10 occurrences with *up* and 16 without. Nearby we have three examples of the shorter "go to battle":

Alma 47:2	and they also feared to go to battle against the Nephites
Alma 47:21	for to go against the Nephites to battle
Alma 48:3	to go to battle against the Nephites

In Mosiah 10, on the other hand, we get variation:

Mosiah 10:9	to go to battle against the Lamanites
Mosiah 10:10	we did go **up** to battle against the Lamanites
Mosiah 10:10	and I even I in my old age did go **up** to battle against the Lamanites
Mosiah 10:10	we did go **up** in the strength of the Lord to battle
Mosiah 10:19	I did stimulate them to go to battle with their might

So it is not surprising that Oliver Cowdery could have initially added an extra *up* when he copied Alma 47:1. Since either reading is possible, 𝒪 probably read as corrected by Oliver in 𝒫, without the *up* ("again to go to battle").

Summary: Accept Oliver Cowdery's corrected reading in 𝒫 that removed the intrusive *up* in Alma 47:1, thus giving "go to battle" rather than "go **up** to battle".

■ **Alma 47:2**

they were exceeding [*fraid* 01ABCDGHKPS | *afraid* EFIJLMNOQRT]

As discussed under Alma 43:21, the critical text will restore original instances of *fraid,* which are always preceded by the adverb *exceeding* in the Book of Mormon text.

■ **Alma 47:2**

and it came to pass that they would not—or the more part of them would not—
obey the [commandment 01 | commandments ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] of the king

Here both manuscripts have the singular *commandment.* Theoretically, the plural could be correct (since we know Oliver Cowdery sometimes dropped off the plural *s*). But in this case, the singular is appropriate: the king has given a single command—namely, that the Lamanites attack the Nephites once more:

> Alma 47:1
>> insomuch that the king of the Lamanites sent a proclamation
>>> throughout all his land among all his people
>> that they should gather themselves together again to go to battle against the Nephites

This command, of course, is contrary to the covenant of peace that Zerahemnah and his army had made earlier with Moroni (see the account in Alma 44).

In Alma 47:3, we do have the use of the plural *commands* in reference to obedience to the king: "therefore he gave Amalickiah the command of that part of his army which was obedient unto his **commands**". Of course, the reference here is not to the single commandment to attack the Nephites since even this loyal part of the army had not yet obeyed that specific command. So the example of *commands* in verse 3 does not contradict the use of the singular *commandment* in the previous verse.

There are other examples in the history of the text where a singular *commandment* has been changed to the plural *commandments* in the early transmission of the text. For cases where Oliver Cowdery mistakenly made this change, momentarily in one case, see the discussion under 1 Nephi 3:16, 1 Nephi 4:34, and Jacob 3:5. For each case of variation in number for *commandment(s),* we follow the earliest text. Here in Alma 47:2, the manuscripts read in the singular, as will the critical text.

Summary: In accord with the reading of both manuscripts, restore the singular *commandment* in Alma 47:2: "they would not . . . obey the **commandment** of the king".

■ **Alma 47:4**

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

Here the 1830 compositor set the singular *desire* rather than the plural *desires,* the reading in both manuscripts. He was probably influenced by the preceding singular *this was.* As discussed under Mosiah 18:10, 11, such usage is quite common in the original text and will therefore be restored here in Alma 47:4.

Summary: Restore in Alma 47:4 the plural *desires,* giving "this was the **desires** of Amalickiah"; such usage is found elsewhere in the original text.

■ **Alma 47:5**

and now he had [*gat/got* 0 | *got* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPRST | *gotten* Q] *the command*
of those parts of the Lamanites which were in favor of the king

𝒪 is extant here and can be read as either *gat* or *got*. Since the past participial *gat* clearly occurs
in 𝒪 for nearby Alma 55:2 ("more power than what he hath **gat**"), the critical text will interpret
the reading here in 𝒪 for Alma 47:5 as "he had **gat** the command". In both Alma 47:5 and Alma
55:2, Oliver Cowdery copied the *gat* in 𝒪 as *got* in 𝒫. For discussion of other cases of *gat* versus
got in the earliest text, see under Alma 10:32.

Here in Alma 47:5, the 1911 LDS edition replaced the past-participial form *got* with *gotten*. As
discussed under 2 Nephi 31:19, either form is theoretically possible, but in actual fact the original
Book of Mormon text has only *gat* and *got,* never *gotten*. So here in Alma 47:5, the form *gotten* is
textually secondary. In this instance, the 1920 LDS edition restored the *got* of the earlier editions.

Summary: Restore in Alma 47:5 the past-participial form *gat,* the most probable reading (thus "and
now he had **gat** the command"); there is some possibility that the verb form in 𝒪 can be interpreted
as *got* ("and now he had **got** the command").

■ **Alma 47:5**

therefore he went forward to the place
which was called [*Oneidah* 01 | *Onidah* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] . . .
therefore they fled to [*Oneidah* 01 | *Onidah* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
to the place of arms

For both occurrences of this name here in Alma 47:5, 𝒪 and 𝒫 have the spelling *Oneidah,* not
Onidah. The 1830 compositor set this name as *Onidah,* which is the spelling used earlier in the
text for the hill Onidah:

Alma 32:4
now as Alma was teaching and speaking unto the people upon **the hill Onidah**
there came a great multitude unto him

𝒪 is not extant in Alma 32:4 for *Onidah,* but 𝒫 and all the printed editions have that spelling for
the name of the hill that Alma preached on. This hill was in the land of Antionum (Alma 31:3), the
place where the Zoramites lived. The name *Oneidah* in Alma 47:5 does not refer to the name of
the mount that Lehonti and his army fled to (instead, the name of that mount is *Antipas,* men-
tioned later in verses 7, 9–10). Mount Antipas is in the land of Nephi and is not the same as the hill
Onidah in the land of Antionum. In fact, *Oneidah* does not directly refer to a hill or mount. Thus
there is no reason to suppose that *Oneidah* (which was where "the place of arms" was located) should
necessarily be spelled the same as *Onidah* ("the hill Onidah"). It is also worth noting that there is
a third name in the text that is similar to *Onidah,* namely *Onihah* (a city mentioned in 3 Nephi 9:7).
Frequently, Book of Mormon names can be very similar, differing by only a single letter. In each
case, the critical text will rely on the earliest textual sources for determining the spelling of names,
thus *Oneidah* here in Alma 47:5, *Onidah* in Alma 32:4, and *Onihah* in 3 Nephi 9:7.

It should also be noted that the 1830 compositor's replacement of *Oneidah* with *Onidah* here in Alma 47:5 could have been influenced by the name of the Iroquois tribe *Oneida,* but only if the compositor thought the name of the tribe was spelled *Onida* (or perhaps *Onidah,* with a word-final silent *h*). The change from *Oneidah* to *Onidah* moves the spelling away from *Oneida,* the standard spelling of the Iroquois tribe. But since *Oneida* is pronounced /ounaidə/, *Onida* (or *Onidah*) is an alternative spelling. There is, for instance, the name of a town in South Dakota, *Onida,* which is "a misspelling of Oneida, the New York hometown of the first settlers who arrived here in 1883"; see page 152 of Linda Hasselstrom, *Roadside History of South Dakota* (Missoula, Montana: Mountain Press Publishing Company, 1994). And Oneida, the company that manufactures flatware, can be found on internet searches even if its name is misspelled as *Onida.*

Summary: Based on the reading in both manuscripts, the correct name for the location of the place of arms in Alma 47:5 is *Oneidah,* not *Onidah.*

■ **Alma 47:5**

for they discovered the army coming

    □ *and supposing that*   01ᶜABCDEFGIJLMNOPQRST

    □ *and they supposed*   1*

    □ *and supposing*   HK

they were coming to destroy them
therefore they fled to Oneidah

Here we see the tendency to omit the subordinate conjunction *that* after the verb *suppose.* Initially, when Oliver Cowdery copied from 𝓞 into 𝓟, he replaced the present participial *supposing that* with *they supposed* (also omitting the *that*); but then virtually immediately Oliver caught his error, crossed out *they supposed,* and supralinearly inserted *supposing that* (there is no change in the level of ink flow for the correction). Similarly, the 1874 RLDS edition omitted the *that* after *supposing,* but the 1908 RLDS edition restored it to the RLDS text. 𝓞 is extant here, and it reads "and supposing that they were coming to destroy them".

The verb *suppose* can take a finite clause as its complement, either with or without the *that.* Although usually we have the *that* after *supposing* (ten times, including here in Alma 47:5), the *that* may also be lacking, as in 2 Nephi 9:28: "for they set it aside / supposing they know of themselves". For other examples of variation involving *that* after the verb *suppose,* see under THAT in volume 3. The critical text will in each case of "supposing (that) <finite clause>" follow the earliest reading, thus with the *that* here in Alma 47:5.

Summary: Maintain in Alma 47:5 the reading in 𝓞: "and supposing that they were coming to destroy them".

■ **Alma 47:7**

and it came to pass that they had gathered themselves together upon the top of the mount
which was called [*Antipah* >% *Antipas* 0 | *Antipas* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]

> Oliver started to spell the name *Antipas* as *Antipah* in ℗, but then he immediately erased the par-
> tially written *h* and overwrote it with an *s*. The name occurs two more times in the text (in the
> following verses 9 and 10). There we see evidence of Oliver Cowdery writing *Antipas* as *Antipus,*
> twice in ℗ and once in ℘:

> > Alma 47:9
> > > he caused his army to pitch their tents in the valley which was near the mount
> > > [*Antipus* 0 | *Antipus* > *Antipas* 1 | *Antipas* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]

> > Alma 47:10
> > > when it was night / he sent a secret embassy into the mount
> > > [*Antipus* > *Antipas* 0 | *Antipas* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]

> The scribes tended to mix up *a* and *u* in their scribal work (see, for instance, the discussion
> regarding the name *Cumorah* under Mormon 6:2). For each name involving a potential mix-up
> for these vowels, we follow the earliest textual sources, thus *Antipas* as the name of the mount
> since this is the immediately corrected spelling for the name in ℗ the first time the name appears
> in the text.

> Notice that there is a military leader later on in the book of Alma whose name is spelled
> *Antipus,* according to the earliest textual sources in ℗. For the spelling of that name, see the dis-
> cussion under Alma 56:18. These two examples show that Book of Mormon names can minimally
> differ from one another, just like *Oneidah, Onidah,* and *Onihah* (see the discussion just above
> under Alma 47:5 regarding the name *Oneidah*).

Summary: Accept *Antipas* as the name of the mount in Alma 47:7, 9–10; the earliest extant reading
supports the *a* rather than the *u* vowel in the last syllable of this name.

■ **Alma 47:12**

desiring that he would come down
and that he [*would* 01ABCDEFGIJLMNOPQRST | HK] *bring his guards with him*

> Here the 1874 RLDS edition omitted the second instance of the modal verb *would;* the 1908
> RLDS edition restored it. Either reading is theoretically possible. In the finite clause after "desire
> that", there is normally a modal (usually *should* or *would*), but there is one example where we
> have a subjunctive verb form: "I desire that this land **be** a land of liberty" (Mosiah 29:32), not
> "I desire that this land **should be** a land of liberty". The critical text will follow the earliest read-
> ing here in Alma 47:12, with the repeated *would:* "desiring that he **would** come down and that he
> **would** bring his guards with him".

Summary: Maintain in Alma 47:12 the two occurrences of the modal verb *would:* "desiring that he
would come down and that he **would** bring his guards with him".

■ **Alma 47:13**

Amalickiah desired him to come down with his army in the nighttime
and surround those men in their [*camps* 0ABCDEFGIJLMNOQRT | *Camps* 1 | *camp* HKPS]

Here the word-final *ps* of *camps* is extant in ⊙, so all the early textual evidence supports the plural *camps* in this passage. The 1874 RLDS edition replaced the plural *camps* with the singular *camp,* and this reading has been retained in the RLDS text. Modern English readers expect the singular noun here. And usually the Book of Mormon text uses the singular (20 times), including one example in the preceding verse:

> Alma 47:12   he went up into the mount nearly to Lehonti's **camp**

It may have been this instance of the singular *camp* that prompted the 1874 change in verse 13 of *camps* to *camp*—and perhaps also prevented the editors for the 1908 edition from restoring *camps* in verse 13, even though *camps* is the reading in ℗. Yet despite these 20 examples of *camp,* there are several other examples where the text has the plural *camps:*

> Mormon 6:11   when the Lamanites had returned unto their **camps**
> Ether 15:16   when it was night / they were weary and retired to their **camps**
> Ether 15:16   and after that they had retired to their **camps** . . .

So either reading is theoretically possible in Alma 47:13. We therefore follow the earliest textual sources and maintain the plural *camps*.

Summary: Maintain the unexpected but original plural *camps* in Alma 47:13: "and surround those men in their **camps**"; such usage is found later on in the text (in Mormon and Ether).

■ **Alma 47:13**

and that he would deliver them up into Lehonti's hands
if he would make him Amalickiah
[*the* 0 | *a* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *second leader over the whole army*

For the noun phrase *second leader,* the original manuscript here reads "**the** second leader". The determiner *the* occurs at the end of a line in ⊙. When copying from ⊙ into ℗, Oliver Cowdery let his eye skip too quickly to the next line in ⊙, and he ended up writing the indefinite article *a* in ℗ rather than the *the*. There is only one "second leader over the whole army", as is shown a few verses later:

> Alma 47:17
> now it was the custom among the Lamanites
> if their chief leader was killed
> to appoint **the second leader** to be their chief leader

Obviously, this process of succession would not have worked in an automatic fashion (as implied by the narrative here in Alma 47) if there had been more than one "second leader". There is no indication that Amalickiah needed to compete in any way to become the first leader after the death of Lehonti.

Summary: Restore in Alma 47:13 the definite article *the* before *second leader* ("**the** second leader over the whole army"); the narrative later in Alma 47:17 shows there is only one second leader.

■ **Alma 47:14**

so that before they awoke
at the dawn of [the ⁰ABCDEFGHKPS|NULL > the 1| IJLMNOQRT] day
they were surrounded by the armies of Lehonti

The original manuscript clearly reads *the day*. When Oliver Cowdery initially copied this passage into the printer's manuscript, he wrote "at the dawn of day"; but then he virtually immediately corrected his error by inserting the definite article supralineary (there is no change in the level of ink flow). Of course, in modern English we expect "at the dawn of day", without the definite article *the* in front of *day*. This expected form of the phrase also influenced the typesetter for the 1879 LDS edition, who omitted the *the* here. The LDS text has continued with this shortened reading. For another example of the tendency to omit the *the* in "of **the** day", see under Jacob 6:5.

Elsewhere the Book of Mormon systematically has the definite article in phrases like "of the day", "of the morning", and "of the night":

Jacob 6:5	his arm of mercy is extended towards you in the light of **the** day
Alma 51:33	which was caused by the labors and heat of **the** day
Alma 56:39	before the dawn of **the** morning
Alma 56:41	again when the light of **the** morning came
Alma 62:20	Moroni went forth in the darkness of **the** night

As David Calabro points out (personal communication), the same use of the definite article is found with the phrase "the dawning of **the** day" in the English of the King James Bible (not "the dawning of day"):

Joshua 6:15	they rose early about the dawning of **the** day
Judges 19:26	then came the woman in the dawning of **the** day
Job 3:9	neither let it see the dawning of **the** day
Job 7:4	and I am full of tossings to and fro unto the dawning of **the** day

Summary: Restore the original definite article in front of *day* in Alma 47:14: "at the dawn of **the** day".

■ **Alma 47:15**

and it came to pass that
when they saw [that ⁰1ABDEFIJLMNOQRT| CGHKPS] they were surrounded
they pled with Amalickiah that he would suffer them to fall in with their brethren

Here the 1840 edition dropped the subordinate conjunction *that*. The RLDS textual traditional has continued with this shorter reading. As discussed under Alma 27:2, *that* is optional for finite clauses that complement the verb *see;* in each instance we follow the earliest textual sources (thus retaining the *that* here in Alma 47:15). For a complete discussion, see under THAT in volume 3.

Summary: Maintain in Alma 47:15 the subordinate conjunction *that* after the verb *see* ("when they saw **that** they were surrounded").

■ **Alma 47:18**

[& 01 | *And* ABCDEFGIJLMNOQRT | *Now* HKPS] *it came to pass that
Amalickiah caused that one of his servants should administer poison by degrees to Lehonti
that he died*

Here the 1874 RLDS edition replaced the conjunctive *and* with *now* as the narrative connector. The RLDS text has retained the use of *now,* even though the *and* is in 𝔓. Either reading is, of course, possible. The occurrence of *and* as the narrative connector before "it came to pass" is by far the most frequent one, but there are also many occurrences of "**now** it came to pass" (as well as "**and now** it came to pass"). In each instance, the critical text will follow the earliest reading, thus "**and** it came to pass" here in Alma 47:18.

Summary: Maintain in Alma 47:18 the original conjunction *and* before "it came to pass", the reading of all the earliest textual sources (including 𝕆).

■ **Alma 47:19**

*the Lamanites appointed Amalickiah to be their leader
and* [*their* 01ABCDEFGIJLMNOQRT | HKPS] *chief commander*

Here the 1874 RLDS edition omitted the repeated *their* from the conjunctive phrase "their leader and **their** chief commander". This shortened reading has continued in the RLDS text, despite the fact that the printer's manuscript contains the repeated *their*. Elsewhere the repeated *their* does occur in similar conjunctive phrases but not necessarily:

> Alma 43:44
> and they were inspired by the Zoramites and the Amlicites
> which were **their** chief captains and leaders
> and by Zerahemnah who was **their** chief captain or **their** chief leader and commander

The *their* is conjunctively repeated once here ("their chief captain or **their** chief leader", but it is not repeated in "their chief captains and leaders" or in "their chief leader and commander"). For each instance of possible repetition, we will follow the reading of the earliest text. For other examples where a repeated *their* has been omitted, see the discussion under CONJUNCTIVE REPETITION in volume 3.

Summary: Maintain the repeated *their* in Alma 47:19: "the Lamanites appointed Amalickiah to be their leader and **their** chief commander".

■ **Alma 47:22**

*but behold as the king came out to meet him
Amalickiah caused that his servants should go* **forth** *to meet the king
and they went* [*up* >% *forth* 0 | 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
and bowed themselves before the king

In the original manuscript, Oliver Cowdery initially wrote "and they went up", but then he immediately replaced the adverb *up* with *forth* (he erased the *u,* overwrote the *p* with an *f,* and then

wrote inline the rest of the word, *orth*. But when Oliver came to copy this passage into the printer's manuscript, he accidentally dropped this adverb, probably because once more his eye skipped too quickly from the end of a line in 𝒪 to the beginning of the next line. (Oliver made the same mistake in Alma 46:34, skipping a small part of the text at the end of a line in 𝒪; see the discussion under that passage regarding the loss of *to do*.) For other instances where *forth* has been lost from the text, if only momentarily, see under Alma 8:21 and Alma 20:28; also see under 2 Nephi 3:20 for the possible loss of *forth* in the early transmission of that passage.

The expression "to go forth" is very frequent in the Book of Mormon text. In fact, earlier in this verse we have one more example of this usage: "Amalickiah caused that his servants should go **forth** to meet the king" (Alma 47:22). Thus the use of *forth* in the original text for the very next clause is fully expected.

Summary: Restore the original occurrence of the adverb *forth* in Alma 47:22, which means that we get two instances of "to go forth" in this verse ("Amalickiah caused that his servants should **go forth** to meet the king and they **went forth** and bowed themselves before the king").

■ **Alma 47:23**

the king put forth his hand to raise them
as was the custom with the Lamanites
[01|,   ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
[& 01| *and* A| *as* BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *a token of peace*
[01|,   ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
which custom they had taken from the Nephites

In the original text, the phrase "and a token of peace" acts as a parenthetical intrusion. The 1837 edition changed the conjunction from *and* to *as,* probably because of the awkwardness of the original parenthetical statement. The critical text will restore the original text here but will mark the parenthetical nature of "and a token of peace" more explicitly (such as replacing the 1830 commas with dashes):

> Alma 47:23 (with revised punctuation)
> the king put forth his hand to raise them
> as was the custom with the Lamanites
> —and a token of peace—
> which custom they had taken from the Nephites

One could interpret this passage as saying that the Lamanite custom of putting forth the hand to raise the person was taken from the Nephites but that the Lamanite identification of that custom as a token of peace was their own. More likely, the passage simply means that the Lamanite custom was originally a Nephite one—not only the custom of extending the hand but also the interpretation of that custom as a token of peace.

A second possible emendation for Alma 47:23 would be to keep the *and* but still add the *as:* "as was the custom with the Lamanites **and as** a token of peace". Such an emendation implies that *as* could have been lost early in the transmission of the text (𝒪 is extant for "& a token of "). There is evidence elsewhere for the occasional loss of *as* in the manuscripts, sometimes only momentarily; for a list of examples, see under 2 Nephi 9:16.

There is one other example in the text where an *and* has been replaced by *as,* again as the result of editing (in this case, in the 1920 LDS edition):

> 3 Nephi 3:19
> therefore this Gidgiddoni was a great prophet among them
> [*&* 1 | *and* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQS | *as* RT] also was the chief judge

Here we have an example of a delayed conjoined subject; the text intends to say that both Gidgiddoni and the chief judge (Lachoneus) were great prophets. (See the discussion of this Hebrew-like structure under 1 Nephi 3:28 as well as more generally under HEBRAISMS in volume 3.) The awkwardness of the added phrase "and also was the chief judge" in 3 Nephi 3:19 is similar to how Alma 47:23 originally read—namely, as an extra thought added on unexpectedly. Despite the difficulty of such extra expressions, the critical text will maintain them, including here in Alma 47:23.

Summary: Restore in Alma 47:23 the earliest reading of the parenthetical phrase "and a token of peace"; although difficult, this kind of sudden addition to a passage is found elsewhere in the original text.

■ **Alma 47:27**

and it came to pass that Amalickiah commanded that
his [*armies* 01ABCDEFGIJLMNOPQRST | *servants* HK] *should march forth*
and see what had happened to the king

Here the 1874 RLDS edition replaced *armies* with *servants;* the 1908 RLDS edition restored the correct *armies*. This error was prompted by three occurrences of the word *servants* in the preceding two verses:

> Alma 47:25−26
> now the **servants** of the king fled
> and the **servants** of Amalickiah raised a cry saying
> behold the **servants** of the king have stabbed him to the heart

Of course, *armies* is correct, not *servants;* the word *servant* refers to a personal attendant, not to a soldier in the army.

Summary: Maintain the plural *armies* in Alma 47:27, the reading of all the earliest textual sources (including 𝓞).

■ **Alma 47:27**

and it came to pass that Amalickiah commanded
that his armies should march forth and see what had happened
[*unto > to* 1 | *to* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *the king*

The original manuscript is not extant here. Spacing between extant fragments suggests that *to* would fit best, but *unto* is also possible. In the printer's manuscript, Oliver Cowdery initially wrote *unto* but then crossed out the *un* with the same level of ink flow, suggesting a virtually immediate correction in accord with the reading in 𝓞.

Most of the time, after the verb *happen,* the text has the preposition *unto* rather than *to.* There are eight occurrences of "happen unto X", but only one other of "happen to X":

> Mosiah 19:22 (𝒪 is not extant here)
>> and the men of Gideon told them of all that had happened
>> **to** their wives and their children

This evidence suggests that "happen to X" is a possibility, although not that frequent. Here in Alma 47:27 the critical text will accept the corrected reading in 𝒫.

Summary: Accept Oliver Cowdery's virtually immediate correction of *unto* to *to* in 𝒫 as the original reading in Alma 47:27.

■ **Alma 47:27**

[*whosoever* 01BDEFIJLMNOS | *Whosoever* AHKPQRT | *whomsoever* CG]
[*loved* 01ABCDEFGIJLMNOPQRST | *loveth* HK] *the king*
let him go forth and pursue his servants

In this passage we have two minor changes in the text. In the 1840 edition, *whosoever* was replaced by *whomsoever.* From a prescriptive point of view, *whosoever* is correct here since it acts as the subject of the *whosoever*-clause. For two other instances where the 1840 edition switched *whomsoever* and *whosoever* (but not always consistently from a prescriptive point of view), see under Alma 3:10 and Alma 3:17. Here in Alma 47:27, the 1874 RLDS edition restored the original (and grammatically correct) *whosoever* to the RLDS textual tradition. But that same edition replaced the following word, the past-tense *loved,* with the present-tense *loveth.* This error in tense was corrected in the 1908 RLDS edition, probably by reference to 𝒫.

Summary: Maintain the original reading in Alma 47:27, the *wh*-form *whosoever* and the past-tense *loved:* "**whosoever loved** the king / let him go forth and pursue his servants".

■ **Alma 47:28**

and it came to pass that
[*when* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQS | RT] *all they who loved the king*
when *they heard these words*
came forth and pursued after the servants of the king

The ungrammaticality of the earliest text for this passage led the editors for the 1920 LDS edition to remove the first *when.* The original manuscript is not extant here, but spacing between the extant text argues that this *when* was in the original manuscript. Another possible emendation would be to add the pronoun *they* before the second *came* and treat the second *when*-clause as parenthetical:

> Alma 47:28 (alternative emendation)
>> and it came to pass that when all they who loved the king
>> —when they heard these words—
>> **they** came forth and pursued after the servants of the king

The original manuscript is extant right before *came forth,* and there is definitely no subject there. The style for this second possible emendation is somewhat more awkward than the 1920 emendation.

There is strong internal evidence that the 1920 emendation is indeed the original reading here in Alma 47:28. When we consider all other *when*-clauses in the original text (631 of them), we find no instance where the subject is ellipted from the main clause but is found within the *when*-clause. Yet this is what we have in the earliest reading for Alma 47:28: "and it came to pass that when all **they** who loved the king when **they** heard these words / came forth and pursued after the servants of the king". The earliest reading here is both unique and unusual. The 1920 emendation suggests the possibility that *when* was accidentally inserted after "and it came to pass that", a common enough place for *when* to occur (118 times elsewhere in the original text).

It is also possible that the second *when,* which is clearly part of the original text, influenced Oliver Cowdery to accidentally write an extra occurrence of *when* in ℗. There is, in fact, one example in the history of the text where an extra *when* was inserted in the environment of the phrase "it came to pass that", although in this case before the phrase:

> Alma 18:12
> and [1ABDEFIJLMNOPQRST | *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

This error created a nonsensical reading in the 1840 edition, yet it was retained in the RLDS textual tradition until the 1908 RLDS edition. We also have an example where Oliver Cowdery anticipated a following *when* as he copied from ℗ into 𝔓:

> 2 Nephi 19:3
> they joy before thee according to the joy in harvest
> and as [*when* > NULL 1| ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] men rejoice
> **when** they divide the spoil

These two examples argue that an anticipatory *when* could have been inserted in Alma 47:28 during the early transmission of the text.

Summary: Accept in Alma 47:28 the emendation in the 1920 LDS edition as the original reading: "and it came to pass that all they who loved the king—when they heard these words—came forth and pursued after the servants of the king"; Oliver Cowdery appears to have accidentally inserted an extra *when* in ℗ in anticipation of a following *when* and in an environment where *when* occurs quite frequently.

■ **Alma 47:29**

they were [*frightened* 01AKPRST | *frighted* BCDEFGHIJLMNOQ] *again*

The original Book of Mormon text uses the verb *frighten* (13 times) but never the archaic verb *fright* (or even the noun *fright*). Here the 1837 edition introduced the dialectal verb *fright,* which was retained in the LDS text until 1920 and the RLDS text until 1892. According to the Oxford English Dictionary, the verb *fright* is now rare and is restricted to poetry and dialectal language.

This verb is very old, with citations dating from Old English. On the other hand, the verb *frighten* is, according to the OED, "a late formation, which has taken the place of the earlier *fright*". The earliest citation under *frighten* in the OED dates from 1666 (in Samuel Pepys' diary). The critical text will maintain the use of the verb *frighten,* the reading of the earliest textual sources for all 13 instances of the word in the Book of Mormon.

Summary: Maintain throughout the text the use of the verb *frighten,* not the dialectal verb *fright* that was accidentally introduced into the 1837 edition for Alma 47:29.

■ **Alma 47:29**

they were frightened again and fled into the wilderness
and came over [*into* 1ART | *in* BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQS] *the land of Zarahemla*

As discussed nearby under Alma 47:1, *into* is the preferred preposition when dealing with movement across geographical boundaries. Just as in Alma 47:1, the 1837 edition is responsible for the change to *in.* The 1920 LDS edition restored the original *into* here in Alma 47:29 but not in Alma 47:1. On the other hand, the 1908 RLDS edition restored the *into* in Alma 47:1 but not here in Alma 47:29. Elsewhere, in expressions of the form "come over in(to) a land", the preposition is consistently *into* (eight times). For a list of examples where *into* has been replaced by *in,* see under Mosiah 23:26.

Summary: Maintain in Alma 47:29 the preposition *into,* the reading of the earliest textual sources ("they . . . came over **into** the land of Zarahemla").

■ **Alma 47:31**

and it came to pass on the morrow
he entered the city [01ABDEFIJLMNOPQRST | *of* CGHK] *Nephi with his armies*

Here the 1840 edition added the preposition *of,* thus expanding "the city Nephi" to the fuller "the city of Nephi". The original manuscript is quite fragmentary for the phrase "the city (of) Nephi", but the *y* of *city* is partially extant and is immediately followed by *Nephi.* There is apparently no *of* in ℗. The 1908 RLDS edition restored the original "the city Nephi" to the RLDS text.

Elsewhere in the text we have only "the city of Nephi" (six times), including one nearby example: "Amalickiah marched with his armies . . . to the land of Nephi to the city **of** Nephi which was the chief city" (Alma 47:20). According to the earliest text, "the city of Nephi" is preferred, but there is one instance of "the city Nephi" (namely, here in Alma 47:31). Similarly, the text strongly prefers "the land **of** Nephi", but there is one instance of "the land Nephi" in the earliest text; see the discussion under Alma 27:22–24.

Evidence involving other examples of "the city (of) X" shows that sometimes the *of* is lacking in the earliest extant sources, as in the following instances where later editions have added the *of:*

1 Nephi 11:13	the city great Jerusalem
Alma 8:18	the city Ammonihah
Alma 53:6	the city Mulek

Alma 55:16   the city Gid
Alma 55:33   the city Morionton
Alma 56:31   the city Antiparah
Alma 57:34   the city Cumeni
Alma 62:18   the city Nephihah

The addition of *of* in Alma 47:31 is probably unintended but not unexpected since English speakers prefer "the city of X" over "the city X".

Summary: In Alma 47:31, the standard text retains the exceptional (but possible) phraseology "the city Nephi", the apparent reading of the original manuscript; in general, the text reads "the city of X"; although "the city X" is possible, it occurs relatively infrequently in the text.

■ **Alma 47:34**

and it came to pass that [*same se* >% NULL 0| 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
Amalickiah took [*that* 0|*the* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *same servant*
that slew the king . . .

Here the original manuscript reads "that same servant", but Oliver Cowdery, when copying to the printer's manuscript, accidentally changed the demonstrative *that* to the definite article *the*. Further evidence that the original manuscript's *that* is correct is found a few words earlier in that manuscript. After the initial words "and it came to pass", Oliver initially wrote *that same se* (where *se* was the beginning of the word *servant*). Oliver caught his error immediately and deleted *same se* using erasure and crossout; he then continued inline with the correct text ("Amalickiah took that same servant that slew the king"). In other words, Oliver anticipated the phrase "that same servant".

Usage in the original text is fairly equally divided between "that same <noun>" and "the same <noun>", with 32 and 27 occurrences respectively. So either determiner works. In each case, we follow the earliest extant reading; here in Alma 47:34, 𝓞 reads "**that** same servant". There is additional evidence that Oliver Cowdery tended to replace "**that** same <noun>" with "**the** same <noun>":

Alma 50:15 (initial error in 𝓞)

  and they also began in [*the* > *that* 0|*that* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] same year
  to build many cities on the north

Alma 50:37 (error in 𝓟)

  and it came to pass that
  in [*that* 0|*the* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] same year
  that the people of Nephi had peace restored unto them

Alma 58:17 (initial error in 𝓟; also in the 1911 LDS edition)

  behold I remained with the remainder of my army
  in [*that* 0ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPRST|*the* > *that* 1|*the* Q] same place
  where we had first pitched our tents

Ether 8:25 (initial error in 𝓟)

  yea even [*the* > *that* 1|*that* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] same liar
  which hath caused man to commit murder from the beginning

Summary: Restore in Alma 47:34 the demonstrative *that* in "that same servant", the reading of the original manuscript.

■ **Alma 47:34**

and it came to pass that Amalickiah took that same servant that slew the king
and [*also* 01A | *all* BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *they which were with him*
and went in unto the queen

The 1837 typesetter seems to have accidentally misread *also* as *all*. Both manuscripts have *also,* as well as the 1830 edition. Either reading will work here, so we follow the reading of the earliest textual sources. The phrase "and also" is very common in the Book of Mormon text.

Summary: Restore *also* for *all* in Alma 47:34: "and **also** they which were with him" (the reading of the earliest textual sources).

■ **Alma 47:34**

and they all testified unto her
that the king was slain by his own servants
and they said [01CFGHIJKLMNOPQRST |, ABDE]
also [01 |, ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQS |: RT]
they have fled

There has been some confusion here regarding whether *also* belongs to the preceding or the following clause—that is, do we have "they said also" or "also they have fled"? The 1830 typesetter avoided making this decision by placing a comma both before and after *also*. Moreover, this equivocating punctuation was followed by the 1837 and 1841 editions as well as the 1849 LDS edition. But the 1840 edition and the 1852 LDS edition (independently, it would appear) removed the first comma, thus deciding that *also* belongs with the preceding clause ("they said also").

We can find evidence elsewhere in the text for each interpretation. For instance, in a few cases, because of a following subordinate conjunction *that,* the *also* must be interpreted as belonging with the preceding verb *say:*

1 Nephi 17:14	and the Lord **said also that** after ye have arriven . . .
Mosiah 13:35	yea and have they not **said also that** he should bring to pass the resurrection of the dead
Alma 30:26	and ye **say also that** he shall be slain for the sins of the world
Alma 30:48	and I **say also that** ye do not know that there is a God

On the other hand, there are numerous examples of *also* being preceded by a connective element (such as *and*), thus showing that a clause can begin with an *also* right before the subject, as in these examples:

Alma 9 preface	**and also** they are cast into prison
Alma 32:3	**and also** they were poor in heart
Alma 43:19	**and also** they were dressed with thick clothing
Helaman 5:34	yea **and also** they were immovable because of the fear . . .

Helaman 11:22	**and also** they had peace in the seventy and eighth year
Ether 6:7	**and also** they were tight like unto the ark of Noah

So it seems that in cases where we have the verb *say* followed by *also* and then immediately followed by the subject of an independent clause, we will have to rely on the context to decide which clause the word *also* should be parsed with. Here in Alma 47:34, either reading seems acceptable.

There are other examples in the text where there has been some question regarding which sentence *also* should go with: namely, 2 Nephi 3:18, Alma 9:4, and Alma 42:15–16. In the first two of these, the verb is *say* (just like here in Alma 47:34), and in both of these cases internal evidence favors placing the *also* with the *say:*

> 2 Nephi 3:18
> and the Lord said unto me **also** :
> I will raise up one unto the fruit of thy loins

> Alma 9:4
> and they saith **also** :
> we will not believe thy words

(See the discussion under each of these passages.) And here is another example where *also* belongs with the preceding verb *say:*

> Alma 17:10–11
> and it came to pass that the Lord did visit them with his Spirit
> and **said** unto them : be comforted
> and they were comforted
> and the Lord **said** unto them **also** :
> go forth among the Lamanites thy brethren and establish my word

In this instance, the Lord is not saying that the sons of king Mosiah should "**also** go forth among the Lamanites and establish my word" since that alone is precisely the purpose of their mission. Moreover, it is very clear from the previous verse that the Lord had previously said something else (namely, for them to be comforted).

Since *also* belongs with the verb *say* in the other instances of potential ambiguity, the critical text will adopt that interpretation here in Alma 47:34.

Summary: Most likely the *also* should be assigned to the preceding verb *say* in Alma 47:34 since that is how it is parsed in other potentially ambiguous examples of "say also" in the text (2 Nephi 3:18, Alma 9:4, and Alma 17:11).

■ **Alma 47:35**

yea he was acknowledged king throughout all the land among all the people of the Lamanites
which was composed of the [NULL >+ *Lamanites & the* 0 | *Lamanites & the* 1 |
Lamanites and the ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *Lemuelites and the Ishmaelites*
and [NULL >+ *all* 0 | *all* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *the dissenters of the Nephites*

Here in the original manuscript, Oliver Cowdery initially wrote "and the dissenters of the Nephites"; somewhat later, probably when he read back the text to Joseph Smith, he supralinearly inserted *all*

before *the dissenters* (his correction is written with somewhat heavier ink flow). Since the *all* is not necessary, it probably represents the reading of the original text.

A similar supralinear correction with somewhat heavier ink flow was also made in this passage. Oliver Cowdery initially wrote "which was composed of the Lemuelites and the Ishmaelites", thus omitting any reference to the Lamanites proper. His omission was probably the result of him just having written "among all the people of the Lamanites". Later Oliver surpralinearly inserted "Lamanites & the" in 𝕆. This correction seems to have been done at the same time the *all* was inserted (namely, when Oliver read back the text to Joseph Smith). Elsewhere, when the text refers to the tribes that belonged to the Lamanites, the reference is always to Lamanites, Lemuelites, and Ishmaelites:

Jacob 1:13	Lamanites Lemuelites and Ishmaelites
4 Nephi 1:38	Lamanites and Lemuelites and Ishmaelites
Mormon 1:8	the Lamanites and the Lemuelites and the Ishmaelites
Mormon 1:9	the Lamanites and the Lemuelites and the Ishmaelites

Summary: Maintain in Alma 47:35 the two corrected readings in 𝕆, namely, the addition of "the Lamanites and" (before "the Lemuelites and the Ishmaelites") and the *all* (before "the dissenters of the Nephites").

■ **Alma 47:36**

> *now these dissenters having the same instruction and the same information* **of** *the Nephites*
> *yea having been instructed in the same knowledge* **of** *the Lord*

Ross Geddes (personal communication, 23 August 2004) suggests that the preposition *of* in the first present participial clause is an error for *as;* that is, the text should read "having the same instruction and the same information **as** the Nephites". Note that the second present participial clause could be the source for the *of* since it reads "yea having been instructed in the same knowledge **of** the Lord". Here both *of*'s are extant in 𝕆, which means that if there is an error it must have occurred as Joseph Smith dictated the text to Oliver Cowdery. Even so, elsewhere in the text there are no examples of *as* and *of* ever being mixed up.

Here the prepositional phrase "of the Nephites" is potentially ambiguous. One could interpret the larger phrase "the same instruction and the same information **of** the Nephites" as meaning 'the same instruction and the same information **concerning** the Nephites'. But this interpretation is clearly wrong in this passage. Another possibility, equally unlikely, is that the *of* means 'from'. These dissenters were originally Nephites, so they did not receive the gospel from the Nephites: they were Nephites and had been taught the gospel from an early age. A third interpretation for this phrase, the correct one, is that these dissenters had "the same instruction and the same information that the Nephites had". This possessive interpretation is clearly possible for "the same instruction and the same information **of** the Nephites".

Of course, the *of* in the second present participial clause, "having been instructed in the same knowledge **of** the Lord", is not possessive in meaning. Here the meaning of "the same knowledge **of** the Lord" is 'the same knowledge **concerning** the Lord'. Normally in the Book of Mormon, the *of* in "the knowledge of X" has the meaning 'concerning'. On the other hand, there are no

instances in the text where "knowledge **of** the Lord" means 'knowledge **from** the Lord'. But there are definitely instances where "the knowledge **of** X" has the possessive meaning 'X's knowledge', as in these examples:

1 Nephi 19:5	that the more sacred things may be kept for the knowledge **of my people**
1 Nephi 22:4	there are many which are already lost from the knowledge **of they which are at Jerusalem**
2 Nephi 1:8	that this land should be kept as yet from the knowledge **of other nations**
Mosiah 18:3	that it might not come to the knowledge **of the king**
Mormon 8:16	and it shall . . . come unto the knowledge **of the people**
Ether 3:19	and because of the knowledge **of this man** he could not be kept from beholding within the veil

And the possessive interpretation is the way Alma 47:36 is using *of* in "the same instruction and the same information **of** the Nephites". Although that reading is difficult for modern English readers, the critical text will maintain the *of* rather than emend it to *as*.

Summary: Maintain in Alma 47:36 the *of* in the phrase "the same instruction and the same information **of** the Nephites"; here the *of* is possessive in meaning and refers to the instruction and the information that the Nephites had.

■ **Alma 47:36**

they became [*more im* > NULL 0| 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *more hardened and impenitent and more wild wicked and ferocious than the Lamanites*

Here in the original manuscript, Oliver Cowdery wrote *more im* at the end of a line, then crossed it out. It looks like he started to write "they became more impenitent" but then corrected the text to read "they became more hardened and impenitent". The phrase "more hardened and impenitent" is not extant, but it fits in the lacuna precisely. One could interpret the initial *more im* as meaning that the original text here read "they became more hardened and **more** impenitent" but that the repeated *more* was accidentally lost when Oliver corrected his initial miswriting in 𝒪. It is at least clear that there is no room for an extra *more* in the lacuna except by supralinear insertion.

Another factor to consider here is that *more* occurs once more in this sentence: "and **more** wild wicked and ferocious". Yet in this second conjunctive phrase, the *more* is not repeated; that is, it does not read "and more wild / more wicked / and more ferocious" (or some variant of that). Thus there is nothing wrong with "more hardened and impenitent", the earliest extant reading (the reading in 𝒫). The critical text will therefore retain the reading without *more* before *impenitent*.

Summary: Maintain in Alma 47:36 the two occurrences of *more* in "they became **more** hardened and impenitent and **more** wild wicked and ferocious"; based on manuscript evidence, there is no firm support for any additional occurrences of *more* in this clause.

