Alma 56

■ **Alma 56:1**

And now it came to pass
in the commencement of the thirtieth year of the reign of the judges
[*in* 01ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQS | *on* RT] *the second day*
[*on* 0ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQS | *of* > *on* 1 | *in* RT] *the first month* . . .

The earliest text (in 𝓞 and 𝓟 as well as in all the early editions) reads "**in** the second day **on** the first month", which the editors for the 1920 LDS edition emended to "**on** the second day **in** the first month", consistent with what we expect in English and also generally consistent with usage elsewhere in the Book of Mormon text. It is quite possible that the original manuscript is in error, that somehow the two prepositions *in* and *on* got mixed up early on in the transmission of the text.

On the other hand, there is some evidence in the Book of Mormon text for the use of *in* for days and *on* for months. To begin with, there is one other example of "**in** the Xth day" in the earliest text:

> 3 Nephi 8:5 (*in* edited to *on* in the 1920 LDS edition)
> in the thirty and fourth year in the first month
> [*in* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQS | *on* RT] the fourth day of the month
> there arose a great storm

𝓞 is not extant here, but since 𝓟 and the 1830 edition are firsthand copies of 𝓞 here and both read *in,* most likely 𝓞 also read *in.* One could argue, though, that this *in* in 3 Nephi 8:5 was the result of the preceding two occurrences of *in:* "**in** the thirty and fourth year **in** the first month". Otherwise, the Book of Mormon has "**on** the Xth day", but there are only four examples:

1 Nephi 18:14	**on** the fourth day which we had been driven back
Alma 14:23	**on** the twelfth day in the tenth month in the tenth year
Alma 16:1	**on** the fifth day of the second month
Alma 49:1	**on** the tenth day of the month

We can view these meager statistics (two versus four) as allowing variation between "**on** the Xth day" and "**in** the Xth day" in the Book of Mormon text. Also note that the King James Bible has the same kind of variation, with 54 occurrences of "**in** the Xth day" and 131 of "**on** the Xth day" (plus 10 of "**upon** the Xth day"). For example, Exodus 12:3 reads "**in** the tenth *day* of this month". The critical text will therefore restore the original occurrence of "in the Xth day" in Alma 56:1 ("in the second day") as well as in 3 Nephi 8:5 ("in the fourth day").

There is no evidence for "on the Yth month" in the King James Bible, but there is some evidence for its use elsewhere in the Book of Mormon. Later on in this chapter of Alma, we have this example for which *on* is extant in 𝓞:

Alma 56:42 (*on* edited to *of* in the 1920 LDS edition)
    and it was in the morning of the third day
    [*on* 01ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQS | *of* RT] the seventh month

The use of *of* here for *on* is similar to the momentary change Oliver Cowdery made in Alma 56:1 when he copied the text from 𝒪 into 𝒫; there he initially wrote "in the second day **of** the first month", but then virtually immediately he corrected the *of* to *on,* the reading in 𝒪 (there is no difference in ink flow for the crossout of the *of* and the supralinear insertion of the *on*).

    There are no other instances in the Book of Mormon of "**on** the Yth month", only six examples of "**in** the Yth month" and three examples of "**of** the Yth month":

Alma 14:23	on the twelfth day **in** the tenth month in the tenth year
Alma 16:1	on the fifth day **of** the second month
Alma 16:1	until the fifth day **of** the second month
Alma 49:1	**in** the eleventh month of the nineteenth year
Alma 52:1	on the first morning **of** the first month
Alma 56:27	**in** the second month of this year
3 Nephi 4:7	**in** the sixth month
3 Nephi 4:11	**in** this the sixth month
3 Nephi 8:5	in the thirty and fourth year **in** the first month

There is one other case of *on* with *month* which has not been edited to *in:*

    3 Nephi 3:8
        but if ye will not do this
        I swear unto you with an oath
        that **on the morrow month** I will command
        that my armies shall come down against you

Here we have *on* rather than *in.* The original manuscript is not extant for this particular preposition, but both 𝒫 and the 1830 edition read *on,* which means that 𝒪 most likely also read *on* since in 3 Nephi both 𝒫 and the 1830 edition are firsthand copies of 𝒪. It could be argued that *on* is used here because of the frequency of the archaic phrase "on the morrow" in the Book of Mormon (37 times). In fact, everywhere else in the text *morrow* means 'on the next day'; only here in 3 Nephi 3:8 does it mean simply 'next'. The Oxford English Dictionary does not list this generalized meaning for *morrow,* although it gives *morrow day,* meaning 'the next day', with citations beginning in Middle English. We have various examples on *Literature Online* <lion.chadwyck.com> of *morrow day* from Early Modern English up into the 1800s (accidentals here regularized):

Rheims Bible (1582)	the morrow day shall be careful for itself
Thomas Fenne (1590)	before the morrow day
William Wyrley (1592)	the morrow day when blushing sun did rise
Henry Lok (1597)	if he the morrow day shall see
John Keats (1819)	until the morrow day

According to <www.google.com>, there are infrequent examples in current English of *morrow month,* but apparently only in artificial, archaic-sounding language (such as "Good tide hammer, we'll see you brightly in morrow month!" and "We shall reminisce come the morrow month").

More generally, there is the occasional example in earlier English of "on the Yth month", as in this one from *Literature Online* (spelling regularized but not punctuation or capitalization):

> William Sherlock (1685)
>
> > As for the Passover, let our Reconciler consider again
> > whether the observation of it **on the second month**
> > by those who were unclean,
> > or in a journey **on the first month,**
> > was a violation of what God had prescribed,
> > when God himself had expressly prescribed it.

The critical text will therefore restore the original prepositions in Alma 56:1, Alma 56:42, and 3 Nephi 8:5. Although "in the Xth day" and "on the Yth month" are strange for modern English, the original text seems to have had an occasional example of such usage.

Summary: Restore the preposition *in* for the phrase "in the Xth day" and the preposition *on* for the phrase "on the Yth month" wherever they occur in the earliest extant text: in Alma 56:1 ("**in** the second day **on** the first month"), in Alma 56:42 ("**in** the morning of the third day **on** the seventh month"), and in 3 Nephi 8:5 ("**in** the fourth day of the month").

■ **Alma 56:3**

now ye have known that
these were [*a desendant* 01 | *a descendant* ABCDEPS | *descendants* FGHIJKLMNOQRT] *of Laman*

As discussed under 1 Nephi 6:2, the original text had four examples of the phrase "a descendant of X" in reference to a plural subject, as here in Alma 56:3 ("these were a descendant of Laman"). These four examples have all been edited to "descendants of X", but the critical text will restore the original singular usage.

■ **Alma 56:5**

therefore it [*supficeth* 0 | *supposeth* 1ABDEPS | *sufficeth* CGHIJKLMNOQRT |
> *supposeth > sufficeth* F] *me that I tell you that*
two thousand of these young men hath taken their weapons of war
and would that I should be their leader

𝒪 is extant for this part of the text and reads *supficeth,* Oliver Cowdery's miswriting of *sufficeth.* Three other times in the manuscripts Oliver miswrote *ff* as *pf:*

> Alma 56:8 (*suffer* as *supfer* twice in 𝒪)
>
> > but I would not [*supfer* 0 | *suffer* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] them
> > that they should break this covenant which they had made
> > supposing that God would strengthen us
> > insomuch that we should not [*supfer* 0 | *suffer* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] more
> > because of the fulfilling the oath which they had taken

Moroni 7:6 (*proffiteth* as *propfiteth* in 𝔓)
  except he shall do it with real intent
  it [*propfiteth* 1 | *profiteth* ABCEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST | *proffiteth* D] him nothing

Regarding the last example, Oliver Cowdery sometimes spelled *profit* with two *f*'s, as *proffit,* which would then make the miswriting *propfit* possible:

Alma 58:5
  but behold this did not [*proffit* 0 | *profit* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] us
    but little

Moroni 7:9
  yea and it [*proffiteth* 1 | *profiteth* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] him nothing

Moroni 10:8
  and they are given by the manifestations of the Spirit of God unto men
    to [*proffit* 1 | *profit* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] them

The problem with the miswriting *supfiseth* here in Alma 56:5 is that it led Oliver Cowdery to misread that word as *supposeth* when he copied the text from 𝒪 into 𝔓. The 1830 edition followed this secondary reading, as did the second edition (1837) and the first two British editions (1841 and 1849). For the 1840 edition, Joseph Smith replaced the secondary *supposeth* with the correct *sufficeth*. It seems doubtful that Joseph referred to 𝒪 in making this emendation. It is obvious that *sufficeth* works better, although one can accept *supposeth* by assuming some kind of semantic ellipsis of a modal verb (as if Helaman meant to write "therefore it supposeth me that I **should** tell you that . . ."). The first printing of the 1852 LDS edition followed the 1849 reading, *supposeth* (which ultimately derives from 𝔓), but the second printing restored the correct *sufficeth* (by reference to the 1840 edition). The LDS editions have continued with *sufficeth,* but the 1908 RLDS edition restored *supposeth* to the RLDS text because 𝔓 reads *supposeth.*

Elsewhere in the text, the complement for the expletive *it* in the phrase "it sufficeth me" is an infinitive clause (usually with the verb *say*):

1 Nephi 6:2	for it sufficeth me **to** say that . . .
2 Nephi 5:4	but it sufficeth me **to** say that . . .
2 Nephi 5:34	and it sufficeth me **to** say that . . .
Alma 40:5	and it sufficeth me **to** know that . . .
Ether 3:17	therefore it sufficeth me **to** say that . . .