■ **Alma 47:36**

nevertheless it is strange to relate not long after their dissensions
they became more hardened and impenitent and more wild wicked and ferocious
 than the Lamanites
drinking in **with** *the traditions of the Lamanites*

Karl Franson suggests (personal communication, 2 October 2003) that in this passage the *with* should be removed to read "drinking in the traditions of the Lamanites". 𝒪 is not extant here, but spacing between extant fragments suggests that *with* was in 𝒪. There are no other occurrences of "to drink in" in the Book of Mormon text. There is one occurrence in the King James Bible, and it occurs without the *with:* "the earth which **drinketh in** the rain that cometh oft upon it" (Hebrews 6:7).

Under definition 4 for the verb *drink,* the Oxford English Dictionary lists the meaning for "to drink in" as 'to take into the mind, especially by the eyes or ears, with the eager delight of one who satisfies physical thirst', but all the citations there lack the preposition *with.* However, the OED online does list one example of this usage under the noun *nourice* 'nurse' (here I regularize the spelling but retain other accidentals):

 James VI of Scotland (1599), later James I of England
  The natural sickness that I have perceived this estate subject to in my time,
  hath been, a feckless arrogant conceit of their greatness and power;
  drinking in with their very nourice-milk,
  that their honor stood in committing three points of iniquity:

The critical text will therefore maintain in Alma 47:36 this unique instance in the Book of Mormon of "to drink in with" since it is the earliest reading and there is evidence for the phraseology in earlier English.

Summary: Maintain in Alma 47:36 the occurrence of *with* in the present participial clause "drinking in **with** the traditions of the Lamanites", the reading of all the (extant) textual sources.

■ **Alma 47:36**

they became more hardened and impenitent and more wild wicked and ferocious than the Lamanites
drinking in with the [*tradition > traditions* 0 | *traditions* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
 of the Lamanites

In this passage, Oliver Cowdery initially wrote "the **tradition** of the Lamanites" in 𝒪. Virtually immediately, Oliver corrected the singular to the plural by inserting inline the *s* ending (there is no change in the level of ink flow). As discussed under Mosiah 1:5, either reading is possible. Here in Alma 47:36, the critical text will maintain the plural *traditions,* the virtually immediate correction in 𝒪.

Summary: Accept Oliver Cowdery's corrected plural in the original manuscript for Alma 47:36: "drinking in with the **traditions** of the Lamanites".

Alma 48

■ **Alma 48:3**

for he had hardened the hearts of the Lamanites and blinded their minds
and stirred them up [*to* 01ABCDEFGHIKLMNOPQRST | *in* J] *anger*

The 1888 LDS large-print edition replaced the preposition *to* with *in,* giving "and stirred them up **in** anger". The 1888 edition was never used as a copytext for any subsequent edition, so this reading with *in* was never transmitted. There is one other example where the preposition has been mixed up in this expression; in that instance, Oliver Cowdery momentarily wrote *to* in 𝓟 instead of the correct *with:*

> 3 Nephi 11:30
> behold this is not my doctrine
> to stir up the hearts of men
> [*to* > *with* 1 | *with* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] anger

This verse and the previous one contain the only instances in the text of "stir up . . . **with** anger", although the one in verse 29 is not quite the same: "and he **stirreth up** the hearts of men to contend **with anger** one with another". Elsewhere there are 24 occurrences of "stir up **to** anger" and 3 of "stir up **in** anger". Since either *to* or *in* is possible in Alma 48:3, we follow the earliest reading: "and stirred them up **to** anger".

Summary: Maintain in Alma 48:3 the original reading with the preposition *to* ("and stirred them up **to** anger").

■ **Alma 48:6**

they took their camp and moved forth
[*towards* 01ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPS | *toward* QRT] *the land of Zarahemla in the wilderness*

As explained under 1 Nephi 5:22, the critical text will in each case follow the earliest textual sources in deciding between *towards* and *toward*. In this instance, the earliest textual sources (including 𝓞) read *towards*. The 1911 LDS edition substituted *toward,* which has continued in the LDS text. The critical text will restore the original *towards* in this passage.

■ **Alma 48:8**

yea he had been strengthening the armies of the Nephites
and erecting small forts or places of resort
throwing up banks of earth round about
to [*ensercle* 0 | *enclose* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *his armies*
and also building walls of stone
to [*ensercle* 0 | *ensircle* 1 | *encircle* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *them about*
round about their cities and the borders of their lands
yea all round about the land

The original manuscript has *encircle* twice here in Alma 48:8; but when copying to the printer's manuscript, Oliver Cowdery accidentally wrote *enclose* rather than *encircle* for the first instance. This created the only occurrence of the verb *enclose* in the entire text. Otherwise, we have only *encircle* (26 times). The same verb is used both times in Alma 48:8 because the text is simply stating that Moroni's armies were encircled by their fortifications (in some cases, by banks of earth, and in other cases, by walls of stone).

Oliver Cowdery made the same mistake one other place in the book of Alma, again as he was copying from 𝓞 into 𝓟; in Alma 53:4, Oliver started to write *enclosed* in 𝓟 but wrote only the first five letters, *enclo:*

Alma 53:4 (lines 35–36, page 303 of 𝓟)

```
breast work of timbers & thus they did cause the Lamanites to labour until they
         incerceled
had <en^clo> the city of Bountiful round about with a strong wall of timber|s| &
```

Oliver immediately crossed out the *enclo* and supralinearly inserted *encircled* (spelled as *incerceled* in 𝓟). In this case, 𝓞 is extant for the last part of *encircled*. Oliver's spelling for the word *encircle* varied considerably in 𝓞 and 𝓟; in this instance, he spelled the word in 𝓞 with an extra *e* before the final *led* (these four letters, *eled,* preceded by a hyphen, begin a line of 𝓞). It is obvious that the word in 𝓞 was not *enclosed*.

Summary: In accord with the reading in 𝓞, restore *encircle* in Alma 48:8 ("to encircle his armies"); the original Book of Mormon text has no instances of the verb *enclose*.

■ **Alma 48:11**

a man whose soul did joy in the liberty and the freedom of his country
[01J |, ABCDEFGHIKLMNOPQRST] *and his brethren*
from bondage and slavery

Ross Geddes (personal communication, 23 August 2004) suggests that there should be no comma separating "his country" from "and his brethren". The text here is referring to freedom from bondage and slavery, and for Moroni this freedom applies to his country and his brethren. Interestingly, the 1888 LDS large-print edition correctly removed the comma here (although we cannot be sure whether that punctuation change was actually intended).

Summary: Remove in Alma 48:11 the comma separating "his country" from "and his brethren" since the text here is referring to Moroni's desire of "freedom . . . from bondage and slavery" for both his country and his people.

■ **Alma 48:14**

now the Nephites were taught to defend themselves against their enemies
even to the shedding of blood
[*even* 0 | 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *if it were necessary*

The second *even* in the original manuscript for Alma 48:14 appears to be unnecessary. And it could be an error in 𝕆, an accidental repetition. Oliver Cowdery dropped this repeated *even* when he copied this passage into the printer's manuscript. Elsewhere in the text, we can find a few more examples of repeated *even* that seem unnecessary:

> Mosiah 24:14
>> and I will also ease the burdens which is put upon your shoulders
>> that **even** you cannot feel them upon your backs
>> **even** while you are in bondage

> Alma 34:3–4
>> yea and he hath exhorted you unto faith and to patience
>> yea **even** that ye would have so much faith
>> as **even** to plant the word in your heart

> Ether 3:17
>> therefore it sufficeth me to say that
>> Jesus shewed himself unto this man in the spirit
>> **even** after the manner and in the likeness of the same body
>> **even** as he shewed himself unto the Nephites

Nonetheless, in these three examples the repetition does not jar the reader like it does in the original text for Alma 48:14. Thus Oliver Cowdery's emendation of the text could be retained in the standard text, but the critical text will restore the repeated *even* since it is the reading in 𝕆.

Here in Alma 48:14 the repeated *even* seems to be a type of multiple negative that extends the scope of negation of the first *even*. A related instance of this kind of extended negation seems to have occurred in the original text for Alma 43:20; there the conjunction *but* extends the negation of a previous *only*, but without reversing the implied negation. Ross Geddes points out (personal communication, 23 August 2004) that the negative *except* is also repeated in Alma 48:14, in a coordinative sense and without reversing polarity:

> Alma 48:14
>> yea and they were also taught never to give an offense
>> yea and never to raise the sword
>> **except** it were against an enemy
>> **except** it were to preserve their lives

Only the second *except* is extant in ◌, but there is room for the first *except* between extant fragments of ◌. For further discussion of the repetition of negative elements in order to maintain the scope of negation, see under NEGATION in volume 3.

Summary: Despite its difficulty, the repeated *even* in Alma 48:14 will be restored in the critical text ("even to the shedding of blood / **even** if it were necessary").

■ **Alma 48:16**

and also that God would make it known unto them
[*whither/whether* 0 | *whither* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *they should go*
to defend themselves against their enemies

Here in the original manuscript, it is difficult to tell whether Oliver Cowdery wrote *whither* or *whether*. As discussed under 1 Nephi 22:4, in each case of *whither/whether* the context will determine which reading should be accepted. We cannot rely on Oliver's manuscript spellings of *whither/whether* since he tended to mix them up. Here in Alma 48:16, *whether* is definitely incorrect since the larger passage makes it clear that Moroni intends to defend the Nephites and lead them into battle against the Lamanites: "and he had sworn with an oath to defend his people / his rights and his country and his religion / even to the loss of his blood" (Alma 48:13). The question in verse 16 is where the Nephites should go to defend themselves. For other examples of *whither* referring to where the Nephites should go, see under Alma 16:5 and Alma 43:22–23.

Summary: Retain in Alma 48:16 the correct *whither* (rather than *whether*) since the question here is knowing where the Lamanites will attack.

■ **Alma 48:17**

yea the devil would never have
[*no* 0A | NULL > *no* >js NULL 1 | BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *power*
over the hearts of the children of men

Here the original manuscript has a multiple negative, "the devil would **never** have **no** power". In his editing for the 1837 edition, Joseph Smith removed this multiple negative by deleting the *no*. The critical text will restore the original multiple negative here despite its nonstandard nature. For each instance of multiple negation, we consider the earliest textual sources. Some instances of multiple negation were introduced into the early text, but other instances are found in the original text. For discussion of that point, see under 2 Nephi 26:32; also see under NEGATION in volume 3.

Summary: Restore the original multiple negative in Alma 48:17: "the devil would **never** have **no** power over the hearts of the children of men".

■ **Alma 48:19**

now behold Helaman and his brethren were
[*not* 0 | *no* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *less serviceable*
unto the people than was Moroni

The original manuscript here reads "not less serviceable". When Oliver Cowdery copied the text into the printer's manuscript, he changed the *not* to *no,* perhaps intentionally. One can argue that the *not* in 𝒪 could have been a mistake for *no* since we have evidence elsewhere in 𝒪 that Oliver sometimes accidentally wrote *not* instead of *no:*

Alma 51:19   `was no<%t(-)%> time for their trials`

In this instance, Oliver caught his error immediately and erased the *t.* There are also several examples in 𝒫 where Oliver started to write *not* but caught his error immediately and corrected the *not* to *no:*

3 Nephi 1:8   `as if there were no<%t(-)%> night`

Moroni 7:24   `& there could no{t(-)|g}ood thing come unto them`

Moroni 8:15   `                      no`
`because he hath ^<<%not(-)%>> baptism`

Moroni 10:21   `if ye have no<%t%> hope`

So there is considerable manuscript evidence that *not,* the reading in 𝒪 for Alma 48:19, could be an error for *no.*

Elsewhere in the text we have no examples of *not less* or *no less* (nor *any less*), so there is no internal evidence here to suggest which reading is characteristic of the Book of Mormon text. But there is considerable evidence for the earliest reading "not less serviceable" in Early Modern English, with the following citations (accidentals regularized) from *Literature Online* <lion.chadwyck.com>:

John Dymmok (about 1600)
they are the very scum and outcast of the country
and **not less serviceable** in the camp for meating [=feeding] and dressing of horses
than hurtful to the enemy with their darts

David Lloyd (1668)
indeed his negotiations in France and Holland . . .
were **not less serviceable** than his battles in England

Edward Fowler (1671)
for the sagacity that is in beasts is **not less serviceable** to them
than is the reason of a wicked man to him

Nathaniel Wanley (1673)
he perceived a greater motion in the muscles of the tongue but his swallow
—to which the tongue is **not less serviceable** than to speech—
did as he acknowledged remain impedited [=impeded]

William Salmon (1692)
because antimony is **not less serviceable** to the purification of man's body
than it is to that of gold if it be rightfully prepared and administered

And we also have this example from the 1700s:

> Edward Gibbon (1788)
>> the reputation of Belisarius was unsullied by a defeat
>> and the vain confidence of the Goths was **not less serviceable** to his designs
>> than the repentance and modesty of the Roman troops

Note also that all of these examples have a comparative *than*-clause, just as here in Alma 48:19 ("not less serviceable unto the people **than** was Moroni"). Thus the expression "not less serviceable" is clearly possible. Of course, so is "no less serviceable". For instance, *Literature Online* lists about as many instances of "no less serviceable" for the 1600s. According to statistics found on <www.google.com>, the phrase "no less serviceable" is over 40 times more frequent than "not less serviceable" in current English; this difference in frequency may have existed in the English of the early 1800s, thus explaining why Oliver Cowdery replaced the *not* with *no* when he copied this phrase into 𝓟. The critical text will accept the earliest reading, "not less serviceable", as the original reading in Alma 48:19.

Summary: Restore in Alma 48:19 the *not* in "not less serviceable", the reading of the original manuscript; evidence for this expression can be found in Early Modern English, from the 1600s into the 1700s, as well as in current English.

■ **Alma 48:21**

but as I have said in the latter end of the nineteenth

- □ *year*   0
- □ *yea*   1ABCDGHKPS
- □ *year yea*   EFIJLMNOQRT

notwithstanding their peace amongst themselves
they were compelled reluctantly to contend with their brethren

Here in the original manuscript, Oliver Cowdery wrote "in the latter end of the nineteenth **year** / notwithstanding their peace amongst themselves". When he copied the text into the printer's manuscript, he miswrote the word *year* as *yea*. The 1830 compositor interpreted the *yea* in 𝓟 as an actual *yea,* so he set the text by placing a semicolon after *nineteenth.* Such a reading interprets "in the latter end of nineteenth" as having an ellipted *year.* In the original text, there is only one passage where the word *year* is ellipted; and in that passage, *year* is ellipted three times within the same sentence (each is marked below with an arrow):

> 4 Nephi 1:6
>> and thus did the thirty and eighth **year** pass away
>> → and also the thirty and ninth
>> → and the forty and first
>> → and the forty and second
>> yea even until forty and nine years had passed away

On the other hand, when only a single year is referred to within a sentence, the word *year* is always present in the original text.

The editor for the 1849 LDS edition, Orson Pratt, noticed that the word *year* was missing here in Alma 48:21, so he added it to the text. But he did not realize that the following *yea* was actually the error for *year*. He adjusted the punctuation by removing the semicolon after *nineteenth* and placing a comma after the extra *year*. On the other hand, the *yea* is really not appropriate here (irrespective of whether *year* is present or not); in the original text of the Book of Mormon, *yea* is consistently used to amplify or comment on the immediately preceding text in a passage. But here in Alma 48:21, the *yea* is merely gratuitous. The LDS text has maintained the extra *yea*, while the RLDS text continues with the reading in 𝓟 (where *year* is missing). The critical text will restore the reading of the original manuscript, where *year* is supplied and there is no *yea*.

Earlier in this chapter we have another example of this same error in 𝓟; in this instance, 𝓞 is not extant but probably read *year:*

> Alma 48:2
> in the latter end of the nineteenth [*yea* 1 | *year* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
> of the reign of the judges

In this case, the 1830 compositor easily determined that the *yea* in 𝓟 was an error for *year.*

For an example where Oliver Cowdery made the same mistake of replacing *year* with *yea* but in the original manuscript, see under Helaman 3:3. In that instance, no *year* has ever been supplied, neither in place of the incorrect *yea* nor in addition to the *yea*. Also under that passage, I provide a list of the places where Oliver accidentally miswrote *year* as *yea*.

Summary: Restore in Alma 48:21 the reading of the original manuscript, "in the latter end of the nineteenth **year**" (and without any following *yea*); the *yea* in the printer's manuscript is simply a scribal slip for *year.*

■ **Alma 48:24**

*nevertheless they could not **suffer** to lay down their lives*
that their wives and their children should be massacreed
by the barbarous cruelty of those who was once their brethren

Keith and Joan Skousen (personal communication, April 1998) have suggested that there might be a problem with the use of the word *suffer* here in Alma 48:24. Normally in today's English, *suffer* means 'to physically endure pain', but in Early Modern English it was very often used with the meaning 'to allow'; one can see this in many passages in the King James Bible and in the Book of Mormon, as in the following examples:

> Mark 10:14
> **suffer** the little children to come unto me and forbid them not

> 1 Nephi 13:30
> the Lord God will not **suffer** that
> the Gentiles will utterly destroy the mixture of thy seed

However, in Alma 48:24, the word *suffer* does not seem to mean 'allow'. But there is a related meaning that will work. Under definition 15 for *suffer* in the Oxford English Dictionary, we find an obsolete meaning for this verb, namely, 'to consent to' (or 'to submit to'), which is undoubtedly

the meaning here in Alma 48:24 (that is, the passage means 'they could not consent to lay down their lives'). Here are two more occurrences of this use of *suffer* in the scriptures:

> Mark 10:4 (King James Bible)
> and they said : Moses **suffered** to write a bill of divorcement
> and to put *her* away

> Mormon 8:25
> and behold their prayers were also in behalf of him
> that the Lord should **suffer** to bring these things forth

The OED cites a number of examples from the early 1300s on with this meaning, including this 1764 example from Oliver Goldsmith: "I must not **suffer** to have the laws broken before my face". Thus there is no error in the Book of Mormon text in Alma 48:24 and Mormon 8:25, but the meaning of *suffer* appears to be archaic in these two verses.

Summary: Maintain the use of the verb *suffer* with the meaning 'consent' in Alma 48:24 and Mormon 8:25.

■ **Alma 48:24**

that their wives and their children should be
[*massacreed* 1 | *massacred* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *by the barbarous cruelty*
of those who was once their brethren

The spelling *massacreed* here in 𝓟 suggests that this past participial form was pronounced /mæsəkrid/ rather than the standard /mæsəkɚd/ (𝓞 is not extant for the word). The Oxford English Dictionary specifies that by the 19th century the spelling *massacree* had become identified as illiterate but that this spelling could be found in both the 18th and 19th centuries. This spelling undoubtedly represents the pronunciation ending in /kri/ rather /kɚ/. The OED also lists the 17th-century spelling *massacry,* which most likely also stands for this pronunciation ending in /kri/ (much like other polysyllabic words ending in *ry,* such as *angry, country, husbandry, idolatry, ministry,* and *revelry*). The occurrence of *massacreed* here in Alma 48:24 may, of course, be an instance of dialectal overlay on the part of Joseph Smith and Oliver Cowdery.

Elsewhere the text has one other occurrence of this verb, and in that instance the word is spelled in the manuscripts according to the standard pronunciation:

> Alma 49:7
> or slay and [*massacre* 01ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] them

This spelling suggests that the spelling *massacreed* in Alma 48:24 may actually stand for *massacre* + *ed* rather than *massacree* + *d*.

Another possibility here is that we have a case of variation in pronunciation, the nonstandard /mæsəkrid/ in Alma 48:24 but the standard /mæsəkɚ/ in Alma 49:7. Elsewhere the critical text has allowed such variation, as in the competition between *drownded* and *drowned;* for that past-tense form, *drownded* is allowed the one time it occurs in the manuscripts, despite the fact that *drownded* may represent a case of dialectal overlay (see the discussion under 1 Nephi 4:2). In the same way, we can have *massacreed* in Alma 48:24 but *massacre* in Alma 49:7.

Summary: Maintain in Alma 48:24 the manuscript spelling *massacreed* since there's a good chance it represents the dialectal pronunciation /mæsəkrid/; on the other hand, the manuscript spelling *massacre,* representing the pronunciation /mæsəkɚ/, will be retained in Alma 49:7.

■ **Alma 48:25**

yea **they** *could not bear that their brethren should rejoice over the blood of the Nephites*
so long as [*there* 01ACEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST | *they* BD] *were any*
who should keep the commandments of God

The 1837 edition accidentally replaced the correct *there* with *they,* probably because of the preceding *they* in the sentence ("yea **they** could not bear that . . ."). This obvious typo was nonetheless copied into the 1841 British edition but was removed from the text in the third edition (1840) and in the 1849 LDS edition. Of course, the critical text will maintain the correct *there.*

Summary: Maintain the occurrence of *there* in Alma 48:25 ("so long as **there** were any who should keep the commandments of God").

■ **Alma 48:25**

so long as there were any who should keep the commandments of God
for the [*promisee > promises >*js *promisess* 1 | *promise* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
of the Lord [*were* 01A | *was* BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
if they should keep his commandments they should prosper in the land

The printer's manuscript has the plural phrase "the promises of the Lord were". Oliver Cowdery initially wrote *promises* in 𝓟 as *promisee,* then overwrote the repeated *e* with an *s.* In the original manuscript, the *ro* of *promises* and the plural verb *were* are extant. Most probably 𝓞 had the plural *promises* since the verb is the plural *were.* The noun immediately preceding *were* is the singular *Lord,* which could have theoretically led to "the promises of the Lord **was**", as originally in 2 Nephi 10:9: "the promises of the Lord **is** great unto the Gentiles" (see the discussion under that passage). Here in Alma 48:25, the earliest textual sources support the plural reading "the **promises** of the Lord **were**".

The 1830 edition changed *promises* to the singular *promise* but retained the plural verb *were* ("the **promise** of the Lord **were**"), which suggests that the loss of the plural ending in the 1830 edition was simply a typo rather than the result of editing. The 1837 edition removed the disagreement in number by changing the *were* to *was* rather than restoring the plural *promises.* But Joseph Smith, in his editing of 𝓟 for the 1837 edition, inserted inline an extra plural *s* after *promises,* perhaps in an attempt to guarantee the plural *promises.*

Ultimately, the question here in Alma 48:25 is whether we have a single promise or more than one promise. Elsewhere the text has two passages that specifically use the noun *promise* to refer to the Lord's statement that if the people keep his commandments they will prosper in the land; one of these instances uses the singular *promise,* the other the plural:

2 Nephi 1:9
> wherefore I Lehi have obtained **a promise** that
> inasmuch as they which the Lord God shall bring out of the land of Jerusalem
> > shall keep his commandments
> they shall prosper upon the face of this land

Mosiah 1:7
> and I would that ye should keep the commandments of God
> that ye may prosper in the land according to **the promises**
> which the Lord made unto our fathers

Thus the occurrence in Alma 48:25 of the plural *promises* is possible, and the critical text will restore the original "the promises of the Lord were" in this passage, the original reading in 𝓟 and the probable reading in 𝓞.

Summary: Restore in Alma 48:25 the plural usage in "the promises of the Lord were", the earliest reading in the manuscripts; in addition, Mosiah 1:7 shows that the plural *promises* is an appropriate reading for Alma 48:25.

Alma 49

■ **Alma 49:1**

the armies of the Lamanites were seen approaching
[*towards* >? *toward* 0 | *towards* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *the land of Ammonihah*

> The *s* at the end of *towards* in 𝒪 appears to be an incorrectly written *s* rather than an aborted *s*. The same kind of defective *s* is found at the end of the plural *stones* three lines later in 𝒪: "they fought with stones & with arrows" (Alma 49:2); the plural *stones* is obviously the correct reading. Here in verse 1, Oliver Cowdery correctly copied *towards* into 𝒫. And all the printed editions have *towards*. As explained under 1 Nephi 5:22, the earliest text has instances of both *toward* and *towards,* with *towards* dominating.

Summary: Maintain the *s*-final form *towards* in Alma 49:1, the apparent reading in 𝒪.

■ **Alma 49:4**

that the Lamanites could not cast
their stones and [*their* 01ABDEFIJLMNOQRT | CGHKPS] *arrows at them*

> Here the 1840 edition omitted the repeated *their* in "their stones and **their** arrows". The RLDS text has continued with the shorter reading. The original text consistently repeats the determiner, when it exists, for conjuncts of *stones* and *arrows;* if there is no determiner for the first conjunct, then there is none for the second (here each of these null cases is marked with an asterisk):

1 Nephi 16:15	with our bows and **our** arrows and **our** stones and our slings
* Mosiah 10:8	with bows and with arrows and with swords and with scimitars and with stones and with slings
* Alma 2:12	with swords and with scimitars and with bows and with arrows and with stones and with slings
Alma 3:5	and their bows and **their** arrows and **their** stones and their slings
Alma 43:20	their swords and their scimitars / their bows and **their** arrows / **their** stones and their slings
Alma 49:2	from **the** arrows and **the** stones of the Lamanites
* Alma 49:2	with stones and with arrows
Alma 49:4	**their** stones and **their** arrows
* Alma 49:19	stones and arrows
Alma 49:22	by **the** stones and **the** arrows which were thrown at them
Alma 50:4	**the** stones and **the** arrows of the Lamanites
Helaman 16:2	with **their** stones neither with **their** arrows

Helaman 16:6	with **their** stones and **their** arrows
Helaman 16:6	with **our** stones and **our** arrows

In the LDS text for Alma 49:22, the repeated *the* has been omitted since the 1849 edition; for discussion, see under that passage. Also see the general discussion under CONJUNCTIVE REPETITION in volume 3.

Summary: Maintain in Alma 49:4 the repeated *their* in the conjunctive noun phrase "their stones and **their** arrows".

■ **Alma 49:5**

now at this time the chief captains of the Lamanites were astonished exceedingly
because of the wisdom of the Nephites
in [*prepairing* >% *repairing* 0 | *preparing* 1 | *preparing* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
their places of security

At the beginning of Alma 49, we read how Moroni had had the city of Ammonihah rebuilt (verses 2–3). This rebuilding so astonished the Lamanites when they came to attack the city that they decided instead to attack the city of Noah (verses 12–14). Here in the original manuscript for verse 5, Oliver Cowdery started to write *prepairing* but then erased the aborted initial *p*. As he erased this letter, he smeared the *n* at the end of the immediately preceding word, *in*. In fact, there is some space before the initial *r* of *repairing*, which means that Oliver had started only the initial *p* of *prepairing* when he decided to erase the *p* and start completely over with the correct word, *repairing*. But when Oliver copied this passage into the printer's manuscript, his erasure was apparently not clear enough, and he ended up writing *prepairing* in ℗.

Either word is acceptable in this context. There are two other examples of the verb *repair* being used to describe the rebuilding of cities:

Mosiah 9:8	and we began to build buildings and to **repair** the walls of the city
3 Nephi 6:7	and there were many old cities **repaired**

On the other hand, there are three examples of the verb *prepare* being used to refer to building up defenses:

Alma 50:6	thus Moroni did **prepare** strong holds
Alma 52:6	by casting up walls round about and **preparing** places of resort
Alma 56:20	we had **prepared** our city and ourselves for defense

As far as the spelling *prepair* is concerned, Oliver Cowdery usually spelled *prepare* as *prepare,* but in the following cases he spelled the word as *prepair:*

PASSAGE	○	℗
Alma 2:13	——	prep**ai**red
Alma 12:37	——	prep**ai**red
Alma 48:10	prep**ai**ring	prepareing
Alma 49:5	<repairing>	prep**ai**ring
Alma 56:20	prep**ai**red	prepared
Alma 56:28	prep**ai**red	prepared

This means that we cannot use the spelling *prepair* as an argument that the word here in Alma 49:5 must have been *repair.* In any event, 𝒪 itself is sufficiently clear: the immediately corrected reading is "**repairing** their places of security".

Summary: Restore in Alma 49:5 the immediately corrected reading of the original manuscript: "the wisdom of the Nephites in **repairing** their places of security"; the erasure of the aborted initial *p* is definitely there and can be seen extending into the *n* of the immediately preceding word, *in;* the erased *p* is also separated from the following word, *repairing.*

■ **Alma 49:8**

but behold to their uttermost astonishment
they were prepared for them in a manner which never had been known
among [*all* 01APS | BCDEFGHIJKLMNOQRT] *the children of Lehi*

Here the 1837 edition omitted the universal quantifier *all,* probably accidentally (Joseph Smith did not mark the deletion in 𝒫). The 1908 RLDS edition restored the original *all* to the RLDS text, probably by reference to 𝒫. Since either reading works, the critical text will restore the *all,* the reading of the earliest sources. There is another example of *all* in the same prepositional phrase:

> Mormon 4:12
> and there never had been so great wickedness among **all** the children of Lehi
> nor even among all the house of Israel

Note also in this second example the parallel use of *all* in the conjoined phrase, "nor even among **all** the house of Israel".

Summary: Restore in Alma 49:8 the *all* before "the children of Lehi", the reading of both manuscripts and the 1830 edition.

■ **Alma 49:9**

the Lamanites or the Amalickiahites were exceedingly astonished at
their manner of [*preperation* 1 | *preparation* ABCDEFGHIJKLMOPQRST | *preparations* N] *for war*

As discussed under Jarom 1:8, there is only one occurrence in the earliest text of the phrase "preparation for war", namely, here in Alma 49:9. In contrast, there are nine instances of the plural "preparations for war" (but eight of these take the verb *make,* unlike the case here in Alma 49:9). For this single instance of "preparation for war", the 1906 LDS large-print edition shifted to the plural expression, perhaps unintentionally. That edition never served as a copytext for any subsequent LDS edition. Either reading is theoretically possible, so we follow the earliest extant reading (in 𝒫) for Alma 49:9, "their manner of **preparation** for war".

Summary: Maintain in Alma 49:9 the singular *preparation* in "preparation for war", the reading of all the earliest (extant) textual sources.

■ **Alma 49:10**

perhaps he would have caused the Lamanites
to have [attackted ₀ | attacked 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] the Nephites
  at the city of Ammonihah

Here 𝓞 is extant for the last three letters of the past participial form *attackted,* which shows that the base form for the verb *attack* ended in a *t* (thus *attackt + ed*). In 𝓟, on the other hand, Oliver Cowdery wrote the word as the standard *attacked.* When we consider all occurrences of the verb *attack* in the manuscripts, we discover that 𝓞 is sufficiently extant for 11 out of 15 cases, and in every one of those extant cases the word ends in a *t,* either as *attackt* (10 times) or as *attact* (once). When Oliver copied the text from 𝓞 into 𝓟, he wrote the word as *attackt* in 11 out of the 15 cases in 𝓟; in one of those cases, in Helaman 1:18, he initially wrote the word without the *t* but then inserted the final *t* inline (probably as an immediate correction since the inserted *t* is written without any change in the level of ink flow). But in four cases in 𝓟 (each marked below with an asterisk), Oliver wrote the verb without the *t.* Here is the complete list:

PASSAGE	𝓞	𝓟
Alma 43:24	——	* attack
Alma 49:10	attack**t**ed	* attacked
Alma 49:11	——	attack**t**
Alma 49:17	attack**t**	attack**t**
Alma 52:5	attack**t**	attack**t**
Alma 52:16	attack**t**	attack**t**
Alma 52:17	attack**t**	attack**t**
Alma 53:5	attack**t**	attack**t**
Alma 55:33	——	attack**t**
Alma 56:21	attack**t**	attack**t**
Alma 56:22	attack**t**	attack**t**
Alma 58:2	attack**t**	* attack
Alma 59:5	attack**t**ed	attack**t**ed
Helaman 1:18	attac**t**	attack > attack**t**
Helaman 1:26	——	* attack

The evidence in 𝓞 argues that Joseph Smith consistently pronounced the verb as /ətækt/ rather than /ætæk/. Oliver Cowdery seems to have always written it down that way in 𝓞, as *attackt,* except for one instance of *attact* (in Helaman 1:18). In 𝓟, on the other hand, Oliver occasionally changed *attackt* to *attack* (four times), which suggests that both were current in his speech. The critical text will assume that for Joseph the verb was *attackt* and will therefore interpret each instance as *attackt,* even in the two cases where 𝓞 is not extant and 𝓟 reads *attack* (namely, in the first and last occurrences in the text). Of course, the original text may have consistently read with the standard *attack,* in which case Joseph's *attackt* would have been due to dialectal overlay.

The dialectal use of *attackt* for standard *attack* was very common during the 1800s, with the following examples (from *Literature Online* <lion.chadwyck.com>) that are contemporary with the 1830 publication of the Book of Mormon:

Henry Finn (1825)   let's be attackted
John Pendleton Kennedy (1832)   our militia was attackted
Charles Fenno Hoffman (1840)   if the tree were attackted from the outside

But there is also evidence from *Literature Online* for the use of *attackt* in Early Modern English (accidentals here regularized except for the original spelling of *attackt*):

Gervase Markham (1595)

hoist up thy sails / delay **attackts** thy sin
flee from ill-boding stars with all thy might

George Hicks (1684)

a principal ship which for many years had been sovereign of the seas
was at last **attacted** by a tempestuous wind which the devil raised

James II of England (1685)

what convulsions have **attacted** the body of this nation
and how vile a ferment has raged in it

Summary: Accept *attackt* as the original form of the verb *attack* here in Alma 49:10 and throughout the Book of Mormon text; all the extant evidence in 𝕆 consistently supports this form rather than the standard *attack*.

■ **Alma 49:15**

for he had supposed that they would be frightened
at the city [01ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRT | *of* s] *Ammonihah*

As discussed under Alma 8:18, we can have either "the city of Ammonihah" or "the city Ammonihah" in the Book of Mormon text. In each case, we follow the earliest textual sources, thus "the city Ammonihah" here in Alma 49:15. In this instance, the 1953 RLDS edition added the *of,* perhaps unintentionally.

Summary: Maintain in Alma 49:15 the earliest reading, "the city Ammonihah" (that is, without the *of*).

■ **Alma 49:20**

thus they were prepared
yea a body of their [*most strong* 01ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQS | *strongest* RT] *men*

As discussed under Alma 43:24, the original text frequently preferred the periphrastic forms for comparison of adjectives rather than the inflectional forms. Here in Alma 49:20, we have an instance of *most strong* that was changed to *strongest* in the 1920 LDS edition. In each case, the critical text will accept the comparative form found in the earliest textual sources.

Summary: Restore in Alma 49:20 the periphrastic form *most strong;* current English prefers the inflectional form *strongest*.

■ **Alma 49:22**

but behold in these attempts they were swept off
by the stones and [*the* 1ABCDGHKPS | EFIJLMNOQRT] *arrows*
which were thrown at them

Here the 1849 LDS edition accidentally omitted the repeated determiner *the* in the conjunctive noun phrase "the stones and **the** arrows". Elsewhere the text consistently repeats the determiner, when it exists, for conjuncts of *stones* and *arrows* (for a list, see the discussion under Alma 49:4). Here in Alma 49:22, the LDS text has continued with the shorter "the stones and arrows".

The original manuscript is not extant for the second half of this phrase, but spacing between extant portions of the text has no room for the repeated *the* except by supralinear insertion. The printer's manuscript, the earliest extant source, has the full phrase, "the stones and the arrows". Here the critical text will follow 𝓟, the earliest textual source. Most likely, the repeated *the* was initially omitted in 𝓞 but then later supplied, especially since the overwhelming tendency in the history of the text has been to omit the repeated determiner rather than to add one. See the general discussion under CONJUNCTIVE REPETITION in volume 3.

Summary: Restore in Alma 49:22 the repeated *the* in the conjunctive phrase "the stones and **the** arrows", the reading of the earliest extant source, the printer's manuscript.

■ **Alma 49:22**

and instead of filling up their ditches
by pulling down the banks of [01ABDEFIJLMNOPQRST | *the* CGHK] *earth . . .*

The 1840 edition introduced the definite article *the* in front of *earth,* but this is clearly a typo, despite it being copied into the early RLDS textual tradition. It was removed from the RLDS text in 1908. To be sure, the expression "the banks of the earth" is quite unexpected for speakers of English. There are two other instances in the text of "banks of earth", one of which occurs earlier here in Alma 49:22:

| Alma 48:8 | throwing up banks **of earth** round about |
| Alma 49:22 | they began to dig down their banks **of earth** |

As expected, there are no instances of "banks of **the** earth" in the original text.

Summary: Maintain the original two occurrences of the phrase "banks of earth" in Alma 49:22; the intrusive *the* that entered the 1840 edition for the second occurrence is a typo.

■ **Alma 49:26**

because he had not obtained his [*desires* 0 | *desire* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *over the Nephites*

The original manuscript is extant here and reads *desires*. Oliver Cowdery, when he copied the text from 𝓞 into 𝓟, replaced the plural *desires* with the singular *desire*. All the printed editions

have followed the reading in 𝑃. As discussed under Mosiah 18:10, 11, the critical text will in each instance of *desire(s)* follow the reading of the earliest textual sources, thus *desires* here in Alma 49:26 since 𝑂 reads that way.

Summary: Restore the plural *desires* in Alma 49:26, the reading of the original manuscript.

■ **Alma 49:27**

yea he was exceeding wroth
and he did curse God and also Moroni
[NULL > & 0 | NULL >+ & 1 | *and* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQS | RT]
swearing with an oath that he would drink his blood

Here in the manuscripts, there was a persistent tendency for Oliver Cowdery to omit the *and* before the present participial clause that ends this sentence. In the original manuscript, Oliver inserted the *and* inline, although the *and* (written as an ampersand) is raised somewhat off the line. The correction is virtually immediate since there is no difference in the level of ink flow. In the printer's manuscript, Oliver once more omitted the *and*. This time his correction is a supra-linear *&,* and it is written with a somewhat heavier ink flow. In this instance, Oliver probably caught his error when he proofed 𝑃 against 𝑂.

Of course, in English we do not expect a connecting *and* for a sentence-final present participial clause unless it is conjoined to a preceding present-participial clause, as in the following example:

> Alma 9:30
> and ye had ought to bring forth works which is meet for repentance
> **seeing** that your hearts have been grossly hardened against the word of God
> **and seeing** that ye are a lost and a fallen people

But there is no such preceding present-participial clause here in Alma 49:27, with the result that the sentence seems to end with a disconnected nonfinite clause. Thus Oliver Cowdery twice omitted the *and* in the manuscripts, at least initially. Similarly, the editors for the 1920 LDS edition removed the seemingly unnecessary *and* in this passage. Yet elsewhere in the earliest text, there are a number of cases with precisely this construction:

> Mosiah 23:14   and also trusting no one to be your teachers nor your ministers
> Mosiah 28:20   and commanding him that he should keep and preserve them
> Alma 16:3   and taking others captive into the wilderness
> Helaman 4:22   and thus seeing that their laws had become corrupted

Not surprisingly, editors have tended to remove this nonstandard usage. For the specific changes, see the discussion under Mosiah 23:13–14. The critical text will restore the original reading in all these cases, including here in Alma 49:27, since textually the *and* is fully intended.

Summary: Restore in Alma 49:27 the original *and* that introduced the sentence-final present participial clause ("**and** swearing with an oath that he would drink his blood").

■ **Alma 49:28**

the people of Nephi did thank the Lord their God
because of his [*marackelous* 0 | *matchless* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *power*
in delivering them from the hands of their enemies

The original manuscript has the phrase "his miraculous power", but Oliver Cowdery misspelled the word as *marackelous*. It was probably the initial *ma* that then led him to misread the word as *matchless* when he copied this passage into the printer's manuscript.

In the original text there are examples of *matchless, marvelous,* and *miraculous* occurring with *power:*

"matchless power"	1 Nephi 17:42, Mosiah 2:11, Mosiah 4:6, Alma 9:11
"matchless and marvelous power"	Mosiah 1:13
"miraculous power"	Alma 9 preface, Alma 10:5, Alma 49:28, Alma 57:26
"marvelous power"	Alma 10:5, Alma 57:26
"miraculous and matchless power"	Helaman 4:25

The original case of "miraculous power" in Alma 10:5 was accidentally changed to "marvelous power" because of the preceding occurrence of this alternative form earlier in the verse (see the discussion under that passage). For each case of "<adjective> power", the critical text will accept the adjective that occurs in the earliest extant reading.

Summary: Restore in Alma 49:28 the original *miraculous* in "because of his miraculous power".

■ **Alma 49:28**

because of his miraculous power in delivering them
from the [*hands* >%? *hand* 0 | NULL > *hands* 1 | *hands* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
of their enemies

In the original manuscript Oliver Cowdery wrote *hands*. The *s* at the end of the word looks like it could have been erased, but there is a distinct possibility that this *s* has actually been damaged by the poor physical conditions the manuscript was subjected to when it was in the cornerstone of the Nauvoo House. This same deterioration is found, for instance, in the word *of* which immediately follows *hands*. In addition, the *d* immediately preceding the *s* in *hands* has been overwritten, which further weakens the appearance of the *s*.

When Oliver Cowdery copied this passage into the printer's manuscript, he wrote the plural *hands* (although he initially skipped the word and had to supralinearly insert it). The occurrence of *hands* in 𝓟 suggests that the *s* was also in 𝓞, although an ink erasure can be poorly done and the copyist can therefore fail to notice the erasure (see, for instance, the nearby discussion under Alma 49:5 regarding the erasure in 𝓞 of the aborted *p* before *repairing*). And there is always the possibility here in verse 28 that Oliver simply expected the plural and incorrectly wrote *hands* a second time. In any event, *hands* has been retained throughout the printed editions of the Book of Mormon.

Elsewhere in the text, when the verb is *deliver,* we consistently get the plural *hands* in the phrase "the hand(s) of one's enemies" (17 times). Of these examples, 16 read with the preposition *out of* ("deliver **out of** the hands of one's enemies"); there is one with the preposition *into* ("deliver **into** the hands of their enemies", Mosiah 11:21). Alma 49:28 is the only example of "the hand(s) of one's enemies" that takes the preposition *from.* Of course, *from* is semantically like *out of,* so there is nothing really unusual about the plural *hands* for the phrase "deliver **from** the hands of one's enemies". The critical text will therefore maintain the plural *hands* in Alma 49:28.

The King James Bible, in contrast to Book of Mormon usage, strongly prefers the singular *hand* in the phrase "the hand(s) of one's enemies" when the verb is *deliver:* there are 12 instances of the singular *hand* (as in 1 Samuel 12:11: "and the LORD . . . delivered you out of the **hand** of your enemies on every side"). But there is one example in the King James Bible of the plural "the hands of one's enemies" when the verb is *deliver* (namely, in Judges 8:34: "and the children of Israel remembered not the LORD their God who had delivered them out of the **hands** of all their enemies on every side"). Yet the original Hebrew for the last example reads in the singular, in agreement with the 12 other instances of "the hand of one's enemies" in the King James Bible. In other words, the plural *hands* in the King James version for Judges 8:34 is not literally translated from the original (as it is in the 12 other cases).

Summary: Retain the plural *hands* in Alma 49:28 since it is the clear reading in 𝓟 and the probable reading in 𝓞; all other usage in the Book of Mormon text supports the plural *hands* in the phrase "the hand(s) of one's enemies" when the verb is *deliver.*

■ **Alma 49:30**

> *yea and there was continual peace among them*
> *and exceeding great prosperity in the church*
> *because of their heed and diligence which they gave unto the word of God*
> *which was declared unto them by Helaman and Shiblon and Corianton*
> *and Ammon and his brethren*

(1) [.*&C* 0 | .*&c.* >jg .*&c.* 1 | *&c.* ABCDEFGHIKLMNOQ | *etc.* JPS | RT]

> *yea and by all those which had been ordained by the holy order of God*
> *being baptized unto repentance and sent forth to preach among the people*

(2) [*&C* 0 | *&c* 1 | *&c.* ABCDEFGHIKLMNOQ | *etc.* JPS | RT]

Here at the end of Alma 49, we have two instances of *etc.* that were removed in the editing for the 1920 LDS edition. Nonetheless, these uses of *etc.* are not redundant but imply additional, unspecified information.

For the first example, the *etc.* may be referring to those who had served with Ammon and his brothers in their mission to the Lamanites, as described in 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 unto the Lamanites". As David Calabro points out (personal communication), this first *etc.* does not generally refer to anyone else who preached among the Nephites since that more general group of preachers is referred to in the following text: "yea and by all those which had been ordained by the holy order of God / being baptized unto repentance and sent forth to preach among the people etc."

For the second example, the *etc.* implies that those "sent forth to preach among the people" would have used their priesthood not only to preach but also to do other tasks (such as baptizing and ordaining others).

The critical text will restore these two original instances of *etc.* here in Alma 49:30 since they are clearly intended. For further discussion, see under ETC. in volume 3.

Summary: Restore the two original instances of *etc.* in Alma 49:30; in each case, the *etc.* provides a necessary reminder of other, unstated possibilities.

■ **Alma 49:30**

yea and there **was** *continual peace among them and exceeding great prosperity in the church*
because of their heed and diligence which they **gave** *unto the word of God*
which **was** *declared unto them by Helaman and Shiblon and Corianton*
   and Ammon and his brethren etc.
yea and by all those which [*had* 01ABCDEFGHIJKMNOPQRST | *have* L] *been ordained*
   by the holy order of God

The 1902 LDS missionary edition accidentally replaced the past-tense *had* with the present-tense *have,* an obvious typo since all the preceding language is in the past tense: "there **was** continual peace . . . their heed and diligence which they **gave** unto the word of God which **was** declared unto them". The 1902 edition was never used as a copytext, so this error was never copied into any subsequent LDS edition.

Summary: Maintain throughout Alma 49:30 the past-tense verb forms, including the *had* in "those which **had** been ordained by the holy order of God".

Alma 50

■ **Alma 50:1**

*And now it came to pass that Moroni did not stop making preparations for war
or to defend* [*themselves* 0A | *themselves* >js *his people* 1 | *his people* BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
against the Lamanites

> Here in his editing for the 1837 edition, Joseph Smith emended *themselves* to *his people* since there
> was no specific referent for the reflexive pronoun *themselves* at the beginning of this chapter.
> (There is also a new chapter here in the original chapter system, namely chapter XXII.) Of course,
> the context implies that *themselves* refers to the Nephites. The last sentence in the previous chapter
> ends with a reference to the people of Nephi in its description of those who had been "sent forth to
> preach among **the people**" (Alma 49:30). Thus there is nothing especially difficult about determin-
> ing the referent for the reflexive pronoun *themselves* at the beginning of the new chapter. It should
> also be pointed out that the reflexive form makes sure that Moroni himself is included as part of
> the referent (in distinction to the emendation *his people*). The critical text will restore the original
> reading here; it is not a mistake, nor does it cause any real difficulty in understanding.

Summary: Restore in Alma 50:1 the original reflexive pronoun *themselves;* even though there is no
explicit antecedent for *themselves* at the beginning of chapter 50, the pronoun is easily determined as
referring to both Moroni and his people.

■ **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 heighth of a man*

> Here the original manuscript reads *those.* When Oliver Cowdery copied this passage into the
> printer's manuscript, he initially wrote *these* but then corrected *these* to *those.* Nonetheless, the
> 1830 compositor ended up setting *these,* which has continued in all subsequent editions. For a list
> of instances where the 1830 compositor mixed up *those* and *these,* see under Mosiah 28:1. For
> instances where Oliver Cowdery mixed up these two demonstratives, see under Alma 3:25.
>   Here at the beginning of Alma 50, there is a long narrative chain that refers to various defen-
> sive works for which *those* is consistently used as a link between the works:

Alma 50:1–4 (original text)

(a)   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

(a′) and upon the top of **those** *ridges of earth*

(b)   he caused that there should be timbers yea *works of timbers*
built up to the heighth of a man round about the cities

(b′) and he caused that upon **those** *works of timbers*

(c)   that there should be *a frame of pickets* built upon the timbers round about
and they were strong and high

(d)   and he caused *towers* to be erected

(c′) that overlooked **those** *works of pickets*

(d′) and he caused places of security to be built upon **those** *towers*

The use of *those* throughout this passage is clearly intended. Thus the one inconsistent change of *those* to *these* at the beginning of verse 2 should be reversed.

Summary: Restore in Alma 50:2 the original *those* ("upon the tops of **those** ridges of earth").

■ **Alma 50:2**

he caused that there should be timbers
—yea works of [*timbers* 01ABCDEFGIJLMNOPQRST | *timber* HK]—
built up to the heighth of a man
round about all the cities

Here the 1874 RLDS edition replaced the plural *timbers* with the singular noncount noun *timber*. The 1908 RLDS edition restored the correct plural, probably by reference to 𝓟. The plural is undoubtedly correct, as exemplified by the usage in the next verse:

Alma 50:3
and he caused that upon those **works of timbers**
that there should be a frame of pickets built upon the **timbers** round about

Note especially the occurrence of the very same phrase "works of timbers" in the first part of Alma 50:3.

Summary: Maintain in Alma 50:2 the original plural *timbers* in the *yea*-phrase: "yea works of timbers"; support for this plural usage can be found in the following verse ("upon those works of timbers").

■ **Alma 50:2**

yea works of timbers built up
to the [*heighth* 1BCD | *height* AEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *of a man*

The printer's manuscript reads *heighth* instead of the standard *height,* here in Alma 50:2 as well as in three other places in the text:

Alma 53:4
to an exceeding [*highth* 0 | *heighth* 1 | *height* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]

Helaman 14:23
 which shall become mountains
 whose [*heighth* 1 | *height* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] thereof is great

Ether 3:1
 which they called the mount Shelem
 because of its exceeding [*heighth* 1 | *height* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]

In Alma 53:4, the original manuscript reading *highth* may stand for either the pronunciation /haitθ/ or /haiθ/. Under the noun *height,* the Oxford English Dictionary lists the form *highth* with the pronunciation /haiθ/ as an alternative for *height* /hait/. The OED further explains that "in Middle English the forms in *-t* were predominant in the north and since 1500 have increasingly prevailed in the literary language, though *heighth* and *highth* were abundant in southern English writers till the 18th century". Most likely, Oliver Cowdery's spelling *highth* in 𝒪 for Alma 53:4 stands for *heighth*.

For all four cases of *heighth,* the 1830 typesetter corrected the colloquial *heighth* to the standard *height,* although in one instance (here in Alma 50:2), the 1837 edition reverted to the nonstandard *heighth* (and the 1840 and 1841 editions continued with that form, thus showing its prevalence in the language of the time). The form *heighth* is common in English today, including my own speech. The critical text will restore all four occurrences of *heighth,* despite the fact that this form may be due to dialectal overlay on the part of Joseph Smith and Oliver Cowdery.

In no place do the manuscripts read *height* except in the plural *heights,* and these instances are restricted to quotations from the King James Bible:

2 Nephi 17:11 (compare with Isaiah 7:11)
 ask either in the depths
 or in the [*hights* 1 | *heights* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] above

2 Nephi 24:14 (Isaiah 14:14)
 I will ascend above the **heights** of the clouds

In the first example, however, the King James text itself has the singular forms *depth* and *height.*

Summary: Restore the colloquial form *heighth* to the four places where it originally occurred in the earliest Book of Mormon text: Alma 50:2, Alma 53:4, Helaman 14:23, and Ether 3:1.

◼ **Alma 50:6**

thus Moroni did prepare
[*strong holds* 01ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOQ | *strongholds* PRST] *against the coming of their enemies round about every city in all the land*

Later editions of the Book of Mormon (in some instances as early as the 1849 LDS edition) have replaced the two-word spelling *strong hold* with the single-word *stronghold* so that the modern editions systematically have *stronghold* wherever possible. However, usage within the text itself strongly argues that the two-word spelling is the correct spelling and should be restored in all cases. In most contexts, it seems to make little difference, but in several we can clearly see that the

word *strong* is an adjective modifying the independent noun *hold* rather than forming the compound noun *stronghold:*

>Alma 53:5
>>and this city became **an exceeding strong hold** ever after

>Alma 53:6
>>Moroni . . . had obtained possession of the city Mulek
>>which was one of **the strongest holds** of the Lamanites in the land of the Nephites

>Alma 55:33
>>for behold the Lamanites had by their labors fortified the city Morionton
>>until it had become **an exceeding strong hold**

>Helaman 1:22
>>he had obtained the possession of **the strongest hold** in all the land

>3 Nephi 1:27
>>for so **strong** were **their holds** and their secret places
>>that the people could not overpower them

For the two cases of "an exceeding strong hold", *strong hold* is now spelled *stronghold* in the standard LDS and RLDS texts, as with 15 other instances of *strong hold(s)*. Yet it seems strange to have the adjective *exceeding* modifying the compound *stronghold* when it really is modifying only the adjective part, *strong*. By separating the adjectival *strong* from the noun *hold*, we correctly represent the fact that *exceeding* modifies *strong* alone in those two instances. Interestingly, since the editors for the 1981 LDS edition otherwise made sure that every adverbial *exceeding* modifying an adjective read as *exceedingly,* these two occurrences of "an exceeding strong hold" should be edited in the standard LDS text to "an exceedingly strong hold". The critical text will, of course, retain the original uses of adverbial *exceeding,* thus "an exceeding strong hold" in Alma 53:5 and Alma 55:33. For discussion of this issue regarding *exceeding(ly),* see under 1 Nephi 2:16 as well as more generally under EXCEEDING in volume 3.

The King James Bible consistently uses the two-word spelling, *strong hold*, 8 times in the singular and 19 times in the plural. In particular, one of its passages is quoted in the Book of Mormon (although edited to *strongholds* in the current LDS and RLDS editions):

>3 Nephi 21:15 (Micah 5:11)
>>and I will cut off the cities of thy land and throw down **all thy strong holds**

Also note the occurrence in the King James text of "the most strong holds" (equivalent to "the strongest holds"):

>Daniel 11:39
>>thus shall he do in **the most strong holds** with a strange god

Summary: Restore every occurrence in the Book of Mormon text of original *strong hold;* although most cases are ambiguous between *strong hold* and *stronghold,* there are five cases where the text clearly requires the two-word form.

■ **Alma 50:8**

and the land of Nephi did run in a [*straight* 0ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST | *strait* 1] *course
from the east sea to the west*

The correct reading here in Alma 50:8 is "in a straight course", not "in a strait course". The manuscript spellings (as well as the 1830 spellings) for *straight*/*strait* provide no clues as to the correct reading; instead, we must rely on the context in each case. For a complete analysis of the phrase "straight course", see under 1 Nephi 8:20.

■ **Alma 50:9**

*he caused that the inhabitants which were in the land of Zarahemla
and in the* [*land* >? *lands* 0 | *land* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
[*around* >% *round* 0 | *round* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *about
should go forth into the east wilderness*

The question here is whether the original singular *land* in 𝓞 was changed to the plural *lands* by inserting an *s* inline. Oliver Cowdery started to write *around* (at least the first two letters, *ar*), then erased the *ar*, overwrote it with *ro*, and then finished the word by writing the final *und* inline. As a result of the erasure, 𝓞 is difficult to read here; and one wonders whether the noise after the *d* of *land* is an inserted *s* or the effects of the erasure of the *ar*. In any event, Oliver Cowdery copied this word into 𝓟 as the singular *land*, which has been retained in all the printed editions. (For discussion of the tendency in 𝓞 for Oliver to write *around about* rather than *round about*, see under 1 Nephi 8:13.)

Elsewhere in the text, we normally have the singular *land* for the expression "(all) the land(s) round about" (13 times), including the following three cases where the expression refers to the land surrounding a specific land that has just been mentioned in the text:

Alma 21:21	in the land of Ishmael and in **all the land round about**
Alma 57:6	from the land of Zarahemla and from **the land round about**
Alma 59:6	from the land of Manti and from **the land round about**

This is precisely how the text reads here in Alma 50:9; even the preposition is repeated (in this case, *in*): "**in** the land of Zarahemla and **in** the land round about". There is only one place where the earliest text reads "the lands round about", and in that instance the phrase is not used to refer to the land surrounding a just-mentioned specific land: "the disciples of Jesus had formed a church of Christ in all the **lands** round about" (4 Nephi 1:1). Thus the most reasonable assumption is that Alma 50:9 originally read "and in the land round about".

Summary: Maintain the singular *land* in Alma 50:9, the apparent reading in 𝓞 and the firm reading in 𝓟 and all the printed editions; the singular usage is consistent with three other examples in the text where "the land round about" refers to the region surrounding a specific land; also maintain the form *round* rather than *around* in this sentence.

■ **Alma 50:12**

thus **Moroni** *with his armies*
which did increase daily because of the assurance of protection
which his works did bring forth unto them
[NULL >+ *therefore they* o | *therefore they* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQS | RT]
did seek to cut off the strength and the power of the Lamanites
from off the lands of their possessions

The transitional *therefore they* was initially missed in the original manuscript; Oliver Cowdery later inserted these two words supralinearly with somewhat heavier ink flow, probably after he read this passage back to Joseph Smith. It is very doubtful that such an insertion would be due to conscious editing on the part of Oliver.

On the other hand, the editors for the 1920 LDS edition consciously decided to remove these two words (the change is marked in the committee copy). Of course, the pronoun *they* seems odd when contrasted with the singular *Moroni* at the beginning of this long sentence. Yet the semantic subject is the plural "Moroni with his armies". A similar example of editing out a connective and a plural pronoun was made by Joseph Smith in his editing of the Words of Mormon 1:17–18 for the 1837 edition, namely, when he removed *wherefore they* from the text (see under that passage for discussion).

The connective *therefore* commonly occurs in the text after an initial subject and a nonfinite clause, as in this famous example at the beginning of the Book of Mormon: "**I Nephi** / having been born of goodly parents / **therefore I** was taught somewhat in all the learning of my father" (1 Nephi 1:1). The critical text will restore the original *therefore they* here in Alma 50:12.

Summary: Restore in Alma 50:12 the words *therefore they,* the corrected reading in ና; although redundant, this type of expression is fully intended and can be found elsewhere in the text.

■ **Alma 50:12**

therefore they did seek to cut off the strength and the power of the Lamanites
from off the lands of their **possessions**
that they should have no power
upon the lands of their [*possessions* 1PS | *possession* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOQRT]

As discussed under 2 Nephi 29:14, the critical text will restore the plural *possessions* here in Alma 50:12 (thus "upon the lands of their **possessions**"). ና is not extant here but probably read "upon the lands of their **possessions**", just as in ኚ. The 1830 typesetter accidentally replaced the plural *possessions* with the singular *possession*. The RLDS text restored the original plural in 1908, but the LDS text has maintained the secondary *possession*. Note the use of the plural *possessions* earlier in this passage ("from off the lands of their possessions"); in that case, the plural *possessions* is extant in ና.

■ **Alma 50:13**

and it was [on 1ABDEFIJLMNOPQRST | in CGHK] the south
by the line of the possessions of the Lamanites

Here the 1840 edition replaced the preposition *on* with *in,* probably accidentally. The RLDS textual tradition continued with the *in* until the 1908 RLDS edition, which restored the original *on* (most likely by reference to 𝒫). 𝒪 is not extant here but probably read *on* (like 𝒫). Elsewhere the text prefers the preposition *on* in this construction that deals with a cardinal direction. For discussion of that evidence (and one possible exception), see nearby under Alma 50:15.

Summary: Maintain in Alma 50:13 the preposition *on* in the phrase "**on** the south", the reading of the earliest textual sources.

■ **Alma 50:13–14**

*and it came to pass that the Nephites began **the** foundation of a city*
and they called the name of the city Moroni . . .
*and they also began **a** foundation for a city*
between the city of Moroni and the city of Aaron
joining the borders of Aaron and Moroni
and they called the name of the city or the land Nephihah

In all the extant textual sources, we have in verse 13 "**the** foundation of a city" but in verse 14 "**a** foundation for a city". In the original manuscript, the article in front of *foundation* is not extant in either case. In each instance, the lacuna is sufficiently long that either article, *a* or *the,* could have been the reading in 𝒪. It does seem strange that one clause would have *the* and the other would have *a*. In terms of English usage, I would expect *the foundation* in both cases, especially since these clauses parallel each other:

> 13   the Nephites began the foundation of a city
>
> 14   they also   began a   foundation for a city

Also notice that in both instances there is a following sentence that refers to the naming of the city (or land):

> 13   and they called the name of the city Moroni
>
> 14   and they called the name of the city or the land Nephihah

If 𝒪 read "**the** foundation for a city" in verse 14, then Oliver Cowdery, when copying from 𝒪 into 𝒫, must have accidentally replaced the *the* with *a,* perhaps under the influence of the *a* in the following prepositional phrase ("for a city"). For another instance where Oliver replaced *the* with *a* as he copied from 𝒪 into 𝒫, see the discussion under Alma 47:13 regarding the expression "**the** second leader over the whole army".

Elsewhere in the Book of Mormon, *a* can modify *foundation* but only in a metaphorical sense rather than in reference to the physical foundation of an actual city or building:

"a sandy foundation"	2 Nephi 28:28, 3 Nephi 11:40, 3 Nephi 18:13
"a foundation for serious consequences"	Alma 50:32
"a sure foundation / a foundation"	Helaman 5:12

There are no other references in the Book of Mormon to the literal foundation of a city or building.

In the King James Bible, nearly every reference to the physical foundation of a city or a building (such as a house or a temple) uses a definite determiner, usually the definite article *the*. The only example where the determiner is the indefinite article *a* is in Luke 6:49: "but he that heareth and doeth not is like a man that without **a** foundation built an house upon the earth". But here we have a negative context ("without a foundation"), so the indefinite *a* is expected. Whenever the context is positive, the King James Bible has only a definite determiner for the physical foundation of cities and buildings. Thus evidence elsewhere in the scriptures supports the occurrence of *the* with *foundation,* providing the reference is to cities and buildings.

Despite these arguments for emending "**a** foundation for a city" to "**the** foundation for a city" in Alma 50:14, the reading with *a* does work. Note that the preposition *for* may make a difference. The phrase "a foundation of a city" does sound strange, but "a foundation for a city" does not. Although in the transcript of 𝒪 for this part of the text I conjectured that verse 14 read "**the** foundation for a city", the critical text will maintain the reading of the earliest extant source (namely, the reading in 𝒫: "**a** foundation for a city").

Summary: Maintain in Alma 50:14 the reading of the earliest extant source, the printer's manuscript: "**a** foundation for a city"; although the indefinite article *a* may be an error for *the* (note the phrase "**the** foundation of a city" in verse 13), the *a* works in verse 14 and will therefore be retained.

■ **Alma 50:15**

and they also began in that same year to build many cities **on** *the north*
one in a particular manner which they called Lehi
which was **in** *the north by the borders of the seashore*

Here we have, based on the printer's manuscript, one case of "**on** the north" and one of "**in** the north". The original manuscript is not extant for either of these prepositional phrases, but usage suggests that the case of "**in** the north" could be an error for "**on** the north". Elsewhere in the text, we find evidence for only the preposition *on* before a cardinal direction immediately followed by a postmodifying *by*-phrase:

Alma 8:3	**on** the west **by** the borders of the wilderness
Alma 22:27	which was **on** the north **by** the land of Zarahemla
Alma 22:29	there was many Lamanites **on** the east **by** the seashore
Alma 27:22	which is **on** the east **by** the sea
Alma 50:13	it was **on** the south **by** the line of the possessions of the Lamanites
Alma 53:22	in the borders of the land **on** the south **by** the west sea
Alma 62:21	they were **on** the east **by** the entrance

In fact, in the nearby example from Alma 50:13, the *on* was accidentally changed to *in* in the 1840 edition (see the discussion under that passage). There is also evidence that Oliver Cowdery sometimes mixed up *on* and *in,* as in the following two examples:

> 1 Nephi 22:8 (*in* initially written in 𝓟 as *on*)
> wherefore it is likened unto the being nursed by the Gentiles
> and being carried [*in* 0ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST | *on* > *in* 1] their arms
>   and upon their shoulders

> Alma 56:31 (*on* initially written in 𝓟 as *in*)
> as if we were going to the city beyond
> [*shore* >% *on* 0 | *in* >% *on* 1 | *in* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] the borders
>   by the seashore

For two other passages where Oliver may have mixed up these two prepositions, see the discussion under Alma 56:1 and 3 Nephi 8:5.

All of this evidence supports the possible emendation of "in the north" to "on the north" in Alma 50:15. Nonetheless, there is nothing particularly difficult about referring to the city of Lehi as being "in the north by the borders of the seashore". So in spite of the internal evidence in favor of "on the north", the critical text will retain the earliest extant reading, "**in** the north by the borders of the seashore".

Summary: Maintain in Alma 50:15 the preposition *in* in the phrase "in the north by the borders of the seashore", the reading of 𝓟 (the earliest extant source) and all the printed editions; nonetheless, the possibility remains that the *in* here is an error for *on.*

■ **Alma 50:18**

yea and they did multiply
and [*wax* 01PST | *were* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOQR] *strong in the land*

Here the 1830 typesetter substituted *were* for *wax.* The 1908 RLDS edition and the 1981 LDS edition correctly restored the original *wax.* It is worth noting here that the original reading is consistent throughout the Book of Mormon text: there are six other occurrences of "to **wax** strong in the land" but none of "to **be** strong in the land":

Jarom 1:5	and the people of Nephi had **waxed** strong in the land
Mosiah 9:11	lest by any means my people should **wax** strong in the land
Alma 62:48	and the people of Nephi . . . began to multiply
	and to **wax** exceeding strong again in the land
Alma 62:51	so that they did **wax** strong and prosper in the land
Helaman 6:12	and they did multiply and **wax** exceeding strong in the land
Ether 6:18	and they did **wax** strong in the land

Notice that there are two other examples of "multiply and wax strong" (in Alma 62:48 and Helaman 6:12).

Summary: Maintain in Alma 50:18 the original verb *wax* in the phrase "wax strong in the land", the systematic expression in the text.

■ **Alma 50:19**

yea [01ABCDEFGIJLMNOPQRST | *and* HK] *we can behold that his words are verified*

Here the 1874 RLDS edition added an extra *and*, perhaps because of the occurrence of *yea and* near the end of the previous verse: "**yea and** they did multiply and wax strong in the land" (Alma 50:18). Here in verse 19, the 1908 RLDS edition restored the original reading without the *and*. For another example of such an intrusive *and*, see the discussion under Alma 45:11.

Summary: Maintain in Alma 50:19 the instance of *yea* without any following *and*.

■ **Alma 50:19 – 20**

yea we can behold that his words are verified even at this time
which he spake unto Lehi saying
blessed art thou and thy children
and they shall be blessed
[*&* >%? NULL 0 | 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
inasmuch as they shall keep my commandments
they shall prosper in the land
but remember : inasmuch as they will not keep my commandments
they shall be cut off from the presence of the Lord

Here in this quotation of the Lord's prophecy to Lehi, there was originally an *and* in the original manuscript before the first *inasmuch*. Oliver Cowdery definitely wrote an ampersand there in 𝒪. But right in front of the *&*, he initially wrote some other letter, which he immediately erased. The erasure of this letter, no longer legible, led him to smear the ink onto the adjacent ampersand. The smearing looks like a couple of very thin ink strokes across the ampersand, but it definitely does not resemble Oliver's normal crossout. Yet when Oliver copied this passage into 𝒫, these seeming strokes led him to think that the ampersand had been crossed out, so he ended up omitting the *and* in 𝒫. The critical text will restore the *and* here.

Since the standard text for this passage has no conjunctive connector before the first *inasmuch*, there has been considerable variation with respect to the punctuation for that *inasmuch*-clause:

> Alma 50:20 (the standard text, with its variation in punctuation)
> and they shall be blessed
> [0 | NULL >jg ; >jg, 1 |, ABDEFIJLMNOQRT |; CKPS |: GH]
> inasmuch as they shall keep my commandments
> [0RT | NULL >jg ; 1 |; ABD |, CEFGHIJKLMNOPQS]
> they shall prosper in the land

Editors and typesetters for the printed editions have struggled to determine whether the first *inasmuch*-clause belongs to the preceding or following main clause. Since the original text actually read *and inasmuch*, the *inasmuch*-clause clearly belongs to the following main clause:

Alma 50:20 (revised text and accidentals for the entire verse)
> Blessed art thou and thy children;
> and they shall be blessed.
> **And** inasmuch as they shall keep my commandments,
> they shall prosper in the land.
> But remember, inasmuch as they will not keep my commandments,
> they shall be cut off from the presence of the Lord.

Every time the text repeats the Lord's promise to Lehi and Nephi about keeping the commandments and prospering in the land, the subordinate *inasmuch*-clause referring to keeping the commandments comes first, as in the following parallel examples that give Lehi's own language for this promise:

> 2 Nephi 1:20
> > and he hath said that
> > inasmuch as ye shall keep my commandments
> > ye shall prosper in the land
> > but inasmuch as ye will not keep his commandments
> > ye shall be cut off from his presence

> 2 Nephi 4:4
> > for the Lord God hath said that
> > inasmuch as ye shall keep my commandments
> > ye shall prosper in the land
> > and inasmuch as ye will not keep my commandments
> > ye shall be cut off from my presence

> Alma 9:13
> > behold do ye not remember the words
> > which he spake unto Lehi saying that
> > inasmuch as ye shall keep my commandments
> > ye shall prosper in the land
> > and again it is said that
> > inasmuch as ye will not keep my commandments
> > ye shall be cut off from the presence of the Lord

For a list of the many citations in the Book of Mormon of this promise (given originally to Lehi and to Nephi), see under 2 Nephi 1:20.

I also note here that the preceding parenthetical statement "and they shall be blessed" in Alma 50:20 can be found in Lehi's discourse to the sons and daughters of Lemuel:

> 2 Nephi 4:9
> > behold I leave unto you the same blessing
> > which I left unto the sons and daughters of Laman
> > wherefore thou shalt not utterly be destroyed
> > but in the end **thy seed shall be blessed**

Thus it would be textually wrong in Alma 50:20 to connect the *inasmuch*-clause to the stand-alone statement "and they shall be blessed".

Summary: Restore in Alma 50:20 the *and* that Oliver Cowdery wrote in 𝓞 as an ampersand right before the first *inasmuch;* the punctuation should be adjusted so that this *inasmuch*-clause belongs to the following main clause ("they shall prosper in the land"), not to the preceding parenthetical statement ("and they shall be blessed").

■ **Alma 50:21**

for it has been their quarrelings and their contentions
yea their murderings and their plunderings
their [*idoletries* >% *idoletry* 0 | *idoletry* 1 | *idolatry* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
[*&* >%? NULL 0 | 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *their whoredoms*
and their abominations which were among themselves
which brought upon them their wars and their destructions

Here Oliver Cowdery initially wrote the plural *idolatries* in the original manuscript (probably because all the preceding nouns are in the plural). He then erased the *ies* at the end of the word and overwrote the erasure with a large *y* and an ampersand. The ampersand was smeared, so he overwrote the ampersand. Even so, when Oliver copied this passage into the printer's manuscript, he omitted the *and;* perhaps the smearing made him think the ampersand had been crossed out. In the previous verse, Oliver made virtually the same error in his copywork, thinking that an ampersand in 𝓞 had been crossed out in 𝓞 because of smearing from an immediately preceding erasure, thus omitting the *and* in 𝓟 (see the preceding discussion under Alma 50:19–20).

Here in verse 21, supplying the *and* after *idolatry* improves the parallelism of the first three pairs of conjuncts: "their quarrelings and their contentions . . . their murderings and their plunderings . . . their idolatry **and** their whoredoms".

Summary: Restore in Alma 50:21 the *and* that Oliver Cowdery accidentally omitted between *their idolatry* and *their whoredoms* when he copied the text from 𝓞 into 𝓟.

■ **Alma 50:23**

but behold there never was a happier time among the people of Nephi
since the [*day* 01 | *days* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *of Nephi than in the* **days** *of Moroni*

The reading "the day of Nephi" in both manuscripts seems strange but possible, yet the 1830 typesetter changed the singular to the plural *days,* probably under the influence of the following plural *days* in "the days of Moroni". The second example argues that the first example read in the original text as "the days of Nephi" (although one could turn this argument around and say that the first example argues that "the **days** of Moroni" should be emended to "the **day** of Moroni").

Excluding the two cases in Alma 50:23, there are 28 occurrences of "the days of X" in the Book of Mormon text but none of "the day of X" (here X stands for a personal name). There is also one more instance of "the days of X" in the text, namely, "the days of Christ" (in Ether 13:4). I do not include this example in the count since *Christ* is not really a personal name but is a title referring to the Messiah. The important point here is that the 1830 typesetter's emendation of "the **day** of Nephi" to "the **days** of Nephi" in Alma 50:23 is consistent with usage throughout the rest of the text.

There is considerable manuscript evidence that Oliver Cowdery tended to incorrectly write *day* instead of the correct plural *days*. For a list of six cases (including one in 𝓞), see under 2 Nephi 25:8. One of those cases is especially pertinent here since it also involves an instance of "the days of X"; in fact, it also has the same preposition, *since:*

> 3 Nephi 2:5
> since the [*day* > *days* 1 | *days* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] of Mosiah

In other words, in 3 Nephi 2:5 we have precisely the same error as is being proposed here in Alma 50:23, namely, "since the **day** of X" as an error for the correct "since the **days** of X". But in 3 Nephi 2:5, Oliver caught his error and virtually immediately corrected *day* to *days*. Moreover, for that part of the text the 1830 edition is a firsthand copy of 𝓞, and it reads in the plural ("the days of Mosiah"). We should also note here that there is one more instance in the text of "the days of X" that takes the preposition *since,* namely, in Helaman 8:19: "even since the **days** of Abraham".

The King James Bible has examples of "the **days** of X" (85 of them) but none of "the **day** of X". Here are two examples with the preposition *since* (as in Alma 50:23):

> Ezra 4:2
> and we do sacrifice unto him
> since the **days** of Esarhaddon king of Assur
> which brought us up hither

> Nehemiah 8:17
> for since the **days** of Jeshua [=Joshua] the son of Nun unto that day
> had not the children of Israel done so

Ultimately, the manuscript reading "the **day** of Nephi" appears to be an error for "the **days** of Nephi". Usage elsewhere in the text as well as in the King James Bible consistently supports the plural "the **days** of Nephi". And Oliver Cowdery was prone to replace *days* with *day*. The critical text will therefore accept the emended reading in Alma 50:23, "the **days** of Nephi".

Summary: Accept the 1830 emendation in Alma 50:23 that changed "the **day** of Nephi" to "the **days** of Nephi"; this change is consistent with all other usage in the text, including "the days of Moroni" later on in this sentence; there is also considerable manuscript evidence that Oliver Cowdery tended to miswrite *days* as *day*.

■ **Alma 50:25**

and the land of [*Morionton* 0 | *Morianton* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]

The very first occurrence of the name *Morianton* in the original manuscript is actually spelled *Morionton*. In fact, every extant occurrence in 𝓞 of this name is spelled with three *o*'s. In the book of Alma (from Alma 50:25 through Alma 59:5), this name occurs 20 times and refers either to the land or city of Morionton or to the Nephite leader Morionton (after whom the land and city were presumably named). Of these 20 occurrences, 13 are sufficiently extant in 𝓞 to determine that the name was spelled there as *Morionton,* including the first occurrence.

In the printer's manuscript, Oliver Cowdery changed the original spelling to *Morianton*—that is, the second *o* was changed to an *a*. Of the 20 occurrences in Alma, Oliver wrote *Morianton* in 𝓟

the first 18 times; for the last two (the second occurrence in Alma 55:33 and the very last occurrence, in Alma 59:5), he wrote the original *Morionton*. These last two occurrences of *Morionton* thus indicate that Oliver probably wrote *Morionton* in 𝒪 all the way through the book of Alma. Based on this evidence, the Nephite leader and the land and city should be spelled as *Morionton*.

Difficulties arise when we compare the name *Morionton* with the name *Morianton* as used in the book of Ether and with two place-names that are similar to *Morianton*:

- *Morianton* (five times)

    a Jaredite king, listed twice in the genealogy in Ether 1 (verses 22 and 23) and three times in the narrative itself, in Ether 10 (verses 9, 12, and 13)

- *Moriancumer* (one time)

    the name of a place, given in Ether 2:13; probably named after Mahonri Moriancumer, the brother of Jared; Joseph Smith later gave this name as the personal name for the brother of Jared (see the discussion under Ether 2:13)

- *Moriantum* (one time)

    the name of a place, given in Moroni 9:9

For these three other names, nothing is extant from 𝒪. As for the seven occurrences of these three names, 𝒫 consistently has the *a* spelling, not the *o*. The similarity between *Moriancumer* and *Coriantumr* suggests that the *a* vowel is correct in *Moriancumer*.

Hugh Nibley has argued that the original people of Zarahemla, the Mulochites (the Mulekites of the standard text), adopted some Jaredite names. For this proposal, see his discussion under "Nephites with Jaredite Names" on pages 243–248 of *Lehi in the Desert and the World of the Jaredites* (Salt Lake City, Utah: Bookcraft, 1952). Following Nibley's argument, if the Nephite leader's name *Morionton* is the same as the Jaredite king's name, then (assuming there has been no phonological change) one could claim that the five occurrences of *Morianton* in the book of Ether (but found only in 𝒫) should be emended to *Morionton* (which is consistently supported by 𝒪 in the book of Alma). Ultimately, the critical text must rely on the earliest textual sources for determining the spelling of names. And the evidence from the manuscripts supports the spelling *Morianton* for the name of the Jaredite king, as well as *Moriancumer* and *Moriantum* (at least with respect to the *a* vowel). Nor must we assume that similar names should be reduced to identical names. There are a number of names in the Book of Mormon text that vary minimally from one another in spelling. See, for instance, the discussion under Alma 47:5 regarding the separate names *Oneidah, Onidah,* and *Onihah;* also see the discussion under 4 Nephi 1:47 regarding the four names *Ammaron, Ammoron, Amaron,* and *Amoron.* Apparently, we have two distinct names, *Morionton* (in Alma) and *Morianton* (in Ether), based on the earliest extant spellings (in 𝒪 for *Morionton* and in 𝒫 for *Morianton*).

Summary: Change the spelling of the Nephite leader (and the city and land presumably named after him) to *Morionton;* there are 13 sufficiently extant occurrences of this name in the original manuscript for Alma 50–59, and all are spelled with an *o* in the middle of the name; on the other hand, the *a* vowel in the middle of names like *Moriancumer, Moriantum,* and the Jaredite king *Morianton* will be retained (in accord with their spellings in the earliest extant source, namely 𝒫).

■ **Alma 50:25**

there would also have been peace among the people of Nephi had it not been for a contention
which took place among them concerning the land of Lehi and the land of Morionton
    which joined upon the borders of Lehi
both of which were on the borders [*by* 01ABCDEFGHIKLMNOPQRST | *of* J] *the seashore*

Here the original text reads "on the borders **by** the seashore". The 1888 LDS large-print edition replaced the preposition *by* with *of.* Since that edition was never used as a copytext for subsequent LDS editions, the change to *of* was restricted to that edition. Elsewhere the preposition *by* is preferred in similar phrases:

Alma 22:28	in the borders **by** the seashore
Alma 50:9	to the borders **by** the seashore
Alma 51:22	in the borders **by** the seashore
Alma 51:26	on the east borders **by** the seashore
Alma 51:32	in the borders on the beach **by** the seashore
Alma 52:11	in the borders of the land **by** the west sea
Alma 52:12	on the borders **by** the west sea
Alma 52:13	on the borders **by** the east sea
Alma 56:31	on the borders **by** the seashore
Alma 62:25	in the borders **by** the seashore
Alma 62:32	upon the borders **by** the seashore
Mormon 2:6	in the borders west **by** the seashore
Mormon 4:3	in the borders **by** the seashore
Ether 14:26	to the borders **by** the seashore

In three of these cases, the preposition *by* has been accidentally replaced with *of,* just like here in Alma 50:25:

Alma 62:25 (1892 RLDS edition)
    in the borders [*by* 1ABCDEFGHIJLMNOQRT | *of* KPS] the seashore

Mormon 4:3 (1906 LDS edition)
    in the borders [*by* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMOPQRST | *of* N] the seashore

Ether 14:26 (1837 edition)
    to the borders [*by* 1AT | *of* BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRS] the seashore

Finally, there are a few cases where the earliest text has a different preposition than *by:*

1 Nephi 16:14	in the borders **near** the Red Sea
Alma 22:27	on the borders **of** the seashore
Alma 50:15	by the borders **of** the seashore
Ether 14:12	to the borders **upon** the seashore

For each phrase of the form "the borders <preposition> the sea(shore)", the critical text will select the preposition that occurs in the earliest textual sources, thus *by* here in Alma 50:25.

Summary: Retain in Alma 50:25 the preposition *by* in the phrase "on the borders **by** the seashore", the reading of the original manuscript; the critical text will maintain similar cases of *by* that have been replaced with *of* in the textual history (as in Alma 62:25, Mormon 4:3, and Ether 14:26).

■ **Alma 50:26**

insomuch that the people of Morionton
took [*up* 1ABDEFIJLMNOPQRST | CGHK] *arms against their brethren*

> Here the 1840 edition (accidentally, it would seem) dropped the adverb *up*. The 1908 RLDS edition restored the *up* to the RLDS text, probably by reference to 𝓟. The original reading with the *up* here is strongly supported by usage elsewhere in the text. See under Alma 27:3 for a complete discussion regarding the phrase "take up arms".

■ **Alma 50:27–28**

(1) *but behold the people which possessed the land of Lehi fled to the camp of Moroni*
   and appealed unto him for assistance
→ *for behold they were not in the wrong*
   and it came to pass that
   [0 | NULL >jg *when* 1 | *when* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
   the people of Morionton which were led by a man whose name was Morionton
(2) *found that the people of Lehi had fled to the camp of Moroni*
   they were exceeding fearful lest the army of Moroni should come upon them and destroy them

> Here in the printer's manuscript, the subordinate conjunction *when* was added in pencil, apparently by the 1830 compositor, John Gilbert. There is a possibility that the *when* was added by Oliver Cowdery. Textually, it makes little difference who made the emendation; since the *when* was written in pencil, it was probably added in the print shop and without consulting 𝓞 itself, which is extant here and lacks the *when* or any other subordinate conjunction. For discussion of the use of pencil in the print shop, see under Alma 22:22–23.
>
> The *when* definitely seems necessary here in Alma 50:28 since the following clause (listed above as 2) repeats the language of an earlier clause in verse 27 (listed above as 1). The text seems excessively repetitious if there is no subordinate conjunction for the clause in verse 28, which was the apparent motive for supplying the *when*. Note, however, that this earlier information is not found in the immediately preceding clause (which I have marked with an arrow) but before it.
>
> Elsewhere in the text, we have a number of instances of "it came to pass" followed by a subordinate clause that repeats narrative information from an earlier clause. If the information does not occur in the immediately preceding clause, then *when* is the preferred subordinate conjunction; in each of the following examples, I use an arrow to mark the clause that intervenes between the original information and its repetition in the later *when*-clause:

Alma 50:7–9

(1)   yea and they went forth and drave all the Lamanites which were in the east wilderness
       into their own lands which were south of the land of Zarahemla
→   and the land of Nephi did run in a straight course from the east sea to the west
(2)   and it came to pass that **when** Moroni had driven all the Lamanites
       out of the east wilderness which was north of the lands of their own possessions
       he caused that . . .

Alma 59:3–4

(1)   he immediately sent an epistle to Parhoron
       desiring that he should cause men to be gathered together
       to strengthen Helaman or the armies of Helaman
→   insomuch that he might with ease maintain that part of the land
       which he had been miraculously prospered in retaining
(2)   and it came to pass **when** Moroni had sent this epistle to the land of Zarahemla
       he began again to lay a plan that . . .