On the other hand, with "it supposeth me" the *it* is always complemented by a *that*-clause:

Jacob 2:8	and it supposeth me **that** . . .
The Words of Mormon 1:2	and it supposeth me **that** . . .
Alma 54:11	but behold it supposeth me **that** . . .
Alma 54:11	or it supposeth me **that** . . .

Thus here in Alma 56:5, the *it* is exceptionally complemented by a *that*-clause ("it sufficeth me **that I** tell you that . . .", not "it sufficeth me **to** tell you that . . ."). Thus from a syntactic point of view (but not a semantic one), the verb *suppose* works better ("it supposeth me that I tell you

that . . .”). But there are examples of existential *suffice* that permit other types of complements besides the infinitive clause:

Alma 37:12   and it may suffice **if** I only say . . .
Alma 40:19   let it suffice **that** I say that . . .

In the first case, we have a conditional *if*-clause, in the second a *that*-clause. Thus the use of the *that*-clause here in Alma 56:5 for “it sufficeth me” is possible, and the critical text will maintain it.

Summary: Maintain in Alma 56:5 the reading of the original manuscript, “it **sufficeth** me that I tell you that two thousand of these young men hath taken their weapons of war”.

■ **Alma 56:7**

but in the twenty and [six O | *sixth* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *year*
when they saw our afflictions and our tribulations for them
they were about to break the covenant which they had made

■ **Alma 56:9**

for behold in the twenty and [six O | *sixth* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *year*
I Helaman did march at the head of these two thousand young men

Here we have two instances where the original manuscript has the cardinal number *six* rather than the expected ordinal number *sixth*. A third instance is found later in this chapter:

Alma 56:20

and thus ended the twenty and [*six* O | *sixth* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] year

In these three verses, Oliver Cowdery emended the *six* to the expected *sixth* when he copied the text from 𝓞 into 𝓟. There are no other instances in the text where we get *six* instead of the expected *sixth;* out of 22 other instances of *sixth* (of which seven are extant in 𝓞), we get an invariant *sixth*.

These three occurrences of *six* in place of *sixth* appear to be the result of the tendency in continuous speech to simplify a complex consonant cluster—in this instance, to omit the voiceless interdental fricative /θ/ when preceded by the obstruent cluster /ks/ at the end of *six* and followed by a consonant (namely, the initial *y* of *year*). Under these phonetic conditions, it takes some articulatory effort to maintain the /θ/ in *sixth year.* Here in Alma 56, Joseph Smith could have pronounced *sixth* as simply *six,* with the result that Oliver Cowdery wrote down *six* instead of *sixth* three times in 𝓞.

David Calabro (personal communication) has suggested one alternative that needs to be considered: namely, the original text here in Alma 56 may have actually read “twenty and six year” in all three of these cases. As discussed under Alma 52:15, we expect the last number (and only the last number) in a compound ordinal to take the ordinal form (as in “twenty and sixth year”). Nonetheless, there are examples in Early Modern English where the last number in a compound ordinal number was actually a cardinal, as in the following examples from *Literature Online* <lion.chadwyck.com>:

Richard Eden (1577)   the twenty and **two** day of September
William Segar (1602)   the twenty and **one** day of May
Samuel Purchas (1625)   the twenty and **eight** day

Lewis Bayly (died 1631)	the seventy and **one** year of Christ
William Drummond (1655)	the twenty and **five** year of his reign
James Durham (1658)	the three hundred and **twenty** year
Samuel Clarke (1665)	the seventy and **one** year of his age
Nathaniel Wanley (1673)	this seventy and **eight** year of mine age
Samuel Clarke (1675)	the seventy and **one** year of his age
Matthew Poole (died 1679)	the thirty and **one** year of Asa king of Judah
Walter Scot (1688)	this seventy and **two** year

Although there are no examples listed on *Literature Online* involving *six,* such examples were undoubtedly possible. The cases involving *one* and *two* clearly show that the issue here is not a phonetic one since the expected ordinal forms, *first* and *second,* are so different from their cardinal forms. In other words, there really seems to have been a tendency in Early Modern English, although not especially frequent, to make the last number in a compound ordinal a cardinal number. But in the Book of Mormon, we find no independent evidence that the occurrence of *six* instead of *sixth* in Alma 56 is due to this kind of tendency. There are, for instance, no examples of compound ordinals, even as mistakes, where *first* is replaced by *one* or *second* by *two.* The only instances in 𝒪 of the cardinal in place of the ordinal are the three examples of *six* here in Alma 56 and one example of *eight* later on in the book of Helaman:

> Helaman 3:19
> and it came to pass that there was still great contentions in the land
> yea even in the forty and seventh year
> and also in the forty and [*eight* ᴏɴ | *eighth* 1ᴀʙᴄᴅᴇꜰɢʜɪᴊᴋʟᴍᴏᴘǫʀꜱᴛ] year

But there is independent evidence that the difficulty here with *eighth* is orthographic, not phonetic. For discussion of that evidence, see under Helaman 3:19.

The critical text will assume that the three instances in 𝒪 of *six* in "twenty and six year" is the result of Joseph Smith omitting the /θ/ sound in his pronunciation of *sixth year,* which led Oliver Cowdery to write down *six* rather than the correct *sixth* three times in 𝒪. Thus Oliver's later decision to consistently emend "twenty and **six** year" to "twenty and **sixth** year" was undoubtedly correct.

Summary: Accept in Alma 56:7, 9, 20 Oliver Cowdery's emendation in 𝒫 of *six* to *sixth* in the phrase "twenty and six(th) year"; the omission in 𝒪 of the /θ/ sound in Oliver's spellings of *sixth* was most probably the result of Joseph Smith's pronunciation of *sixth year* as *six year.*

■ **Alma 56:9**

but behold
[*theres* >% *heres* >% *here is* ᴏ | *here is* 1ᴀʙᴄᴅᴇꜰɢʜɪᴊᴋʟᴍɴᴏᴘǫʀꜱᴛ]
one thing in which we may have great joy
for behold in the twenty and sixth year
I Helaman did march at the head of these two thousand young men

The original manuscript is unclear here. It appears that Oliver Cowdery first started to write either *there is* or the contracted form *there's* (although the latter would have been written without an apostrophe, as *theres*). Oliver wrote the initial *t* but then erased it; he continued on by

writing *heres* inline, the contracted form for *here's*. Finally, the *heres* was corrected by erasure and overwriting to *here is*. This correction is consistent with the fact that the Book of Mormon text completely avoids verbal contractions. Nonetheless, sometimes Oliver initially wrote such contractions in the manuscripts:

> Alma 48:3 (*he'd* initially in 𝒪 in place of *he had*)
>
> > for [*hed >% he had* 0 | *he had* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] hardened
> > the hearts of the Lamanites

> Alma 55:9 (*we're* initially in 𝒪, plus an extra *are,* partially corrected to *we are are*)
>
> > [*were are > we are are* 0 | *we are* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] glad

> Alma 55:11 (*we're* initially in 𝒫, plus an extra *are,* corrected to *we are*)
>
> > [*we are* 0BCDEFGHIJMNOQ | *were are >+ we are* 1 | *We are* AKLPRST] weary

There's also a case in 3 Nephi where the typesetter for the 1837 edition set *it is* as *its* (but with no apostrophe):

> 3 Nephi 12:34
>
> > for [*it is* 1ACFGHIJKLMNOPQRST | *its* BDE] God's throne

Surprisingly, this typo was maintained in the LDS textual tradition until 1852.

Elsewhere in the text, we have evidence for both *there is* and *here is* as explanatory introductions to a following clause:

> Alma 7:7 (𝒪 is not extant)
>
> > and behold **there is** one thing which is of more importance than they all
> > for behold the time is not far distant
> > that the Redeemer liveth and cometh among his people

> Alma 40:1 (𝒪 is extant for *here is*)
>
> > now my son
> > **here is** somewhat more I would say unto thee
> > for I perceive that thy mind is worried concerning the resurrection of the dead

> Alma 42:1 (𝒪 is not extant for *there is*)
>
> > and now my son I perceive
> > **there is** somewhat more which doth worry your mind
> > which ye cannot understand
> > which is concerning the justice of God in the punishment of the sinner
> > for ye do try to suppose that it is injustice
> > that the sinner should be consigned to a state of misery

Thus the earliest textual sources support both *here is* and *there is*. We follow in each case the earliest textual sources, thus the corrected reading here in 𝒪 for Alma 56:9: "but behold **here is** one thing in which we may have great joy".

Summary: In Alma 56:9, Oliver Cowdery first started to write in 𝒪 either *there is* or the contracted form *there's* (which he would have spelled as *theres,* without an apostrophe); he initially corrected this reading to the contracted form *here's* (but without the apostrophe); ultimately, he corrected *heres* to *here is,* the reading that will be maintained in the critical text.

■ **Alma 56:9**

the city of [*Judeah* 1 | *Judea* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]

In both manuscripts, Oliver Cowdery consistently spelled *Judea* with an *h* at the end. Besides the example here in Alma 56:9, we have four more examples in Alma 56–57:

> Alma 56:15
> the city of [*Judeah* 0 1 | *Judea* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]

> Alma 56:18
> the city of [*Judeah* 0 1 | *Judea* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]

> Alma 56:57
> the city of [*Jewd* >% NULL 0 | 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
> [*Judeah* 0 1 | *Judea* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]

> Alma 57:11
> therefore it became expedient that we should take those provisions
> and send them to [*Judeah* 0 1 | *Judeah* > *Judea* A | *Judea* BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]

Unlike the first case (here in Alma 56:9), the other cases are all extant in 𝓞 and have the final *h*. Note that in Alma 57:11, the 1830 compositor originally set the name as *Judeah,* the reading in 𝓟; perhaps he didn't recognize the place as the city Judea since in this case only there is no explicit reference to "the city of Judea". During the printing of the 1830 sheets, *Judeah* in Alma 57:11 was corrected to *Judea* as an in-press change. Subsequent printed editions have continued with the spelling *Judea* in all five cases.