Alma 62:17–18

      and when they had entered into this covenant
(1)   they sent them to dwell with the people of Ammon
→   and they were in number about four thousand which had not been slain
(2)   and it came to pass that **when** they had sent them away
       they pursued their march towards the land of Nephihah

3 Nephi 17:12–13

(1)   so they brought their little children
        and sat them down upon the ground round about him
(1′) and Jesus stood in the midst
→   and the multitude gave way till they had all been brought unto him
(2)   and it came to pass that **when** they had all been brought
(2′) and Jesus stood in the midst
       he commanded the multitude that they should kneel down upon the ground

When the information is found in the immediately preceding clause, the subordinate conjunction can be either *when* or *after:*

1 Nephi 18:20–21

       they repented of the thing which they had done
(1)   insomuch that they loosed me
(2)   and it came to pass that **after** they had loosed me
       behold I took the compass and it did work whither I desired it

Alma 45:22–23

(1)   they did appoint priests and teachers throughout all the land over all the churches
(2)   and now it came to pass that **after** Helaman and his brethren had appointed
          priests and teachers over the churches
       that there arose a dissension among them

Alma 62:15–16

> they overtook a large body of men of the Lamanites and slew many of them
>
> (1) and took their provisions and their weapons of war
> (2) and it came to pass **after** they had took them
> they caused them to enter into a covenant that . . .

3 Nephi 18:39 – 3 Nephi 19:1

> (1) and the disciples saw and did bear record that he ascended again into heaven
> (2) and now it came to pass that **when** Jesus had ascended into heaven
> the multitude did disperse

Mormon 2:25–26

> we did stand before them with such firmness
>
> (1) that they did flee from before us
> (2) and it came to pass that **when** they had fled
> we did pursue them with our armies

Mormon 6:5–6

> and when three hundred and eighty and four years had passed away
>
> (1) we had gathered in all the remainder of our people unto the land Cumorah
> (2) and it came to pass that **when** we had gathered in all our people in one
> to the land of Cumorah
> behold I Mormon began to be old

Ether 15:30–31

> when Coriantumr had leaned upon his sword that he rested a little
>
> (1) he smote off the head of Shiz
> (2) and it came to pass that **after** he had smote off the head of Shiz
> that Shiz raised upon his hands and fell

Since in Alma 50:27–28 there is an intervening clause ("for behold they were not in the wrong"), the decision to supply *when* rather than *after* was probably correct.

There is considerable evidence in the manuscripts that Oliver Cowdery sometimes omitted the subordinate conjunction *when*, especially after "it came to pass (that)":

> 2 Nephi 4:10
>
> and it came to pass that
> [NULL > *when* 1 | *when* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
> my father had made an end of speaking unto them . . .

> Alma 43:48
>
> and it came to pass that
> [NULL > *when* 1 | *when* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
> the men of Moroni saw the fierceness and the anger of the Lamanites . . .

> 3 Nephi 4:25
>
> so that on the morrow
> [NULL > *when* 1 | *when* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
> the robbers began their march . . .

Ether 15:15
> and it came to pass that
> [NULL > *when* 1 | *when* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
> they were all gathered together . . .

On the other hand, there appears to be no example where Oliver omitted *after* in the manuscripts. There is one case where he later thought he had omitted an *after* in 𝒪, but he was wrong; instead, he had omitted an *and*. See under Jacob 7:1 for discussion of that case. Thus manuscript evidence supports the decision to supply *when* rather than *after* as the subordinate conjunction in Alma 50:28. The critical text will therefore accept the emendation made in 𝒫 (most likely by the compositor) in the print shop while the 1830 edition was being typeset.

Summary: Accept in Alma 50:28 the conjectural emendation that the 1830 compositor, it would appear, made in 𝒫, namely, his addition of the subordinate conjunction *when* after "it came to pass that"; usage elsewhere in the text and evidence from scribal errors support this emendation.

■ **Alma 50:30**

and behold they would have carried this plan
into [*an* 1A | BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *effect*
which would have been a cause to have been lamented

Here the 1837 edition removed the indefinite article *an,* replacing "into an effect" with the commonly expected English expression without the article, "into effect". Joseph Smith is probably responsible for this change here in Alma 50:30 since the same change was marked by him in the printer's manuscript later on in the book of Alma:

Alma 56:30
> we were desirous to bring a stratagem
> into [*an* 0A | *an* >js NULL 1 | BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] effect upon them

The fact that the expression "into an effect" occurs both times in the manuscript (and one is extant in 𝒪) argues that this is the intended reading in the Book of Mormon. There are no other instances of "into an effect" in the text, but neither are there any instances in the earliest text of the expected "into effect". The critical text will therefore restore both instances of the original phrase "into an effect".

The online Oxford English Dictionary and *Literature Online* <lion.chadwyck.com> have no instances of "into an effect" in either earlier or current English. I have found a number of examples of "into an effect" on <www.google.com>, although most have been written by non-native speakers of English. The following two examples, though, appear to have been written by native speakers:

Barry James, *International Herald Tribune* (2001)
> By next year, all European governments will have put **into an effect**
> a requirement that all luggage destined for the hold must be screened
> or searched to prevent the risk that a suicide terrorist could conceal
> a bomb in checked baggage.

Boundary County (Idaho) Planning and Zoning Commission (2006)
> Boundary County Commissioners, in response to these issues, caused
> to be put **into an effect** an emergency ordinance October 4, 2005,
> and instructed the Planning and Zoning Commission to conduct
> a review of the Comprehensive Plan.

In both of these cases, "into an effect" could be due to the use of the indefinite article immediately after ("put into **an** effect **a** requirement" and "put into **an** effect **an** emergency ordinance"). In the two Book of Mormon cases, on the other hand, there is no immediately following indefinite article that could have led to an anticipatory *an* in "into an effect". In any event, the phrase "into an effect" is clearly marginal in current English.

Summary: Restore in Alma 50:30 and Alma 56:30 the phrase "into **an** effect" in place of the expected "into effect"; although there is only a little evidence for this phrase in English, its use twice in the earliest Book of Mormon text appears to be intentional.

■ **Alma 50:32**

now behold the people which were in the land
[*or* > *of* >%? NULL 0| 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *Bountiful*
or *rather Moroni . . .*

Here at the beginning of a line in 𝓞, Oliver Cowdery wrote *or* prematurely, initially skipping the prepositional phrase *of Bountiful.* Virtually immediately he corrected the *or* to *of* by overwriting the *r* with an *f*. However, he also made some erasure right before the capital *B* of the following *Bountiful,* which partially interfered with the *of* and made it look like the *f* had been erased, at least at first glance. In two other places in this chapter, nearby erasures made it look like the word *and* had been erased; see the discussion under Alma 50:19–20 and Alma 50:21 for the accidental erasure of an ampersand, thus leading to the loss of *and* when copying from 𝓞 into 𝓟. Similarly, here in Alma 50:32, the small word *of,* partially erased (but unintentionally), was accidentally omitted when Oliver copied the text from 𝓞 into 𝓟, giving "the land Bountiful". The fact that the *of* was at the beginning of a line in 𝓞 may have also contributed to its loss in the copying process. As discussed under 1 Nephi 17:7, the earliest text clearly prefers "the land Bountiful" over "the land **of** Bountiful", but the phrase with the *of* still occurs. Here in Alma 50:32 the critical text will restore this instance of "the land **of** Bountiful".

Summary: Restore in Alma 50:32 the original *of* in "the land of Bountiful"; its occurrence in 𝓞 appears to be intended, but the *f* was partially erased, which led Oliver Cowdery to accidentally omit the *of* when he copied the text into 𝓟.

■ **Alma 50:34**

and there they did head them by the narrow pass
which led [by 01ABCDEGHIJKLMNOPQRST | to > by F] the sea **into** *the land northward*

Here the typesetter for the 1852 LDS edition accidentally replaced the preposition *by* with *to*. The resulting text, the reading in the first printing of that edition, has *to* followed by *into,* which won't work geographically: "the narrow pass which led **to** the sea **into** the land northward". The second printing of the 1852 edition restored the original preposition *by,* probably by reference to the 1840 edition. The critical text will, of course, maintain the original *by.*

Summary: Maintain the preposition *by* in Alma 50:34: "which led **by** the sea into the land northward".

■ **Alma 50:37**

(1) *and it came to pass* **that**
(2) *in [that 0 | the 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] same year*
(3) *[the > that 0 | that 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] the people of Nephi had peace restored unto them*
(4) *[NULL >+ that 0 | that 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] Nephihah the second chief judge died*

The original text here in Alma 50:37 has four occurrences of *that.* The first and the last instances are the subordinate conjunction *that,* both of which refer to the initial "and it came to pass". When Oliver Cowdery initially wrote the text down here in the original manuscript, he accidentally missed the repeated subordinate conjunction, but somewhat later (probably when he read back the text to Joseph Smith), he supralinearly inserted the *that* before *Nephihah* (the correcting *that* is written with somewhat heavier ink flow). The use of the repeated subordinate conjunction *that* is common in speech and unedited writing (as in "he said **that** after he returned from vacation next week **that** he would take up the matter"). In standard editing, the repeated *that* would be removed. The original text of the Book of Mormon has numerous instances of this colloquial usage; in fact, many instances of repeated *that* have been retained in the standard text. For some examples, see the discussion under 1 Nephi 10:2–3; for a complete list of examples, see under THAT in volume 3.

Here in Alma 50:37, we also see the tendency of Oliver Cowdery to replace the demonstrative *that* with *the* in the phrase "in **that** same year", giving "in **the** same year". In this case, he made the mistake as he copied from 𝒪 into 𝒫. Earlier in this chapter, Oliver made the same error in 𝒪 but immediately corrected it:

> Alma 50:15
> and they also began
> in [*the > that* 0 | *that* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] same year
> to build many cities on the north

In that case, Oliver initially wrote *the* in 𝒪; then he immediately overwrote the *e* with an *a* and wrote the final *t* inline before continuing on with *same year.* We also saw this same tendency to replace *that* with *the* in the phrase "that same servant" in Alma 47:34 (see under that passage for other cases of this mix-up).

We also have one case of the relative pronoun *that* here in Alma 50:37: "in that same year **that** the people of Nephi had peace restored unto them". In the original manuscript, Oliver Cowdery initially skipped this relative pronoun as he took down Joseph Smith's dictation. His correction was immediate; after writing the *the* of the subject noun phrase "the people of Nephi", he over-wrote the *e* with an *a* and then wrote the *t* inline before continuing with *the People* (in other words, he made the same basic kind of correction as he did in Alma 50:15, mentioned just above in the previous paragraph).

Readers have difficulty processing the relative pronoun *that* in this passage since they tend to interpret it as a subordinate conjunction—in other words, they tend to initially interpret this sentence as if it read "and it came to pass . . . that the people of Nephi had peace restored unto them". Of course, this interpretation is incorrect since the previous verse (Alma 50:36) has already said as much. It is possible here in verse 37 that the original text actually read *when* instead of *that* and that *when* was accidentally replaced by *that* as Joseph Smith dictated the text to Oliver Cowdery. One could argue that the three other *that*'s in this passage led to the introduction of a fourth one. For an independent example where the relative pronoun *when* was replaced by *that* (although in that instance the replacement occurred as Oliver copied the text from 𝓞 to 𝓟), see under Alma 40:5. As discussed under that passage, either *that* or *when* is possible. And even if *that* is the correct relative pronoun here in Alma 50:37, one could emend the standard text by replacing the *that* with *when,* not as an instance of conjecture, but simply as a help with the reading of the text:

> Alma 50:37 (possible revision of the text)
> and it came to pass that in that same year
> **when** the people of Nephi had peace restored unto them
> that Nephihah the second chief judge died

Of course, the critical text will keep all four of the original *that*'s in this passage.

Summary: Restore in Alma 50:37 the original demonstrative *that* in the phrase "in that same year"; the other instances of *that* in this passage will also be maintained, including a repetition of the sub-ordinate conjunction *that* and one instance of the relative pronoun *that*.

■ **Alma 50:38**

nevertheless he had refused Alma to take possession of those records
*and those things which were esteemed by Alma and his **fathers** to be most sacred*
therefore Alma had conferred them
upon his son [01ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQS|, RT] *Helaman*

Douglas Stringer has suggested (personal communication, 2 November 2003) that the plural *fathers* in this passage could be an error for the singular *father*—that is, Mormon here is referring to Alma and his father, also named Alma. There is one manuscript example where Oliver Cowdery wrote *fathers* instead of the correct *father,* in this case as he copied the text from 𝓞 into 𝓟:

> 1 Nephi 15:12
> the house of Israel was compared unto an olive tree
> by the Spirit of the Lord
> which was in our [*father* 0T | *fathers* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRS]

In that case, the text is referring to Lehi's dream, so the singular *father* is definitely correct. Here in Alma 50:38, the plural *fathers* is extant in 𝓞. Moreover, the plural form definitely works since Lehi, Nephi, and all the other Nephite fathers highly valued the records and the other sacred objects (see, for instance, Alma's discussion with his son Helaman in Alma 37). The critical text will maintain the plural *fathers* here in Alma 50:38.

At the end of this verse, the editors for the 1920 LDS edition placed a comma between *his son* and *Helaman*. The comma is definitely intended since it is marked in red in the 1920 committee copy. This comma adds a nonrestrictive meaning to the last sentence, as if Alma had only one son, Helaman. But we know he had two other sons, Shiblon and Corianton, so the comma should be removed from the standard text to indicate the correct restrictive relationship.

Summary: Maintain the plural *fathers* in Alma 50:38, the reading of the original manuscript; in addition, the nonrestrictive comma between *his son* and *Helaman* at the end of this verse should be removed from the LDS text (since Alma had two other sons).

■ **Alma 50:39**

yea to support and maintain the cause of God all his days
and to bring the wicked to justice according to their **crime**

The original manuscript is not extant for *crime(s)*. Either the singular *crime* or the plural *crimes* would fit within the lacuna. And even if 𝓞 read as *crime,* it still could have been an error for *crimes*. See the discussion under Alma 30:11 for an example in 𝓞 where Oliver Cowdery initially wrote *crime* instead of *crimes*.

The problem with the singular *crime* is that the discussion here in Alma 50:39 is a general one. The wicked have usually committed more than one crime. Moreover, the reference here is to a plurality of individuals, and they would not have committed the same crime. All other general references to crime committed by individuals have the plural *crimes* rather than the singular:

Jacob 2:9	to admonish you according to your **crimes**
Jacob 2:23	because of your grosser **crimes**
The Words of Mormon 1:15	and they punished according to their **crimes**
The Words of Mormon 1:16	having been punished according to their **crimes**
Mosiah 26:11	that thou may judge them according to their **crimes**
Alma 4:16	according to the wickedness and the **crimes** of the people
Alma 10:14	or at the trials of the **crimes** of the people before the judges
Alma 30:11	that men should be judged according to their **crimes**

Of course, in English the word *crime* can be used in a noncount sense, as in "some people have committed a lot of **crime** in their lives". Thus one could argue that the singular *crime* works here in Alma 50:39 since it can be given a noncount sense. For that reason, the critical text will accept the singular *crime* in this instance. Nonetheless, the possibility remains that the original text actually read in the plural as *crimes* (given that in all other instances the noun *crime* is used as a count noun in the Book of Mormon text).

Summary: Maintain the singular *crime* in Alma 50:39, the reading of the earliest extant source (the printer's manuscript); the word *crime* can be interpreted here in a noncount sense, thus permitting the singular; usage elsewhere in the text argues for *crime* as a count noun, which suggests that the original text may have read *crimes* here in Alma 50:39.

■ **Alma 50:40**

now behold his name was [*Parhoron* 0 | *Pahoran* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
and [*Parhoron* 0 | *Pahoran* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *did fill the seat of his father*

The earliest occurrences of the name *Pahoran* are actually spelled *Parhoron* in the original manuscript, with an *r* before the *h* and an *o* for the last vowel. Joseph Smith probably pronounced this name with stress on the second syllable (just as we do today), but this pronunciation made it very difficult for Oliver Cowdery, the scribe here, to hear the *r* before the *h*. As a result, by the 5th occurrence (in Alma 51:5), Oliver started to spell the name as *Pahoron* in 𝒪. For the 7th and 8th occurrences (in Alma 51:7), Oliver appears to have once more spelled the name with the *r* before the *h,* but for these two occurrences he spelled the last vowel as *a*. He soon returned to the *o* spelling for the last vowel but now neglected once more the *r* before the *h*. All the remaining extant spellings (from Alma 62:44 through Helaman 1:13) are spelled in this way, as *Pahoron.*

In the printer's manuscript, Oliver Cowdery first copied this name as *Pahoran,* which is what the standard text has today. However, beginning with Alma 61:9 (almost halfway through the occurrences of this name), Oliver started to spell the name as *Pahoron,* probably because this is how he had spelled the name in the original manuscript for this part of the text. This spelling, *Pahoron,* continues in the printer's manuscript through the last occurrence of the name (in Helaman 2:3).

In the following list, I provide every extant instance in the manuscripts of the name *Parhoron.* In each case, I give the word as transcribed in volumes 1 and 2 of the critical text. The right-leaning slash (/) is not in the transcription per se but is used here to stand for the end of a manuscript line; for the other symbols, see the introductions to those two volumes:

	PASSAGE	𝒪	𝒫
1	Alma 50:40	Par(-)horon	Pahoran
2	Alma 50:40	Pa[r(-)|s]horon	Pahor[a|u]n
3	Alma 51:2	[P]a[r]hor[on]	Pahoran
4	Alma 51:3	Pa{<%r(-)h%>|r}<o(-)>oron	Pahoran
5	Alma 51:5	Pa(+)horon	Pahora{n}
6	Alma 51:6	P{a}horon	Pahoran
7	Alma 51:7	P{h(-)|a}rhoran	Pahoran
8	Alma 51:7	P{a}[r]hor{<%h%>|a}n	Pahoran
9	Alma 51:12	[Par]{h}o(ro)n	Pahoran
10	Alma 59:3	——	P{o|a}horan
11	Alma 60:1	([P|p])ro[n]	Pahoran
12	Alma 60:1	( )[ron]	Pahoran
13	Alma 61:1	——	Pahoran

	PASSAGE	𝒪	𝒫
14	Alma 61:2	——	Pahoran
15	Alma 61:9	——	{P}aho{r}on
16	Alma 62:1	——	Pahoron
17	Alma 62:2	——	Pahoron
18	Alma 62:3	——	{P}ahoron
19	Alma 62:6	——	Pa{h}oro{r|n}s
20	Alma 62:7	——	Pahoron
21	Alma 62:8	——	Pahoron
22	Alma 62:11	——	Pahoron
23	Alma 62:14	——	Pahoron
24	Alma 62:26	——	Pahoron
25	Alma 62:44	Paho{r}on	Pahoron
26	Helaman 1:2	Pa{hor}on	Paho-/-ron
27	Helaman 1:2	P[a]horon	Pa{h}oron
	scribal error in 𝒫	——	<Pahoron Pa>
28	Helaman 1:3	(Pah)	Pahoron
29	Helaman 1:4	(P)[ah]oron	Pahoron
30	Helaman 1:5	( )/-[hor{o}n]	Pahoron
	heading in 𝒪	(o)ron	——
31	Helaman 1:9	Pa/( )	Pa{h}oron
32	Helaman 1:9	——	Pahoron
33	Helaman 1:10	——	Pahoron
34	Helaman 1:11	Pa{<%c%>|ho}ron	Pahor{o}n
35	Helaman 1:12	——	Pahoron
36	Helaman 1:13	P{a}horon	Pahoro{n}
37	Helaman 2:3	——	Pahoron

For the first two occurrences of the name (here in Alma 50:40), the *r* before the *h* is not the normal *r* that Oliver Cowdery produced, although the very first occurrence does appear to be more like an *r* than, say, an *s*. Later, when Oliver made a mistake in writing the name *Parhoron*, his final version shows a very clear *r* in the correction (as in, for instance, the 4th and 7th occurrences listed above).

The evidence is very strong that the last vowel in the name is an *o,* not *a*. The final vowel is fully extant for 15 instances in 𝒪, and it reads *o* for 13 of those cases, including the first two instances of the name in the text (here in Alma 50:40). The evidence for the *r* before the *h* is not as consistent, but still the support for the *r* is stronger than the evidence for no *r* at all before the *h*.

One alternative explanation for the extra *r* in *Parhoron* is that Oliver Cowdery, instead of writing only the vowel *a*, wrote *ar* in anticipation of the *or* in the following syllable. However, there is no phonological anticipation of this kind in the spelling of similar names such as *Cezoram* and *Cumorah;* that is, they are never miswritten as *Cerzoram* or *Curmorah* (although, it should be pointed out, there are no extant occurrences of these two names in 𝒪, unlike the case of *Parhoron*).

There is no direct support for the sequence *rh* from other names in the Book of Mormon, but there is evidence for *nh* (in *Giddianhi* and *Kumenonhi*) and *mh* (in *Limhi, Limher,* and *Limhah*). In other words, there is evidence that a syllable-final sonorant can be followed by a syllable-initial /h/. In addition, there is evidence for *rsh (Jershon)*—that is, a syllable-final /r/ followed by a syllable-initial voiceless fricative (namely, /š/) that is phonetically similar to /h/.

Summary: Based on the earliest spellings of the name in 𝒪, the correct spelling of *Pahoran* is probably *Parhoron;* even if there is no *r* before the *h,* the last vowel is definitely an *o,* which means that *Pahoron* is an alternative possibility while *Pahoran,* the spelling in the standard text, is not.

Alma 51

■ **Alma 51:1–2**

And now it came to pass
in the commencement of the twenty and fifth year of the reign of the judges
over the people [NULL >+ *of Nephi* 0 | *of Nephi* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
(1) [NULL >+ *they* 0 | *they* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *having established peace*
between the people of Lehi and the people of Morionton concerning their lands
and having commenced the twenty and fifth year in peace
(2) *nevertheless* **they** *did not long maintain an entire peace in the land*

Initially in the original manuscript, Oliver Cowdery skipped the phrase *of Nephi* and the first occurrence of the subject pronoun *they*. Both seem necessary here. Elsewhere, whenever the text has the phrase "of the reign of the judges over the people", the word *people* is postmodified by either *of Nephi* (44 times) or *of the Nephites* (once, in Helaman 7:1). The *they* here seems to refer to the people themselves, as is suggested by the second occurrence of *they* (in verse 2): "nevertheless **they** did not long maintain an entire peace in the land". The ink level for the supralinearly inserted phrase *of Nephi* and the subject pronoun *they* is somewhat heavier, which suggests that both corrections were made at the same time, probably when Oliver read the text back to Joseph Smith.

It should be noted that in this passage we have an initial sentence fragment that is never completed, but is followed by a new clause beginning with *nevertheless*. This kind of construction is similar to the use of *wherefore* following an initial sentence fragment (see the discussion under 1 Nephi 11:1). *Wherefore* acts positively, like the conjunction *and,* while *nevertheless* acts negatively, like the conjunction *but.*

Summary: Accept in Alma 51:1 the corrected reading in 𝌆, "over the people **of Nephi** / **they** having established peace".

■ **Alma 51:2**

for behold there **were** *a part of the people*
which desired that a few particular points of the law should be altered

The problem here is that the grammatically plural *were* is the verb for the following singular *a part,* although *a part* is postmodified by the plural phrase "of the people" (which gives a plural sense to the complete noun phrase, "a part of the people"). Elsewhere in the text, we sometimes get the plural *there were* when a following singular noun phrase refers to a plural group of people (sometimes the plurality is not directly expressed):

Mosiah 2:2
> and there [*were* 1ABCDEFHIJKLMNOPQRST | *was* G] a great number
> even so many that they did not number **them**

Mosiah 18:7
> there **were** a goodly number gathered together
> to the place of Mormon to hear the words of Alma

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

3 Nephi 11:1
> there **were** a great multitude gathered together of the people of Nephi
> round about the temple which was in the land Bountiful

So the plural verb *were* in Alma 51:2 is perfectly acceptable. (For discussion of the noun *number* as delayed subject for either *there were* or *there was,* see under Mosiah 2:2.)

Summary: Accept the plural *were* in Alma 51:2 despite the fact that the grammatical subject is the singular *a part;* the complete noun phrase here is "a part of the people", a semantic plural.

■ **Alma 51:7**

and it came to pass that the voice of the people came
in [*the* 0A | *the* >js NULL 1 | BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *favor of the freemen*

The original manuscript is extant here and definitely reads "in **the** favor of the freemen"—that is, with the definite article *the* in the expression "in **the** favor of X". Joseph Smith removed the *the* in his editing for the 1837 edition, in agreement with general usage in English. Elsewhere in the text, there are four other occurrences of the phrase "in favor of X":

Alma 10:26	I have spoken **in favor of** your law to your condemnation
Alma 35:6	those which were **in favor of** the words which had been spoken . . .
Alma 47:5	those parts of the Lamanites which were **in favor of** the king
Alma 51:8	those which were **in favor of** kings were those of high birth

But there are no other instances of "in **the** favor of X". Except for the first occurrence (in Alma 10:26), these examples of "in favor of X" are extant in the original manuscript. In particular, the nearby occurrence of "in favor of kings" (in Alma 51:8) forms a contrastive pair with the earlier "in the favor of the freemen" (in Alma 51:7), so one wonders whether the extra *the* before *favor* in verse 7 might not be an error. It is quite possible that the extra *the* is due to the predominance of *the* in the surrounding text in verse 7 ("**the** voice of **the** people came in *the* favor of **the** freemen").

In the Oxford English Dictionary (under definition 6 for the noun *favour*), the phrase is nearly always "in favor of X", but there is one 1556 example (from *Aurelio and Isabell*) cited with original accidentals as "Hoo well have you spoken in **the** favoure of the wemen" (that is, "how well have you spoken in **the** favor of the women"). Another Early Modern English example is found in the OED under definition 4 for the noun *undertaker* (also given here with original accidentals):

Acts of the Privy Council of England (1586)
> A letter to the Lord Deputie of Irelande . . . in **the** favor of Mr. Smithwicke,
> . . . that he might be accepted into the nomber of those
> that were Undertakers for landes in that Realme.

Examples of "in **the** favor of" can be found in current English, as in the following example from <pondered.org> (dating from no earlier than 2004): "and hence Benjamin Franklin was in **the** favor of choosing the turkey as USA's national symbol". Although there is only one occurrence of the phrase "in the favor of X" in the earliest Book of Mormon text (here in Alma 51:7), the critical text will restore the *the* in that instance since this usage is possible, although infrequent.

Summary: Restore in Alma 51:7 the definite article *the* before *favor* in the phrase "in **the** favor of the freemen" (the reading of the original manuscript); although the expression "in the favor of X" is unusual, there is occasional evidence for it in current English as well as in Early Modern English.

■ **Alma 51:7**

and Parhoron retained the judgment seat
*which caused much rejoicing **among** the brethren of Parhoron*

- □ *and also **among** the people of liberty*   0
- □ *and also **many** of liberty*   1*
- □ *and also **many** the people of liberty*   1ᶜ¹
- □ *and also **many of** the people of liberty*   1ᶜ²ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST

The original text (as found in the original manuscript) has a clearly parallelistic construction here, the conjoining of two prepositional phrases headed by the preposition *among:* "**among** the brethren of Parhoron and also **among** the people of liberty". The parallelistic use of *among* is found elsewhere in the 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 . . .

> Helaman 11:27
> now behold these robbers did make great havoc
> yea even great destruction **among** the people of Nephi
> and also **among** the people of the Lamanites

The last example is especially interesting since it also uses the word *also* before the repeated *among.*

Here in Alma 51:7, when Oliver Cowdery was copying the text from 𝒪 into 𝒫, he turned over the leaf to a new page of 𝒫 after having written "among the brethren of Pahoran & also". At that point, Oliver apparently glanced too quickly at 𝒪 and misread the repeated *among* as *many,* which is visually similar to *among* except for the initial *a*. He initially wrote "many of liberty" in 𝒫, but then almost immediately he noticed that he had omitted *the People,* which he supplied supralinearly. But he did not notice that he had replaced *among* with *many.* Thus the new page of 𝒫 begins with the reading "many the People of liberty". When the 1830 compositor was reviewing

𝒫 prior to setting the type for this part of the text, he recognized that "many the People of liberty" was incorrect, so in pencil he minimally edited 𝒫 by supralinearly inserting the preposition *of* before *the People,* thus creating the current reading, "among the brethren of Pahoran and also **many of** the people of liberty".

Obviously, we can make sense of this secondary reading: some people may have voted for Parhoron without being particularly enthused, so these less enthusiastic supporters didn't fully rejoice when he was retained as chief judge. Of course, this interpretation is wholly unnecessary since the original text clearly states that both Parhoron's relatives and supporters rejoiced over his victory.

Summary: Restore in Alma 51:7 the original text with its repeated preposition *among:* "among the brethren of Parhoron and also **among** the people of liberty".

■ **Alma 51:7**

and Parhoron retained the judgment seat
(1) *which caused much rejoicing among the brethren of Parhoron and also among the people of liberty*
(2) [*which* 0A | *which* >js *who* 1 | *who* BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *also put the kingmen to silence*
that they durst not oppose but were obliged to maintain the cause of freedom

Here in his editing of the text for the 1837 edition, Joseph Smith decided that the second *which* refers to the people of liberty (and also perhaps the brethren of Parhoron); Joseph therefore grammatically emended the *which* to *who.* But in actuality, it was the results of the election itself that put the kingmen to silence (at least for the time being). Here the entire initial statement "and Parhoron retained the judgment seat" is modified by two sentential relative clauses (listed above as 1 and 2). The first one refers to the rejoicing of the winners, the second to putting the kingmen to silence. The text is not claiming that the people of liberty had to do anything more (at least at that time) to silence the kingmen. The critical text will therefore restore the original *which* here in Alma 51:7. Of course, any original *which* would be restored in the critical text anyway, even when it corresponds to *who* or *whom* in modern English. For further discussion of the editing of *which* to *who(m),* see under WHICH in volume 3.

Summary: Restore the original *which* in Alma 51:7; in this case, the *which* does not refer to people but instead heads a sentential relative clause.

■ **Alma 51:10**

but behold we shall see that
[*this* 0 | *his* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *promise which he made was rash*

The original manuscript reads *this promise.* But when Oliver Cowdery copied the text from 𝒪 into 𝒫, he accidentally copied the *this* as *his,* which is visually similar. The nonredundancy of the original reading here is preferred, although redundancies such as "his promise which he made" are found in the original text of the Book of Mormon, as in the moderately redundant "for he hath fulfilled **his** promise which **he** hath made unto our fathers" (Alma 37:17). Also see the discussion under 1 Nephi 7:17 regarding the redundancy of the original phrase "according to **my** faith which

is in **me**". The critical text will follow the earliest reading here in Alma 51:10, the nonredundant "**this** promise which **he** made".

Summary: Restore *this promise* in Alma 51:10, the reading of the original manuscript.

■ **Alma 51:11**

Amalickiah had gathered together
a [*wonderful* 01ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQS | *wonderfully* RT] *great army*

In this passage, the original text reads "a wonderful great army". Theoretically, the word *wonderful* can be interpreted as either an adjective or an adverb. In the adjective case, *wonderful* modifies *army* and means that the army caused wonder. In the adverb case, *wonderful* modifies *great* and means that the size of the army caused wonder. The editors for the 1920 LDS edition decided that *wonderful* was an adverb in this passage, and thus they grammatically emended *wonderful* to *wonderfully*. Elsewhere in the text, there are only two examples of the attributive adjective *wonderful* (that is, where *wonderful* acts as a premodifier):

Alma 2:5	having much dispute and **wonderful contentions** one with another
3 Nephi 14:22	and in thy name done many **wonderful works**

As discussed under Alma 42:15, there are many examples in the original text where adverbs lack their expected *-ly* ending. The phrase *wonderful great* was quite frequent in Early Modern English and meant 'wonderfully great', as in 2 Chronicles 2:9: "for the house which I am about to build *shall be* wonderful great". Here are some additional examples (cited with accidentals regularized) of *wonderful great* as found on *Literature Online* <lion.chadwyck.com>; in these examples, *wonderful* is clearly adverbial:

Stephen Batman (1582)	to be as it were wonderful great
Richard Niccols (1611)	and wonderful great must that great light be indeed
Francis Godwyn (died 1633)	the cardinal's private estate—although it were wonderful great—

Given the historical usage, the 1920 interpretation of *wonderful* in Alma 51:11 as an adverb modifying *great* is most likely correct. The critical text will, of course, restore the original *wonderful* here in Alma 51:11 no matter whether *wonderful* is an adverb or an adjective.

Summary: Restore in Alma 51:11 the original *wonderful* without the *-ly* ending ("a wonderful great army"); this instance of *wonderful great* has the expected meaning 'wonderfully great'.

■ **Alma 51:14**

he was exceeding wroth because of the stubbornness of those people
[*of* 0A | *of* >js NULL 1 | BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *whom he had labored*
with so much diligence to preserve

In the original manuscript, the preposition *of* is found at the head of the relative clause, thus "**of** whom he had labored with so much diligence to preserve". The *of* was copied into the printer's

manuscript and set by the 1830 compositor. Elsewhere in the original text, we have no cases of the verb *preserve* taking a prepositional phrase rather than a direct object noun phrase as its complement (see, in particular, the discussion regarding the phrase "preserved unto himself" in Jacob 5:74). It is possible that this extra *of* in Alma 51:14 is a scribal error, especially given the immediately preceding occurrences of *of* ("because **of** the stubbornness **of** those people"). Joseph Smith removed this preposition in his editing for the 1837 edition.

Nonetheless, as discussed under 2 Nephi 3:14, there are similar instances in the earliest text of an unexpected *of* at the head of a relative clause. Despite their difficulty, these examples do not seem especially objectionable. The critical text will therefore restore in Alma 51:14 the original instance of *of* in the relative clause "**of** whom he had labored with so much diligence to preserve"; nonetheless, the possibility remains that this *of* is an error resulting from the preceding occurrences of *of*.

Summary: Restore in Alma 51:14 the original *of* in "**of** whom he had labored with so much diligence to preserve"; although unusual, this *of* may have been in the original text.

■ **Alma 51:15**

and it came to pass that he sent a petition
with the voice of the people unto the governor of the land
desiring that he should [*head* 0 | *heed > head >*jg *read* 1 | *read* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *it*
and give him Moroni power to compel those dissenters to defend their country
or to put them to death

In the original manuscript, Oliver Cowdery almost always spelled the word *heed* as *head.* There are 10 extant occurrences of his spelling for *heed* in 𝄞, and all but one are incorrectly spelled as *head* (the correct spelling *heed* is found in 1 Nephi 16:3). But in copying the text into the printer's manuscript, Oliver gave the correct spelling *heed* in nearly every case. Of his 23 instances in 𝄞 of *heed,* Oliver initially spelled only two cases of *heed* as *head.* In 1 Nephi 8:33, he mistakenly wrote *beheld,* which he immediately corrected to *headed* by supralinear insertion; then he crossed out *headed* and wrote the correct spelling *heeded* inline. And here in Alma 51:15, Oliver initially spelled *heed* correctly, but then he apparently decided that *head* (what he had written in the original manuscript) was actually right, so he overwrote the second *e* with an *a.*

Later, in the print shop, the 1830 compositor rejected the reading *head;* but instead of restoring the correct *heed,* he decided that Oliver Cowdery's *head* was an error for *read.* Using his pencil, the compositor overwrote the *h* of *head* with an *r,* with the result that he set *read* when he came to setting the type for this passage. All the subsequent printed editions have continued with this incorrect reading ("desiring that he should **read** it"). One could argue that Moroni's petition began with a statement to the effect "please read", but of course this interpretation is wholly unnecessary. Moroni was simply requesting Parhoron to approve his request, which makes much better sense.

Summary: Restore the word *heed* in Alma 51:15 ("desiring that he should **heed** it"); here in 𝄞 the word *heed* was spelled *head,* Oliver Cowdery's typical misspelling in 𝄞 for *heed* (but rarely in 𝄞).

■ **Alma 51:16**

for it was his first care to put an end
to such contentions and dissensions among the people
for behold this had been hitherto
a cause of [*all* 01ABCDEFGHIKLMNOPQRST | ᴊ] *their*
[*destructions* 0 | *distructions* 1 | *destruction* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]

As discussed under 1 Nephi 15:5, the plural *destructions* is occasionally found in the original text of the Book of Mormon, but always with the meaning 'destructive events' (as here in Alma 51:16). In this passage, the text is not referring to the final destruction of the Nephite people. We see this difference in the following passages that involve the word *all*:

> 2 Nephi 26:6
>> and they shall be visited with thunderings and lightnings and earthquakes
>> and **all manner of destructions**

> The Words of Mormon 1:1–2
>> behold I have witnessed **almost all the destruction** of my people the Nephites
>> and it is many hundred years after the coming of Christ
>> that I deliver these records into the hands of my son
>> and it supposeth me that he will witness **the entire destruction** of my people

> 3 Nephi 10:14
>> he that hath the scriptures let him search them
>> and see and behold if **all these deaths and destructions** . . . and all these things
>> is not unto the fulfilling of the prophecies of many of the holy prophets

The second passage refers to the complete destruction of the Nephites. In the two other passages, the text refers to individual events of destruction. Thus the plural is appropriate for Alma 51:16 as well as for 2 Nephi 26:6 and 3 Nephi 10:14. For Alma 51:16, both manuscripts correctly read in the plural, but the 1830 compositor set the singular *destruction*. The critical text will restore the correct plural, *destructions*.

Here in Alma 51:16, the 1888 LDS large-print edition accidentally omitted the *all* from this prepositional phrase that refers to destruction. But since no subsequent LDS edition used the 1888 edition as a copytext, the *all* has been retained in the LDS text.

Summary: Restore the plural *all their destructions* in Alma 51:16 since the reference is to individual events of destruction and not to the complete destruction of a people.

■ **Alma 51:17**

and it came to pass that Moroni commanded that his army should go against those kingmen
to pull down **their** *pride and* [*their* 01ABDEFIJLMNOPQRST | CGHK] *nobility*
　and level them with the earth
or they should take up arms and support the cause of liberty

Here the 1840 edition deleted the repeated *their* in the phrase "their pride and **their** nobility". Yet as we have seen many times, the Book of Mormon text prefers the repeated determiner in conjoined constructions. Undoubtedly this change in the 1840 edition is not due to Joseph Smith's

editing for that edition since the same phrase in the next verse retains the repeated *their:* "and they did pull down **their** pride and **their** nobility" (Alma 51:18). The repeated *their* in Alma 51:17 was restored to the RLDS text in 1908. For further examples of the loss of the repeated *their,* see under CONJUNCTIVE REPETITION in volume 3.

Summary: Maintain in Alma 51:17 the repeated *their* in "their pride and **their** nobility"; the 1840 omission of the *their* is most probably a typo rather than the result of editing on the part of Joseph Smith.

■ **Alma 51:20**

and the remainder of those dissenters
rather than [*to* 01ABCDEPS | FGHIJKLMNOQRT] *be smote down to the earth by the sword*
yielded to the standard of liberty

As discussed under Alma 24:18–19, the original *to* in the archaic expression "rather than to" will be restored in the critical text. Here in Alma 51:20, the *to* was omitted from the LDS text beginning with the 1852 edition. The 1858 Wright edition also omitted the *to.* The first two RLDS editions followed that reading, but the 1908 RLDS edition restored the original *to* (since 𝓟 read that way).

■ **Alma 51:20**

and the remainder of those dissenters . . . yielded to the standard of liberty
and were compelled to hoist the title of liberty
[*upon* 1ABCDEFGIJLMNOPQRST | *on* HK] *their towers and in their cities*

There are a number of instances in the history of the text where the prepositions *upon* and *on* have been mixed up; for a list of examples, see under Alma 2:38. Here in Alma 51:20, the 1874 RLDS edition replaced *upon* with *on;* the 1908 RLDS edition restored the original *upon* (the reading in 𝓟). In this case, *upon* is definitely correct since that is the preposition that consistently occurs with the noun *tower:*

2 Nephi 12:15	and **upon** every high tower and upon every fenced wall
Mosiah 11:12	yea a very high tower / even so high that he could stand **upon** the top thereof and overlook the land of Shilom . . .
Mosiah 19:5	he fled and ran and got **upon** the tower which was near the temple
Mosiah 19:6	and Gideon pursued after him and was about to get **upon** the tower
Alma 46:36	he caused the title of liberty to be hoisted **upon** every tower
Alma 50:4	and he caused places of security to be built **upon** those towers
Helaman 7:10	it was **upon** a tower which was in the garden of Nephi
Helaman 7:10	as Nephi had bowed himself **upon** the tower which was in his garden
Helaman 7:11	as he was a pouring out his soul unto God **upon** the tower
Helaman 7:14	because I have got **upon** my tower that I might pour out my soul

The example in Alma 46:36 strongly supports the use of *upon* here in Alma 51:20 since it also refers to the hoisting of the title of liberty.

Summary: Maintain in Alma 51:20 the preposition *upon,* the reading of the earliest extant sources; elsewhere the text consistently uses *upon* rather than *on* when referring to towers.

■ **Alma 51:23–24**

*and it came to pass that Amalickiah took possession of the city
yea possession of* **all** *their fortifications
and* [01ABCDEFGIJLMNOPQRST | all HK] *those which fled out of the city of Moroni
came to the city of Nephihah*

The 1874 RLDS edition accidentally inserted an *all* before the phrase "those which fled out of the city of Moroni". The typesetter for that edition was probably the one who made this error; most likely, he was influenced by the *all* in the immediately preceding phrase "**all** their fortifications".

Summary: Maintain in Alma 51:24 the phrase "those which fled out of the city of Moroni", which has no *all* modifying *those* (the reading of the earliest textual sources, including ᴓ).