The manuscript spelling, *Judeah,* is probably incorrect. Evidence elsewhere in the manuscripts shows that Joseph Smith did not spell out known biblical names to the scribe; he may have simply expected the scribe to know the spelling of names like *Isaiah, Manasseh, Melchizedek, Nazareth,* and *pharaoh.* Or if the scribe didn't know the correct spelling, the assumption was that the typesetter would since he could consult a Bible. Thus scribe 2 of 𝓞 could misspell *Isaiah* as *Isauh* (in 1 Nephi 15:20) and *pharaoh* as *Pharro* (in 1 Nephi 4:2), all without correction in 𝓞. For a general discussion of this point, see under 1 Nephi 11:13 for the spelling of the name *Nazareth;* included there is a list of Oliver's Cowdery's misspellings of biblical names in the Isaiah passages.

The Book of Mormon name *Judea* is the name of a Nephite city, but it appears to derive from the biblical name. One clear example of a Book of Mormon geographical name deriving from biblical sources is *Jerusalem:*

> Alma 21:1–2
> behold Aaron took his journey
> towards the **land** which was called by the Lamanites **Jerusalem**
> calling it after the land of their fathers' nativity
> and it was away joining the borders of Mormon
> now the Lamanites and the Amlicites and the people of Amulon
> had built a great **city** which was called **Jerusalem**

Other Book of Mormon place-names that may be of biblical origin include the land of Joshua (Mormon 2:6) and the city of Boaz (Mormon 4:20).

The spelling with the final *h* for *Judeah* in the manuscripts is quite probably due to the spelling of the related name *Judah,* which does end in an *h* and occurs 22 times in the Book of Mormon. In 𝔓, Oliver Cowdery consistently spelled *Judah* with its final *h* (21 times); the remaining instance in 𝔓 is also spelled correctly by scribe 2 of 𝔓 (in 3 Nephi 24:4). Only two instances of *Judah* are extant in 𝕆: one is spelled *juda* by scribe 3 of 𝕆 (in 1 Nephi 5:12); the other was spelled correctly by Oliver as *Judah* (in 1 Nephi 20:1). The 1830 typesetter's decision to emend *Judeah* to *Judea* was undoubtedly based on his recognition of the name as a biblical one.

Yet even under the assumption that the name of the city is biblical, it is difficult to actually determine what the biblical spelling for *Judea* should actually be. In the King James Bible, the name is consistently spelled in the New Testament as the archaic *Judaea* (43 times), not *Judea.* The spelling *Judaea* is based on the Latin *Iudaea,* transliterated from the Greek *Ιουδαια.* The name occurs only once in the King James Old Testament, namely, as *Judea,* in Ezra 5:8: "we went into the province of **Judea**" (not *Judaea*). Yet the Hebrew original here in Ezra actually reads *Judah,* not *Judea,* while the corresponding name in the Septuagint is the accusative of the Greek *Ιουδαια.* So one could argue that if the King James Bible had been translated systematically according to the Greek, the Ezra example should have read "we went into the province of **Judaea**". Of course, on the basis of the Hebrew it should read "we went into the province of **Judah**".

In any event, the typesetter for the 1830 Book of Mormon chose the Old Testament spelling *Judea* over the New Testament *Judaea.* Generally speaking, the Book of Mormon uses the Old Testament spellings for biblical names rather than the New Testament spellings, as shown in the following list (each Book of Mormon place-name that appears to derive from a biblical name is marked with an asterisk):

	BOOK OF MORMON	OLD TESTAMENT	NEW TESTAMENT
	Noah	Noah	Noe, Noah
	Melchizedek	Melchizedek	Melchisedec
*	Judea	Judea	Judaea
*	Joshua	Joshua	Jesus
*	Boaz	Boaz	Booz
	Elijah	Elijah	Elias
	Isaiah	Isaiah	Esaias
	Jeremiah	Jeremiah	Jeremy, Jeremias

It should also be noted that the Book of Mormon does follow the New Testament spellings for names of individuals found only in the New Testament, such as the personal name *Jesus* for the Savior and *John* for Jesus's disciple.

It is, of course, possible that the manuscript name *Judeah,* ending in an *h,* is actually correct. Ultimately, we have to decide whether Joseph Smith would have thought that *Judeah,* if that's what he read, was crucially different from *Judea.* Since Joseph would have been familiar with the name *Judea* (whether spelled as *Judea, Judaea,* or even *Judeah*), I suspect he would have interpreted it as a biblical name and would not have spelled it out to Oliver Cowdery. Since the name of the land could very well be the biblical name, the critical text will accept the spelling *Judea,* the Old Testament spelling (despite its single occurrence in the Old Testament). This is, by the way,

how David Norton spells the name in both the New and Old Testaments in his recent *The New Cambridge Paragraph Bible with the Apocrypha: King James Version* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005).

Summary: Accept the Old Testament biblical spelling *Judea* for all five occurrences of the name in Alma 56–57; Oliver Cowdery's consistent manuscript spelling, *Judeah,* seems to be a mistake influenced by the spelling *Judah.*

■ **Alma 56:10**

for behold his army had been reduced by the Lamanites
because [*of the numerority of* 01A | BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *their forces*
[*haveing* 0 | *having* 1A | *had* BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *slain a vast number of our men*

The earliest text reads "because of the **numerority** of their forces having slain a vast number of our men". This reading presents two problems. First, the word *numerority* seems problematic. Second, the construction itself is syntactically difficult. These two problems led Joseph Smith to edit the text for the 1837 edition by deleting "of the numerority of" and by replacing the participial form *having* with the finite verb form *had.* Joseph's editing replaced the original prepositional construction "because of NP" with the subordinate conjunctive construction "because S" (NP stands for a noun phrase and S for a finite clause).

The word *numerority* is not found in the Oxford English Dictionary nor on *Literature Online* <lion.chadwyck.com>. If *numerority* is an actual word, it seems to be a blend of *numeral* and *superiority,* meaning perhaps something like 'numerical superiority'. There is only one instance of it on <www.google.com> (beyond numerous references to its occurrence in the earlier text of the Book of Mormon):

> *Web Dictionary of Cybernetics and Systems*
> There are two kinds of growth phenomena, (1) growth in **numerority,**
> e.g., population growth or growth in the number of cars produced, and
> (2) growth in structure, e.g., growth of a crystal or of an enterprise.

This citation derives from a Belgium website, <pespmc1.vub.ac.be>, which makes one wonder if the unnamed author of the text is a native speaker of English.

A more reasonable possibility is that the word *numerority* in 𝓞 is an error. One possible emendation would be the word *numerosity,* which differs from *numerority* by a single letter. Although *numerosity* is in the OED (with the meaning 'the state of being numerous'), it is not independently found anywhere in the scriptures. In the OED, citations of *numerosity* with this meaning date from 1611 up into the 1800s.

A more reasonable emendation for *numerority* is the word *enormity,* which is found twice in the Book of Mormon text (and both instances are extant in 𝓞):

> Alma 52:5
> and also seeing the **enormity** of their number
> Teancum thought it was not expedient
> that he should attempt to attackt them in their forts

Alma 57:13

> but it came to pass that our prisoners were so numerous
> that notwithstanding the [*enormity* 0ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST |
>   *enumerority* > *enormity* 1] of our number
> we were obliged to employ all our force to keep them or put them to death

This last example is particularly interesting. Although the original manuscript reads *enormity,* in the printer's manuscript Oliver Cowdery initially wrote *enumerority* for this word but then crossed it out and supralinearly wrote *enormity.* Oliver's tendency to replace *enormity* with *enumerority* strongly suggests that the similar *numerority* in Alma 56:10 is also an error for *enormity.* Moreover, in both these passages, there is a following instance of *number* that could have led to an original *enormity* being replaced by *numerority* in the first case and *enumerority* in the second:

Alma 56:10   the **enormity** (> *numerority*) of their forces
            having slain a vast **number** of our men

Alma 57:13   notwithstanding the **enormity** (> *enumerority*)
            of our **number**

One could argue, of course, that the *enumerority* in Alma 57:13 was prompted by the *numerority* in Alma 56:10, but the distance of 4.3 manuscript pages between the two occurrences makes this possibility rather unlikely. Since the word *numerority* is very problematic, the critical text will assume that it is an error for *enormity.*

The second problem with the original text here in Alma 56:10 is the awkwardness of a present-participial clause as the noun phrase for the prepositional *because of.* One way to deal with this construction would be to place a comma (or perhaps a dash) after *forces:*

Alma 56:10 (emended text, with adjusted punctuation)

> for behold, his army had been reduced by the Lamanites
> because of the enormity of their forces,
> having slain a vast number of our men,
> for which cause we have to mourn.

Such an addition in punctuation would help the reader interpret the present-participial clause "having slain a vast number of our men" as modifying "their forces" rather than "the enormity of their forces". The intent of Joseph Smith's editing here (where he deleted "of the numerority of" and changed *having* to *had*) was to create an easier reading with that same basic meaning ("because their forces had slain a vast number of our men").