■ **Alma 51:25**

but it came to pass that **Amalickiah** *would not suffer the Lamanites
to go against the city of Nephihah to battle
but* [*he* 0 | 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *kept them down by the seashore*

The original manuscript has the subject pronoun *he* after the conjunction *but*. While copying into the printer's manuscript, Oliver Cowdery accidentally dropped the pronoun. As noted under Mosiah 24:11, either reading will work here in Alma 51:25. More specifically, we note that elsewhere in the original text, in three cases of an initial clause beginning with "it came to pass" followed later by a *but*-clause, the subject is explicitly repeated (as a pronoun), but in four cases the potentially repeatable subject is ellipted:

□ *repeated subject*

Alma 14:4
but it came to pass that **they** did not
but they took them and bound them with strong cords

Alma 53:7
and it came to pass that **he** did no more attempt a battle with the Lamanites
in that year
but he did employ his men in preparing for war

Alma 57:9
and it came to pass that **we** did camp round about the city for many nights
but we did sleep upon our swords and keep guards

□ *ellipted subject*

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

Alma 14:20
and it came to pass that **they** departed and went their ways
but came again on the morrow

Helaman 10:12
> and behold now it came to pass that
> when the Lord had spoken these words unto Nephi
> **he** did stop and did not go unto his own house
> **but** did return unto the multitudes
> which were scattered about upon the face of the land

Ether 14:29
> and it came to pass that **they** came forth
> **but** were driven again

In these examples, the subject can be explicitly repeated as a pronoun or ellipted. In the case of Alma 51:25, the critical text will therefore follow the reading in 𝒪, the earliest textual source.

Summary: Restore the subject pronoun *he* in Alma 51:25 ("but **he** kept them down by the seashore").

■ **Alma 51:25–26**

Amalickiah would not suffer the Lamanites
to go against the city of **Nephihah** *to battle*
but he kept them down by the seashore
leaving men in every city to maintain and defend it
and thus he went on taking possession of many cities :
→ *the city of* **Nephihah** *and the city of Lehi and the city of Morionton*
and the city of Omner and the city of Gid and the city of Mulek
all of which were on the east borders by the seashore

Here verse 25 contradicts verse 26: verse 25 states that Amalickiah avoided attacking the city of Nephihah, but verse 26 lists the city of Nephihah as one of the cities on the seashore that Amalickiah seized (marked above with an arrow). Both occurrences of the name *Nephihah* are extant in 𝒪. Later on, in Alma 59, the text refers once more to these cities on the seashore (at least the three most southern of those cities, marked below with an arrow), but there the text reads *Moroni* rather than *Nephihah:*

Alma 59:5
> and it came to pass that while Moroni was thus making preparations
> > to go against the Lamanites to battle
> behold the people of Nephihah which were gathered together
> → from the city of **Moroni** and the city of Lehi and the city of Morionton
> were attackted by the Lamanites

Also in Alma 59 (verses 5–8) the city of Nephihah is attacked for the first time (if we exclude the dubious reading here in Alma 51:26). As discussed below, the city of Nephihah is not on the seashore, but the city of Moroni is.

What seems to have happened here in Alma 51:26 is that the name *Moroni* was accidentally replaced by *Nephihah*. Such an error could have entered the text during the early transmission of the English-language text, either by Joseph Smith as he dictated the text or by Oliver Cowdery as he took down Joseph's dictation. Another possibility, of course, is that Mormon himself made the

error in the original Book of Mormon text. For either possibility, the preceding occurrence of *Nephihah* in verse 25 could have prompted the error in verse 26. Also note that the names *Nephi* and *Lehi* collocate elsewhere in the text (especially in reference to the two original patriarchs, Nephi and his father Lehi). This means that the occurrence of the following "the city of Lehi", along with the preceding *Nephihah* in verse 25, could have led to inadvertently replacing "the city of Moroni" with "the city of Nephihah" in verse 26.

There is one example, a nearby one, where Oliver Cowdery momentarily replaced *Moroni* with *Nephi;* this error occurred the first time the city of Moroni was mentioned in the text:

> Alma 50:13
>
> and it came to pass that the **Nephites** began the foundation of a city
> and they called the name of the city
> [*Nephi* >% *Moroni* 0 | *Moroni* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
> and it was by the east sea
> and it was on the south by the line of the possessions of the Lamanites

This error may have been prompted by the earlier occurrence of *Nephites* in the passage, thus providing support for the proposed explanation here in Alma 51:26 of why an original "the city of Moroni" could have been replaced by "the city of Nephihah".

Other passages support emending *Nephihah* to *Moroni* in Alma 51:26. For instance, in Alma 50, after referring to the founding of the city of Moroni (verse 13), the text refers to the city of Nephihah and the city of Lehi; the latter city was on the seashore (like the city of Moroni) but further north, while Nephihah was located inland between Moroni and Aaron:

> Alma 50:14–15
>
> and they also began a foundation for a city
> between the city of Moroni and the city of Aaron
> joining the borders of Aaron and Moroni
> and they called the name of the city or the land **Nephihah**
> and they also began in that same year to build many cities on the north
> one in a particular manner which they called **Lehi**
> which was in the north by the borders of the seashore

Going from south to north, along the east coast, we have the following cities: Moroni, Lehi, Morionton, Omner, Gid, and Mulek. Nephihah, on the other hand, is inward from the east coast (between Moroni and Aaron). Furthermore, in Alma 59:5 it says that the Nephites who fled from Moroni, Lehi, and Morionton went to Nephihah to help defend it. It had not yet fallen, but eventually the Lamanites take the city (in Alma 59:5–8).

Finally, note that Alma 51:25 states that Amalickiah kept the Lamanites "down by the seashore, leaving men in **every city** to maintain and defend it". Obviously, Mormon was getting ahead of himself, since at that point in the narrative only the city of Moroni had been taken (in verse 23). It appears that the *thus* at the beginning of verse 26 represents a summarizing statement and that Mormon intended to include the city of Moroni (which was definitely on the east seacoast) but accidentally wrote *Nephihah*. This would give the following emendation for verse 26:

Alma 51:26 (proposed emendation)
    and thus he went on taking possession of many cities :
    the city of **Moroni** and the city of Lehi and the city of Morionton
    and the city of Omner and the city of Gid and the city of Mulek
    all of which were on the east borders by the seashore

John L. Sorenson discusses this problem regarding Alma 51:26 in footnote 25 on page 132 of his book *Mormon's Map* (Provo, Utah: FARMS, 2000):

> Comparison of Alma 51:26 and 59:5 exposes what appears to be a scribal error. The former says that the Lamanites captured Nephihah in their first strike, but 59:5 has the place still in Nephite hands some five years later. I suppose that the historian listed Nephihah too hastily in the former passage, a natural enough response to the dismay felt at the smashing success of Amalickiah's initial campaign.

On page 245 of his *An Ancient American Setting for the Book of Mormon* (Salt Lake City and Provo, Utah: Deseret Book and FARMS, 1996), Sorenson makes the same basic argument:

> The record reports Nephihah's capture at this time (Alma 51:24−26), but that statement is incorrect if we credit Alma 59:9−11. (We need not be shocked to find that the scribes made errors. Moroni on the title page of the Book of Mormon suggests as much, saying, "If there are faults they are the mistakes of men.")

Sorenson's analysis suggests that the text could be revised by deleting "the city of Nephihah and" from Alma 51:26. However, as an explanation for the problematic reading in Alma 51:26, accidentally inserting such a long phrase seems considerably less likely than accidentally replacing *Moroni* with *Nephihah.*

Over the years, other sources have noted the problem with "the city of Nephihah" in Alma 51:26. For instance, the index to the 1981 LDS edition reads: "NEPHIHAH, CITY OF—*possibly two cities by this name*". George Reynolds, on page 322 of *The Story of the Book of Mormon* (Independence, Missouri: Zion's Printing and Publishing Company, 1888), discusses the evidence for two cities with the name *Nephihah.* He also refers to Orson Pratt's footnote to Alma 56:25 in the 1879 LDS edition, which states Pratt's belief that there were two cities with the name *Nephihah:* "This is not the city referred to by letter *l,* Alma 50". For additional discussion of the theory that there is some kind of error regarding the name of the city Nephihah in Alma 51:26, see page 32 of John Clark, "A Key for Evaluating Nephite Geographies", *Review of Books on the Book of Mormon,* volume 1 (1989): 20−70. Also see page 236 in Daniel H. Ludlow, *A Companion to Your Study of the Book of Mormon* (Salt Lake City, Utah: Deseret Book, 1976).

Here I wish to thank Dan McKinlay for his help in finding sources that refer to this textual problem regarding the city of Nephihah.

Summary: Emend Alma 51:26 so that *Nephihah* is replaced by *Moroni;* evidence elsewhere in the text consistently refers to the city of Nephihah as being inland and the city of Moroni as being the southernmost Nephite city on the east coast; the preceding *Nephihah* in Alma 51:25 seems to have prompted the replacement of *Moroni* with *Nephihah* in verse 26; there is one instance of scribal error by Oliver Cowdery (in 𝓞 for Alma 50:13) where he momentarily replaced *Moroni* with *Nephi* under the influence of a preceding *Nephites,* which suggests that Oliver was the source for the proposed error in Alma 51:26.

■ **Alma 51:29**

they were met by Teancum who had slain Morionton
and had headed [*his* 01ABDEFIJLMNOPQRST | *the* CGHK] *people in* **his** *flight*

In the 1840 edition, the *his* modifying *people* was changed to *the,* perhaps unintentionally. The 1908 RLDS edition restored the correct *his* to the RLDS text. In the earliest text (here the original manuscript), we have two instances of *his* in this conjoined predicate: "and had headed **his** people in **his** flight". This reading is rather awkward, and there is a natural tendency to misread the *his* in *his flight* as referring to Teancum rather than Morionton. The 1840 removal of the first *his* may have been influenced by this difficulty, although even then the *his* modifying *flight* could still be misread as referring to Teancum.

One possible conjecture here is that the second *his* is an error for *their;* in other words, the original text read as follows: "they were met by Teancum who had slain Morionton and had headed his people in **their** flight". If this conjecture is correct, one could argue that during the dictation of the text the original *their* was accidentally replaced by *his* under the influence of the preceding *his* in *his people*. We have evidence for similar errors in the manuscripts. For instance, in Alma 44, Oliver Cowdery initially wrote *his* in 𝒪 under the influence of the preceding singular *Moroni:*

> Alma 44:23
> and the armies of the Nephites or of **Moroni** returned
> and came to [*his* >% *their* 0 | *their* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] houses
>   and their lands

In the following case, an original *their* may have been replaced by *his* under the influence of the singular *Ammon:*

> Mosiah 21:29 (earliest reading)
> yet **Ammon** and his brethren were filled with sorrow
> because so many of **his** brethren had been slain

But other evidence suggests that the *his* in Mosiah 21:29 may be correct (for discussion, see under that passage).

Elsewhere in the text (unlike here in Alma 51:29), the noun *flight* always refers to the flight of a whole group, never to just its leader. In the following, I list the cases where in theory the text could have referred to the flight of the leader rather than to the flight of his people:

> 1 Nephi 4:36 (not "the flight of our father Lehi")
> now we were desirous that he should tarry with us for this cause
> that the Jews might not know concerning **our flight** into the wilderness

> Alma 50:33 (not "his flight")
> therefore Moroni sent an army with their camp
> to head the people of Morionton to stop **their flight** into the land northward

> Helaman 2:11 (not "he took his flight")
> but behold when Gaddianton had found that Kishcumen did not return
> he feared lest that he should be destroyed
> therefore he caused that his band should follow him
> and **they took their flight** out of the land by a secret way into the wilderness

Note that the example in Alma 50:33 refers specifically to the flight of the people of Morionton, not to the flight of Morionton, their leader. So for Alma 51:29 there is some evidence, both internal and external, to support the conjecture "and had headed his people in **their** flight".

On the other hand, there are cases where the leader acts for the entire group, especially with respect to military actions. For instance, in the following passage Zerahemnah's assessment of the military situation also applies to Zerahemnah's men:

> Alma 43:53
>> therefore when **Zerahemnah** saw the men of Lehi on the east of the river Sidon
>> and the armies of Moroni on the west of the river Sidon
>> that **they** were encircled about by the Nephites
>> **they** were struck with terror

For several other examples of this kind of usage, see under Alma 43:53. Also consider the following case where *his tents* actually refers to the tents of Moroni and his men:

> Alma 46:31 (original text)
>> and it came to pass that he took his army
>> and marched out with **his tents** into the wilderness
>> to cut off the course of Amalickiah in the wilderness

(Also note that in this example *Amalickiah* actually refers to Amalickiah and his men, not just Amalickiah.) Under Alma 46:31, I provide a list of several other cases where *his tents* means 'their tents'. Thus the occurrence of *his flight* in Alma 51:29 is not impossible.

Alison Coutts also points out (personal communication) that the verb *flee* can explicitly refer to a leader fleeing but with the understanding that his men are fleeing with him, as in the following examples (note especially the plural pronoun *them* in the first example):

> Alma 52:24 (referring to Teancum and his men)
>> and it came to pass that when the Lamanites saw that **he began to flee**
>> they took courage and pursued **them** with vigor

> Mormon 2:9 (referring to king Aaron and his men)
>> and now the Lamanites had a king and his name was Aaron
>> and he came against us with an army of forty and four thousand
>> and behold I withstood him with forty and two thousand
>> and it came to pass that I beat him with my army that **he fled** before me

> Ether 15:6–7 (referring to Coriantumr and his men)
>> and the people of Shiz were stirred up to anger against the people of Coriantumr
>> wherefore the people of Shiz did give battle unto the people of Coriantumr
>> and when Coriantumr saw that he was about to fall
>> **he fled** again before the people of Shiz

In Alma 51:29, the critical text will therefore retain the earliest extant reading, the uniquely occurring *his flight* (even though this may be an error for *their flight*).

Summary: Maintain in Alma 51:29 both instances of *his,* the reading in ○: "they were met by Teancum who had slain Morionton and had headed **his** people in **his** flight"; nonetheless, there is some possibility that the second *his* is an error for *their.*

■ **Alma 51:30**

and it came to pass that he headed Amalickiah also
[as 01APRST *| and* BCDEFGHIJKLMNOQ*] he was marching forth with his numerous army*
that he might take possession of the land Bountiful and also the land northward

Here the 1837 edition replaced the subordinate conjunction *as* with the coordinating conjunction *and*. The resulting "and he was marching forth with his numerous army" creates a semantically disconnected sentence. This 1837 change was undoubtedly a typo; as we might expect, this change was not marked by Joseph Smith in 𝓟. The 1908 RLDS edition restored the original *as* to the RLDS text, probably by reference to 𝓟; the LDS text restored the change in 1920, probably by reference to the 1830 edition. Similarly, the critical text will follow the earliest textual sources (the two manuscripts and the 1830 edition).

There is one place where the 1837 edition replaced an earlier *and* with an *as*. In this case, the change appears to be intended (although it too was not marked in 𝓟 by Joseph Smith):

> Alma 47:23
> and it came to pass that the king put forth his hand to raise them
> as was the custom with the Lamanites
> [*&* 01 | *and* A | *as* BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] a token of peace
> which custom they had taken from the Nephites

For further discussion of this emendation, see under that passage.

Summary: Maintain the original subordinate conjunction *as* in Alma 51:30: "he headed Amalickiah also **as** he was marching forth with his numerous army".

■ **Alma 51:31**

but behold he met with a disappointment
[of >+ by 0 *| of > by* 1 *| by* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST*] being repulsed by Teancum and his men*

The original manuscript initially had the preposition *of,* as did the printer's manuscript. In 𝓟, Oliver Cowdery replaced the *of* with *by*—and without any change in the level of ink flow for the supralinear correction. In 𝓞, Oliver also replaced the *of* with *by,* but there the ink flow for the supralinear correction is considerably heavier; in addition, the quill that Oliver used for the correction appears to have been somewhat duller. The distinct difference in ink flow argues that the correction in 𝓞 took place later, probably when Oliver copied the text into 𝓟. In other words, the change to *by* appears to be editing on Oliver's part.

The phrase *of being* postmodifying a noun is found elsewhere in the text (but there are no other examples of *by being* in the Book of Mormon):

> Alma 4:18   now Alma did not grant unto him **the office of being** high priest
>   over the church
> Alma 17:29   now they wept because of **the fear of being** slain

Notice that in both these examples the head noun is preceded by the definite article *the* (that is, "**the** office of being high priest" and "**the** fear of being slain"). These two examples suggest that

in Alma 51:31 the indefinite article *a* in the earliest reading ("with **a** disappointment of being repulsed") may be an error for *the:*

> Alma 51:31 (possible emendation)
>> but behold he met with **the** disappointment **of** being repulsed by Teancum
>>> and his men

Ⓞ is extant here and clearly has the indefinite article *a*. Note, however, that an original *the* (which begins with the voiced interdental /ð/) would have been preceded by *with* (which ends in an interdental fricative, either /θ/ or /ð/). In other words, Oliver Cowdery could have misheard Joseph Smith's *with the* as *with a*.

Ultimately, the earliest text here in Ⓞ for Alma 51:31 is not especially difficult. Despite the strangeness of "**a** disappointment **of** being repulsed", the critical text will follow the original reading in Ⓞ with its indefinite article *a* and the preposition *of*. The correction of *of* to *by* in Ⓞ appears to be secondary.

Summary: Restore the original preposition *of* in Alma 51:31: "he met with a disappointment **of** being repulsed by Teancum and his men"; when Oliver Cowdery copied the text from Ⓞ into Ⓟ, he decided, it would appear, to emend the *of* to *by,* a reading which is not supported elsewhere in the text (but *of* is); there is also a possibility that in Ⓞ the *a* before *disappointment* is a mishearing for *the*.

■ **Alma 51:37**

and thus [*ended* 01ABCDGHKPS|*endeth* EFIJLMNOQRT] *the twenty and fifth year*
   of the reign of the judges over the people of Nephi
and thus [*ended* 01ABCDGHKPS|*endeth* EFIJLMNOQRT] *the days of Amalickiah*

Here we have two instances of *ended* that were conjointly emended to *endeth* in the 1849 LDS edition. The fact that both instances were changed to *endeth* suggests that the change was intended, although that edition left all other instances in the text of *ended* unchanged. The critical text will restore these two original instances of *ended,* as explained under Alma 3:27. In fact, the original text had no examples of present-tense *endeth*.

Alma 52

■ **Alma 52:1**

behold they found Amalickiah was dead
in his [NULL >-? *own* 0 | *own* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *tent*

The original manuscript initially read "in his tent"; it is difficult to tell if *own* was supralinearly inserted—there appears to be some writing there, but it is faint. In any event, the printer's manuscript (as well as all the printed editions) has "in his own tent". For a list of other cases where Oliver Cowdery initially omitted *own* in the manuscripts (one in 𝒪 and two in 𝒫), see under Enos 1:10.

The use of *own* with dwelling places is fairly prominent in the text. Most refer to "one's own house" (10 times). There is one reference to "one's own home" (in 3 Nephi 19:1). There is also a reference to the plural "their own houses" (in Mosiah 6:3). More generally, there are references to "one's own land(s)" (21 times) and "one's own country" (once, in Helaman 16:7). There are no other occurrences of "one's own tent", but there is a nearby occurrence of "one's own camp", near the end of the previous chapter: "and he returned again privily to his own camp" (Alma 51:35). One could argue that the *own* added in Alma 52:1 ("in his own tent") was prompted by the *own* in the preceding "to his own camp". Nonetheless, there would have been little motivation to consciously add *own* here in Alma 52:1, given that "Amalickiah was dead in his tent" sounds perfectly fine. Most probably, the original text had the *own* in Alma 52:1. The critical text will assume as much since the reading in 𝒫 with *own* is firm.

Summary: Accept in Alma 52:1 the *own* that Oliver Cowdery seems to have supralinearly inserted in 𝒪; the reading in 𝒫 is clear and has the *own,* as do other passages that refer to "one's own house", "one's own home", and "one's own camp".

■ **Alma 52:2**

and they abandoned their design
in marching [*into/unto* 0 | *into* 1ABDEFIJLMNOPQRST | *to* CGHK] *the land northward*

The original manuscript, although extant here, is difficult to read. The preposition seems to be *into,* although *unto* is also possible. The word is definitely not the shorter *to.* In any event, Oliver Cowdery wrote *into* in the printer's manuscript when he copied the text from 𝒪 into 𝒫. In the 1840 edition, the *into* was replaced by *to.* This change is probably a typo rather than the result of conscious editing. Finally, *into* was restored to the RLDS text in 1908.

Elsewhere in the text, we have three occurrences of "marching **into** a land" and four of "marching **to** a land", but none of "marching **unto** a land":

Alma 43:25	and marched over **into** the land of Manti
Alma 47:20	Amalickiah marched with his armies . . . **to** the land of Nephi
Alma 49:13	they marched forward **to** the land of Noah
Alma 52:39	to march with their brethren forth **into** the land Bountiful
Alma 53:3	they were marched back **into** the land Bountiful
Helaman 1:17	that they should march down **to** the land of Zarahemla
Mormon 6:4	we did march forth **to** the land of Cumorah

In the case of Helaman 1:17, 𝕆 is extant and reads *to;* in 𝕇, however, Oliver Cowdery initially wrote *into* but then virtually immediately corrected it to *to.* In each case, we rely on the earliest textual sources to determine the preposition. Thus the reading in Alma 52:2 is most probably "**into** the land northward", not "**unto** the land northward" (nor "**to** the land northward").

Summary: Accept in Alma 52:2 the preposition *into* in the phrase "into the land northward", the probable reading in 𝕆 and the definite reading in 𝕇.

■ **Alma 52:2**

and they abandoned their design in marching
into the land [*Northwards >% Northward* 0 | *northward* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]

Here Oliver Cowdery initially wrote *Northwards* in the original manuscript, but then he erased the final *s* (an immediate correction). The corrected reading in 𝕆 is consistent with all adjectives and adverbs ending in *-ward(s)* that specify a cardinal direction: 44 other occurrences of *northward,* 20 of *southward,* and 3 of *eastward,* but none ending in *-wards.*

There has been a similar tendency in the text for Oliver Cowdery to add *s* to the word *forward* (for discussion, see under 1 Nephi 8:30). The tendency to add the *s* may be prompted by the adverbial form *towards,* which is much more frequent than *toward* in the earliest text of the Book of Mormon (see the discussion under 1 Nephi 5:22).

Summary: Maintain in Alma 52:2 *northward,* the corrected reading in 𝕆; there are no instances of *northwards* (or the related directional forms *eastwards, southwards,* and *westwards*) in the Book of Mormon text.

■ **Alma 52:9**

and he also sent orders unto him
that he should fortify the land [1ABCEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST | *of* D] *Bountiful*

Here the 1841 British edition added the *of* to "the land Bountiful"; the following 1849 LDS edition removed it. As noted under 1 Nephi 17:7, either reading is possible, although most instances in the text lack the *of.* In each case, the critical text will follow the earliest extant reading, in this case "the land Bountiful" (the reading in 𝕇). 𝕆 is not extant here, but spacing between extant fragments of 𝕆 suggests that the *of* was not in 𝕆.

Summary: Maintain in Alma 52:9 the earliest extant reading without the *of* in "the land Bountiful" (the reading in 𝕇).

■ **Alma 52:10**

and that he [*would also > also would* 1 | *also would* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
fortify and strengthen the cities round about

Here in 𝓟, Oliver Cowdery initially wrote "he would also fortify and strengthen the cities", but then virtually immediately he moved the word *also* from after *would* to before it (giving "he also would fortify and strengthen the cities"); there is no difference in the ink flow for the correction. As discussed under 2 Nephi 21:13, *also* can occur either before or after the first auxiliary verb in a verb phrase. In each case, we follow the earliest sources, thus here in Alma 52:10 the corrected reading in 𝓟: "he also would fortify and strengthen the cities". 𝓞 is not extant here, but the lacuna is sufficiently short that the *also* was probably supralinearly inserted, which could have made the placement of the *also* subject to error when the text was copied from 𝓞 into 𝓟.

Summary: Maintain in Alma 52:10 the placement of *also* before the auxiliary verb *would,* the corrected reading in 𝓟 ("he also would fortify and strengthen the cities").

■ **Alma 52:10**

and that he also would fortify and strengthen the cities round about
which had not fallen into the [*hand > hands* 0 | *hands* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
of the Lamanites

Here in 𝓞, Oliver Cowdery initially wrote "into the **hand** of the Lamanites"; but then virtually immediately he inserted the plural *s* inline, giving "into the **hands** of the Lamanites". Elsewhere the text has only the plural *hands* in expressions of the form "fall into the hand(s) of X" (26 times); and of these other occurrences, eight are of the form "fall into the hands of the Lamanites" (like here in Alma 52:10). In fact, in one instance, Oliver made the same error of initially writing *hand,* although in this case the error was in 𝓟:

> Helaman 4:9
> yea they retained many cities which had fallen
> into the [*hand > hands* 1 | *hands* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] of the Lamanites

For a list of the cases where *hand* and *hands* have been mixed up in the history of the text, especially in the manuscripts, see under Mosiah 16:1.

Summary: Accept in Alma 52:10 the corrected reading in 𝓞 of *hands* ("fallen into the **hands** of the Lamanites"); usage elsewhere in the text consistently supports the use of the plural *hands* in the expression "fall into the hands of X".

■ **Alma 52:12**

now the king [*Ammoron* 01ABCDEFGHKMPQRST | *Ammaron* IJLNO] *had departed*
out of the land of Zarahemla

Ammoron is the name of the brother and successor of Amalickiah. The name occurs 24 times in the text (from Alma 52:3 through Helaman 1:16), of which 16 are fully extant in 𝓞, and 15 of those

read *Ammoron,* including the first occurrence (in Alma 52:3). 𝓟 consistently has the correct spelling *Ammoron.*

Here in Alma 52:12 the name *Ammoron* was accidentally replaced by *Ammaron* in the 1879 LDS edition, a simple typo. Everywhere else the 1879 edition maintained the correct *Ammoron.* This particular misspelling here in Alma 52:12 continued in a number of LDS editions that were set from the 1879 edition (namely, the 1888, 1902, 1906, and 1907 editions). The 1905 edition restored the correct *Ammoron* to the LDS text.

Elsewhere the Book of Mormon has three other names that are very similar to *Ammoron,* namely, *Amaron* (twice, in Omni 1:3–4), *Ammaron* (ten times, from 4 Nephi 1:47 through Mormon 4:23), and *Amoron* (once, in Moroni 9:7). There is a possibility that *Ammaron* could actually be *Ammoron;* for discussion, see under 4 Nephi 1:47. But there is no doubt here in the books of Alma and Helaman that the name for the brother of Amalickiah is *Ammoron.*

Summary: The correct spelling for the name of the brother of Amalickiah is *Ammoron;* 15 out of the 16 fully extant occurrences of the name in 𝓞, including the first occurrence, support this spelling.

■ **Alma 52:12**

now the king Ammoron **had** *departed out of the land of Zarahemla*
and [*had* 01ABDEFIJLMNOPQRST | CGHK] *made known unto the queen*
 concerning the death of his brother
and **had** *gathered together a large number of men*
and **had** *marched forth against the Nephites on the borders by the west sea*

The 1840 edition accidentally dropped the perfect auxiliary *had* here in Alma 52:12. This change was not intentional because the *had* was retained for the two following conjoined predicates ("and **had** gathered . . . and **had** marched"). The 1908 RLDS edition restored the *had* to the RLDS text.

Summary: Maintain the three repetitions of the past-tense perfect auxiliary *had* in Alma 52:12: "had departed . . . and **had** made known . . . and **had** gathered . . . and **had** marched".

■ **Alma 52:13**

that they should also harass the Nephites on the borders by the east sea
and should take possession of their lands
as much as it [*were* 01A | *was* BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *in their power*

It is difficult to tell whether this 1837 change of the subjunctive *were* to the indicative *was* was intended or not. For other cases in the text where we have "as much as it was/were . . .", there have been no changes with respect to *was/were* (although 𝓞 is not extant for any of these other cases):

Jacob 1:4	and touch upon them as much as it **were** possible
Mosiah 21:18	now the people of Limhi kept together in a body as much as it **was** possible
Mormon 2:21	and we did gather in our people as much as it **were** possible

We may also add here the phrase "inasmuch as it was/were . . .", for which there is one example:

> Alma 1:32   the law was put in force upon all those who did transgress it
> inasmuch as it **were** possible

For this example, the 1920 LDS edition emended the *were* to *was*. As discussed under Alma 1:32, the earliest text favors *were* in the phrase "as it was/were possible", with only one example of *was* (namely, in Mosiah 21:18, listed above). The critical text will, in each case, follow the earliest reading, thus "as much as it **were** in their power" here in Alma 52:13. For further discussion of the use of the subjunctive *were* in the Book of Mormon text, see under MOOD in volume 3.

Summary: Restore in Alma 52:13 the subjunctive *were* in "as much as it **were** in their power" (the reading of the earliest textual sources, including 𝓞).

■ **Alma 52:15**

but behold it came to pass
in the [*twentyeth* 0 | *twenty* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *and seventh year*
of the reign of the judges . . .

Here we have an instance in the earliest text (the original manuscript) where both numbers in a compound ordinal number are themselves ordinals: "in the twenti**eth** and seven**th** year". What we expect, of course, is for only the last number to be an ordinal; the first number should be a cardinal, thus "in the twenty and seven**th** year", which is how Oliver Cowdery copied this compound number into 𝓟. The same kind of reading with the extra ordinal is found in 𝓞 near the end of the book of Alma:

> Alma 63:4
>
> and it came to pass that
> in the [*thirtyeth* 0 | *thirty* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] and seventh year
> of the reign of the judges . . .

Once more Oliver corrected the first ordinal to its cardinal form when he copied the text from 𝓞 into 𝓟, replacing "in the thirti**eth** and seven**th** year" with "in the thirty and seven**th** year". In addition, there is independent evidence in 𝓞 that Oliver tended to replace the cardinal number with the ordinal in anticipation of the final ordinal in the compound:

> Helaman 3:2
>
> and there was no contention among the people
> in the [*fortyeth* >% *forty* 0 | *forty* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] and fourth year

Thus one could interpret the two earlier instances of the extra ordinal in 𝓞 (in Alma 52:15 and Alma 63:4) as cases of scribal error.

There are also some instances in the history of the text where the last number in a compound ordinal is not an ordinal but a cardinal. There are two types that occur: (1) *six* instead of the expected *sixth* and (2) *eight* instead of *eighth*. It should be noted that the first of these involves an obstruent cluster at the end of the word, /ksθ/ in *sixth* /sɪksθ/, which may explain the tendency to omit the final obstruent, the interdental /θ/ (especially during dictation when it would have been hard to hear the acoustically weak /θ/ when followed by the consonant-initial

word *year*). There are three places in 𝒪 where *sixth* was replaced by *six;* in fact, all three are found in the same chapter of Alma:

> Alma 56:7 (Oliver Cowdery's error in 𝒪, corrected in 𝒫)
>> the twenty and [*six* 0 | *sixth* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] year

> Alma 56:9 (Oliver Cowdery's error in 𝒪, corrected in 𝒫)
>> the twenty and [*six* 0 | *sixth* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] year

> Alma 56:20 (Oliver Cowdery's error in 𝒪, corrected in 𝒫)
>> the twenty and [*six* 0 | *sixth* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] year

On the other hand, there are eight places in the text where *eighth* was replaced by *eight*—rather randomly and not always in compound ordinal numbers (as in the first example listed below). Moreover, this type of error (replacing *eighth* with *eight*) is found in the printed editions as well as in the manuscripts, which suggests that the error here is orthographic rather than phonetic:

> Alma 4:9 (typo in the 1841 British edition)
>> this [*Eighth* 1 | *eighth* ABCEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST | *eight* D] year

> Alma 53:23 (Oliver Cowdery's initial reading in 𝒫)
>> the twenty and [*eight > eighth* 1 | *eigth* A | *eighth* BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] year

> Alma 63:7 (typo in the 1888 LDS edition)
>> the thirty and [*eighth* 0ABCDEFGHIKLMNOPQRST | *eigth* 1 | *eight* J] year

> Helaman 3:19 (Oliver Cowdery's error in 𝒪, corrected in 𝒫; typo in the 1906 LDS edition)
>> the forty and [*eight* 0N | *eighth* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMOPQRST] year

> Helaman 3:22 (typo in the 1906 LDS edition)
>> the forty and [*eighth* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMOPQRST | *eight* N] year

> Helaman 4:8 (Oliver Cowdery's error when correcting 𝒫; typo in the 1841 British edition, copied into the two subsequent LDS editions, 1849 and 1852)
>> the fifty and [*eigth > eight* 1 | *eighth* ABCGHIJKLMNOPQRST | *eight* DEF] and ninth years

> Helaman 6:41 (typo in the 1841 British and 1852 LDS editions)
>> the sixty and [*eighth* 1ABCEGHIJKLMNOPQRST | *eight* DF] year

> 3 Nephi 2:4 (typo in the 1841 British edition)
>> the ninety and [*eighth* 1ABCEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST | *eight* D] year

The critical text will consider all of these occurrences of the cardinal number instead of the expected ordinal number as errors, whether in the manuscripts or in the printed editions. For discussion of the case of *six,* see under Alma 56:7, 9; for the case of *eight,* see under Helaman 3:19.

Except for seven manuscript exceptions, the earliest text of the Book of Mormon is consistent in its representation of compound ordinal numbers: the last number in the compound—and only the last—is ordinal; all the preceding numbers in the compound are cardinal. Listing separately the seven manuscript exceptions, all made by Oliver Cowdery but not corrected until later, we get the following statistics for the various types of compound ordinal numbers in the earliest textual source (Z stands for the hundreds, Y for the tens, and X for the ones):

	EXAMPLE	REGULAR	EXCEPTIONAL
Y and Xth	50 and 1st	133	7
Z and Y and Xth	200 and 30 and 1st	12	0
Z and Yth	300 and 20th	3	0
Z and Xth	200 and 1st	1	0

Except for the last example, the seven exceptions in the earliest extant text are all restricted to 𝓞:

	FORM	SOURCE
Alma 52:15	20th and 7th	𝓞
Alma 56:7	20 and 6	𝓞
Alma 56:9	20 and 6	𝓞
Alma 56:20	20 and 6	𝓞
Alma 63:4	30th and 7th	𝓞
Helaman 3:19	40 and 8	𝓞
Helaman 4:8	50 and 8	𝓟ᶜ

The King James Bible basically follows the expected pattern for compound ordinal numbers:

	EXAMPLE	REGULAR	EXCEPTIONAL
X and Yth	7 and 20th	37	0
Y and Xth	30 and 1st	11	0
Z and Yth	400 and 80th	1	0
Z and Xth	600 and 1st	0	1

Unlike the Book of Mormon, the King James text has 37 cases where the digit representing the ones precedes the tens; even so, only the last number takes the ordinal form, as in Genesis 8:14: "on the **seven** and **twentieth** day of the month". The only exception to the general pattern is found in Genesis 8:13, where both numbers are ordinals: "and it came to pass in the **six hundredth** and **first** year". The only other comparable example, in 1 Kings 6:1, follows the standard pattern: "and it came to pass in the **four hundred** and **eightieth** year". The example in Genesis 8:13 of "in the six hundredth and first year" shows that the extra ordinal form can occur in the King James text. Of course, modern translations, such as the Revised Standard Version, translate the compound ordinal in Genesis 8:13 as "in the six hundred and first year".

David Calabro points out (personal communication) that in earlier English there is evidence for compound ordinals where every conjoined number in the compound is an ordinal. (To be sure, there are many more examples of the standard construction, where only the last number in the compound is an ordinal.) *Literature Online* <lion.chadwyck.com> provides many examples of the fully ordinal construction, especially in Early Modern English (here the accidentals are regularized):

William Hart (1620)	upon the twenti**eth** and third day of December
John Weever (1631)	in the forti**eth** and third year
Francis Godwyn (died 1633)	in his fifti**eth** and third year
Philemon Holland (1637)	in the thirti**eth** and sixth year of king Henry
Philemon Holland (1637)	in the forti**eth** and sixth year after his death

Joseph Mede (died 1638)   the sixti**eth** and ninth week

Joseph Moxon (1659)   the two hundred**th** and sixteenth part

George Wither (1666)   the thousand**th** and seven hundredth year

George Sinclair (1672)   to the twenti**eth** and ninth inch

James VII of Scotland (1682)   and of our reign the thirti**eth** and fourth year

George Sawbridge (1683)   the three hundred**th** and fifth Olympiad

George Sawbridge (1683)   on the five hundred**th** and sixth year

George Sawbridge (1683)   in the three hundred**th** and fortieth year

Matthew Poole (1683)   in the twenti**eth** and sixth year of Asa

George Sinclair (1685)   from the twenti**eth** and first relation

George Sinclair (1685)   to your Lordship / who is the twenti**eth** and fifth lineally descended from Dougald

George Sinclair (1688)   the twenti**eth** and fourth part of the natural day

John Flavel (died 1691)   the whole hundred**th** and nineteenth psalm

John Dunton (1692)   the one hundred**th** and second of this collection

William Wotten (1693)   hundred**th** and first and second

John Sage (1695)   till the twenti**eth** and third of July

William Whiston (1696)   the hundred**th** and fourteenth place

Thomas Burnet (1697)   in the six hundred**th** and first year

The frequency of this construction in literary sources drops off considerably in the following centuries; for instance, *Literature Online* lists only a couple of later examples with this construction:

Tobias Smollett (1751)   at the fort**ieth** and seventh proposition

Sydney Morgan (1806)   in his hundred**th** and ninth year

Dates in wills, public records, oaths, parish records, and legal petitions in the 1700s continue to show this construction, as in the following examples from <www.google.com> (once more the accidentals are regularized):

Samuel Stratton (1717)

    in witness whereof I the said Samuel Stratton have hereunto set my hand and seal
    the twenti**eth** and fifth day of April anno 1717
    and in the third year of his majesty's reign over England

Tobias Smollett, translation of *Don Quixote* (1755)

    this I can with great truth affirm that on the twenti**eth** and fifth day of February
    in this year of God one thousand six hundred and fifteen . . .

Ruthwell Scotland parish register (1775)

    Margaret daughter to John Gallaty and Fanny Nicolson in Ruthwell Town
    the twenti**eth** and fifth
    and baptized twenti**eth** and seventh of October

Alexander Stewart (1776)

    humbly showeth that your petitioner having been duly made by said convention
    a prisoner as a subject to the king of Great Britain
    on the twenti**eth** and seventh day of July last . . .

We also have these two interesting examples from *The Most Ancient Lives of Saint Patrick* (1880), edited by James O'Leary:

> on the seventeenth day of March
> in the one hundred**th** and twenti**eth** and third year of his age
> departed he forth of this world
>
> now Saint Patrick died
> in the four hundred**th** and nineti**eth** and third year of Christ's incarnation

For both of these citations, there are three ordinal numbers in each compound number.

Thus the evidence from earlier English overwhelmingly demonstrates that ordinals can occur for each conjoined number in an ordinal compound. Consequently, the critical text will restore the two original occurrences of this construction, in Alma 52:15 ("in the twentieth and seventh year") and in Alma 63:4 ("in the thirtieth and seventh year"). The possibility remains, of course, that these two instances are scribal errors, as suggested by the initial error in 𝓞 for Helaman 3:2.

Summary: Restore the ordinal number *twentieth* in Alma 52:15 ("in the twentieth and seventh year") as well as the ordinal number *thirtieth* in Alma 63:4 ("in the thirtieth and seventh year"); in each case, the use of ordinals throughout the compound ordinal number is based on the reading of the earliest source, the original manuscript; there is abundant evidence for this usage in Early Modern English, including one example in the King James Bible ("in the six hundredth and first year").

■ **Alma 52:15**

Moroni . . . had began his march
towards the land [*of* 01| ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *Bountiful*

Here the 1830 edition omitted the *of* from "the land of Bountiful"; it has never been restored in any subsequent edition, despite its occurrence in both manuscripts. As noted under 1 Nephi 17:7, either reading is possible, although most instances in the text of "the land (of) Bountiful" lack the *of*. In each case, the critical text will follow the earliest extant reading, thus in this case "the land **of** Bountiful".

Summary: Restore in Alma 52:15 the earliest extant reading, "the land **of** Bountiful".

■ **Alma 52:15**

that he might assist Teancum
with his [*men* 0ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST|*armies* >– *men* 1]
in retaking the cities which [*they* 01ABCDEFGHIJKLMOPQRST|*he* N] *had lost*

Here we have two minor errors based on equivalent meaning. When copying from 𝓞 into 𝓟, Oliver Cowdery initially replaced *men* with *armies*. Somewhat later he crossed out *armies* and supralinearly inserted *men,* the reading in 𝓞. Oliver probably made this correction when he proofed 𝓟 against 𝓞; not only is the ink flow for the correction somewhat weaker, but the quill is duller. Elsewhere the text has only one other example of "with his men" (in Alma 47:14) but eight of "with his army" and six of "with his armies", so it is not surprising that Oliver initially

replaced *men* with *armies* in 𝓟. But any of these readings is possible, so the critical text will follow the earliest reading, in this instance "Teancum with his **men**".

The other error of semantic equivalence involves the pronoun *they* in the relative clause "which they had lost". The 1906 LDS edition accidentally replaced *they* with *he,* perhaps under the influence of the preceding *his* in the phrase "with his men". This edition was never used as a copytext, so the secondary *he* was not perpetuated.

Summary: Follow in Alma 52:15 the reading of the earliest textual sources (including 𝓞) for *men* and *they:* "that he might assist Teancum with his **men** in retaking the cities which **they** had lost".

■ **Alma 52:15–16**

> *but behold it came to pass*
> *in the twentieth and seventh year of the reign of the judges*
> *that Teancum by the command of Moroni*
> **who had** *established armies to protect the south and the west borders of the land*
> [01ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQS | *and* RT] **had** *began his march towards the land of Bountiful*
> *that he might assist Teancum with his men in retaking the cities which they had lost*
> *and it came to pass that Teancum had received orders*
> *to make an attackt upon the city of Mulek and retake it if it were possible*

Verse 15 here is a sentence fragment since no predicate is assigned to the subject noun *Teancum.* After a long excursus dealing with Moroni rather than Teancum, verse 16 just starts over and ends up describing the orders Moroni sent Teancum ("and it came to pass that Teancum had received orders to . . ."). The 1920 LDS edition attempted to fix this passage, at least in part, by inserting an *and* before *had begun* (originally *had began*), which definitely makes the fragmented sentence itself read better ("who had established armies to protect the south and the west borders of the land **and** had began his march towards the land of Bountiful . . ."). It is quite possible that Oliver Cowdery omitted an *and* here in 𝓞 since such an error is fairly common for him in the manuscripts (see the examples discussed jointly under 1 Nephi 17:39–40 and 1 Nephi 17:40).