Summary: Restore the earliest text in Alma 56:10 except that *numerority* should be emended to *enormity* ("because of the **enormity** of their forces / having slain a vast number of our men"); this emendation is supported by Alma 57:13, where Oliver Cowdery initially wrote *enumerority* in 𝓟 instead of the correct *enormity;* in Alma 56:10 a comma or a dash could be placed after *forces* to assist the reader in interpreting the following present-participial clause as modifying "their forces".

■ **Alma 56:11**

nevertheless we may console ourselves in this point
that they have died in the cause of their country
and [NULL > *of* 1|*of* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *their God*

The original manuscript is not extant here. Oliver Cowdery initially wrote "of their country and their God" in the printer's manuscript, then supralinearly inserted the *of* before *their God*. The insertion is without any change in level of ink flow, so it appears to be virtually immediate. Elsewhere in the text, we have two similar conjunctive cases involving the noun *cause*, both of which lack the repeated *of*:

> Mosiah 29:7 (not "and **of** perverting")
>> which would be the cause **of** shedding much blood
>> and perverting the way of the Lord

> Alma 61:14 (not "and **of** our God")
>> that we may rejoice in the great privilege of our church
>> and in the cause **of** our Redeemer and our God

In the second example, one could argue that the *of* is not repeated because the words *Redeemer* and *God* refer to the same person, whereas in "the cause **of** their country and **of** their God", *country* and *God* have different referents.

The repetition of prepositions in conjuncts is characteristic of the Book of Mormon text (see the discussion under CONJUNCTIVE REPETITION in volume 3), but it is not the norm in standard English. Thus here in Alma 56:11, Oliver Cowdery initially wrote in 𝒫 what he expected (namely, no repeated *of*). 𝒪 is not extant here, but there is room for the repeated *of* in the lacuna.

Throughout this first third of page 310 in 𝒫, Oliver Cowdery initially omitted many small words in verses 11–16. Besides the *of* here in line 2, the following words, set here in bold, were initially omitted in 𝒫:

> line 3   **all of** whom are chief Captains
> line 4   **&** we suppose **that they are** now at this time in the land of Nephi
> line 7   & the city **of** Zeezrum **&** the city of Cumeni
> line 10   **yea** & they were depressed in body

It appears that Oliver was getting tired in his copywork and made an unusually high number of momentary omissions in 𝒫 for this part of the text. The words that were initially skipped in 𝒫 either are extant in 𝒪 or there is clearly room for them between extant portions of 𝒪. All are supralinearly inserted in 𝒫 with no change in the level of ink flow. (The ink flow for the inserted *all* in line 3 is somewhat sharper, but this appears to be the result of how Oliver held the quill when he obliquely inserted this word supralinearly.)

Summary: Accept in Alma 56:11 Oliver Cowdery's inserted *of* in the printer's manuscript ("and **of** their God"), the probable reading of the original manuscript; similar instances of Oliver's initial omission of small words can be found elsewhere for this first third of page 310 in 𝒫.

■ **Alma 56:13**

and now these are the cities
[01ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQS | *of* RT] *which the Lamanites have obtained possession*
  [*of* 0 | 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
by the shedding [0 | *of* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *the blood of so many of our valiant men*

Here we have two cases of variation involving the preposition *of*. The first case deals with the place-
ment of the preposition in the relative clause "which the Lamanites have obtained possession".
𝒫 reads without any preposition at all, as do all the printed editions except for the last two LDS
editions (1920 and 1981). The 1920 edition added the expected *of* at the beginning of the relative
clause. This relative clause is extant in 𝒪; there is definitely no *of* before the relative pronoun
which, but the *of* is partially extant at the end of a line in 𝒪. When Oliver Cowdery copied the
text from 𝒪 into 𝒫, he apparently skipped the *of* at the end of the line in 𝒪. For evidence that
Oliver sometimes omitted small words at the ends of lines in 𝒪, see the discussion and examples
listed under Alma 11:21.

Usage elsewhere in the text supports placing the *of* at the end of the relative clause. In the
Book of Mormon text, whenever the relative clause refers to possessing something, the *of* is
found at the end of the relative clause, not at the beginning:

> Alma 52:5
> and now Teancum saw that
> the Lamanites were determined to maintain those cities which they had taken
> and those parts of the land **which** they had obtained possession **of**

> Alma 57:4
> but the people of Antiparah did leave the city
> and fled to their other cities **which** they had possession **of**
> to fortify them

Thus the critical text will restore the original *of* at the end of the relative clause here in Alma
56:13: "these are the cities which the Lamanites have obtained possession **of**".

The second case of variation involving *of* has to do with the mixed gerundive that occurred
in the earliest text for this passage. Although 𝒪 is not extant for all of the gerundive, it is suffi-
ciently extant to show that there was no *of* between the gerund *shedding* and the direct object *the
blood*. Moreover, there is clearly room in the lacuna for the definite article *the* before *shedding*.
The transcript for 𝒪 reads as follows:

> Alma 56:13–14 (line 15, page 344′ of 𝒪)
>
> ```
> (            d)ing the bloo(d of   ) many of our valiant men the land of Manti or the
>    BY THE SHED              SO
> ```

Thus it appears that 𝒪 read "by the shedding the blood of so many of our valiant men". When
Oliver Cowdery copied the text from 𝒪 into 𝒫, he added the preposition *of* after *shedding*, thus
making the gerundive more nominal in form ("by the shedding of the blood of so many of our
valiant men"). Another possibility would have been to omit the *the* before *shedding*, which would
have produced a more verbal gerundive ("by shedding the blood of so many of our valiant men").
As discussed under 1 Nephi 17:32, the mixed gerundive construction without the *of* occurred
fairly often in the original text of the Book of Mormon (for a complete list of examples, see

under GERUNDIVES in volume 3). The critical text will restore the original instance of the mixed gerundive here in Alma 56:13.

Summary: Move the preposition *of* at the beginning of the relative clause in Alma 56:13 to the end of that clause (giving "the cities which the Lamanites have obtained possession **of** "); the clause-final position for the *of* is supported by the reading in Ọ as well as by usage elsewhere in the text; also restore the mixed gerundive in this passage: "by the shedding the blood of so many of our valiant men" (also the apparent reading in Ọ).

■ **Alma 56:14**

the land of Manti or the city of Manti
and the city [*of* 0ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST | NULL > *of* 1] *Zeezrom*
and the city of Cumeni
and the city [*of* 01ABCDGHIJKLMNOPQRST | E | NULL > *of* F] *Antiparah*

In this verse, we have the momentary loss in 𝔓 of the *of* in "the city **of** Zeezrom". Ọ is extant here, and the *of* is definitely there. In fact, every city in this conjoining of city names has the *of* in the original text. But in the last example, "the city **of** Antiparah", the 1849 LDS edition omitted the *of*. The subsequent 1852 LDS edition followed the 1849 reading, "the city Antiparah", in the first printing, but the *of* was restored in the second printing, probably by reference to the 1840 edition.

As noted under 1 Nephi 11:13, for each case of "city (of) X", we follow the earliest textual sources with respect to the *of*. Thus the *of* will be maintained for "the city of Zeezrom" and "the city of Antiparah" here in Alma 56:14. This is the only occurrence of "city (of) Zeezrom" in the Book of Mormon text. The phrase "city (of) Antiparah" occurs eight times in the text. Besides the case with the original *of* here in Alma 56:14, there are four instances with the *of;* these are all found at the beginning of Alma 57:

Alma 57:1	the city of Antiparah
Alma 57:2	the city of Antiparah
Alma 57:3	against the city of Antiparah
Alma 57:4	the city of Antiparah

In none of these cases has the original *of* ever been removed. On the other hand, there are three instances of "the city Antiparah" later in chapter 56, and for each of these cases there has been a strong tendency in the printed editions to add the *of:*

Alma 56:31
    near the city [01A | *of* BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] Antiparah

Alma 56:33
    near the city [01ABCGHKPRST | *of* DEFIJLMNOQ] Antiparah

Alma 56:34
    in the city [01ABCGHKPRST | *of* DEFIJLMNOQ] Antiparah

For the first example, the *of* was added in the 1837 edition and has been retained in every subsequent edition. For the two other examples, the 1841 British edition added the *of,* but the 1920 LDS edition removed it from the LDS text.

Summary: Follow the earliest textual sources with respect to the *of* for every case of "city (of) X" in the text; for the phrase "the city (of) Antiparah", the original text had five instances with the *of* and three without; the only instance in the text of "the city (of) Zeezrom", in Alma 56:14, has the *of*.

■ **Alma 56:15**

when I arrived [*at* 0ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST | *to > at* 1] *the city of Judea*

> Here Oliver Cowdery initially wrote "**to** the city of Judeah" in 𝒫, but almost immediately he corrected the preposition to *at,* the reading in 𝒪. The critical text will continue with the original preposition *at.* For a complete discussion of the variation between *to* and *at* in the history of the text, see under 1 Nephi 17:14.

Summary: Maintain in Alma 56:15 the original preposition *at* in the clause "when I arrived at the city of Judea".

■ **Alma 56:15**

and I found Antipus and his men toiling
with their [*mights* 01ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQS | *might* RT]
to fortify the city

> As discussed under Jacob 1:19, the original text prefers the plural *mights* over the singular *might.* Here in Alma 56:15, the critical text will restore the original plural.

■ **Alma 56:17**

therefore you may well suppose that [*the* 0 | *this* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *little force*
which I brought with me—yea those sons of mine—gave them great hopes and much joy

> The original manuscript clearly has the definite article *the* rather than the determiner *this.* The *e* at the end of *the* ends in a slight flourish, which apparently led Oliver Cowdery to miscopy the *the* as *this* in the printer's manuscript. Either reading actually works, so the correct decision should be to follow the earliest textual source, namely *the* (the reading in 𝒪). For other instances where *the* and *this* have been mixed up in the text, see under 2 Nephi 10:23.