Another possible emendation would be to replace the first *had* (the one immediately after *who*) with *having* (although this change still does not correct the fragmented sentence):

> Alma 52:15 (proposed emendation)
>> Teancum by the command of Moroni
>> who **having** established armies to protect the south and the west borders of the land
>> had began his march towards the land of Bountiful
>> that he might assist Teancum with his men in retaking the cities
>>> which they had lost . . .

But there are no examples of mix-ups between *had* and *having* in the manuscripts, although there has been some editing in the printed editions (in the 1837 and the 1920 LDS editions) where these two verb forms have been intentionally switched: namely, in Mosiah 10:7, Mosiah 23:1, Mosiah 29:42, Alma 16:21, Alma 19:17, Alma 56:10, and Mormon 1:7. But in the manuscripts, it seems more likely an *and* was omitted in Alma 52:15 than the first *had* was an error for *having.* Since the earliest reading for the fragmented sentence does seem to be especially difficult, the critical text will accept the 1920 emendation that supplies an *and* between the two finite predicates headed by *had.*

As far as the fragmented sentence itself is concerned, Mormon was apparently unable to recover from his initial switch in topic from Teancum to Moroni. And we can find evidence for this kind of sentential incompleteness elsewhere in the text. In the following example, king Limhi (the speaker here) specifies a subject, in this case Zeniff, who is then referred to by means of a series of relative clauses and present participial clauses, yet Limhi never provides a finite predicate for the initial noun *Zeniff* or its pronoun *he*. In fact, Limhi also switches the topic in this passage, from Zeniff to king Laman:

> Mosiah 7:21–22
> > and ye all are witnesses this day
> > that **Zeniff** who was made king over this people
> > **he** being overzealous to inherit the land of his fathers
> > therefore being deceived by the cunning and craftiness of king Laman
> > who having entered into a treaty with king Zeniff
> > and having yielded up into his hands the possessions of a part of the land
> > or even the city of Lehi-Nephi and the city of Shilom and the land round about
> > and all this he done for the sole purpose
> > of bringing this people into subjection or into bondage

Here in Mosiah 7:21–22, Limhi ultimately ends up starting over with a summarizing statement ("and all this he done for the sole purpose of . . ."). The critical text will maintain the original fragmented sentence in Alma 52:15–16 as well as in Mosiah 7:21–22.

Summary: Accept in Alma 52:15 the *and* that the 1920 LDS edition placed between the two finite predicates in the relative clause (thus "who had established armies . . . **and** had began his march"); the original fragmented sentence here will be maintained since such incomplete sentences can be found elsewhere in the text.

■ **Alma 52:18**

Moroni did arrive with his army [*to* 01ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQS | *at* RT] *the land of Bountiful*

The editors for the 1920 LDS edition changed the preposition here from *to* to *at*. The critical text will follow the original preposition *to*. For a complete discussion of this 1920 change, also implemented elsewhere in the text, see under 1 Nephi 17:14.

Summary: Restore in Alma 52:18 the original preposition *to* in "Moroni did arrive with his army **to** the land of Bountiful".

■ **Alma 52:21**

and it came to pass that Moroni
having no [*hopes* >%? *hope* 0 | *hopes* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *of meeting them*
  upon fair grounds
therefore he resolved upon a plan . . .

Oliver Cowdery originally wrote *hopes* here in 𝒪 ("having no **hopes** of meeting them upon fair grounds"). But it is difficult to tell whether Oliver wrote a defective *s* at the end of *hopes* or

whether he tried to erase the plural *s.* Later, when Oliver copied this passage into 𝔓, he interpreted the word in 𝔒 as *hopes* and copied it as such into 𝔓. All the printed editions have retained the plural *hopes.*

Elsewhere in the original text, there are 39 instances of the singular noun *hope,* as in Alma 13:29: "having **a hope** that ye shall receive eternal life". But there are also six other instances of the plural *hopes.* In fact, in two of these cases, we can see the tendency to replace the unexpected plural with the singular:

> Alma 56:17 (initial error by Oliver Cowdery in 𝔒)
> > yea those sons of mine gave them
> > great [*hope > hopes* 0 | *hopes* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] and much joy

> Mormon 5:2 (*hopes* changed to *hope* in the 1840 edition and in the 1920 LDS edition)
> > but behold I was without [*hopes* 1ABDEFIJLMNOPQS | *hope* CGHKRT]

The four other examples of *hopes* are invariant in the textual history:

1 Nephi 16:5	I had joy and great **hopes** of them
Alma 7:3	I have come having great **hopes** and much desire that . . .
Alma 22:14	the sting of death should be swallowed up in the **hopes** of glory
Alma 57:12	the Lamanites began to lose all **hopes** of succor

Thus the plural *hopes* is clearly possible here in Alma 52:21. The critical text will accept it since it is the reading in 𝔓, the earliest fully legible source for the word; although 𝔒 is extant, one cannot be sure whether the plural *s* was defectively written or erased.

Phrases with the plural *hopes* like "no hopes of X" and "without hopes" were common in the 1800s, and examples can be found dating back to the 1600s, as in the following examples found on *Literature Online* <lion.chadwyck.com> (accidentals regularized):

John Cleveland (1647)	no hopes of a reprieve
Thomas Washbourne (1654)	without hopes of getting free
Benjamin Keach (1679)	and sorely grieved / could see no hopes of rest
Benjamin Keach (1684)	I am not without hopes

The use of the plural *hopes* in the Book of Mormon is perfectly acceptable even in the unexpected cases of "no hopes of X" and "without hopes".

Summary: Maintain in Alma 52:21 the plural *hopes,* the definite reading in 𝔓 and perhaps the reading in 𝔒; usage elsewhere in the text supports the possibility of the plural *hopes* (as originally in Mormon 5:2: "I was without **hopes**").

■ **Alma 52:22**

and Moroni and his army by night marched
[*into* 01APS | *in* BCDEFGHIJKLMNOQRT] *the wilderness on the west of the city Mulek*

Here the 1837 edition accidentally replaced the preposition *into* with *in.* Elsewhere in the text, we have four cases of "march **into** the wilderness":

Alma 16:7	Zoram and his sons . . . marched away beyond the borders of Manti **into** the south wilderness
Alma 46:31	he took his army and marched out with his tents **into** the wilderness
Alma 46:32	he did according to his desires and marched forth **into** the wilderness
Alma 56:39	and we took our march **into** the wilderness

There is only one case of "march **in** the wilderness", and in this one case the use of *in* is appropriate:

Alma 43:24

and Alma informed the messengers of Moroni that
the armies of the Lamanites were marching round about **in** the wilderness
that they might come over into the land of Manti

In this instance, the movement is "round about in the wilderness" near the land of Manti, whereas in all the other cases (including here in Alma 52:22) the movement is into the wilderness itself.

Summary: Restore the original preposition *into* in Alma 52:22, in accord with the reading of the earliest textual sources as well as other usage in the text.

■ **Alma 52:23**

and as Teancum saw the armies of the Lamanites coming out against him
he began [*a* 0 | *to* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *retreat down by the seashore northward*

The original manuscript has the noun phrase *a retreat* rather than the infinitival *to retreat* (the reading of the printer's manuscript as well as all the printed editions). Of course, either reading is theoretically possible.

Elsewhere in the text, there are three examples of "begin **to** retreat" but none of "begin **a** retreat":

Alma 58:24	therefore they began **to** retreat into the wilderness again
Helaman 1:29	insomuch that they began **to** retreat back towards the land of Zarahemla
Mormon 2:3	and they began **to** retreat towards the north countries

The noun *retreat* also occurs elsewhere in the text (seven times), but there are no other instances with the verb *begin*. The vast majority of cases of the verb *begin* are complemented by infinitive clauses, but there are a handful of cases where *begin* is complemented by a noun phrase:

Alma 50:13	the Nephites began **the foundation** of a city
Alma 50:14	and they also began **a foundation** for a city
Alma 52:15	Moroni . . . had began **his march** towards the land of Bountiful
3 Nephi 4:25	when the robbers began **their march**

The last two are highly significant here since *march* and *retreat* are semantically similar. In fact, "he began a retreat" in Alma 52:23 is indirectly supported by the nearby "Moroni . . . had began his march" (in Alma 52:15).

Oliver Cowdery probably copied "he began **a** retreat" as "he began **to** retreat" because of the much higher frequency in the text of "to begin to do something" than "to begin something". On the other hand, there is little evidence that the reading in ◯, "he began **a** retreat", could be

a mistake for "he began **to** retreat". There are no instances in the history of the text where *to* has been replaced by *a*. Clearly, "he began a retreat" is the unexpected reading, so it is not surprising that Oliver accidentally changed the *a* to *to* when he copied the text. Thus the critical text will accept the reading of ℧, "he began **a** retreat".

We should also note that the use of the noun *retreat* in Alma 52:23 ("he began a retreat") implies a controlled retreat on the part of Teancum's army. A similar example of a controlled retreat is found in Alma 58:18 (as implied by the verb *cause*): "I caused that my men—those which were with me—should retreat into the wilderness". The secondary reading in Alma 52:23 ("he began to retreat") obscures this sense of a controlled retreat.

Summary: Restore in Alma 52:23 the reading in ℧, "he began a retreat"; the secondary reading in 𝒫, "he began to retreat", is due to the much greater frequency in the text of "to begin to do something", but this secondary reading loses the sense of a controlled retreat.

■ **Alma 52:26**

and thus Moroni had obtained [*a* 01A | BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *possession of the city Mulek with a part of his army*

The earliest textual sources, including the original manuscript, read *a possession* rather than simply *possession*. The use of the indefinite article here is quite odd, which explains why it was omitted in the 1837 edition, most likely on purpose. One possibility here is that the *a* in ℧ is intrusive, that Oliver Cowdery accidentally added it as Joseph Smith dictated the text (or Joseph himself accidentally added it).

The phrase *a possession* is found elsewhere in the Book of Mormon, but only in 2 Nephi 24:23, where we have a King James quote from Isaiah 14:23: "I will also make it **a** possession for the bittern". In this instance, the *a* is required. But there are instances of this usage in the King James text where the *a* would be omitted in modern English:

Genesis 23:4   give me **a** possession of a burying place with you
Numbers 27:7   thou shalt surely give them **a** possession of an inheritance
                          among their father's brethren

We should also note that elsewhere the earliest Book of Mormon text has a number of unexpected uses of the indefinite article, such as "Alma was a stirring up the people to **a** rebellion" (Mosiah 18:33), "they were in **a** preparation to hear the word" (Alma 32:6), and "we had also **a** plenty of provisions brought unto us" (Alma 57:6). The evidence suggests that the *a* is intended in all these cases, just as it could be here in Alma 52:26 (see under each of these passages for the evidence).

Besides the one Isaiah quote, there are no other occurrences of *a possession* in the Book of Mormon text. When the verb is *obtain* (as here in Alma 52:26), we usually get "obtain possession of X" (that is, without any determiner for *possession*):

Alma 2:25   and except we make haste / they obtain possession of our city
Alma 50:32   and thus he would obtain possession of those parts of the land
Alma 52:5   and those parts of the land which they had obtained possession of
Alma 53:6   Moroni . . . had obtained possession of the city Mulek

Alma 53:8	they had obtained possession of a number of their cities
Alma 56:13	these are the cities which the Lamanites have obtained possession of
Alma 58:23	Gid and Teomner . . . had obtained possession of their strong hold
Alma 62:30	after he had obtained possession of the city of Nephihah
Helaman 4:5	they succeeded in obtaining possession of the land of Zarahemla

For other verbs, we typically get *possession,* never *a possession:*

"to take possession of"	35 times
"to get possession of"	3 times
"to gain possession of"	1 time
"to have possession of"	1 time
"to be in possession of"	1 time
"to lose possession of"	1 time

These many examples suggest the possibility that in Alma 52:26 Oliver Cowdery accidentally inserted the indefinite article *a* in ℗.

There are a number of cases in the text where we get "**the** possession of"—that is, where the definite article *the* occurs even though it is not necessary. In fact, in the following list, there are three examples of "the possession of" where the verb is *obtain* (each is marked with an asterisk):

	Alma 58:38	and we are in **the** possession of our lands
*	Alma 58:41	that ye may have success in obtaining **the** possession of all that which the Lamanites hath taken from us
*	Alma 62:26	thus had Moroni and Parhoron obtained **the** possession of the city of Nephihah
*	Helaman 1:22	he had obtained **the** possession of the strongest hold in all the land
	3 Nephi 3:11	in demanding **the** possession of the land of the Nephites

These examples suggest that in Alma 52:26 Joseph Smith could have dictated "obtained **the** possession of the city Mulek" but that Oliver Cowdery accidentally heard this as "obtained **a** possession of the city Mulek". The vowel in *a* and *the* in normal speech is the schwa vowel /ə/. The voiced interdental /ð/ at the beginning of *the* could have been obscured by the voiced dental /d/ at the end of *obtained,* thus leading Oliver to think he had heard *a* /ə/ rather than *the* /ðə/. For a case where a similar sort of substitution may have occurred, see the discussion under Alma 51:31 (where "with **a** disappointment of being repulsed" may be an error for "with **the** disappointment of being repulsed").

Besides the examples from the King James Bible (listed above), there is evidence elsewhere in Early Modern English for the use of the indefinite article in the expression "a possession of", as in the following examples (with accidentals regularized) from *Literature Online* <lion.chadwyck.com>:

Elkanah Settle (1675)
>   the lustful villain offered marriage to thee
>   and by a treacherous and perfidious craft
>   gilded the sin till it looked fair and lovely
>   abused thy tender years and weaker knowledge
>   to take **a possession of** thy virgin honor
>   before the deeds were sealed that should convey it

John Bunyan (1682)

the simple town believing that what was said was true
with one consent did open Ear-gate—the chief gate of the corporation—
and did let him with his crew into **a possession of** the famous town of Man-soul

Aphra Behn (1687)

and from one favor to another continued so to oblige the fair fickle creature
that he won with that and his handsome mien **a possession of** her heart

Based on this evidence from English usage, the critical text will restore the original *a* in Alma 52:26, although there is a possibility that during the early transmission of the text this *a* was either accidentally inserted or was a mishearing of *the*.

Summary: Restore in Alma 52:26 the indefinite article *a* in "Moroni had obtained **a** possession of the city Mulek", the reading of the original manuscript; nonetheless, the possibility remains that the original text read without the *a* ("Moroni had obtained possession of the city Mulek") or with *the* instead of *a* ("Moroni had obtained **the** possession of the city Mulek").

■ **Alma 52:27**

and [*then* 01ABCDEFGIJLMNOPQRST | HK] *they were met by Lehi and a small army*

Here the 1874 RLDS edition accidentally omitted the connective word *then*. The 1908 RLDS edition restored the *then*, probably by reference to 𝓟. In theory, either reading will work. Of course, the original *then* increases the connectivity with the preceding text.

Summary: Maintain the occurrence of *then* in Alma 52:27, the reading of the earliest textual sources.

■ **Alma 52:33**

and it came to pass that Jacob being their leader
being also a Zoramite and having an unconquerable spirit
[NULL >+ *he* 1 | *he* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *led the Lamanites forth to battle*
with exceeding fury against Moroni

𝓞 is not extant for the subject pronoun *he*, but spacing between extant fragments supports its occurrence in 𝓞. When Oliver Cowdery copied from 𝓞 into 𝓟, he initially omitted the *he*, perhaps because the *he* was redundant, given that there was already a subject, *Jacob*, for the predicate "led the Lamanites forth to battle". Later, probably when he proofed 𝓟 against 𝓞, Oliver supralinearly inserted the pronoun *he* (the level of ink flow for the correction is somewhat heavier). For other instances of this kind of redundancy, the subject pronoun has often been edited out, but not always. For some discussion and examples, see under Mosiah 16:5. Also see the general discussion under SUBJECT REPETITION in volume 3.

Summary: Maintain in Alma 52:33 the repeated subject, the pronoun *he* (the probable reading in 𝓞 and the corrected reading in 𝓟).

■ **Alma 52:36**

and Lehi pressed upon their rear with such fury with his strong men
that the Lamanites in the rear delivered up their weapons of war
and the remainder of them being much confused knew not
[*whither* 0DEFT | *where > whether* 1 | *whether* ABCGHIJKLMNOPQRS] *to go or to strike*

As discussed under 1 Nephi 22:4, there has been considerable confusion, not only in the manuscripts but also in the editions, between the two words *whither* and *whether*. This particular example in Alma 52:36 has been one of the most confusing. 𝒪 clearly reads *whither,* but this is not definite proof of the original reading since Oliver Cowdery typically mixed up the spelling of the words *whither* and *whether* in the manuscripts. One aspect of this confusion occurred when he copied this passage into 𝒫. He initially wrote *where,* which has the same meaning as *whither.* But then virtually immediately he corrected *where* by crossing out the final *re* and supralinearly inserted *ther* (there is no change in the level of ink flow for this correction in 𝒫). Thus he ended up writing *whether,* although his intended meaning seems to have been 'whither' (that is, 'where').

The editions have generally maintained *whether* here in Alma 52:36. The 1841 British edition replaced *whether* with *whither,* perhaps unintentionally. The two subsequent LDS editions (1849 and 1852) continued with *whither,* but the 1879 LDS edition restored the *whether* of the first three editions. Finally, the 1981 LDS edition made the change back to *whither* once more.

The word *whether* interprets the meaning of this passage as one of logical choice—namely, the armies of the Lamanites didn't know whether they should flee ("to go") or whether they should stay and fight ("to strike"). In my opinion, this interpretation is forced, especially since the verb *go* seems too general to describe the specific act of fleeing from the field of battle. It is true that the Book of Mormon text does use *whether* with cases of choice between logical alternatives: "**whether** to do evil or to do good" (Alma 12:31) and "**whether** to do good or do evil" (Alma 41:7). But the actual meaning in Alma 52:36 doesn't seem to be a logical choice between two options. Instead, the Lamanite armies were so confused that they didn't know where to maneuver or position themselves ("to go") or where to attack or engage in battle ("to strike"). The choice for the Lamanites is not between fleeing and fighting—they are surrounded by the Nephite armies. Rather it is about what battle action they should take. Here in Alma 52:36, the critical text will maintain the word *whither,* the same as the 1981 LDS reading.

Summary: Maintain in Alma 52:36 the word *whither,* which means 'where'; the Lamanites are unable to decide where to position themselves on the battlefield or where to attack.

■ **Alma 52:36–37**

and the remainder of them
[*being much confused* 0ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST | NULL >+ *being much confused* 1]
knew not whither to go or to strike
[NULL >+ *now* 01 | *Now* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *Moroni seeing their confusion*
he said unto them . . .

The word *now* is supralinearly inserted in both manuscripts, and in each case with heavier ink flow. In fact, the *now* in the original manuscript was written with an extremely heavy ink flow, so it

seems very unlikely that Oliver Cowdery would have initially missed the word when he first copied this passage into 𝒫—unless 𝒪 didn't have the *now* at that time. To be sure, the text would have read rather awkwardly here without any transitional word before *Moroni*. Under that assumption, it seems quite plausible that Oliver edited the text here by supralinearly inserting the *now,* first in 𝒫, then correcting 𝒪 to agree with 𝒫.

There are actually three supralinear corrections for this line in 𝒫. One was virtually immediate, namely, the correction of *where* to *whether,* discussed above. There is no change in the level of ink flow for this correction, nor is there any change in the sharpness of the quill. In contrast, the two other supralinear corrections are written with heavier ink flow, namely, the restoration of the present participial phrase "being much confused" (which is extant and written inline in 𝒪) and the secondary *now.* Moreover, the heavier ink flow for these two corrections in 𝒫 is identical, the quill used to write them was equally dull, and they were both inserted above the supralinear correction of *where* to *whether:*

Alma 52:36–37 (line 11, page 303 of 𝒫)

```
                 being much confused                      now
                                      ther
     -der of <^> them ^ knew not whe<re>^ to go or to strike ^ Moroni seeing their confusion
```

It is quite clear that the *now* was inserted in 𝒫 at the same time Oliver Cowdery restored the present participial phrase "being much confused". In other words, Oliver decided to insert the extra *now* into the text when he proofed 𝒫 against 𝒪, considerably later than when he first copied the text from 𝒪 into 𝒫. Moreover, the supralinearly inserted *now* in 𝒪 appears to have been written using the same dull quill used to make the correction in 𝒫.

Ultimately, the question is whether any emendation was necessary here in Alma 52:37. Earlier in this passage, we have a similar example that does not have any transitional word at the beginning of its verse (marked below with an arrow):

Alma 52:33–34
     and it came to pass that Jacob being their leader
     being also a Zoramite and having an unconquerable spirit
     he led the Lamanites forth to battle with exceeding fury against Moroni
     [01|. ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
→ Moroni being in their course of march
     therefore Jacob was determined to slay them

The participial clause at the beginning of verse 34 means 'since Moroni was in their course of march'. Similarly, we can interpret the participial clause at the beginning of verse 37 as meaning 'since Moroni saw their confusion'. Just as in verse 34, the extra *now* in verse 37 is not necessary. The critical text will therefore remove this secondary *now* from Alma 52:37.

Summary: Remove from Alma 52:37 the intrusive *now* that Oliver Cowdery added later to both manuscripts when he proofed 𝒫 against 𝒪; although unusual, the original sentence-initial present participial clause ("Moroni seeing their confusion") is acceptable without any *now,* just as the one at the beginning of Alma 52:34 is acceptable ("Moroni being in their course of march").

Alma 53

■ **Alma 53:1**

and Moroni placed men over them to guard them
[*whilsts >% whilst* 0 | *while* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *they should perform their labors*

The original manuscript has the archaic *whilst.* (Oliver Cowdery originally wrote *whilst* with an extra *s* at the end of the word, but he immediately corrected his error by erasing this *s*.) While copying the text into the printer's manuscript, Oliver accidentally replaced *whilst* with the expected *while.* Elsewhere the Book of Mormon text still retains three examples of original *whilst:*

> Alma 31:17
>> and thou hast elected us that we shall be saved
>> **whilst** all around us are elected to be cast by thy wrath down to hell

> Alma 50:22
>> and those who were faithful in keeping the commandments of the Lord
>>> were delivered at all times
>> **whilst** thousands of their wicked brethren have been consigned to bondage . . .

> Moroni 9:6
>> for we have a labor to perform **whilst** in this tabernacle of clay

Of course, *while* is much more frequent in the text (with 81 occurrences of this subordinate conjunction in the original text). The critical text will restore the original instance of *whilst* here in Alma 53:1.

Interestingly, there is one case in 𝔓 where Oliver Cowdery initially wrote *whilst* (spelled as *whilest*), but in that case he immediately corrected the word to *while* by erasing the extra *st* from the end of the word:

> Helaman 14:27
>> and he said unto me that
>> [*whilest >% while* 1 | *while* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] the thunder
>>> and the lightning lasted . . .

Summary: Restore *whilst* in Alma 53:1, in accord with the reading of the original manuscript.

■ **Alma 53:1**

whilst they should perform their [*labours* 01NQ | *labors* ABCDEFGHIJLMORT | *labor* KPS]

The 1892 RLDS edition unintentionally replaced the plural *labors* with the singular *labor.* The RLDS text has continued with the secondary *labor,* even though 𝔓 reads in the plural; the word is extant in 𝒪 and reads in the plural.

Elsewhere the text has six other examples that refer to performing labor, of which one (marked below with an asterisk) parallels the language here in Alma 53:1 (both read "perform their labors"):

1 Nephi 17:41	and the **labor** which they had to perform were to look
Alma 8:1	to rest himself from the **labors** which he had performed
Alma 30:33	notwithstanding the **many labors** which I have performed in the church
* Alma 34:32	the day of this life is the day for men to perform their **labors**
Alma 34:33	then cometh the night of darkness wherein there can be no **labor** performed
Moroni 9:6	for we have **a labor** to perform whilst in this tabernacle of clay

For each case of "perform labor(s)", the critical text will follow the earliest textual sources, thus *labors* here in Alma 53:1 (the reading in ⊙, spelled there as *labours*).

Summary: Maintain the plural *labors* in Alma 53:1, the reading of the earliest textual sources (including both manuscripts).

■ **Alma 53:3**

and Teancum by the orders of Moroni caused
that they should commence [in >js NULL 1 | in A | BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] laboring
in digging a ditch round about the land or the city Bountiful

Here in his editing for the 1837 edition, Joseph Smith removed the first *in* from "commence **in** laboring in digging". Probably the repetition of the *in* sounded strange. The removal of the first *in,* however, created a unique expression for the verb *commence* in the Book of Mormon, namely, a present participial verb form immediately following the verb *commence*. Elsewhere, the present participial verb form following *commence* is headed by the preposition *in:*

1 Nephi 14:17	the work of the Father shall commence **in preparing** the way
Alma 50:1	that they should commence **in digging** up heaps of earth
Alma 55:25	that they should commence a labor **in strengthening** the fortifications
3 Nephi 21:28	then shall the work commence . . . **in preparing** the way

The example in Alma 55:25 suggests the possibility of emending *in laboring* in Alma 53:3 to *a labor.*

The original reading can, however, be maintained if one treats the second instance of "in <present participial clause>" as an appositive to the first instance. One could show this in the standard text by placing a comma, dash, or colon between "in laboring" and "in digging":

Alma 53:3 (original text, with extra punctuation)
    and Teancum by the orders of Moroni caused
    that they should commence in laboring :
    in digging a ditch round about the land or the city Bountiful

And as described in the following verse, the Lamanites labored not only in digging a ditch but also in building "a breastwork of timbers upon the inner bank of the ditch" and also in casting up "dirt out of the ditch against the breastwork of timbers". In other words, Moroni's purpose was

to keep the Lamanite prisoners working, as explained in verse 5: "now Moroni was compelled to cause the Lamanites to labor because it were easy to guard them while at their labor". Thus the original reading in Alma 53:3 is acceptable, and the critical text will restore it.

Summary: Restore in Alma 53:3 the original *in* that Joseph Smith deleted in his editing for the 1837 edition; some kind of punctuation break between "in laboring" and "in digging" would help show that the digging was only one aspect of the Lamanite prisoners' labor.

■ **Alma 53:5**

now Moroni was compelled to cause the Lamanites to labor
because it [*were* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLOP | *were > was* M | *was* NQRST] *easy*
to guard them while at their labor

The original manuscript is not extant here. The verb *were* (or *was*) would have occurred at the end of a line in 𝓞, so it is quite possible that 𝓞 actually read *was* but was miscopied by Oliver Cowdery as *were*. In the early 1900s, the LDS text adopted *was* in place of *were*. The 1906 large-print edition was the first one to replace the *were* with *was,* an emendation followed in the third printing of the 1905 Chicago edition (in 1907) and in the 1911 large-print Chicago edition (and in all subsequent LDS editions). The 1953 RLDS edition also made this change, probably independently of the modern LDS text.

Elsewhere in the text we have two other occurrences of "because it was", but none of "because it were":

| Alma 10:9 | because it **was** said by an angel of God |
| Helaman 14:10 | and because it **was** hard against you / ye are angry with me |

Although the evidence is meager, these two examples support emending "because it **were** easy" in Alma 53:5 to "because it **was** easy".

The Book of Mormon text, of course, has many examples of *it were* as a subjunctive form in conditional statements, such as "save it were", "if it were", "as it were", "except it were", and "whether it were". Even so, there are some firm instances of *it were* in the earliest text that would normally read *it was* in standard English; some of these instances of *it were* have been changed to *it was,* but not all (each of the textually invariant cases is marked below with an asterisk):

* Mosiah 1:4	for **it were** not possible that our father Lehi could have remembered all these things
* Alma 20:17	nevertheless **it were** better that he should fall than thee
Alma 55:23	they found that **it were** not expedient that they should fight with the Nephites
* 3 Nephi 7:18	for **it were** not possible that they could disbelieve his words
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
Ether 15:14	that they might receive all the strength which **it were** possible that they could receive

These instances of *it were* are equally as strange as the one in Alma 53:5, yet only half of them have been changed to *it was* (namely, Alma 55:23 when Oliver Cowdery copied from 𝒪 into 𝒫, and Mormon 2:16 and Ether 15:14 in the editing for the 1837 edition). The critical text will therefore restore the original use of *it were* here in Alma 53:5 since it appears to be intended.

Summary: Restore in Alma 53:5 the occurrence of *it were* in "because it were easy", the earliest reading; despite its nonstandard form, the original text has other instances of *it were* in nonconditional clauses that have never been edited to *it was*.

■ **Alma 53:6**

and it came to pass that
Moroni [*had* 01ABCDEFGIJLMNOPQRST | HK] *thus gained a victory*
    over one of the greatest of the armies of the Lamanites
and **had** *obtained possession of the city Mulek*

The 1874 RLDS edition accidentally omitted the first *had* in this sentence. It was restored to the RLDS text in 1908. Parallelism with the following conjoined predicate ("and **had** obtained possession of the city Mulek") provides support for the first *had*. For most instances of a conjoined past-perfect predicate, the preceding predicate also has a past-perfect *had* (as here in Alma 53:6). But there are instances where the first predicate lacks the past perfect auxiliary, as in Alma 1:19: "those that **did belong** to the church of God and **had taken** upon them the name of Christ". In each case, we follow the earliest textual sources, thus the *had* in both predicates for Alma 53:6.

Summary: Maintain the use of *had* in both conjoined predicates in Alma 53:6: "Moroni **had** thus gained a victory . . . and **had** obtained possession of the city Mulek".

■ **Alma 53:6**

Moroni had thus gained a victory over one of the greatest of the armies of the Lamanites
and had obtained possession of the city [01ABCDGHKPS | *of* EFIJLMNOQRT] *Mulek*

Here the 1849 LDS edition inserted an *of* in the phrase "the city Mulek", giving "the city **of** Mulek". The LDS text has retained the intrusive *of*. Elsewhere in the text (from Alma 51:26 through Helaman 5:15), there are nine instances of "the city **of** Mulek" and three of "the city Mulek". As with all city names, either reading is theoretically possible, so here in Alma 53:6 we follow the earliest textual sources, including 𝒪, which lacks the *of* in "the city (of) Mulek". A couple of times in 𝒫, Oliver Cowdery accidentally omitted the *of* in the phrase "the city of Mulek"; for discussion, see under Helaman 5:15.

Summary: Restore in Alma 53:6 the shorter form "the city Mulek" since this is the reading in both manuscripts as well as in the early editions.

■ **Alma 53:6**

Moroni had thus gained a victory over one of the greatest of the armies of the Lamanites
and had obtained possession of the city Mulek
which was one of the strongest holds of the Lamanites **in the land of Nephi**

Dale Caswell, a student in my fall 1997 textual criticism class, suggested in his term paper for the class that this passage incorrectly states that the city of Mulek was "in the land of Nephi". Drawing upon usage throughout the rest of the text, he shows that this Nephite city would have been "in the land of the Nephites", while the land of Nephi was further south and had been under Lamanite control for at least a hundred years.

Caswell also points out that there are 56 other occurrences of "the land (of) Nephi" in the text and that every one of them refers either specifically to the land that Nephi originally settled when he separated from his brothers Laman and Lemuel or generally to the traditional Lamanite territory as a whole (see the discussion under Alma 22:28 regarding the phrase "on the west in the land of Nephi"). Later, as described in the book of Omni, Mosiah (the father of king Benjamin) and his followers abandoned the original land of Nephi and migrated to the land of Zarahemla. The people of Zeniff returned to the original land of Nephi but were eventually forced to abandon it (as described in the book of Mosiah). On the other hand, the city of Mulek is listed as one of several Nephite cities captured by the Lamanites:

> Alma 51:26 (emended text)
> and thus he went on taking possession of many cities :
> the city of Moroni
> and the city of Lehi
> and the city of Morionton
> and the city of Omner
> and the city of Gid
> and the city of Mulek
> all of which were on the east borders by the seashore

(The earliest text here actually reads "the city of Nephihah" rather than "the city of Moroni", but internal evidence argues that *Nephihah* here is a mistake for *Moroni*. See the discussion under Alma 51:25–26.) Given the order of capture for this list of cities, we may presume that the city of Moroni was the most southern of these cities (and thus nearest to Lamanite territory), while the city of Mulek was the most northern. John L. Sorenson, in his book *Mormon's Map* (Provo, Utah: FARMS, 2000), comes to the same conclusion regarding the location of Mulek (see his map 3 on page 40 and the nearby discussion). Moreover, the narrative in Alma 52:15–19 shows that the city of Mulek was near the city of Bountiful (which was in the north and near the narrow neck of land, as described in Alma 22:29–34). Teancum, when he realizes he doesn't have enough forces to attack the city of Mulek, now in Lamanite hands, returns to the city of Bountiful to await the arrival of Moroni and his army. All of this means that it is quite improbable for the city of Mulek to be "in the land of Nephi".

Later the expression "the land of the Nephites" turns up twice in the text:

Helaman 6:38
> and it came to pass on the other hand
> that the Nephites did build them up and support them
> beginning at the more wicked part of them
> until they had overspread all **the land of the Nephites**

3 Nephi 3:11
> and now it came to pass when Lachoneus received this epistle
> he was exceedingly astonished because of the boldness of Giddianhi
> in demanding the possession of **the land of the Nephites**

In both passages, the text refers to the entire Nephite territory, not "the land of Nephi" (neither the original land of Nephi nor the more general Lamanite territory).

One possibility here in Alma 53:6 is that the original text actually read "the land of Nephi"; that is, this reading was a mistake that Mormon himself made when he made his record. The original manuscript is extant here, and it reads "the land of Nephi". Perhaps the plates did too. Since Mormon had just written that the city of Mulek "was one of the strongest holds of the Lamanites", he might have been influenced by the reference to the Lamanite strong holds to write "in the land of Nephi" since for some time in the past the Lamanites' territory had included the original land of Nephi.

But there is also considerable evidence that Oliver Cowdery sometimes mixed up *Nephi* and *Nephite(s)* in the manuscripts. We have cases where he initially wrote (or started to write) *Nephites* instead of *Nephi:*

Alma 44:24 (line 28, page 280 of 𝓟)
```
    the people of Nephi<%t(-)%>
```

Alma 45:13 (lines 23–24, page 314′ of 𝓞)
```
    th|e|  people {<%Nephites%>|of Nephi}
```

And there are also cases where Oliver mistakenly wrote (or started to write) *Nephi* for *the Nephites:*

Helaman 3:22 (line 22, page 335 of 𝓟)
```
              the      tes
    the people of ^ Nephi^
```

Helaman 7:1 (line 32, page 344 of P)
```
              the
    the people of ^ Ne{ph|pit}es
```

All these examples involve the word *people* rather than *land* (that is, here we have mix-ups between "the people of Nephi" and "the people of the Nephites"), but the difficulty would have been similar with "the land of Nephi" and "the land of the Nephites". In other words, there is indirect scribal evidence to support the proposal that Oliver Cowdery could have accidentally written in Alma 53:6 "the land of Nephi" (the more common expression) instead of "the land of the Nephites". Since "the land of Nephi" in this one instance is quite improbable, the critical text will accept the emendation "the land of the Nephites".

For some alternative explanations of why the original text may have actually read "in the land of Nephi", see page 236 in Daniel H. Ludlow, *A Companion to Your Study of the Book of Mormon*

(Salt Lake City, Utah: Deseret Book, 1976). Basically, these various proposals argue that there must have been some different interpretation or use of the term "the land of Nephi" in Alma 53:6.

Summary: Emend Alma 53:6 to read "in the land of the Nephites" since the city of Mulek was in Nephite territory and had been only temporarily under Lamanite control; all other occurrences of "the land (of) Nephi" refer specifically to the original land settled by Nephi or, more generally, to the traditional Lamanite territory.

■ **Alma 53:6**

and thus he had also [*built* 0ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST | *builded* > *built* 1] *a strong hold*
to retain his prisoners

> Here in the printer's manuscript, Oliver Cowdery initially wrote *builded,* the archaic (and perhaps dialectal) simple past-tense and past-participial form for the verb *build*. Virtually immediately Oliver inserted a *t* after *buil* and crossed out the final *ded* (there is no change in the level of ink flow for this correction). The original manuscript is extant here and reads *built.* Elsewhere the original text has only examples of *built* (69 times). This is the only place where *builded* has intruded into the text, and then only momentarily. Oliver may have been influenced by the language of the King James Bible, which has 51 cases of *builded* (including one of *buildedst*) and 170 of *built.* For other examples of variation in the Book of Mormon text for past-tense and past-participial forms, see under PAST TENSE and PAST PARTICIPLE in volume 3.

Summary: Maintain in Alma 53:6 *built* as the simple past-tense and past-participial form for the verb *build;* there are no instances of the archaic *builded* in the original text of the Book of Mormon.

■ **Alma 53:8**

and now it came to pass that
the armies of the Lamanites **on the west sea south**
while in the absence of Moroni
on account of some intrigue amongst the Nephites
which caused dissensions amongst them
had gained some ground over the Nephites
yea insomuch that they had obtained possession
of a number of their cities in that part of the land

> Ross Geddes (personal communication, 12 September 2004) suggests that there may be some defect in the text with respect to the specification "on the west sea south". He first notes that the text literally states the Lamanites were "**on** the west sea south", yet elsewhere the text uses only prepositions that are literally appropriate for being on the seacoast:

1 Nephi 2:5	in the borders which was **nearer** the Red Sea
1 Nephi 16:14	which was in the borders **near** the Red Sea
Alma 22:27	which was bordering even **to** the sea on the east and on the west
Alma 22:27	which ran from the sea east even **to** the sea west
Alma 22:32	from the east **to** the west sea

Alma 22:33	even from the east **unto** the west sea
Alma 27:22	which is on the east **by** the sea
Alma 50:13	and it was **by** the east sea
Alma 50:34	by the narrow pass which led **by** the sea into the land northward
Alma 50:34	yea **by** the sea on the west and on the east
Alma 52:11	in the borders of the land **by** the west sea
Alma 52:12	on the borders **by** the west sea
Alma 52:13	on the borders **by** the east sea
Alma 53:22	in the borders of the land on the south **by** the west sea
Helaman 3:8	from the sea south **to** the sea north
Helaman 3:8	from the sea west **to** the sea east
Helaman 11:20	from the sea west **to** the sea east
Ether 2:13	even **to** that great sea
Ether 2:13	and as they came **to** the sea

In other words, with *sea* we can have prepositions like *to, by, unto, near,* and *nearer,* but there are no examples that use *on* except in the earliest extant text for Alma 53:8. Of course, we cannot say that *on* is impossible here since such usage does occur in English (as in "he has a cabin on Lake Ladoga").

Referring to examples like Alma 52:12 ("on the borders by the west sea"), Geddes suggests that Alma 53:8 could be emended to read "the armies of the Lamanites on **the borders by** the west sea south". Such an emendation would assume that during the dictation of the text, *the borders by* was accidentally omitted, a reasonable enough possibility. Nonetheless, we should note here that Alma 53:8 also has an unusual noun phrase, "on the west sea south", not the more expansive expression "on the south by the west sea" (the reading in Alma 53:22). This means that Alma 53:8 has two unique characteristics: (1) the nonliteral use of the preposition *on* to refer to the location of the Lamanite armies and (2) the succinct noun phrase *west sea south*. It seems doubtful that we would want to emend this noun phrase as well. In other words, the phraseology in Alma 53:8 is unique in more than one way, which suggests that it would be best to leave the whole original reading unchanged. Not only is it understandable, it is also fully extant in 𝒪.

Summary: Maintain in Alma 53:8 the original reading "the armies of the Lamanites on the west sea south . . . had gained some ground over the Nephites"; this clause, unique in more than one way, is fully extant in 𝒪 and is understandable.

■ **Alma 53:9**

and thus because of iniquity amongst themselves
yea because of [*desensions* 0 | *dissensions* 1ABCDEFGIJLMNOQRT | *dissension* HKPS]
    and intrigue among themselves
they were placed in the most dangerous circumstances

The current RLDS text has the singular *dissension* in Alma 53:9 (first introduced in the 1874 RLDS edition). But the previous verse shows that the plural *dissensions* is a consistent reading for this passage: "on account of some intrigue amongst the Nephites which caused **dissensions** amongst them" (Alma 53:8). Notice also the use of the word *intrigue* in both verses. The 1874 RLDS change

is undoubtedly a typo since the plural *dissensions* in the previous verse was left alone. In verse 9, the conjoining of the singular *intrigue* may have prompted the replacement of the plural *dissensions* with the singular *dissension*.

Summary: Maintain both occurrences of the plural *dissensions* in Alma 53:8–9, the reading of the earliest textual sources, including ○.

■ **Alma 53:10**

but by Ammon and his brethren
—or rather by the power and [*word* 01ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRT | *work* s] *of God—*
they had been converted unto the Lord

As noted under Alma 12:12–14, there are numerous places in the text where *work(s)* and *word(s)* have been mixed up, including here in Alma 53:10. In this instance, the 1953 RLDS edition accidentally replaced *word* with *work*. Elsewhere in the text, we have a number of cases where *word* and *power* are conjoined, but none of *work* and *power:*

1 Nephi 14:1	he shall manifest himself unto them in **word** and also in **power**
Jacob 6:8	and deny the good **word** of Christ and the **power** of God
Alma 17:17	according to the **word** and **power** of God which was given unto him
Ether 5:4	in the which shall be shewn forth the **power** of God and also his **word**

Summary: Maintain the original reading in Alma 53:10, which conjoins *power* and *word;* the 1953 RLDS reading of *work* is a typo; *power* and *word* are typically conjoined in the text, but never *power* and *work*.

■ **Alma 53:12**

and for this cause they were brought down into the land of Zarahemla
and they [*ever* 0ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST | *even > ever* 1] *had been protected by the Nephites*

The original manuscript is extant here for the last letter of *ever,* and that letter appears to be an *r,* not an *n* (thus "and they **ever** had been protected by the Nephites"). In other words, the people of Ammon had continually been protected by the Nephites. And this is the reading found two verses earlier in the text, one that is virtually identical in phraseology:

Alma 53:10
    they had been converted unto the Lord
    and they had been brought down into the land of Zarahemla
    and had **ever** since been protected by the Nephites

In verse 10, the word *ever* is fully extant.

    When Oliver Cowdery copied the text in verse 12 from ○ into ℘, he initially wrote *even* instead of *ever*. This secondary reading ("and they **even** had been protected by the Nephites") is theoretically possible since no one would have expected the Nephites to have protected these Lamanites, their former enemies. In any event, Oliver caught his error in ℘ virtually immediately

and overwrote the *n* with an *r* (there is no change in the level of ink flow). See the general discussion under Mosiah 2:15–16 concerning Oliver's difficulty in distinguishing between *n*'s and *r*'s. For another example where *ever* was almost mixed up with *even,* see under Alma 19:27. Here in Alma 53:12, the critical text will follow the reading in 𝒪, *ever.*

Summary: Maintain in Alma 53:12 the word *ever* ("and they **ever** had been protected by the Nephites"), the apparent reading in 𝒪 and the consistent reading in all the other textual sources.

■ **Alma 53:13**

when they saw the danger and the many afflictions and tribulations
which the Nephites [*did > bore* 1 | *bore* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *for them . . .*

Here 𝒪 is not extant for the verb *bore* (the corrected reading in 𝒫 and the reading of all the printed editions). However, when Oliver Cowdery first attempted to write this word in 𝒫, he wrote the auxiliary verb *did,* as if to write *did bear.* But he never wrote the *bear* in 𝒫; instead, he immediately crossed out the *did* and supralinearly wrote *bore.* This error and its correction in 𝒫 suggest that 𝒪 read as *bare,* not *bore;* a reading like *bore* in 𝒪 would not have led as easily to *did bear* as *bare* would have. In support of this proposed momentary error in 𝒫, there is one very clear example, although not by Oliver Cowdery but by the 1830 compositor, where *bare* was changed to *did bear:*

> 1 Nephi 17:1
> and our women [*bare* 01 | *did bear* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] children
> in the wilderness

Here in Alma 53:13, the critical text will assume that 𝒪 read *bare.* Another possibility is that 𝒪 read *bear,* which could have easily led to an error like *did bear* but less likely to *bore* as a replacement. The past-tense form *bore* has entered the text in two instances, and in each case it came from *bare,* not *bear:*

> 1 Nephi 11:7
> after thou hast beheld the tree
> which [*bare/bore* 0 | *bore* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] the fruit
> of which thy father tasted . . .

> Mosiah 14:12
> and he [*bear* 1IJO | *bare* ABCDEFGHKLMNPQS | *bore* RT] the sins of many

There is only one firm instance of *bore* in the earliest text, in Alma 1:25 ("and they **bore** with patience the persecution"), but this is not extant in 𝒪. As explained under 1 Nephi 11:7, there are numerous instances of *bare* in the earliest text, so the most reasonable reading for the past-tense form for the verb *bear* in 𝒪 (and in the original text) for Alma 53:13 is *bare:* "when they saw the danger and the many afflictions and tribulations which the Nephites **bare** for them".

Summary: Emend Alma 53:13 so that the past-tense form of the verb *bear* is *bare,* the most probable reading in 𝒪 and the one that best explains why Oliver Cowdery initially wrote *did* in 𝒫 and then corrected it to *bore.*

■ **Alma 53:13**

they were moved with compassion and were desirous
to take up arms in [*the* 01ABCDEFGIJLMNOQRT | HKPS] *defense of their country*

Here 𝒪 reads "in **the** defense of their country" (with *defense* spelled as *defence*). The RLDS edi-
tions lack the definite article *the,* reading "in defense of their country" (in accord with expected
English usage). Elsewhere in the text, we have seven occurrences of "in **the** defense of X", but
only one of "in defense of X" (marked below with an asterisk):

	Omni 1:10	in **the** defense of my brethren
*	Alma 51:20	in defense of their country
	Alma 60:29	in **the** defense of your country and your little ones
	Alma 61:6	in **the** defense of their country and their freedom
	Alma 62:5	in **the** defense of their freedom
	Alma 62:9	in **the** defense of their country
	3 Nephi 3:2	in **the** defense of your liberty and your property and your country
	Ether 14:2	in **the** defense of his property and his own life
		and they of his wives and children

For two of these examples, there is evidence for the loss of the *the:*

> Alma 62:5 (loss in the 1874 RLDS edition, restored in 1908 to the RLDS text)
>
> and it came to pass that thousands did flock unto his standard
> and did take up their swords
> in [*the* 1ABCDEFGIJLMNOPQRST | HK] defense of their freedom
> that they might not come into bondage

> Alma 62:9 (initial loss by Oliver Cowdery in 𝒫)
>
> yea those men of Pachus and those kingmen
> whosoever would not take up arms
> in [NULL > *the* 1 | *the* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] defense of their country
> but would fight against it
> were put to death

The last example shows the momentary loss of the *the* when Oliver Cowdery copied the text
from 𝒪 into 𝒫, which therefore implies that the one manuscript example without the *the* (in
Alma 51:20) could be an error, even though that example is extant in 𝒪 and shows no sign of the
the, not even a weakly inserted supralinearly *the.*

Moreover, the phraseology in Alma 51:20 ("in defense of their country") is otherwise identical
to two other cases, in Alma 61:6 and Alma 62:9, and is similar in all other cases. The most consis-
tent solution, then, would be to assume that Alma 51:20 is actually a scribal error and that the text
there should be emended to read "in **the** defense of their country". Nonetheless, "in defense" is
possible in English, so we may simply have a unique occurrence without the *the* in Alma 51:20.
For that one case, the critical text will therefore retain "in defense of their country", the reading
of all the textual sources (including 𝒪).

In today's English we expect "in defense of X" rather than the now archaic "in **the** defense of X".
Evidence for the latter can be found throughout the history of the English language, from late Middle

English on, as in the following examples gleaned from *Literature Online* <lion.chadwyck.com>
(given here with original spellings and capitalization):

Geoffrey Chaucer (about 1385)	In the defence of hir and of hir right
Thomas Deloney (1588)	in the defence of his gospel
	and our good Queene of England
James Chamberlaine (1680)	In the Defence of his beloved Lord
George Cockings (1772)	in the defence of their country
Robert Montgomery Bird (1835)	in the defence of Guzman

Summary: Follow the reading of the earliest textual sources concerning the question of whether *the*
should occur in the phrase "in (the) defense of X"; in eight cases, we have the *the,* but in Alma 51:20
the *the* appears to be lacking; this lack of *the* may nonetheless be an early error that entered the text
since there is textual evidence for the tendency to omit the *the* from that phrase (momentarily in 𝓟
for Alma 62:9 and twice in the 1874 RLDS edition for Alma 53:13 and Alma 62:5).

■ **Alma 53:18**

now behold there were two thousand
of [*those* 01ABCDEFGIJLMNOPQRST | *these* HK] *young men*
which entered into this covenant
and took their weapons of war to defend their country

Here the 1874 RLDS edition replaced *those* with *these,* a common error in the history of the Book
of Mormon text. (For examples of where the 1830 typesetter mixed up these two demonstratives,
see under Mosiah 28:1; for examples where Oliver Cowdery made this mistake in the manu-
scripts, see under Alma 3:25.) The 1908 RLDS edition restored the correct *those* here in Alma
53:18. For each case of *these* versus *those,* we follow the reading of the earliest textual sources, thus
those here in Alma 53:18.

Summary: Maintain in Alma 53:18 the occurrence of *those* in "those young men which entered into
this covenant", the reading of all the earliest textual sources (including 𝓞).

■ **Alma 53:19**

they became now at this [*period* 0ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST | *time* >+ *period* 1] *of time*
also a great support

𝓞 is extant here and reads "at this period of time". But when Oliver Cowdery copied the text
from 𝓞 into 𝓟, he seems to have initially written "at this time of time", an obvious error. Later,
probably when he proofed 𝓟 against 𝓞, he caught his error, crossed out the first *time,* and supra-
linearly wrote *period.* The ink level for *period* is somewhat heavier, but the entire inline phrase
"at this time of time" shows no change in the level of ink flow.

Elsewhere the text strongly prefers the shorter phrase "at this time". There are 34 instances of
this phrase, including two in Alma 53 that shortly precede the one here in verse 19:

| Alma 53:15 | in their dangerous circumstances **at this time** |
| Alma 53:16 | they did assemble themselves together **at this time** |

It was perhaps these two nearby instances of "at this time" that influenced Oliver Cowdery to miswrite "at this time of time" in 𝓟.

There is independent evidence for the phraseology "at this period of time", with three examples elsewhere in the text:

Mosiah 2:28	**at this period of time** when I am about to go down to my grave
Alma 58:5	and thus were our circumstances **at this period of time**
Alma 58:31	all of them are **at this period of time** in our possession

For each case of "at this (period of) time", the critical text will follow the earliest textual sources. Here in Alma 53:19, 𝒪 is extant and reads "at this period of time".

Summary: Maintain the relatively infrequent phrase "at this period of time", found in Alma 53:19 and three other places in the text; normally the text uses the shorter "at this time".

■ **Alma 53:22**

and now it came to pass that
Helaman did march at the head of his two thousand
[*striplings >% stripling* 0 | *stripling* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *soldiers*

Here in the original manuscript, Oliver Cowdery originally wrote *striplings*. He seems to have expected *stripling* as a noun rather than as an adjective (replacing, but only momentarily, *stripling soldiers* with *striplings*). But Oliver immediately caught his error in 𝒪 and erased the plural *s* at the end of *striplings*. The only other example of *stripling* in the Book of Mormon text also occurs as an adjective: "and the remainder I took and joined them to my stripling Ammonites" (Alma 56:57). According to the Oxford English Dictionary, the word *stripling* appears to derive from the meaning 'one who is slender as a strip' (that is, 'one whose figure is not yet filled out'). Under definition 1 for *stripling,* the OED describes the noun as a youth who is "just passing from boyhood to manhood" and provides citations from the late 1300s into the 1800s. The word *stripling* occurs once (as a noun) in the King James Bible, namely, when king Saul wants to find out who this young man is that has challenged Goliath: "inquire thou whose son the stripling *is*" (1 Samuel 17:56). The use of *stripling* as a modifier, originally nominal but now having become adjectival, is described under definition 2 in the OED, with citations from the 1500s into the 1800s (such as the citation from Alexander Pope in 1725 of "gay stripling youths"). Today the vast majority of speakers are totally unfamiliar with the word *stripling* and can only guess at its meaning in the Book of Mormon.

Summary: Maintain in Alma 53:22 and Alma 56:57 the two instances of *stripling* as a noun modifier.

■ **Alma 53:23**

and thus ended the twenty and eighth year
of the reign of the judges over the people of Nephi
[*.&c.* 1 | *&c.* ABCDEFGHIKLMNOQ | *etc.* JPS | RT]

Here the end of Alma 53 (the end of chapter XXIV in the original chapter system) has an instance of *etc.* that appears to be completely gratuitous. Note that the *etc.* comes right after "and thus ended the twenty and eighth year of the reign of the judges over the people of Nephi". One wonders what else could have happened in that year after the year had ended! It is not surprising then that this example of *etc.* was removed from the LDS text by the editors for the 1920 edition. That edition removed quite a few cases of *etc.*, although in other cases we usually find that the *etc.* can be identified with specific information. See, for instance, the discussion regarding the original *etc.* in Mosiah 8:8, Alma 3:17, and Alma 43:8.

One way to look at this unexpected instance of *etc.* here at the end of Alma 53 is to realize that there would have been many other things written in the original record, the large plates of Nephi, that Mormon chose not to record in his abridgment of the Nephite history. A similar example of using *etc.* to stand for general indeterminate information is found at the end of Alma 49 (at the end of chapter XXI in the original chapter system); in fact, it occurs twice in the summarizing last verse:

> Alma 49:30 (both instances of *etc.* are omitted in the 1920 LDS edition)
> yea and there was continual peace among them
> and exceeding great prosperity in the church
> because of their heed and diligence which they gave unto the word of God
> which was declared unto them by Helaman and Shiblon and Corianton
> and Ammon and his brethren
> (1) [*.&C* 0 | *.&c.* >jg *.&c.* 1 | *&c.* ABCDEFGHIKLMNOQ | *etc.* JPS | RT]
> yea and by all those which had been ordained by the holy order of God
> being baptized unto repentance and sent forth to preach among the people
> (2) [*&C* 0 | *&c* 1 | *&c.* ABCDEFGHIKLMNOQ | *etc.* JPS | RT]

For further discussion, see under that passage.

The use of *etc.* to stand for general abridgment of the text can also be found at the very end or near the end of the prefaces that typically precede the beginning of books in the Book of Mormon:

> 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
> the Lord warns Lehi to depart out of the land of Jerusalem . . .
> they cross the large waters into the promised land
> [*&C.* 1 | *&c.* ABCDEFGHIKLMNOPQRS | *etc.* J | *and so forth*   T]
> this is according to the account of Nephi
> or in other words I Nephi wrote this record

2 Nephi preface (the first instance of *etc.* was omitted in the 1837 edition)

> An account of the death of Lehi
> Nephi's brethren rebelleth against him
> the Lord warns Nephi to depart into the wilderness

(1) [*&C* 0 | .*&C.* >js NULL 1 | *&c.* A | BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]

> his journeyings in the wilderness

(2) [*&C* 0 | .*&C.* 1 | *&c.* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRS | *and so forth* T]

Helaman preface (the *etc.* was omitted in the 1981 LDS edition)

> An account of the Nephites their wars and contentions and their dissensions . . .
> according to the record of Helaman . . .
> and also according to the records of his sons . . .
> according to the record of Helaman and his sons
> even down to the coming of Christ
> which is called the book of Helaman
> [*&C.* > *&Cet.* 0 | *&C* 1 | *&c.* ABCDEFGHIKLMNOQR | *etc.* JPS | T]

In the prefaces, the *etc.* indicates that there is more in the actual account that follows. On the other hand, an *etc.* at the end of an original chapter in the account proper can indicate that there is more information in the original unabridged account. The critical text will therefore restore the *etc.* here at the end of Alma 53 since it is intended and can be explained as an indicator of abridgment.

Summary: Restore the *etc.* in Alma 53:23 since it is intentional and appears to refer to additional information in the original record that Mormon chose not to cover in his abridged record.

Alma 54

■ **Alma 54:1**

And now it came to pass
in [*the commencement of* 0T | 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRS] *the twenty and ninth year*
[NULL >+? *of the Reign* 0 | 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
[NULL >+ *of the Judges* 0 | *of the Judges* 1AEFHIJKLMNOPQS | *of the judges* BCDGRT]
that Ammoron sent unto Moroni desiring that he would exchange prisoners

During the early transmission of the text, there were several significant omissions here in Alma 54:1 for the expression "in the commencement of the twenty and ninth year of the reign of the judges". In fact, we have no extant manuscript evidence that this expression ever had the phrase "of the reign". The extant portion of the original manuscript shows that the phrase "of the judges" was initially omitted and then supralinearly inserted at the beginning of a line. It is possible that an original "of the reign" was also initially omitted and supralinearly inserted at the end of the previous line in 𝓞, which is no longer extant. This possibility is represented as follows in the transcript for 𝓞:

> Alma 54:1 (lines 4−5, page 339′ of 𝓞)
>
> ```
>                                                (                                      )
>                                                              OF THE REIGN
>     And now it came to pass in the comme(                                   )
>                                                NCEMENT OF THE TWENTY & NINTH YEAR ^
>
>   of the Judges
>               oron
>     ^ that Am<a^moron> sent unto Moroni (d                                 )
>                                             ESIREING THAT HE WOULD EXCHANGE PRIS
> ```

In line 5, Oliver Cowdery, the scribe in 𝓞, miswrote *Ammoron* as *Amamoron*, which he later corrected to *Amoron* (although Oliver undoubtedly intended to correct the name to *Ammoron*). This correction in the name is written with heavier ink flow. Oliver also omitted "of the judges" in 𝓞; this phrase is supralinearly inserted in line 5 and with heavier ink flow, just like the name correction. But this phrase is written even higher up in the interlinear space than the name correction. Moreover, the supralinear phrase begins in the gutter. It appears Oliver corrected the name prior to supralinearly inserting the phrase "of the judges".

The problem here is that we cannot be sure whether the preceding phrase, "of the reign", was ever in 𝓞. There is no room for it in the lacuna at the end of line 4, as noted in the transcript. If "of the reign" was in 𝓞, it would have been supralinearly inserted at the end of the line. Of course, it is also possible that the phrase was in the original text but was omitted by Oliver Cowdery when he took down Joseph Smith's dictation and was somehow left missing when Oliver supralinearly

inserted "of the judges". One would think that if "of the reign" had been supralinearly inserted in 𝒪 (especially with heavier ink flow), it would have been copied into 𝒫.

When we examine 𝒫, the copy of 𝒪, we discover that the phrase "of the reign" is missing there (along with the initial phrase "the commencement of"):

Alma 54:1–2 (lines 20–21, page 305 of 𝒫)

```
                                                        year
        And now it came to pass in the twenty & ninth <y^ear> of the Judges that Am-
    -moron sent unto Moroni desireing that he would exchange prisoners & it came
```

In accord with the reading in 𝒪, the 1981 LDS edition restored the original phrase "the commencement of" to this passage. (For further discussion of cases where "the commencement of" has been omitted from the text, if only momentarily, see under Alma 30:5.) On the other hand, all the printed editions follow 𝒫 in lacking the phrase "of the reign" here in Alma 54:1. This phrase is definitely expected in expressions of the form "Xth year of the reign of the judges". In the earliest extant sources for the text, there are 96 instances of "Xth year of the reign of the judges". Besides the example here in Alma 54:1, there is only one other instance of "Xth year of the judges", in Alma 16:9: "and thus ended the eleventh year of the judges". 𝒪 is not extant for Alma 16, so it is possible that 𝒪 had the phrase "of the reign" and that it was lost when Oliver Cowdery copied the text from 𝒪 into 𝒫 (or perhaps it was omitted in 𝒪 itself). There is definitely evidence that "of the reign" can be lost from the text, although we have no confirmed cases where Oliver himself made such a mistake:

> Alma 4:20 (error by scribe 2 of 𝒫, corrected by Oliver Cowdery
>   when proofing 𝒫 against 𝒪)
>   and thus in the 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

> Alma 17:6 (error by the typesetter for the 1849 LDS edition)
>   now these were their journeyings :
>   having taken leave of their father Mosiah
>   in the first year [*of the reign* 1ABCDGHKPS | EFIJLMNOQRT] of the judges

Although the reading in Alma 16:9 without "of the reign" may be an error, the critical text will maintain it since such a reading is possible. Similarly, here in Alma 54:1, the earliest extant reading without "of the reign" will also be maintained, even though the longer reading with the phrase may actually be the original reading. Basically, we will follow the earliest textual sources in determining whether the expression "Xth year of the reign of the judges" should actually have the phrase "of the reign".

Summary: Maintain in Alma 54:1 the reading based on the extant portions of 𝒪, "in the commencement of the twenty and ninth year of the judges", although the phrase "of the reign" may have been in the original text; the reading without "of the reign" is supported by the reading in Alma 16:9 ("and thus ended the eleventh year of the judges"), although this too may be an error.

■ **Alma 54:2**

for he desired the provisions
which [*was imparted* 1A | *were imparted* BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRT | *were impart* S]
   for the support of the Lamanite prisoners
for the support of his own people

The 1953 RLDS edition has a typo here, namely, *impart* for the correct past-participial form *imparted*. The original manuscript is not extant for the final *ed* of *imparted,* but undoubtedly the *-ed* ending was originally there. (The grammatical change of *was* to *were* is typical of Joseph Smith's editing for the 1837 edition. See the discussion under SUBJECT-VERB AGREEMENT in volume 3.)

Summary: Maintain the correct past-participial form *imparted* in Alma 54:2.

■ **Alma 54:3**

now the Lamanites had taken many women and children
and there was not a woman nor a child among all the prisoners
of [*the Nephites > NULL* 1 | ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *Moroni*
or the prisoners which Moroni had taken

Here in the printer's manuscript, Oliver Cowdery initially wrote "among all the prisoners of **the Nephites**", a reading that will work. Oliver immediately corrected the text here by crossing out *the Nephites* and then writing inline the correct *Moroni.* The original manuscript is not extant here, but spacing between extant fragments allows room for only the shorter *Moroni.* Mormon himself was dissatisfied with what he wrote here since he added a clarifying *or*-phrase to the text: "among all the prisoners of Moroni **or** the prisoners which Moroni had taken". The occurrence of *Moroni* in the *or*-phrase supports the preceding occurrence of *Moroni* in "among all the prisoners of Moroni".

The corrective *or* is a very prominent characteristic of the original text of the Book of Mormon; for discussion and examples, see under Alma 22:22−23. The correction in 𝓟 suggests that in theory there could have been a corrective *or* for the phrase "among all the prisoners of Moroni", namely, "among all the prisoners of the Nephites **or** of Moroni". Yet when Oliver Cowdery made his correction here in 𝓟, he did not resort to such a device to deal with his own scribal error of *the Nephites.* Elsewhere there is an actual instance in the text where Mormon did correct *the Nephites* to *Moroni* by means of such an *or:* "and the armies of the Nephites or of Moroni returned" (Alma 44:23).

Summary: Maintain in Alma 54:3 the phrase "among all the prisoners of **Moroni**", the immediately corrected reading in 𝓟 and the presumed reading in 𝓞.

■ **Alma 54:6**

behold I would tell you [*something* 01ABCDGHKPS | *somewhat* EFIJLMNOQRT]
concerning the justice of God

The 1849 LDS edition replaced *something* with *somewhat,* probably by accident; this secondary reading has continued in the LDS text. In the previous verse, there is an instance of *somewhat,* which seems to have prompted the change in verse 6:

Alma 54:5

> behold Ammoron I have wrote unto you **somewhat**
> concerning this war which ye have waged against my people

Also notice that in both verses the word *somewhat*/*something* is followed by *concerning*.

Elsewhere in the text, there is one other occurrence of "tell somewhat", but none of "tell something":

Alma 56:2

> behold my beloved brother I have **somewhat** to **tell** you
> concerning our warfare in this part of the land

Nonetheless, one can "tell a thing", as in Helaman 14:9: "thus hath the Lord commanded me by his angel that I should come and tell **this thing** unto you". Moreover, one can "tell things" (28 times in the text), for instance, nearby in Alma 54:7: "yea I would **tell** you **these things** if ye were capable of hearkening unto them". The use of *things* in verse 7 is directly connected with the use of *something* here in verse 6: "behold I would tell you **something** concerning the justice of God".

So there is really nothing inappropriate about something being told in Alma 54:6. In fact, the use of *something* implies that Moroni has a specific piece of information to convey to Ammoron. On the other hand, *somewhat* implies an impreciseness that is inappropriate for this letter of Moroni's. But in Alma 56:2 (cited above), Helaman uses *somewhat* because he doesn't intend to tell Moroni everything that has been going on in the war being waged in that other part of the land.

Summary: Restore the original *something* in Alma 54:6: "I would tell you **something** concerning the justice of God"; the secondary *somewhat* is actually inappropriate here.

■ **Alma 54:6**

except ye repent and withdraw your armies into your own **lands**
[NULL >− *or the lands* 0 | *or the lands* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQS | *or the land* RT]
  of your possessions
which is the **land** *of Nephi*

Here the 1920 LDS edition replaced the plural *lands* in the corrective *or*-phrase with the singular *land,* undoubtedly because the following relative clause takes the singular *land* ("which is the **land** of Nephi"). This change was intended since it was marked in the 1920 committee copy. Note, however, that in the preceding phrase we have the plural use of *lands* ("into your own lands"). The corrective *or* in this passage allows Moroni to restate what he means by "your own lands"—namely, "the lands of your possessions" (the Lamanites' traditional territory, the land of Nephi). In this way Moroni makes sure to exclude the Nephite lands that the Lamanites had seized during this war. When Oliver Cowdery initially wrote down the text in ℗, he accidentally omitted "or the lands". Later, probably when he read the text back to Joseph Smith, he supralinearly supplied this phrase (the correction is written with weaker ink flow). The critical text will therefore restore the original plural *lands* in the corrective *or*-phrase, "or the **lands** of your possessions". For further discussion of the phrase "land(s) of one's possession(s)", see under 2 Nephi 29:14. For a similar instance where *lands* was replaced by *land* in the 1920 LDS edition, see nearby under Alma 54:13.

In this part of the text, these various Lamanite lands are generally referred to as "the land of Nephi" (see the discussion regarding the phrase "the land of Nephi" under Alma 22:28). Overall, there are 56 instances in the original text of the singular "the **land** (of) Nephi", but none of the plural "the **lands** (of) Nephi".

Summary: Restore in Alma 54:6 the original plural *lands* in "or the lands of your possessions"; in this passage, the phrase "the land of Nephi" refers in a general way to all the individual Lamanite lands.

■ **Alma 54:8**

but as ye have [*once* 01PST | ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOQR] *rejected these things*
and have fought against the people of the Lord
even so I may expect you will do it again

Here the 1830 typesetter omitted the word *once*. It was restored to the text by reference to the manuscripts, 𝔓 for the 1908 RLDS edition and probably both 𝔒 and 𝔓 for the 1981 LDS edition. In this passage the word *once* seems to mean 'formerly' or 'in the past'. The text is not emphasizing a specific moment or instance of rejection (where *once* would mean 'one time only'). Note, for instance, the similar language in the King James Bible in reference to Paul's conversion: "he which persecuted us in times past now preacheth the faith which **once** he destroyed" (Galatians 1:23). There are similar uses in the Book of Mormon text of *once* with the meaning 'formerly', as in the following sampling:

Alma 15:16	those which were **once** his friends
Alma 48:24	those who was **once** their brethren
Helaman 5:35	a Nephite by birth who had **once** belonged to the church of God
Mormon 5:17	they were **once** a delightsome people

The unexpectedness of *once* in Alma 54:8 may have led the 1830 typesetter to omit the word, although probably unintentionally.

Summary: Maintain the original occurrence of *once* in Alma 54:8; the word here has the meaning 'formerly' rather than the more etymological meaning 'one time only'.

■ **Alma 54:9**

(1) *yea and except* [*you* 01ABCDEFIJLMNOQRT | *ye* GHKPS] *withdraw your purposes*
(2) *behold* [*ye* 0ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST | *you* > *ye* 1] *will pull down the wrath*
(3) *of that God whom* [*ye* > *you* 0 | *you* > *ye* > *you* 1 | *you* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *have rejected*
(4) *upon* [NULL >– *you* 0 | *you* > *ye* > *you* 1 | *you* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
    [*yea* 0 | 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *even to your utter destruction*

In this passage there are four places where the textual history has varied between *you* and *ye*. As noted under Mosiah 4:14, the second person plural subject pronoun can be either *ye* or *you* in the Book of Mormon text (also see the complete discussion under YE in volume 3). For each instance of *ye/you,* the critical text will follow the reading of the earliest textual sources. Thus here in Alma 54:9, we follow the reading, sometimes corrected, in 𝔒:

Alma 54:9 (original text)
>>   yea and except **you** withdraw your purposes
>>   behold **ye** will pull down the wrath of that God
>>   whom **you** have rejected
>>   upon **you**

In the original manuscript for this passage, the phrase "upon you" is followed by a *yea*-clause: "yea even to your utter destruction". When Oliver Cowdery initially took down Joseph Smith's dictation here, he wrote "upon **yea**". In other words, he accidentally omitted the *you*. Later he supplied the *you* supralinearly (the correcting *you* was written with weaker ink flow). The first two letters of *you* are difficult to read in 𝓞, but the final *u* is clear. When Oliver copied this part of the text into 𝓟, he accidentally omitted the *yea*. Another example in Oliver's copywork where he omitted in 𝓟 the *yea* after *you* can be found in Alma 42:31; in that case, like here in Alma 54:9, Oliver initially omitted the *you* in 𝓞 and then supplied it supralinearly (see the discussion under Alma 42:31). The critical text will restore the original *yea* here in Alma 54:9.

The *yea* in Alma 54:9 is supported by other instances in the text of *yea* followed by *even to* (where *to* is a preposition):

Alma 13:22	yea even to them that are scattered abroad upon the face of the earth
Alma 55:17	yea even to their women and all those of their children . . .
Alma 56:37	yea even to a considerable distance
Helaman 3:35	yea even to the purifying and the sanctification of their hearts
Mormon 2:29	yea even to the narrow passage which led into the land southward

For one instance where the *to* was removed from "yea even to", see under 1 Nephi 18:9.

Summary: In accord with the reading of the original manuscript, restore *yea* in Alma 54:9 ("yea even to your utter destruction"); also maintain in this passage the appropriate *you* versus *ye* forms, based on the reading of the earliest textual sources.

■ **Alma 54:10**

but as the Lord [*lives > liveeth* 0 | *liveth* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] . . .

Here in the original manuscript, Oliver Cowdery initially wrote "as the Lord **lives**". Oliver immediately corrected *lives* by overwriting the *s* with an *e*, then writing *th* inline, giving *liveeth*. He copied this correctly into 𝓟 as *liveth*. The Book of Mormon text has only the form *liveth* in *as*-clauses:

"as the Lord liveth"	17 times
"as the Lord God liveth"	2 times
"as Christ liveth"	1 time

Similar *as*-clauses are common in the King James Bible:

"as the LORD liveth"	27 times
"as the LORD God of Israel liveth"	2 times
"as the LORD of Hosts liveth"	2 times
"as the LORD thy God liveth"	2 times
"as God liveth"	2 times

But there are no instances of the verb form *lives* for these expressions in either the Book of Mormon or the King James Bible. For further discussion regarding the competition in the Book of Mormon text between the inflectional endings *-(e)th* and *-(e)s*, see under INFLECTIONAL ENDINGS in volume 3.

Summary: Maintain in Alma 54:10 the immediately corrected reading in 𝓞, "as the Lord **liveth**", the consistent reading elsewhere in the Book of Mormon for this familiar biblically styled oath.

■ **Alma 54:10**

but as the Lord liveth our armies shall come upon you except ye withdraw
and ye shall soon be visited with death
for we will [*retain* 0ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST | *retake > retain* 1] *our cities and our lands*
yea we will maintain our religion and the cause of our God

Sometimes in the original text of the Book of Mormon the word *retain* means 'take back'. As a consequence, some instances have been edited to *regain,* but not here in Alma 54:10. Moroni is determined to take back the cities and lands that the Nephites have lost to Ammoron and his armies. Note Moroni's statement to Ammoron in verse 7 that he, Ammoron, is going to hell "except ye repent and withdraw your murderous purposes and return with your armies to your own lands". For Moroni, the crucial goal is to regain the lost Nephite territory. So in lieu of a peaceful Lamanite retreat, Moroni is planning to attack Ammoron: "our armies shall come upon you except ye withdraw" (verse 10). As indicated by the conjunction *for* at the beginning of the following clause ("**for** we will retain our cities and our lands"), the purpose of Moroni's military campaign is to take back the cities and lands that they, the Nephites, have lost. But since this instance of the verb *retain* can also be interpreted as 'maintain', it has never been emended. In fact, this alternative interpretation is supported by the following *yea*-clause, which actually uses the verb *maintain,* although in reference to a different sort of maintaining: "yea we will maintain our religion and the cause of our God". Of course, that *yea*-clause simply makes it all that more difficult to realize that the preceding *retain* means 'take back'. Yet when Oliver Cowdery copied the text here into 𝓟, he initially wrote *retain* as *retake,* which means that he correctly interpreted *retain* as meaning 'take back'. Virtually immediately Oliver crossed out *retake* and supralinearly inserted *retain,* the reading in 𝓞 (there is no change in the level of ink flow for the correction in 𝓟). The critical text will maintain the use of *retain* here in Alma 54:10, but with the understanding that it means 'take back'; the preceding language in Moroni's epistle to Ammoron argues against the meaning 'maintain' for *retain,* although that meaning is not impossible.

There are seven places in the LDS text where original *retain* has been replaced with *regain.* For the list as well as discussion, see under Alma 58:3. Also see the more general discussion under Alma 44:11 regarding the various meanings of the word *retain* in the Book of Mormon. It is worth noting here that there is one other instance of *retain* that may mean 'take back' (but which has never been edited to *regain*):

Alma 58:10

> therefore we did pour out our souls in prayer to God
> that he would strengthen us and deliver us out of the hands of our enemies
> yea and also give us strength that we might **retain** our cities and our lands
> and our possessions for the support of our people

But in this instance, *retain* could well mean 'maintain', especially given the language two verses later in Helaman's letter to Moroni:

Alma 58:12

> and we did take courage with our small force which we had received
> and were fixed with a determination to conquer our enemies
> and to **maintain** our lands and our possessions
> and our wives and our children and the cause of our liberty

Ultimately, of course, the critical text itself does not need to decide the meaning for *retain* in any of these cases, edited or unedited. The original *retain* will be maintained in each case.

Summary: Maintain the two instances of *retain* in Alma 54:10 and Alma 58:10 (that is, "retain our cities and our lands"); in the first case, based on the context, the meaning is 'take back', although 'maintain' is not impossible; in the second case, either 'take back' or 'maintain' is possible.

■ **Alma 54:12**

and I will follow you
even [*unto* > *into* ı | *into* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *your own land*

Here in the printer's manuscript, Oliver Cowdery initially wrote *unto* (thus "**unto** your own land"); then virtually immediately he overwrote the *u* with *i*, giving "**into** your own land" (there is no change in the level of ink flow for the correction). 𝓞 is not extant for the preposition, but it probably read *into* (given the virtual immediacy of the correction in 𝓟). Moreover, other instances of the verb *follow* have *into,* not *unto,* for the following prepositional phrase:

Alma 28:1   behold the armies of the Lamanites had followed their brethren
             into the wilderness
Alma 58:19   therefore they did follow us **into** the wilderness

Of course, these two instances refer to following someone "into the wilderness" rather than "into a land". Nonetheless, these examples are consistent with the corrected reading in 𝓟 for Alma 54:12. The critical text will retain the preposition *into* in this passage.

There are many instances in the manuscripts where Oliver Cowdery accidentally wrote *unto* instead of the correct *into;* for a list, see under 2 Nephi 8:23. So the momentary error here in 𝓟 for Alma 54:12 is not surprising.

Summary: Accept in Alma 54:12 the corrected reading of the printer's manuscript: "and I will follow you even **into** your own land".

■ **Alma 54:12**

yea *and it shall be blood for blood*
[NULL > *yea* 0 | *yea* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *life for life*

Here we have two instances of *yea* in close proximity. Oliver Cowdery initially omitted the second *yea* in 𝒪, but he caught his error and supralinearly inserted the *yea* (giving "yea life for life"). There is no change in the level of ink flow, so the correction seems to have been virtually immediate. The text has other instances of *yea* in close proximity for which Oliver momentarily omitted the second *yea*, as in the following example where he made the error when he copied the text from 𝒪 into 𝒫:

> Alma 56:56
> **yea** and they had fought as if with the strength of God
> [*yea* 0ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST | NULL > *yea* 1]
> never was men known to have fought with such miraculous strength

The critical text will retain the repeated *yea* in Alma 54:12.

Summary: Retain in Alma 54:12 the corrected reading in 𝒪, "**yea** life for life".

■ **Alma 54:13**

ye have sought to murder us
and we have only sought to defend [*our lives* 0 | *ourselves* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]

The original manuscript is not completely clear here, but it does seem to read "our lives". In the ultraviolet photographs of 𝒪, there is some noise between the *r* and the *l,* so one could suppose that *se* had been originally written between these two letters. Nonetheless, the *i* between the *l* and the *v* seems very clear; in fact, the *i* looks like it was inserted. One possibility is that Oliver Cowdery originally wrote *ourselves,* erased the *se* and inserted the *i,* but this seems an unusual way for him to have corrected a word (by erasing letters in the middle of the word).

This reading ("defend our lives") would be a unique one in the Book of Mormon text. Otherwise, we get only "defend one's self" (ten with *themselves,* two with *ourselves,* and one with *himself*). Given the prevalence of "defend themselves" and "defend ourselves", it is not surprising that Oliver Cowdery, when he copied the text here from 𝒪 into 𝒫, wrote "defend ourselves".

Despite its uniqueness, the reading of the original manuscript here in Alma 54:13 seems appropriate, especially given the semantic contrast between Ammoron's attempt to "murder us" and the Nephites' attempt to "defend our lives".

Summary: Restore in Alma 54:13 "defend our lives", the apparent reading of the original manuscript.

■ **Alma 54:13**

yea and we will seek our [*lands* 0 | *land* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
[*the lands* 01APS | BCDEFGHIJKLMNOQ | *the land* RT] *of our first inheritance*

The original manuscript is extant here for the two instances of the plural *lands:* a direct object "our lands" followed by an appositive noun phrase, "the **lands** of our first inheritance". When Oliver Cowdery copied the text from 𝒪 into 𝒫, he changed the first *lands* to *land,* giving "our **land** / the **lands** of our first inheritance". In the 1837 edition, the first part of the appositive noun phrase was omitted, giving "our land of our first inheritance", a rather awkward expression. The deletion of *the lands* was probably accidental (especially since Joseph Smith didn't mark it in 𝒫). The 1908 RLDS edition restored the reading of 𝒫 and the 1830 edition ("our **land** / the **lands** of our first inheritance"). The 1920 LDS edition made a similar restoration except that the plural *lands* in the appositive was replaced by the singular *land,* so as to make the two nouns agree in number, thus "our **land** / the **land** of our first inheritance". (The editors for the 1920 edition made a similar emendation nearby in Alma 54:6, changing "or the **lands** of your possessions" to "or the **land** of your possessions".) Here in Alma 54:13, the critical text will, of course, restore the original text, with the two nouns agreeing in the plural: "our **lands** / the **lands** of our first inheritance".

The plural phrase "**lands** of one's inheritance" occurs fairly often in the text, usually in reference to the house of Israel or to the Jews (see the discussion under 2 Nephi 9:2 for examples). There are also examples of this plural phrase referring to the Nephite lands in general (in the Words of Mormon 1:14 and in Mormon 2:27–28). We also find examples of the related phrase "lands **for** one's inheritance" in reference to the Zoramite converts (in Alma 35:9, 14) and to the people of Ammon (in Alma 43:12). Thus the original plural *lands* in Alma 54:13 is perfectly acceptable.

Summary: Restore the plural *lands* both times in Alma 54:13, the reading in the original manuscript ("we will seek our **lands** / the **lands** of our first inheritance").

■ **Alma 54:15**

now it came to pass that Ammoron
when he had received this epistle
[*he* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQS | RT] *was angry*

The earliest extant text for Alma 54:15 (namely, the printer's manuscript) has a pronominal repetition of the subject *Ammoron* (namely, "Ammoron . . . he was angry"). The original manuscript is not extant here; spacing between extant fragments is sufficiently long that it is difficult to determine whether the redundant pronoun *he* was in 𝒪 or not. But the *he* is definitely in 𝒫.

The editors for the 1920 LDS edition removed the redundant *he* since its use here in written English is nonstandard. But the original text had numerous examples of such redundant usage, some of which have been edited out of the text. For some discussion and examples, see under Mosiah 8:7 and Alma 43:36. For a general discussion, see under SUBJECT REPETITION in volume 3. The critical text will restore all instances of this kind of redundancy, as here in Alma 54:15.

Summary: Restore in Alma 54:15 the redundant subject pronoun *he,* the reading of the earliest extant sources (in this case, 𝒫).

■ **Alma 54:17**

for behold your fathers did wrong their brethren
insomuch that they did rob them of their right to the government
when it [*rightfully* 0 | *rightly* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *belonged*
[*unto* 01ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRT | *to* S] *them*

The original manuscript reads "rightfully belonged unto them". Oliver Cowdery accidentally replaced *rightfully* with *rightly* when he copied the text from 𝒪 into 𝒫. This change is in agreement with two instances of "rightly belong" in the original text (one of which occurs in the very next verse after Alma 54:17):

> Mosiah 29:6
>> now I declare unto you that he to whom the kingdom doth **rightly** belong
>> hath declined and will not take upon him the kingdom

> Alma 54:18
>> and now behold if ye will lay down your arms and subject yourselves
>> to be governed by those to whom the government doth **rightly** belong
>> then will I cause that my people shall lay down their weapons

Here in Alma 54:17, the original text has a unique reading that has been eliminated from the subsequent text—although, to be fair, there are only two opposing instances of "rightly belong". In fact, these three cases are the only instances of the words *rightly* and *rightfully* in the entire Book of Mormon text. Since *rightfully* is clearly the reading in 𝒪 and it does work, the critical text will restore it.

There is one additional textual variant here in Alma 54:17, namely, the replacement of the preposition *unto* with *to* in the 1953 RLDS edition, thus changing "belonged **unto** them" to "belonged **to** them". In fact, the two instances of "doth rightly belong" (listed above) have the preposition *to* rather than *unto:* "**to** whom the kingdom doth rightly belong" (in Mosiah 29:6) and "**to** whom the government doth rightly belong" (in Alma 54:18). But more generally, the Book of Mormon text allows variation between the prepositions *unto* and *to*. See, for instance, the discussion regarding the phrase "to give heed (un)to X" in Alma 21:23. The critical text will retain the original preposition *unto* here in Alma 54:17.

Summary: Restore in Alma 54:17 the adverb *rightfully,* the reading in 𝒪 ("when it **rightfully** belonged unto them"); also maintain the original preposition *unto* in this clause.