Summary: Restore the definite article *the* before *little force* in Alma 56:17 ("the little force which I brought with me").

■ **Alma 56:17**

therefore you may well suppose that the little force
which I brought with me—yea those sons of mine—
gave them great [*hope > hopes* 0 | *hopes* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *and much joy*

> As discussed under Alma 52:21, the original text has a number of instances of plural *hopes* where modern readers expect the singular *hope.* Here in Alma 56:17, Oliver Cowdery initially wrote *hope*

but then virtually immediately corrected *hope* to *hopes* by inserting the plural *s* inline (there is no change in the level of ink flow). Oliver's initial *hope* may have been influenced by the following conjoined singular, "and much joy". The critical text will retain the plural *hopes*.

Summary: Maintain in Alma 56:17 the corrected plural reading in *O*, "great **hopes**".

■ **Alma 56:18**

when the Lamanites saw that
[*Antipas/Antipus* o | *Antipus* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *had received*
a greater strength to his army . . .

Here in *O*, Oliver Cowdery wrote the *u* in *Antipus* so that it looks more like an *a*, giving *Antipas*. As noted under Alma 47:7, *Antipas* is actually the name of a mountain. And interestingly, that name was frequently miswritten in *O* as *Antipus* (but not for its first occurrence, in Alma 47:7). Here in Alma 56, the name refers to a military leader, Antipus. His name is found 20 times in the text (all here in this chapter); 13 instances are fully extant in *O*, and all but this one in verse 18 read *Antipus*. The first occurrence of the name, in verse 9, is extant only for the last three letters of the name. But in the ultraviolet photos for this page of *O*, the vowel appears to be a *u*, not an *a*. For all 20 occurrences of the name in *P*, Oliver wrote it as *Antipus*. Here in Alma 56, the critical text will maintain the spelling *Antipus* for the name of the military leader, a spelling that is distinct from *Antipas,* the name of the mountain in Alma 47.

Summary: Maintain the name *Antipus* for the military leader, referred to 20 times in Alma 56.

■ **Alma 56:18–20**

they were compelled by the orders of Ammoron
to not come against the city of Judea or against us to battle
(1) *and thus were we* [*favoured* 01DEFMNQ | *favored* ABCGHIJKLOPRST] *of the Lord*
for had they come upon us in this our weakness
they might have perhaps destroyed our little army
(2) *but thus were we* [*favoured* 0 | *preserved* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]

they were commanded by Ammoron
to maintain those cities which they had taken

The original manuscript has the word *favored* (spelled as *favoured*) at both the beginning and ending of Alma 56:19. In the printer's manuscript, Oliver Cowdery accidentally miscopied the second *favoured* as *preserved* (both words are visually similar). Here Helaman is simply repeating the idea that the Lord favored them by preventing the Lamanites from attacking. Note, however, that the repetition leads back to the decision of Ammoron not to attack the city of Judea but rather to maintain the cities which they had already taken (compare the end of verse 18 with the beginning of verse 20).

Elsewhere in the text, the verb *preserve* and the noun *preservation* are occasionally used to refer to the preservation of soldiers:

Alma 44:9	it is your cunning that hath preserved you from our swords
Alma 44:9	it is your breastplates and your shields that hath preserved you
Alma 57:26	their preservation was astonishing to our whole army
Alma 57:36	I was filled with exceeding joy because of the goodness of God in preserving us

To be sure, the English language allows for armies to be preserved, so the secondary reading *preserved* is semantically possible in Alma 56:19.

The first occurrence of *favored* in verse 19 is, of course, probably not a mistake for *preserved* since elsewhere in the text "favored of the Lord" is fairly frequent (with six other occurrences) and there are no occurrences of "preserved of the Lord". Moreover, we expect the preposition *by* with *preserved* (for instance, "preserved by the hand of the Lord" in 1 Nephi 5:14 or "preserved by the hand of God" in Alma 46:24).

Finally, we should note that there is evidence elsewhere in the text for beginning and ending a verse with identical summarizing phraseology, including the repetition of a *thus,* just as in Alma 56:19:

Alma 49:20
(1) thus they were prepared
 —yea a body of their most strong men—
 with their swords and their slings
 to smite down all who should attempt to come
 into their place of security by the place of entrance
(2) and thus were they prepared
 to defend themselves against the Lamanites

Summary: Restore the reading of the original manuscript in Alma 56:19 so that the ending as well as the beginning of the verse reads "thus were we favored".

■ **Alma 56:19**

and thus [*were we* 01ABCDEFGHIKLMNOPQRST | *we were* J] *favored of the Lord*

Here the 1888 LDS edition switched from the inverted word order of "and thus were we favored" to "and thus we were favored". That edition never served as a copytext, so this change was never copied into any subsequent LDS edition. Either word order is theoretically possible. Later on in this verse, the same original inverted word order is used: "but thus were we favored". Yet later in this chapter we get the noninverted word order: "and thus **we were** prepared with ten thousand men" (Alma 56:28). The critical text will, in each case, follow the earliest textual sources: "thus were we favored" twice in Alma 56:19 and "thus we were prepared" in Alma 56:28. For another example of this kind of change (but in the 1837 edition), see under Mosiah 11:6, where an original "thus were they supported" was changed to "thus they were supported".

Summary: Maintain the original inverted word order *were we* in Alma 56:19 ("and thus **were we** favored of the Lord").

■ **Alma 56:20**

and thus ended the twenty and [*six* 0 | *sixth* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *year*

As discussed under Alma 56:7, 9, the *six* here in 𝒪 is very likely the result of Joseph Smith pronouncing "sixth year" without the /θ/ sound when he dictated the text to Oliver Cowdery. With high probability, the emended *sixth* in 𝒫 is the correct reading.

■ **Alma 56:22**

and it came to pass that we kept spies out round about to watch the movements of the Lamanites that they might not pass us by night [*or* 0 | *nor* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *by day*

The original manuscript reads "by night **or** by day". Oliver Cowdery miscopied the *or* as *nor* in the printer's manuscript. Either conjunction is possible here in this negative context (that is, within the scope of the preceding *not*). Elsewhere in the text, we have instances of either conjunction within the scope of a *not*:

| 2 Nephi 1:25 | he hath **not** sought for power **nor** authority over you |
| Alma 55:19 | he did **not** delight in murder **or** bloodshed |

There has been a tendency in the printed editions to consciously replace *or* with *nor* in such negative contexts. But some examples, as in Alma 55:19, have never been edited; for a list of other unedited examples, see under Alma 26:11. For a nearby example of the grammatical change from *or* to *nor*, see below under Alma 56:40. The critical text will restore the original *or* here in Alma 56:22.

Summary: Restore in Alma 56:22 the *or* of the original manuscript: "that they might not pass us by night **or** by day".

■ **Alma 56:30**

we were desirous to bring a stratagem into [*an* 0A | *an* >js NULL 1 | BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *effect upon them*

Here the original text reads "into **an** effect" instead of the expected "into effect". Joseph Smith deleted the *an* in his editing for the 1837 edition. As discussed under Alma 50:30, the use of the *an* in this phrase is clearly intended and will be restored in the critical text.

■ **Alma 56:31**

as if we were going to the city beyond [*shore* >% *on* 0 | *in* >% *on* 1 | *in* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *the borders by the seashore*

Here initially in 𝒪, Oliver Cowdery accidentally skipped ahead and started to write the word *shore*. He erased this wholly misplaced word and overwrote the end part with the preposition *on*. When he copied the text from 𝒪 into 𝒫, Oliver initially wrote *in* as the preposition. He erased the *i* vowel and overwrote it with an *o*, thus changing *in* to *on*. Despite all these efforts to get the correct reading of *on* in the manuscripts, the 1830 compositor ended up setting *in*.

Elsewhere in the text, there are examples of both "**on** the borders by the seashore" and "**in** the borders by the seashore" (as well as two examples with the preposition *to* and one with *upon*):

Alma 22:28	**in** the borders by the seashore
Alma 50:9	**to** the borders by the seashore
Alma 50:25	**on** 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 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

Although half the examples have the preposition *in* (six times), *on* is also possible (occurring two more times in the text). Thus the critical text will restore the original preposition *on* in Alma 56:31.

Summary: In accord with the reading of the two manuscripts, restore the preposition *on* in Alma 56:31 ("**on** the borders by the seashore").

■ **Alma 56:31**

and we were to march near the city [01A | *of* bcdefghijklmnopqrst] *Antiparah*

As discussed nearby under Alma 56:14, the critical text will restore the original reading without the *of* in "the city Antiparah" here in Alma 56:31. In this instance, the 1837 edition introduced the expanded reading with the *of*. Nearby, in verses 33 and 34, the 1841 British edition added the *of* to the same phrase.

■ **Alma 56:33**

but he did not march forth
until I had gone forth with my little army
and **came** *near the city Antiparah*

The text here has an invariant *came;* it is quite possible that this *came* is a past-participial form rather than a simple past-tense form, as if the text reads "until I had gone forth with my little army and **had came** near the city Antiparah". As explained under 1 Nephi 5:1, 4, the original text had quite a few cases where the past participle for the verb *come* was *came* rather than the standard *come*. Virtually all instances of past-participial *came* in the original text have been edited to *come*, but this may be one that has escaped editing. There is one example where such a conjoined *came* has been emended to *come:*

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 . . .

For discussion of this example, see under Alma 43:35.