■ **Alma 54:22**

but behold these things [*matter* 0RT | *mattereth* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQS] *not*

Here the original manuscript reads "these things **matter** not". When Oliver Cowdery copied the text from 𝒪 into 𝒫, he replaced *matter* with *mattereth*. In the original text, there are many instances where plural nouns took verbs ending in the historically present-tense singular ending *-(e)th.* For this possibility, see the discussion regarding the expression "Nephi's brethren **rebelleth** against him" in the 1 Nephi preface (discussed in part 1 of volume 4). Here in Alma 54:22, however, the original text has the standard null ending for the verb *matter.* Interestingly, the 1920 LDS edition restored

the original *matter,* not by reference to Ⓞ but in accord with the standard rules of subject-verb agreement. For further discussion of the phrase "mattereth not", see under Mosiah 13:9.

Summary: Maintain in Alma 54:22 the verb form *matter* ("these things matter not"), the reading of the original manuscript.

■ **Alma 54:24**

▫ *& behold* **I am now** *a bold Lamanite*   0
▫ *& behold* **now I am** *a bold Lamanite*   1
▫ *And behold,* **now,** **I am** *a bold Lamanite*   ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQS
▫ *And behold* **now,** **I am** *a bold Lamanite*   RT

Ammoron was originally a Nephite dissenter who (along with his brother Amalickiah and other Nephites) had joined the Lamanites. Thus Ammoron's statement in Ⓞ, "and behold **I am now** a bold Lamanite", is quite correct. But when Oliver Cowdery copied the text here from Ⓞ into Ⓟ, he accidentally placed the *now* right after *behold:* "and behold **now I am** a bold Lamanite". The 1830 typesetter placed commas around *now,* which helps correctly interpret the *now* in this passage as an adverb of time. The 1920 LDS edition removed the comma before the *now,* which incorrectly makes *now* a narrative connector (as in the use of *now* in "and **now** if there be fault / it be the mistake of men" from the title page of the Book of Mormon). Grant Hardy, in his FARMS article "On Punctuation and Parentage", *Insights* 24/2 (2004): 2–3, suggests emending the punctuation in the current LDS text for Alma 54:24 by moving the comma from after *now* to before it, thus restoring the adverb of time interpretation to this passage. And this is how Hardy punctuates this passage in *The Book of Mormon: A Reader's Edition* (Urbana, Illinois: University of Illinois Press, 2003). The critical text will restore the *now* to its original position, after the verb, with its meaning as an adverb of time: "and behold **I am now** a bold Lamanite". For this reading there is no need to worry about the punctuation with respect to *now.*

Summary: Restore *now* to its correct position after *I am* in Alma 54:24, in accord with the reading of the original manuscript ("and behold **I am now** a bold Lamanite").

Alma 55

■ **Alma 55:2**

for I will not grant unto him that he shall have any more power
than what he hath [*gat* O | *got* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]

As discussed under Alma 47:5, there are two instances in the original text of *gat* as the past participial form for the verb *get*. In this particular case, O clearly reads *gat*. When Oliver Cowdery copied the text from O into P, he replaced the archaic *gat* with the modern *got*. The critical text will restore the *gat* here.

■ **Alma 55:4**

that perhaps he might find a man which was a descendant
of [*Lamman > Lamam > Lamans* O | *Laman* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *among them*

Here the corrected text in O reads "a descendant of Laman's". Oliver initially misspelled the name *Laman* as *Lamman*. He made the same mistake when he wrote the name a second time, in the immediately following verse:

> Alma 55:5
> and it came to pass that they found one
> whose name was [*Lamman > Laman* O | *Laman* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]

Alison Coutts points out (personal communication) that the misspelling *Lamman* here in Alma 55:4–5 may represent a mispronunciation on Joseph Smith's part of *Laman* as /læmən/ rather than /leimən/. Perhaps Joseph didn't realize here in Alma 55 that the text was referring to the original Laman, the oldest son of Lehi. The name *Laman* is fairly infrequent in the preceding part of the book of Alma, occurring only four times:

> Alma 3:7   and the Lord God set a mark upon them / yea upon Laman and Lemuel
>   and also the sons of Ishmael
> Alma 18:38   and he also rehearsed unto them concerning the rebellions
>   of Laman and Lemuel and the sons of Ishmael
> Alma 24:29   but they were actual descendants of Laman and Lemuel
> Alma 43:13   to withstand against the Lamanites which were a compound
>   of Laman and Lemuel and the sons of Ishmael . . .

In each case, the reference is to both Laman and Lemuel (and also in three of the cases to the sons of Ishmael). But here in Alma 55:4–5, some 33 manuscript pages after the last reference, the text suddenly refers only to Laman, which may have momentarily confused Joseph into thinking he had a new name here.

In any event, for both instances of *Lamman* in 𝒪, Oliver Cowdery crossed out the incorrect *Lamman* and supralinearly inserted *Laman*. But in the first case of the corrected spelling for the name (in verse 4), Oliver Cowdery initially wrote *Lamam* supralinearly, which he then corrected to *Lamans* by overwriting the final *m* with *ns*. This final form, *Lamans,* stands for the possessive form *Laman's*. In general, Oliver did not use the apostrophe when writing down possessive forms in the manuscripts (for this point, see the discussion regarding the phrase "three days' journey" in the 1 Nephi preface). The possessive form *Laman's* is clearly intended in 𝒪; the only question is whether it is textually correct. When Oliver copied the text from 𝒪 into 𝒫, he apparently thought otherwise since he omitted the possessive *s* and wrote "a descendant of Laman" in 𝒫. The printed editions have continued with this reading.

Under Alma 46:24, I list a number of cases in the manuscripts where Oliver Cowdery wrote— sometimes initially, sometimes finally—instances of the double genitive (namely, noun phrases of the form "X of Y's"), such as "a descendant of Laman's" here in Alma 55:4. For each of these cases, the critical text will basically follow the final manuscript reading in determining whether the original reading was an instance of the double genitive. As discussed under Alma 46:24, there are four cases of original double genitive in the manuscripts.

Elsewhere in the original text, there are 28 instances of "a descendant of X", but no others of "a descendant of X's". But for each of these 28 instances, the intent of the phrase is to declare someone's lineage, as in Alma 54:23: "I am Ammoron and a descendant of Zoram". Here in Alma 55:4, on the other hand, Moroni is hunting for someone who is a descendant of Laman (that is, a Lamanite). Thus there is a systematic difference in narrative purpose between this example in Alma 55:4 and all the other examples of "a descendant of X". Since the corrected extant reading in 𝒪 for Alma 55:4 will work, the critical text will accept this particular instance of the double genitive.

Summary: Restore in Alma 55:4 the corrected reading in 𝒪 that takes the double genitive form "X of Y's", namely, "that perhaps he might find a man which was **a descendant of Laman's** among them"; as noted under Alma 46:24, there are three other examples of the double genitive in the original text.

■ **Alma 55:6–8**

now Moroni caused that Laman and a small number of his men should go forth
  unto the guards which were over the Nephites
now the Nephites were guarded in the city of Gid

□ 01A	□ BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST
therefore Moroni	*therefore Moroni*
caused that	**appointed**
Laman and	*Laman and*
	caused that
a small number of men	*a small number of men*
which was appointed	
to *go with him*	**should** *go with him*

and it came to pass that when it was evening
Laman went to the guards which were over the Nephites

Here the original text in verse 7 was substantially emended in the 1837 edition. The textual differences (noted in bold above) were not marked by Joseph Smith in his editing of the printer's manuscript. In 𝔓 itself, he marked only the grammatical change of *which* to *who,* but the revised text in the actual 1837 edition ended up omitting the relative pronoun altogether. These additional changes are rather drastic compared to other emendations Joseph made for the 1837 edition. Yet Joseph was probably the one responsible for these changes since it is unlikely anyone else would have taken such liberty with the text.

The earliest text for verse 7 is definitely a sentence fragment. The original manuscript is virtually extant for this verse, and there is no room for any sizeable supralinear insertion at the end of the verse. There is a small lacuna after "to go with him", and it must have contained the beginning of the next verse, namely, "& it came". The 1837 revision removed the sentence fragment from the text, but changed the meaning somewhat: in the earlier text there is a small number of men that are appointed to go with Laman, but in the revised text it is Laman who is appointed (to the position of leadership, it would seem). Of course, the real goal of the 1837 editing was to eliminate the sentence fragment, not change the meaning.

A less drastic emendation would be to add in one place the minimal amount of words that would remove the fragment and complete the intended sense. Under 1 Nephi 17:46, I discuss the expression "desire that S", where S is a finite clause, and note that except for one case in 1 Nephi 17:46, this expression always has a modal verb in the *that*-clause. In the clear majority of cases, that modal is *should.* Here in Alma 55:7, the missing text could well have had the modal *should* (in fact, *should* is the modal that was selected in the 1837 editing to replace the infinitival marker *to* in this passage). In addition, an original predicate at the end of verse 7 would have been prone to loss if it contained the verb form *go,* thus leading to confusion with the preceding phrase "to go with him". Finally, we note that verse 7 basically repeats—or starts to repeat—the idea expressed at the beginning of the previous verse 6: "now Moroni caused that Laman and a small number of his men should go forth unto the guards which were over the Nephites". Yet verse 7 also introduces some new information regarding where the Nephite prisoners were being held, namely, "in the city of Gid". What seems to be required at the end of verse 7 is some minimal statement to the effect that Moroni sent Laman and his men to the city of Gid. I would therefore propose the following emended reading for this passage:

> Alma 55:6–8 (proposed emendation)
>> now Moroni caused that
>> Laman and a small number of his men should go forth
>> unto the guards which were over the Nephites
>> now the Nephites were guarded in the city of Gid
>> therefore Moroni caused that
>> Laman and a small number of men
>> which was appointed to go with him
>> **should go to the city of Gid**
>> and it came to pass that when it was evening
>> Laman went to the guards which were over the Nephites

Note that the phraseology "to go with him / should go to the city of Gid" is quite difficult to process. This difficulty, along with the repetition of the *go* in the infinitive clause and the finite predicate, could have led to the loss of the original predicate that was necessary for sentential closure.

Of course, other emendations are possible here, such as adding the word *forth* (based on the reading in verse 6: "Laman and a small number of his men should go **forth** unto the guards which were over the Nephites") or removing the *of* from "the city **of** Gid" (the reading at the beginning of verse 7), giving "the city Gid" (as in verse 16: "and he went to the city Gid"). It will be difficult to determine what the text actually read at the end of verse 7. But at least the emendation proposed here preserves the necessary meaning of the original text and provides some possibility for why the original predicate might have been omitted during the dictation of the text. Another possibility to keep in mind is that such a missing predicate could have occurred in Mormon's original record, the result of his own error.

Summary: Restore in Alma 55:7 the earliest text but with the following conjectured predicate at the end of the verse: "should go to the city of Gid"; this minimal emendation satisfies the required semantics for the larger passage yet is sufficiently difficult with its repetition of *go* to have led to the loss of the predicate.

■ **Alma 55:8**

and behold they saw him [*a* >+ NULL 0| 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *coming and they hailed him*

Here in the original manuscript, Oliver Cowdery wrote "they saw him **a** coming". At some later time, Oliver crossed out the prepositional *a,* perhaps when he copied the text from 𝒪 into 𝒫 (the *a* is lacking in 𝒫). The ink flow for the crossout of the *a* here in 𝒪 is very heavy and distinctly different than any other correction on this page of 𝒪. The crossout, in other words, appears to be due to editing. The critical text will restore the *a* in this instance.

The original text had a good many instances of the archaic, now dialectal, use of the prepositional *a*. For each instance of *a* supported by the earliest textual sources, the critical text will restore the *a*. See, for instance, the discussion under 1 Nephi 8:28 and Alma 28:5. For a complete list of this usage in the original text, see under PREPOSITIONAL A in volume 3.

Summary: Restore in Alma 55:8 the prepositional *a* that was originally in 𝒪 but was later consciously removed by editing.

■ **Alma 55:8**

and behold they saw him a coming and they hailed him
[*but* 01EFIJLMOQRT|*But* ABCDGHKPS|*and* N] *he saith unto them : fear not behold I am a Lamanite behold we have escaped from the Nephites*

Here the 1906 LDS edition changed the conjunction *but* to *and,* perhaps intentionally since the verb *hail* seems positive in meaning, in agreement with the meaning 'to salute, greet; to welcome' (the first definition for the second verb *hail* listed in the Oxford English Dictionary). But actually the meaning here in Alma 55:8 is more related to the third definition under that verb in the OED: 'to call or shout to from a distance, in order to attract attention'. Basically the guards are challenging

the approach of Laman since he could be an enemy. There is an underlying negative implication in the use of the verb *hail* here, thus the use of the *but* to reverse the polarity. The 1906 edition was never used as a copytext, so this secondary *and* is restricted to that edition. The critical text will maintain the original *but* here in Alma 55:8 since it is the reading of the earliest textual sources (including ○) and is wholly appropriate.

Summary: Maintain here in Alma 55:8 the conjunction *but* (the original reading) since it reverses the polarity of the preceding verb *hail;* in this verse *hail* means 'to challenge' and has a negative implication.

■ **Alma 55:8–12**

and behold they saw him a coming and they **hailed** *him*
(1) *but he* [*sayeth* 01 | *saith* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *unto them : fear not . . .*
and they **said** *unto him : give us of your wine . . .*
(2) *but Laman* [*sayeth* 0 | *sayeth* >js *said* 1 | *saith* A | *said* BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *unto them :*
let us keep of our wine till we go against the Nephites to battle . . .
for **said** *they : we are weary . . .*
(3) *and Laman* [*sayeth* 0 | *sayeth* >js *said* 1 | *saith* A | *said* BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *unto them :*
you may do according to your desires

In this extensive conversation, the past tense is always used when the Lamanite guards speak to Laman ("and they hailed him", "and they said", "for said they"). On the other hand, in the original text, Laman's answers (listed above as 1–3) are always in the historical present tense ("but he saith", "but Laman saith", "and Laman saith"). In his editing of 𝓟 for the 1837 edition, Joseph Smith changed the last two occurrences of *saith* to *said,* as he did in general for *saith* in past-tense contexts throughout the Book of Mormon text. But in his editing of 𝓟, Joseph neglected to emend the first *saith* to *said,* with the result that in the 1837 edition (and in all subsequent editions) the original *saith* has been retained. For consistency's sake, this first *saith* should also be edited to *said* in the standard text. The critical text, on the other hand, will restore or maintain each instance of the historical present-tense *saith* whenever it is supported by the earliest text.

Summary: Restore in Alma 55:8–12 the two instances of the historical present-tense *saith* (in verses 10 and 12) that Joseph Smith edited to *said* for the 1837 edition; also maintain the *saith* in verse 8 that Joseph neglected to edit to *said* for that edition.

■ **Alma 55:14**

and it came to pass [01ABCDEFIJLMNOQRT | *that* GHKPS]
they did drink and were merry

The 1858 Wright edition inserted the subordinate conjunction *that* after "it came to pass". In this context, readers expect the *that* after "it came to pass". The RLDS text has maintained this reading with the secondary *that.* The original manuscript is extant here, and there is no *that.* Elsewhere in the text, the *that* is frequently missing after "it came to pass" if there is an intervening subordinate conjunction or a prepositional phrase before the main clause, as in these two examples:

1 Nephi 1:6
    and it came to pass **as he prayed unto the Lord**
    there came a pillar of fire and dwelt upon a rock before him

Omni 1:20
    and it came to pass **in the days of Mosiah**
    there was a large stone brought unto him with engravings on it

Only rarely do we find the *that* missing when the main clause immediately follows "it came to pass":

Alma 53:16
    but behold it came to pass
    they had many sons which had not entered into a covenant
    that they would not take their weapons of war
    to defend themselves against their enemies

Since such readings are not impossible, the critical text will accept them, including here in Alma 55:14.

Summary: Maintain in Alma 55:14 the rare case when there is no *that* between "it came to pass" and an immediately following main clause; there is at least one other example of this usage in the earliest text (namely, in Alma 53:16).

■ **Alma 55:16**

and he [*went* 01AT | *sent* BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRS] *to the city Gid*
while the Lamanites were in a deep sleep and drunken

> The original manuscript is extant here and reads "and he **went** to the city Gid". The typesetter for the 1837 edition misread *went* as *sent* (the change was not marked by Joseph Smith in 𝒫). This secondary reading continued in all subsequent editions until the 1981 LDS edition restored *went* to the LDS text. Later in this chapter, it is very clear that Moroni himself is there at the city of Gid with his men:

> > Alma 55:21
> >   and then **he** caused his men **which were with him**
> >   to withdraw a pace from them and surround the armies of the Lamanites

> Thus *went* is definitely the correct reading in verse 16.

Summary: Maintain in Alma 55:16 the original reading, "and he **went** to the city Gid", since verse 21 clearly shows that Moroni was there at the city of Gid.

■ **Alma 55:16**

and he went to the city [01ABDEFIJLMNOQRT | *of* CGHKPS] *Gid*
while the Lamanites were in a deep sleep and drunken

> The 1840 edition expanded "the city Gid" to "the city **of** Gid". The RLDS textual tradition has continued with the extra *of.* This change is probably accidental and not due to editing. Elsewhere

the text has instances of both "the city **of** Gid" and "the city Gid", yet none of these other instances show any textual variation:

Alma 51:26	and the city of Omner and the city **of** Gid and the city of Mulek
Alma 55:7	now the Nephites were guarded in the city **of** Gid
Alma 55:25	in strengthening the fortifications round about the city Gid
Alma 55:26	when he had fortified the city Gid
Helaman 5:15	and from thenceforth to the city **of** Gid
Helaman 5:15	and from the city **of** Gid to the city of Mulek

So in each case of "the city (of) Gid", we follow the earliest reading.

Summary: Maintain in Alma 55:16 the shorter form "the city Gid", the reading of the earliest textual sources (including ☉).

■ **Alma 55:16**

and Moroni had prepared his men with **weapons of war**
and he went to the city Gid while the Lamanites were in a deep sleep and drunken
and cast in [*the* 01ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQS | RT] *weapons of war in unto the prisoners*

Here the original text has the definite article *the* in front of the second instance of "weapons of war". The editors for the 1920 edition deleted this *the* (the change is marked in the committee copy). However, the reason the definite article is there in the original text is because the text is referring to the weapons of war mentioned at the beginning of the verse. The verse-initial clause ("Moroni had prepared his men with weapons of war") means that Moroni's men took extra weapons of war along with them (in addition to their own personal weapons). The text is not saying that Moroni had his men arm themselves, an obvious given. Thus the definite article later on in the verse ("and cast in **the** weapons of war in unto the prisoners") refers to those extra weapons that Moroni's men brought along.

Summary: Restore in Alma 55:16 the definite article *the* before the second instance of "weapons of war"; here the *the* refers to the earlier instance in the verse of "weapons of war".

■ **Alma 55:16**

and cast **in** *the weapons of war* [*in* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQS | RT] *unto the prisoners*

Here the original text repeats the preposition *in*. ☉ is not extant, but there is room for the repeated *in* in the lacuna. In any event, 𝒫 has the repeated *in*. The 1920 LDS edition removed it because of its redundancy. Nonetheless, such usage can be found in several other places in the original Book of Mormon text as well as in the King James Bible. For those examples and discussion, see under Jacob 7:8. The critical text will restore the repeated *in* here in Alma 55:16.

Summary: Restore in Alma 55:16 the repeated *in* since this is the reading of the earliest textual sources (in this case, 𝒫 and all the early editions); there is support for such usage elsewhere in the original text.

■ **Alma 55:18**

but **had** *they awoke the Lamanites*
—behold they were drunken—
and *the Nephites could have slain them*

Here we may have an example of a Hebraistic *and* separating a main clause from its preceding subordinate clause ("but had they awoke the Lamanites") and an intervening parenthetical clause ("behold they were drunken"). In this instance, the subordinate clause is the conditional *had*-clause (where *had* precedes the subject). The *and* is not extant in 𝒪, but there is room for the ampersand in the lacuna. To be sure, 𝒫 has the ampersand. All the printed editions have maintained the *and* here, probably because one can include the parenthetical clause as part of the main clause—that is, the text can be read as "but had they awoke the Lamanites / behold they were drunken and the Nephites could have slain them".

One can argue, however, that this *and* in Alma 55:18 could be the result of a scribal error on Oliver Cowdery's part. Consider the following example in the next chapter where Oliver initially wrote an *and* after a conditional *had*-clause:

> Alma 56:50
> and had I not returned with my two thousand
> [*&* >% NULL 0| 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] they would have obtained
> their purpose

In this case, Oliver immediately erased the ampersand in 𝒪. Of course, there is a structural difference between these two cases of *and:* in Alma 55:18, there is an intervening parenthetical clause, "behold they were drunken" (at least under one interpretation), while in Alma 56:50 there is no intervening clause between the *had*-clause and the following main clause.

Ultimately, this instance of the extra *and* in Alma 55:18 is the only case in the earliest text of this particular Hebrew-like construction with inverted *had*-clauses (or where one can interpret the *had*-clause in this way). Nonetheless, there are quite a few instances with the much more frequent conditional construction, the *if*-clause (see, for instance, the discussion under 1 Nephi 17:50 and Helaman 12:13–21; also see the general discussion under HEBRAISMS in volume 3). Moreover, many of these *if*-clauses have an intervening clause that more readily allows the occurrence of the Hebrew-like *and* before the main clause, as here in Alma 55:18. The critical text will therefore retain the *and* in this passage, especially since one can alternatively interpret the *behold*-clause as part of the main clause.

Summary: Maintain in Alma 55:18 the *and* that occurs before the clause "the Nephites could have slain them".

■ **Alma 55:19**

but he delighted in the saving [0| *of* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *his people from destruction*

The original manuscript is sufficiently extant here that we can determine there was no *of* between the gerund *saving* and the direct object *his people*. The definite article *the* that precedes *saving* is not extant in 𝒪, but spacing between surviving fragments supports its occurrence in 𝒪. When

the text was copied from 𝓞 into 𝓟, Oliver Cowdery inserted the preposition *of:* "he delighted in the saving **of** his people". Alternatively, Oliver could have deleted the *the:* "he delighted in saving his people" (which is what we expect in modern English). Nonetheless, the original text had a number of mixed gerundives like the original one here in Alma 55:19, with *the* preceding the gerund but without any following *of.* For several examples that continue in the text, see under 1 Nephi 17:32 and Alma 40:15. Also see the general discussion under GERUNDIVES in volume 3; there I provide several examples of this usage from various sources. Here is one example from Benjamin Franklin dating from 1782: "He said there was no Want of Money in the Nation; that the chief Difficulty lay in **the finding out new Taxes** to raise it" (original accidentals retained).

Summary: Accept in Alma 55:19 the difficult reading in 𝓞 with the *the* before *saving* but no *of* between *saving* and *his people;* this kind of gerundive construction occurs a number of times in the original text of the Book of Mormon and will be maintained or restored wherever the earliest textual sources support it.

■ **Alma 55:19**

and for this cause [*that* 0| 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *he might not bring upon him injustice he would not fall upon the Lamanites and destroy them in their drunkenness*

Here Oliver Cowdery accidentally omitted the subordinate conjunction *that* when he copied the text from 𝓞 into 𝓟. The *that* is found at the end of the line in 𝓞, which probably explains why it was lost during the copying process. See under Alma 11:21 for a list of cases where Oliver sometimes made copying errors at the end of a line in 𝓞, when his eye would move too quickly to the beginning of the next line and he would omit or misread the line-final word in 𝓞.

Elsewhere in the text, whenever we have "for this cause" followed by a sentence acting as an appositive for the noun *cause,* we always get the conjunction *that* at the head of the sentence:

> 1 Nephi 4:17
> > and again I knew that the Lord had delivered Laban into my hands
> > **for this cause that** I might obtain the records according to his commandments

> 1 Nephi 4:36
> > now we were desirous that he should tarry with us
> > **for this cause that** the Jews might not know concerning our flight
> > > into the wilderness

> 2 Nephi 10:15
> > wherefore **for this cause that** my covenants may be fulfilled
> > > which I have made unto the children of men
> > > that I will do unto them while they are in the flesh
> > I must needs destroy the secret works of darkness and of murders
> > > and of abominations

> Alma 9:25
> > and now **for this cause that** ye may not be destroyed
> > the Lord hath sent his angel to visit many of his people

Helaman 12:22

therefore **for this cause that** men might be saved
hath repentance been declared

3 Nephi 21:6

for thus it behooveth the Father that it should come forth from the Gentiles
that he may shew forth his power unto the Gentiles
for this cause that the Gentiles if they will not harden their hearts
    that they may repent and come unto me and be baptized in my name . . .

Thus the subordinate conjunction *that* should definitely be restored in Alma 55:19.

Summary: Restore in Alma 55:19 the original *that* which heads the sentence that acts appositively to the noun *cause:* "for this cause **that** he might not bring upon him injustice . . ." (the reading of the original manuscript).

■ **Alma 55:20**

but he had obtained his [*desire* 01 | *desires* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
for he had armed those prisoners of the Nephites

Here both manuscripts have the singular *desire,* but the 1830 compositor set the plural *desires.* In general, the original text allows for either grammatical number when referring to someone's desire(s). We find the opposite number for *desire(s)* in another example of the phrase "to obtain one's desire(s)" earlier in the book of Alma:

Alma 49:26

because he had not obtained
his [*desires* 0 | *desire* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] over the Nephites

In this instance, the original manuscript reads *desires* and Oliver Cowdery changed the noun to the singular when he copied the text from 𝓞 into 𝓟. As discussed under Mosiah 18:10, 11, the critical text will in each case of *desire(s)* follow the number in the earliest textual sources.

Summary: Restore the singular *desire* in Alma 55:20, the reading of the manuscripts ("but he had obtained his **desire**").

■ **Alma 55:20**

for he had armed those prisoners of the Nephites
which were within the [*walls* 0 | *wall* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *of the city*

Here the original manuscript reads "within the **walls** of the city". Oliver Cowdery miswrote *walls* as *wall* when he copied the text into the printer's manuscript. Elsewhere in the text, we get "within the **walls**", including a second one later on in this same verse:

Mosiah 2:7   king Benjamin could not teach them all within the **walls** of the temple
Mosiah 11:10   that his workmen should work all manner of fine work
                  within the **walls** of the temple
Alma 14:28   and every soul which was within the **walls** thereof . . .

Alma 55:20   to gain possession of those parts which were within the **walls**
Alma 62:23   they were all within the **walls** of the city
Alma 62:24   the armies of Moroni were within the **walls**

The only original occurrence of singular *wall* in this expression is in Alma 53:5, but quite clearly this example is different in that it reads "within **a** wall" rather than "within **the** wall":

Alma 53:5
    and in this city they did guard the prisoners of the Lamanites
    yea even within **a wall** which they had caused them to build with their own hands

Thus the incorrect singular "within the **wall**" in the current text for Alma 55:20 is a unique reading and should be changed back to "within the **walls**" (in agreement with the second instance of this phrase later on in the verse).

Summary: In accord with the reading of the original manuscript and the consistent use of "within the walls" elsewhere in the text, restore the plural *walls* in Alma 55:20.

■ **Alma 55:20**

for he had armed those prisoners of the Nephites
which were within the walls of the city
and [*had gave* 01ABDEFIJLP | *he gave* CGHK | *had given* MNOQRST] *them power*
to gain possession of those parts which were within the walls

The original text here in Alma 55:20 read "and had gave", which is perfectly acceptable for the original language of the Book of Mormon (since it allowed simple past-tense forms like *gave* for the past participle). In the 1840 edition, the *had* was replaced by *he*. This change could have been a typo or an attempt to improve the grammar—namely, creating an acceptable simple past-tense verb form by replacing the perfective *had* with the pronoun *he*. The 1908 RLDS edition restored the original *had* here but kept the past-participial *gave*. The 1953 RLDS edition emended the non-standard use of *gave* to *given*. For the LDS textual tradition, which had always retained the original *had,* the past participial form *gave* was grammatically emended to *given* in the 1905 edition. The critical text will, of course, restore the earliest reading, "and **had gave** them power". For discussion of the past participial form *gave,* see under 1 Nephi 5:8 and, more generally, under PAST PARTICIPLE in volume 3.

Summary: Restore in Alma 55:20 the original occurrence of *gave* as the past participle for the verb *give;* the 1840 change of *had* to *he* is textually secondary and was removed from the RLDS text in 1908.

■ **Alma 55:21**

and then he caused [*his* 01 | *the* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *men which were with him*
to withdraw a pace from them and surround the armies of the Lamanites

In this passage, the original text distinguishes between Moroni's men who were with him and all the men of his army. The 1830 edition replaced the *his* with *the* in an attempt, perhaps unintentional,

to avoid the redundancy with the following relative clause ("which were with him"). Elsewhere in the text, there are a number of places where such redundancies have been left unedited:

> Alma 58:18
>> I caused that **my** men
>> —those which were with **me**—
>> should retreat into the wilderness

> Mormon 6:10
>> and it came to pass that my men were hewn down
>> yea or even **my** ten thousand which were with **me**

> Ether 2:15
>> and the brother of Jared repented him of the evil which he had done
>> and did call upon the name of the Lord for **his** brethren which were with **him**

Under 1 Nephi 7:17, I discuss the redundancy of the original text for that passage, namely, "according to **my** faith which is in **me**". The critical text will accept all examples of this kind of redundancy, provided there is support for the reading in the earliest textual sources. Thus *his* will be restored here in Alma 55:21 ("**his** men which were with him").

Summary: Restore in Alma 55:21 the original possessive pronoun *his*, despite the redundancy of the following relative clause (thus, "**his** men which were with **him**"); this kind of redundancy can be found elsewhere in the text.

■ **Alma 55:23**

and in these circumstances they found
that it [*were* 0 | *was* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *not expedient*
that they should fight with the Nephites

Here the original manuscript reads *were*. Oliver Cowdery changed the *were* to *was* in copying to the printer's manuscript. This change seems consistent with all other usage in the text. Elsewhere there are 15 occurrences of "it **was** . . . expedient", but none of "it **were** . . . expedient". Consider this example which also involves the verb *find*:

> 3 Nephi 4:5
>> Giddianhi found that it **was** expedient
>> that he should go up to battle against the Nephites

There is one example of *were,* but it is a subjunctive *were* in a conditional clause with inverted word order:

> Mosiah 5:3
>> and were it expedient / we could prophesy of all things

In that passage the subjunctive *were* is what we expect. But in all the other cases, there is no conditional sense; rather, all 15 cases involve a simple past-tense form in the indicative. So the most logically consistent solution would be to accept the grammatically corrected reading in Alma 55:23, "it **was** not expedient".

On the other hand, as noted nearby under Alma 53:5, there are a number of nonsubjunctive clauses in the earliest text where *were* occurs rather than the expected *was*. The critical text will restore these instances of *were,* including this one in Alma 55:23, despite its uniqueness as far as the phrase "it was/were . . . expedient" is concerned.

Summary: Restore in Alma 55:23 the unique instance of *were* in the phrase "it were not expedient", the reading of the original manuscript; all other instances of this phrase read "it was . . . expedient" in the earliest text.

■ **Alma 55:28**

and it came to pass that the Nephites began again to be victorious
and to [Proclaim > reclaim 0 | reclaim 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] their rights
and their privileges

Here in the original manuscript, Oliver Cowdery seems to have initially written *proclaim* (with the *p* capitalized) as the first word on a new page of 𝒪. Virtually immediately he crossed out the initial *Pro* and supralinearly wrote *re,* thus changing *proclaim* to *reclaim* (there is no change in level of ink flow for the correction). Oliver's error may be related to the fact that *proclaim*/*reclaim* is the very first word on a new leaf of the original manuscript. While switching to the new page, Oliver apparently forgot precisely which word he was supposed to be writing down.

The context supports the reading *reclaim,* although in all other contexts only people are *reclaimed* (six times), as in Jacob 7:24: "many means were devised to **reclaim** and restore the Lamanites to the knowledge of the truth". Nonetheless, one can conceive of rights and privileges being reclaimed. For instance, in Moroni 7:27, the related verb *claim* is used in a similar context: "hath miracles ceased because that Christ hath ascended into heaven and hath sit down on the right hand of God to **claim** of the Father **his rights of mercy** which he hath upon the children of men". Another possible verb for the context in Alma 55:28 is *recover,* as in 3 Nephi 3:10: "that this my people may **recover** their rights and government". In any event, here in Alma 55:28 the extant verb in the original manuscript clearly ends in *claim,* so the verb there is not *recover.*

In contrast to the verbs *reclaim, claim,* and *recover,* the verb *proclaim* is used in the Book of Mormon to refer only to what is actually spoken:

Mosiah 1:10	for on the morrow I shall **proclaim** unto this my people out of mine own mouth that . . .
Mosiah 1:18	Mosiah went . . . and **proclaimed** unto all the people . . .
Alma 46:21	when Moroni had **proclaimed** these words . . .

In addition, 17 occurrences of the noun *proclamation* all involve the idea of declaring either a command or some news. Given the context in Alma 55:28, *reclaim* (despite its unique reference to reclaiming rights and privileges) works better than *proclaim.*

Summary: Accept in Alma 55:28 Oliver Cowdery's corrected reading in 𝒪: "to **reclaim** their rights and their privileges".

■ **Alma 55:29**

many times did the Lamanites attempt to encircle them about by night
but in these attempts they did lose many **prisoners**

> Here in verse 29 the text is referring to numerous futile attempts on the part of the Lamanites to surround and attack the Nephites at night. As explained earlier in the passage, the Nephites had already taken many Lamanites as prisoners; we have, for instance, the following statement in verse 27: "and it came to pass that they did—notwithstanding all the intrigues of the Lamanites— keep and protect all the prisoners which they had taken".
>
> David Eddington (personal communication, 23 October 2003) points out that what the text literally says in verse 29 seems odd, namely, that the Lamanites lost many prisoners when they wouldn't have been prisoners until they had been captured. One could propose here that an original essive *as* is missing: "but in these attempts they did lose many **as** prisoners". There is some evidence in the next chapter of Alma for this usage:

> > Alma 56:54   they were compelled to deliver up their weapons of war
> >   and also themselves **as** prisoners of war
> > Alma 56:56   and for this cause did the Lamanites deliver themselves up
> >   **as** prisoners of war

> But usage also shows that in many instances the plural noun *prisoners* lacks the *as* that modern English readers might expect:

> > Alma 57:14   after they had surrendered themselves prisoners of war
> > 3 Nephi 4:27   there were many thousands which did yield themselves up
> >   prisoners unto the Nephites
> > 3 Nephi 5:4   when they had taken all the robbers prisoners
> > Moroni 9:9   many of the daughters of the Lamanites have they taken prisoners

> The critical text will therefore maintain in Alma 55:29 and elsewhere in the text the original instances of *prisoners* for which the essive *as* is lacking (that is, without the *as* that modern English readers expect).

Summary: Retain in Alma 55:29 the original reading without any *as* before *prisoners* ("in these attempts they did lose many prisoners"); this kind of essive usage without *as* can be found elsewhere in the text.

■ **Alma 55:31**

but behold the Nephites were not slow to remember the Lord their God
in this their [*times* 01ABCDEGHKPS|*time* FIJLMNOQRT] *of affliction*

> Here the original text apparently read "this their times of affliction". The number disagreement between *this* and *times* led to changing *times* to *time* in the 1852 LDS edition. The LDS text has continued with the singular *time*.

There are a few instances in the original text of "this <possessive pronoun> <plural noun>", as explained under Mosiah 7:23. Besides the example here in Alma 55:31, we also have "and is not **this our afflictions** great" (in Mosiah 7:23) and "ye shall go on in **this your ways** of sin" (in Helaman 9:21). The critical text will therefore restore the original plural noun *times* here in Alma 55:31.

Summary: Restore in Alma 55:31 the original plural *times* ("in this their **times** of affliction"), the reading of the earliest textual sources (including both manuscripts).

■ **Alma 55:31**

yea they would not **partake** *of their wine*

☐ *yea they would not* **take** *of wine*   01A

☐ NULL   BCDEFGHIJKLMNOQRT

☐ *yea they would not* **partake** *of wine*   PS

save they had firstly given to some of the Lamanite prisoners

In this passage, the 1837 edition omitted the text from the first *wine* to the second one, thus deleting "yea they would not take of wine", which is extant in 𝒪. Joseph Smith did not mark this deletion in 𝒫, so the 1837 reading is probably a simple typo resulting from the 1837 typesetter's eye skipping from the first *wine* to the second one. The omitted text is not necessary for the meaning; on the other hand, there doesn't seem to be any strong reason for deleting it either. The critical text will restore the longer reading since it is the reading of the original manuscript.

Two parts of this passage are not extant in the original manuscript: (1) "yea they would not parta" (the final *ke* of the main verb is extant at the beginning of a line in 𝒪); and (2) "save they had firstly given to some". This brings up two possible emendations to the text. The first one deals with the use of the verb *partake* in the first *yea*-clause but *take* in the second one. The 1908 RLDS edition emended the text so that in both cases the verb is *partake*. This emendation seems appropriate since *yea*-clauses usually involve some repetition of words (see the discussion under Alma 12:12–14). But the original manuscript is extant for the *take* in the second *yea*-clause, so the RLDS emendation contradicts the manuscript evidence.

On the other hand, one might consider emending the *partake* in the first *yea*-clause to *take*. The original manuscript is not extant here, but the first part of the verb (either *parta* or *ta*) would have ended the line (as noted above, the beginning of the next line is extant and it reads *-ke*). Spacing between extant fragments suggests that *ta* fits best. If the word was originally *partake* in 𝒪, the initial *par* would have probably been supralinearly inserted. We also note that Oliver Cowdery frequently misread the ends of lines in the original manuscript when he copied from 𝒪 into 𝒫 (see the examples listed under Alma 11:21). Here in Alma 55:31, Oliver could have easily misread *take* as *partake* when he copied the text from 𝒪 into 𝒫.

Elsewhere in this chapter (Alma 55), we have three additional occurrences of "take of wine" with the meaning 'drink of wine', but none of "partake of wine":

Alma 55:10–11
but this saying only made them more desirous to drink of the wine
for said they : we are weary / therefore let us **take** of the wine

Alma 55:13 (two times)
    and it came to pass that they did **take** of the wine freely
    and it was pleasant to their taste
    therefore they **took** of it more freely

The phrase "partake of wine" does occur elsewhere, but only in reference to the sacrament:

Moroni 6:6
    and they did meet together oft
    to **partake** of bread and wine in remembrance of the Lord Jesus

Thus usage and spacing considerations in 𝒪 support the reading "take of wine" in both *yea*-clauses in Alma 55:31.

    The second possible emendation has to do with whether a pronoun such as *it,* in reference to the wine, should follow *given* in "save they had firstly **given** to some of the Lamanite prisoners". The original manuscript is not extant for this part of the sentence, but spacing between extant fragments favors the shorter text without any *it*. In English, we normally expect a direct object for the verb *give,* but under certain conditions it may be omitted. Some examples of this omission are found later in 3 Nephi when Christ administers the sacrament:

3 Nephi 18:3–4
    and when the disciples had come with bread and wine
    he took of the bread and brake and blessed it
    and he **gave** unto the disciples and commanded that they should eat
    and when they had eat and were filled
    he commanded that they should **give** unto the multitude

3 Nephi 18:8–9
    and it came to pass that when he had said these words
    he commanded his disciples
    that they should take of the wine of the cup and drink of it
    and that they should also **give** unto the multitude that they might drink of it
    and it came to pass that they did so and did drink of it and were filled
    and they **gave** unto the multitude and they did drink and they were filled

3 Nephi 20:3–5
    and it came to pass that he brake bread again and blessed it
    and **gave** to the disciples to eat
    and when they had eat he commanded them
    that they should break bread and **give** unto the multitude
    and when they had **given** unto the multitude
    he also gave them wine to drink and commanded them
    that they should **give** unto the multitude

These examples show quite clearly that *give* does not need to have a direct object pronominal *it,* especially when it refers to food and drink. Thus there is no need to emend the text in Alma 55:31 so that it would read "save they had firstly given **it** to some of the Lamanite prisoners".

Summary: Restore in Alma 55:31 the beginning of the second *yea*-clause that was accidentally omitted in the 1837 edition; in accord with the spacing between extant fragments of 𝒪, emend *partake* (in the

first *yea*-clause) to *take* (thus "they would not take of their wine"), which is consistent with four other occurrences of the phraseology "take of wine" in this chapter, including the *take* in the second *yea*-clause in this verse ("yea they would not **take** of wine"); do not add the direct object pronoun *it* after the verb *give* near the end of the verse (thus maintaining "save they had firstly **given** to some of the Lamanite prisoners") since elsewhere the text typically omits the pronoun *it* after *give* when referring to food and drink.

■ **Alma 55:31**

save they had [*firstly* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLPS | *firstly > first* M | *first* NOQRT] *given to some of the Lamanite prisoners*

> Here the 1906 LDS large-print edition replaced the adverb *firstly* with the standard form, *first*. The LDS text has continued with *first* in this passage; the RLDS text has maintained the original *firstly*. As explained under Jacob 1:17, the critical text will restore *firstly* wherever it is found in the earliest textual sources.

■ **Alma 55:33**

(1) *it was expedient for Moroni to make preparations to attackt the city Morionton for behold the Lamanites had by their labors fortified*

(2) *the city* [1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRT | *of* S] *Morionton*

> Here we have two examples of "the city Morionton", that is, without the *of*. The original manuscript is not extant for either of these two cases, although there isn't much room for an *of* in either case except by supralinear insertion. The printer's manuscript for these two instances of "the city (of) Morionton" lacks the *of*. In the second case, the 1953 RLDS edition inserted the *of*, but not in the first case, which implies that the intrusive *of* in the second case is a typo.
>
> There are no more instances of "the city Morionton" in the text, but there are two occurrences of "the city **of** Morionton" (in Alma 51:26 and Alma 59:5). In both of those passages, we have a series of cities conjoined together, each of which has the structure "the city of X". As discussed under Alma 47:31, we let the earliest textual sources determine the correct reading for each instance of "the city (of) X". The critical text will therefore maintain the two instances of "the city Morionton" here in Alma 55:33 as well as the two instances of "the city **of** Morionton" elsewhere in the text.

Summary: Retain both instances of "the city Morionton" in Alma 55:33, the reading of the earliest extant text (here the printer's manuscript).

[THIS PAGE LEFT INTENTIONALLY BLANK]