Here is another case where the conjoined verb form may be a past participle that has never been emended:

3 Nephi 18:36
he touched with his hand the disciples whom he had chosen
one by one even until he had touched them all
and **spake** unto them as he touched them

For other examples in the original text of past-participial *spake,* see under 1 Nephi 3:30.

For an extensive discussion of this kind of usage, see under PAST PARTICIPLE in volume 3. In general, the critical text will maintain (or restore, as the case may be) all original nonstandard instances of the simple past-tense form for the past participle. Of course, here in Alma 56:33 and in 3 Nephi 18:36 we cannot be absolutely sure whether the conjoined verb form is actually a past participle.

Summary: Maintain the verb form *came* in Alma 56:33 ("until I had gone forth with my little army and **came** near the city Antiparah"); it is possible that in this instance *came* is acting as a past participle; similarly, the verb form *spake* will be maintained in 3 Nephi 18:36 ("even until he had touched them all and **spake** unto them as he touched them").

■ **Alma 56:33–34**

but he did not march forth until I had gone forth with my little army
and came near the city [01ABCGHKPRST | *of* DEFIJLMNOQ] *Antiparah*
and now in the city [01ABCGHKPRST | *of* DEFIJLMNOQ] *Antiparah*
were stationed the strongest army of the Lamanites

Here we have two instances where the 1841 British edition added the preposition *of* to the phrase "the city Antiparah". The LDS text maintained the longer reading until the 1920 edition. As discussed under Alma 56:14, the critical text will maintain the shorter reading here in Alma 56:33–34. Earlier in the chapter, in verse 31, the 1920 LDS edition did not remove the intrusive *of* from the same phrase; in that case, the *of* had been added in the 1837 edition.

■ **Alma 56:37**

when they saw the army of Antipus pursuing them
with their [*mights* 01ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQS | *might* RT]
they did not turn to the right nor to the left

As discussed under Jacob 1:19, the original text prefers the plural *mights* over the singular *might.* In this passage, the critical text will restore the original plural. For a similar example, see nearby under Alma 56:15.

■ **Alma 56:37**

they did not turn to the right nor to the left
but pursued their march in a [*strait* 01 | *straight* ᴀʙᴄᴅᴇꜰɢʜɪᴊᴋʟᴍɴᴏᴘǫʀsᴛ] *course after us*

As discussed under 1 Nephi 8:20, the correct reading here in Alma 56:37 is "in a straight 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.

■ **Alma 56:37**

and [01 |, ᴀʙᴄᴅᴇꜰɢʜɪᴊᴋʟᴍɴᴏᴘǫʀsᴛ]
as we [*suppose* 01ᴇꜰɢʜɪᴊᴋʟᴍɴᴏᴘǫʀsᴛ | *supposed* ᴀʙᴄᴅ]
[01 |, ᴀʙᴄᴅᴇꜰɢʜɪᴊᴋʟᴍɴᴏᴘǫʀsᴛ]
[*that* 01 | ᴀʙᴄᴅᴇꜰɢʜɪᴊᴋʟᴍɴᴏᴘǫʀsᴛ] *it was their intent to slay us*
    before Antipus should overtake them
and this that they might not be surrounded by our people

The original manuscript reads "& as we **suppose** that it was their intent to slay us before Antipus should overtake them". The present-tense *suppose* appears to be an error for *supposed* since Helaman is explaining in a letter the intent of the Lamanites during the battle, not afterwards when Helaman was composing this letter. The past-tense *d* is missing because it was hard for Oliver Cowdery to hear the final voiced stop *d* when it was immediately followed by a voiced interdental fricative /ð/ (the initial *th* sound of *that*).

Oliver Cowdery copied *suppose* into the printer's manuscript, but the 1830 compositor correctly set *supposed* since he realized that Helaman was reporting what they, Helaman and his men, had been thinking during their engagement with the Lamanites. At the same time, the compositor realized that his copytext read as a sentence fragment, so his solution was to treat "as we supposed" as a parenthetical clause. Thus he omitted the *that* and placed commas around "as we supposed":

> Alma 56:37 (the 1830 text with its original accidentals)
>   and, as we supposed, it was their intent to slay us before Antipus should
>   overtake them, and this that they might not be surrounded by our people.

The 1849 LDS edition reverted to the present-tense *suppose* (but without reference to the manuscripts, which were unavailable at that time). Perhaps Orson Pratt, the editor for the 1849 edition, felt that the present tense was more appropriate for a parenthetical statement made by Helaman when he wrote his letter to Moroni. The 1858 Wright edition made the same change to the present tense, independently it would seem since that edition was set in New York City directly from a copy of the 1840 edition and presumably without reference to any other edition. Both the LDS and RLDS texts have continued with the present-tense *suppose*.

Later in this letter from Helaman, there is another clause referring to Helaman's state of knowledge where the past-tense verb form has been similarly replaced with a present-tense form:

> Alma 56:43
>   and now whether they were overtaken by Antipus
>   we [*kew* 0 | *knew* 1ᴀʙᴄᴅᴇɢɪᴊᴋʟᴍɴᴏᴘǫʀsᴛ | *know* > *knew* ꜰ | *know* ʜ] not

Here the 1852 edition, in its first printing, and the 1874 RLDS edition replaced the correct past-tense *knew* with *know*. Yet *knew* is clearly correct since by the time Helaman wrote this letter, he definitely knew that the Lamanites had overtaken Antipus and his men (as described in Alma 56:49).

An alternative emendation here in Alma 56:37 would be to omit the subordinate conjunction *as,* thus giving "and we supposed that it was their intent to slay us before Antipus should overtake them". Elsewhere in the original text, there are quite a few instances of *as*-clauses that are never completed. The typical editorial solution for removing such fragments has been to delete the *as* (for some examples and discussion, see under 1 Nephi 8:7).

The critical text will restore in Alma 56:37 the conjectured original reading with its past-tense *supposed:* "and as we supposed that it was their intent to slay us before Antipus should overtake them". The sentence fragment will be maintained. The incomplete *as*-clause would not be as difficult to comprehend if we placed a dash before the following independent clause, thereby showing that the *as*-clause had been cut off:

> Alma 56:37 (the original text, as conjectured, with revised accidentals)
> and as we supposed that it was their intent
> to slay us before Antipus should overtake them—
> and this that they might not be surrounded by our people.

The subordinate conjunction *that* will also be maintained since the *that* is extant in ○ and was, in fact, the reason why Oliver Cowdery was unable to perceive the past-tense *d* at the end of the immediately preceding *supposed.*

Elsewhere in the text, when the verb *suppose* takes a finite clause as its complement, the *that* almost always precedes the clause (96 times). In only three cases is the *that* lacking in the earliest textual sources:

1 Nephi 4:28	for they supposed it was Laban
2 Nephi 9:28	supposing they know of themselves
3 Nephi 15:22	for they supposed it had been the Gentiles

For each case of "suppose (that) S", where S stands for a finite clause, we follow the earliest textual sources in determining whether the *that* is there or not. For some discussion regarding the occasional loss of the *that* when the verb is *suppose,* see under Alma 47:5.

Summary: Emend in Alma 56:37 the reading in ○ so that the verb *suppose* is in the past tense: "and as we **supposed** that it was their intent to slay us before Antipus should overtake them"; Oliver Cowdery apparently misheard *supposed that* as *suppose that;* despite its incompleteness, the original *as*-clause should be restored since such usage is quite common in the original text; the original *that* after *supposed* will also be restored to the text since it was in ○.

■ **Alma 56:40**

now *they durst* [*not* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRT | *now* s] *turn to the right nor to the left*
lest they should be surrounded

> The typesetter for the 1953 RLDS edition replaced the *not* in this sentence with the visually simi-
> lar *now,* undoubtedly prompted by the *now* at the beginning of the sentence. The critical text
> will, of course, retain the original *not*. The following *nor* requires a preceding negative.

Summary: Maintain in Alma 56:40 the negative *not,* "now they durst **not** turn to the right nor to the left".

■ **Alma 56:40**

now they durst not turn to the right **nor** *to the left*
  lest they should be surrounded
neither would I turn to the right [*or* 0ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQS | *nor > or* 1 | *nor* RT] *to the left*
  lest they should overtake me

> Here at the beginning of this verse, the original manuscript reads "to the right **nor** to the left", but
> then 𝒪 switches to "to the right **or** to the left" in the following independent clause. When copying
> into the printer's manuscript, Oliver Cowdery initially wrote the *or* as *nor* but then crossed out
> the *n,* thus restoring the reading of 𝒪. This initial *nor* in 𝒫 was undoubtedly due to the fact that he
> had just copied "to the right **nor** to the left" at the beginning of the verse. The editors for the 1920
> LDS edition decided to edit the text here in Alma 56:40 so that both occurrences of "to the right
> (n)or to the left" would read *nor.*
>
> Either *nor* or *or* is used to combine conjuncts in a negative context, as in two other examples
> where *right* and *left* are conjoined:

> | Alma 24:23 | **neither** would they turn aside to the right hand **or** to the left |
> | Alma 56:37 | they did **not** turn to the right **nor** to the left |

> Note that if the preceding negative is *neither,* we get *or;* but if the preceding negative is *not,* we
> get *nor.* This is precisely what we get in Alma 56:40: "they durst **not** turn to the right **nor** to the
> left . . . **neither** would I turn to the right **or** to the left". Interestingly, the *or* in Alma 24:23 was left
> unchanged in the 1920 LDS edition. It turns out that the original text does not systematically sup-
> port *neither-or* and *not-nor.* As one might suspect, there are also examples of *not-or* and *neither-
> nor,* as in the following examples that have never been edited:

> | Alma 55:19 | he did **not** delight in murder **or** bloodshed |
> | Helaman 1:31 | **neither** on the north **nor** on the south |

> For each instance of negative coordination, the critical text will follow the earliest textual sources,
> thus "they durst **not** turn to the right **nor** to the left . . . **neither** would I turn to the right **or** to the
> left" here in Alma 56:40. For a complete discussion regarding cases of variation involving nega-
> tive words, see under NEGATION in volume 3.

Summary: Restore in Alma 56:40 the original *or* in the second occurrence of "to the right (n)or to
the left" while maintaining the *nor* in the first occurrence.

■ **Alma 56:41**

and it came to pass that again
[*we saw the Lamanites* > NULL 0| 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
when the light of the morning came
we saw the Lamanites upon us

This is an interesting example where Oliver Cowdery got ahead in his writing down of Joseph Smith's dictation. What seems to have happened is that they started out together, Joseph dictating "and it came to pass that again" and Oliver writing this down. Of course, writing is slower than dictation, so by the time Oliver had finished writing "& it came to pass that again" in 𝒪, Joseph had moved along far enough that he was now dictating "we saw the Lamanites upon us" (that is, he had already dictated the *when*-clause, "when the light of the morning came"). Oliver started to write "we saw the Lamanites upon us", getting down the first four words when he realized he had skipped the intervening *when*-clause. So he immediately crossed out "we saw the Lamanites" and wrote inline the correct sequence, with Joseph possibly repeating the correct text for him. If this explanation is correct, it shows that Joseph had in his purview 20 words (the number of words from the initial *and* to the final *us*). In other words, he was able to see at least that many words at a time, which allowed him (if he wasn't careful) to dictate too many words at a time. It is also possible that this error was produced by Joseph himself, who may have accidentally skipped the *when*-clause, which he then corrected. In either case, the implication remains that Joseph could see at least 20 words. (Also see under Alma 45:21 for the case in Alma 45:22 where Joseph took over for Oliver and wrote down 28 words in 𝒪. Apparently Joseph needed to finish what he was viewing before taking a break. In that particular instance, Joseph must have originally been seeing 28 words and undoubtedly a few more.)

Stan Larson has suggested that the change here in Alma 56:41 is an example where Joseph Smith had "translated a phrase out of usual English order, possibly because he was following the word order in the original" (here the word *original* seems to refer to the unknown original Nephite language on the plates). Larson claims that what Oliver crossed out was the entire main clause, namely, "we saw the Lamanites **upon us**"; yet the transcript of 𝒪 shows that there would have been no room in the lacuna for the prepositional phrase *upon us* except by supralinear insertion:

Alma 56:40−42 (lines 12−14, page 346′ of 𝒪)

```
(                          & i)t came to pass that again <we saw the Laman>
  EVEN UNTIL IT WAS DARK

(                          ) of the morning came we saw the Lamanites upon
 <        > WHEN THE LIGHT

(                     t)hem
(                     r)e but it came to pass that they did not persue us far be
  US & WE DID FLEE BEFO
```

At the beginning of line 41 in 𝒪, there would have been space for only the final part of *Lamanites* (that is, *ites* preceded by a hyphen) and the words "when the light". In other words, Oliver had initially written down only part of the main clause when he caught the error and corrected what he had written down. This correction does not appear to be due to editing on Joseph's part (or Oliver's, for that matter). For Larson's proposal, see page 10 of "Textual Variants in Book of Mormon Manuscripts", *Dialogue: A Journal of Mormon Thought* 10/4 (1977): 8−30.

Summary: Maintain in Alma 56:41 the immediately corrected reading in 𝇋 where the *when*-clause precedes the final main clause: "and it came to pass that again when the light of the morning came / we saw the Lamanites upon us".

■ **Alma 56:42**

and it was in the morning of the third day
[*on* 01ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQS | *of* RT] *the seventh month*

> The 1920 LDS edition replaced the unexpected preposition *on* with *of*. As discussed nearby under Alma 56:1, there is some evidence that *on* is the original reading here, even though most other prepositional phrases in the text referring to "the Yth month" are headed either by the preposition *in* or by *of*.

■ **Alma 56:43**

and now whether they were overtaken by Antipus
we [*kew* 0 | *knew* 1ABCDEGIJKLMNOPQRST | *know* > *knew* F | *know* H] *not*

> The verb here in the original text reads in the past tense, in both manuscripts and in the early editions (although *knew* is miswritten as *kew* in 𝇋). For the first printing of the 1852 LDS edition, *knew* was replaced by *know,* perhaps unintentionally. The same change was also made in the 1874 RLDS edition, perhaps independently. The subsequent 1892 RLDS edition restored the original *knew* to the RLDS text, which is unusual since that edition rarely departed from the reading of its copytext, the 1874 edition.
>
> There is a tendency in the text to change past-tense clauses to present-tense ones when the clause refers to the speaker's knowledge, as in the following examples involving the verb *know:*
>
> > Alma 38:4 (1840 change)
> > for I [*knew* 01ABPS | *know* CDEFGHIJKLMNOQRT] that thou wast in bonds
> >
> > Alma 38:4 (1920 LDS change)
> > yea and I also [*knew* 01ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQS | *know* RT]
> > that thou wast stoned for the word's sake
> >
> > Helaman 9:36 (1830 change)
> > and then shall he say unto you that
> > I Nephi [*knew* 1PS | *know* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOQRT] nothing
> > concerning the matter
>
> The same tendency has affected the past-tense *supposed* in nearby Alma 56:37 ("and as we supposed that . . ."), which was changed on three separate occasions to *suppose* (once by Oliver Cowdery as he took down Joseph Smith's dictation as well as in the 1849 LDS edition and the 1858 Wright edition); see the discussion under that passage. In all of these cases, the critical text will maintain the past-tense verb forms in these clauses that refer to the knowledge of the speaker or writer.

Summary: Maintain the past-tense *knew* in Alma 56:43 ("and now whether they were overtaken by Antipus / we **knew** not").

■ **Alma 56:43**

behold we know not but they have halted for the purpose
that we should come against them
that they [*may* 0 | *might* 1ABCDEFGIJLMNOPQRST | *should* HK] *catch us in their snare*

The original manuscript here reads *may* in the resultive *that*-clause, "that they **may** catch us in their snare". Oliver Cowdery, when he copied the text from 𝕆 into 𝕇, replaced the *may* with *might*, probably unintentionally. His change to the conditional *might* could have been influenced by the conditional modal *should* in the preceding resultive *that*-clause ("that we **should** come against them"). The influence of the preceding *should* was more direct in the 1874 RLDS edition, which replaced the *might* with *should*. The 1908 RLDS edition restored the *might* of the printer's manuscript. The critical text will restore the original *may*. See under Jacob 5:13 for a list of mix-ups between *may* and *might*.

Elsewhere in the original text, we have many examples of *may* and *might* in a subordinate clause where its preceding main clause has *should,* 16 with *may* and 41 with *might*. Although *might* is more frequent, *may* is clearly possible, as in the following example where *may* occurs three times:

> Mosiah 2:9
> for I have not commanded you to come up hither
> to trifle with the words which I shall speak
> but that you **should** hearken unto me
> and open your ears that ye **may** hear
> and your hearts that ye **may** understand
> and your minds that the mysteries of God **may** be unfolded to your view

In fact, the use of *may* in Alma 56:43 makes Helaman's thinking seem less hypothetical, thus more accurately reflecting his thinking at the time of this battle.

Summary: In accord with the reading of the original manuscript, restore the modal *may* in Alma 56:43 ("that we should come against them / that they **may** catch us in their snare").

■ **Alma 56:46**

for as I had **ever** *called them my sons*
—for they were all of them very young—
even so they said unto me :
father / behold our God is with us

One wonders here if perhaps the original text didn't have *even* in place of *ever* in the first clause (that is, "for as I had **even** called them my sons"). The original manuscript is extant here, and it clearly reads *ever,* although this clarity is not a guarantee since Oliver Cowdery frequently mixed up his *n*'s and *r*'s, especially at the ends of words (see, for instance, the discussion under Mosiah 2:15–16 regarding *clear* versus *clean*).

For each case where there is a question of whether the word is *ever* or *even,* we first consider what the scribe actually wrote in the manuscripts. There is some evidence that Oliver Cowdery

frequently took pains to make sure he distinguished between *ever* and *even,* as in the following cases of momentary error in the manuscripts:

> Mosiah 13:33 (*even* corrected to *ever* in 𝒫 with slightly heavier ink flow)
>> yea even all the prophets which have prophesied
>> [*even* >+ *ever* 1 | *ever* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] since the world began

> Mosiah 20:8 (*ever* virtually immediately corrected to *even* in 𝒫)
>> [*ever* > *even* 1 | *even* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] all their preparations for war did he discover

> Alma 26:32 (*ever* virtually immediately corrected to *even* in 𝒪)
>> for behold they had rather sacrifice their lives
>> than [*ever* > *even* 0 | *even* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] to take the life
>>> of their enemy

> Alma 36:16 (*ever* virtually immediately corrected to *even* in 𝒪)
>> and now for three days and for three nights was I racked
>> [*ever* > *even* 0 | *even* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] with the pains
>>> of a damned soul

> Alma 53:12 (*even* virtually immediately corrected to *ever* in 𝒫)
>> and they [*ever* 0ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST | *even* > *ever* 1] had been protected
>>> by the Nephites

> Alma 58:41 (*ever* virtually immediately corrected to *even* in 𝒫)
>> yea and that he may favor this people
>> [*even* 0ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST | *ever* > *even* 1] that ye may have success
>> in obtaining the possession of all that which the Lamanites hath taken from us

In some cases of theoretically possible variation, the context makes it clear which reading is correct. But in other cases, we must consider usage elsewhere in the text. For instance, in Mosiah 11:12 (see the discussion under that passage), internal evidence strongly supports the use of *even* in "he built a tower near the temple / yea a very high tower **even** so high that . . .". Similarly, here in Alma 56:46, usage elsewhere supports *ever* rather than *even* after the past-perfect auxiliary *had:*

1 Nephi 8:11	to exceed all the whiteness that I **had ever** seen
Alma 19:27	it was the Great Spirit . . . which **had ever** delivered them
Alma 53:10	and they . . . **had ever** since been protected by the Nephites

There are no examples of *had even* in the text. Nonetheless, *even* will work in Alma 56:46; but since *ever* is clearly written in the manuscripts and usage elsewhere supports *ever,* the critical text will maintain *ever* here in Alma 56:46.

Summary: Accept the word *ever* rather than *even* in Alma 56:46: "I had **ever** called them my sons"; 𝒪 definitely reads *ever,* and *had ever* is found elsewhere in the text while *had even* is not (although the latter argument is not conclusive here since *had even* will work).

■ **Alma 56:46**

and he will not suffer that we [*shall* 01ABCDEFGHIJKLNOPS | *should* MQRT] *fall*

In this passage the typesetter for the 1905 LDS missionary edition, it would appear, accidentally replaced the modal *shall* with *should*. This reading has been followed by all the later LDS editions that derive from the 1905 edition (namely, the LDS editions from 1911 up through the 1981 edition). Elsewhere in the text, various modals can occur in the *that*-clause that complements the verb phrase "will/wilt . . . suffer". The most frequent modal is *shall,* but there are single examples of other modals, plus several examples without any modal. We get the following statistics for the original text (here I include the original *shall* in Alma 56:46 as part of the statistics):

shall	20 times
<no modal>	6 times
will	1 time
may	1 time
should	1 time

In the following, I provide a second example for the first type and one example for each of the other types:

1 Nephi 13:31 (*shall* in the *that*-clause)
neither will he suffer that the Gentiles **shall** destroy the seed of thy brethren

Mosiah 4:14 (no modal in the *that*-clause)
neither will ye suffer that they transgress the laws of God

1 Nephi 13:30 (*will* in the *that*-clause)
thou seest that the Lord God will not suffer
that the Gentiles **will** utterly destroy the mixture of thy seed

Mormon 8:5 (*may* in the *that*-clause)
and how long that the Lord will suffer that I **may** live / I know not

Alma 60:35 (*should* in the *that*-clause)
for behold God will not suffer that we **should** perish with hunger

The last example shows that *should* is possible.

Clearly *shall* is overwhelmingly preferred in *that*-clauses that complement the verb phrase "will/wilt . . . suffer". For each case, however, we let the earliest textual sources determine whether there is a modal verb and, if so, which one. Thus the original *shall* in Alma 56:46 will be restored in the critical text. For some discussion on those cases where there is no modal, see under Mosiah 11:24.

Summary: Restore the modal *shall* in Alma 56:46; the 1905 LDS change is undoubtedly a typo and not due to editing since the text has retained the vast majority of examples of *shall* in *that*-clauses acting as complement to the verb phrase "will/wilt . . . suffer".

■ **Alma 56:47**

yea they had been taught by their mothers
that if they did not doubt
[*that* 01ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRS | RT] *God would deliver them*

Here we have an example of the repeated subordinate conjunction *that* which was intentionally removed in the 1920 LDS edition (its deletion is marked in the committee copy). As discussed under 1 Nephi 10:2–3, the original text had numerous examples of the repeated *that*. Some have been removed, as here in Alma 56:47; but others have been left in the standard text, as in the following example:

> Alma 20:1
>> and it came to pass **that** when they had established a church in that land
>> **that** king Lamoni desired that Ammon should go with him to the land of Nephi

For further discussion regarding the repeated *that* in the original text, see the discussion under THAT in volume 3.

Summary: Restore the repeated subordinate conjunction *that* in Alma 56:47 since repeated *that*'s were quite prevalent in the original text (and are still quite frequent in the current text).

■ **Alma 56:47–48**

yea they had been taught by their mothers
that if they did not doubt
that God would deliver them
and they rehearsed unto me the words of their mothers saying
we do not doubt
our mothers knew [01PS | *it* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOQRT]

Both manuscripts read without any direct object for the verb *knew*. The 1830 typesetter added *it* after *knew*, perhaps accidentally. Subsequent editions have maintained the *it* except for the RLDS text since 1908 (the 1908 RLDS edition restored the reading in 𝓟 without the *it*).

Elsewhere in the text, we have two examples of *knew* followed by *it*, but there is one example where *knew* has no direct object (marked below with an asterisk):

> 3 Nephi 5:20   and no one knew **it** save it were himself . . .
> 3 Nephi 9:20   and they knew **it** not
> * Ether 3:19   for he knew / nothing doubting

For an example in the manuscripts of the tendency to add the direct object *it*, see 1 Nephi 1:11, where in 𝓟 Oliver Cowdery's initial correction to 𝓞 read "and bade him that he should read **it**". There Oliver immediately erased the *it*, which implies that 𝓞 did not have the *it* (𝓞 is not extant here). There would have been no other motivation for Oliver to remove the *it* in 1 Nephi 1:11 since that reading is perfectly fine. As another example where an *it* has been inserted into the text, see under 2 Nephi 17:11; in that case, the 1830 typesetter supplied a direct object *it* after *ask* in "ask either in the depths or in the heights above", probably under the influence of the corresponding King James passage (see under 2 Nephi 17:11 for discussion of this change, which was most likely intentional).

One wonders here in Alma 56:48 if the subordinate conjunction *that* should not follow the verb *doubt* ("we do not doubt **that** our mothers knew"). Unfortunately, there are no other examples in the text of *doubt* taking a finite clause as its direct object. The original manuscript is extant here in Alma 56:48, and there is no *that* (inserted or otherwise) after *doubt*. There is therefore no manuscript evidence for emending the text by inserting a *that* after *doubt* in Alma 56:48.

In fact, there is reason to believe that the finite clause "our mothers knew" is not the direct object for the verb *doubt* but an independent clause. Grant Hardy, in his FARMS publication "Of Punctuation and Parentage", *Insights* 24/2 (2004): 2–3, suggests that a semicolon could be placed between these two clauses in the current text: "we do not doubt; our mothers knew it". He also mentions this punctuation in a footnote as an alternative reading for the passage in *The Book of Mormon: A Reader's Edition* (Urbana, Illinois: University of Illinois Press, 2003). The language at the end of the previous verse is supportive of this reanalysis of the punctuation: "yea they had been taught by their mothers that if they did not doubt that God would deliver them" (Alma 56:47). It is also supported by language in the next chapter:

> Alma 57:26
>> and we do justly ascribe it to the miraculous power of God
>> because of their exceeding faith in that which they had been taught to believe
>> that there was a just God
>> and whosoever did not doubt
>> that they should be preserved by his marvelous power

Hardy's suggested emendation in punctuation allows one to interpret Alma 56:48, even without the intrusive *it,* as explaining that these young Ammonites said that they did not doubt and that their mothers knew, namely, that God would deliver them if they did not doubt. In other words, the issue here is not one of doubting whether their mothers knew. The critical text will accept Hardy's suggested emendation by placing a semicolon between what appears to be two independent clauses, especially in light of the two references elsewhere in Alma 56–57 to these young men's lack of doubt that God would preserve them.

Summary: In accord with the reading of the manuscripts, remove in Alma 56:48 the pronoun *it* after "our mothers knew"; there is no evidence for inserting a *that* after *doubt* in "we do not doubt our mothers knew"; in fact, references elsewhere in this part of the text argue that the original text here in Alma 56:48 has two independent clauses, "we do not doubt" and "our mothers knew", which means there is a need for some kind of punctuation break (such as a semicolon) between these two clauses.

■ **Alma 56:52**

and thus were the Lamanites pursuing them with great vigor
when [*I* > NULL 1 | ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] **Helaman** *came upon their rear*
with **his** *two thousand and began to slay them exceedingly*
insomuch that the whole army of the Lamanites halted and turned upon **Helaman**

This verse switches from the first person to the third person, perhaps because Mormon stopped directly quoting from Helaman's letter and decided to summarize a longer passage. The last time

this narrative specifically used the first person is in verse 50 ("and had **I** not returned with **my** two thousand / they would have obtained their purpose"). The narrative specifically returns to the first person in verse 54 ("and now it came to pass that **we** the people of Nephi—the people of Antipus and **I** with **my** two thousand—did surround the Lamanites"). All of verse 51, the first part of verse 52, and all of verse 53 could belong to the first-person narrative of the rest of the letter or to the third-person abridgment that definitely appears for most of verse 52:

Alma 56:50–54

□ *1st person*

50   the army of Antipus being weary
        because of their long march in so short a space of time
        were about to fall into the hands of the Lamanites
        and had **I** not returned with **my** two thousand
        they would have obtained their purpose

□ *1st or 3rd person*

51   for Antipus had fallen by the sword and many of his leaders
        because of their weariness which was occasioned by the speed of their march
        therefore the men of Antipus
        being confused because of the fall of their leaders
        began to give way before the Lamanites
52   and it came to pass that the Lamanites took courage
        and began to pursue them

□ *3rd person*

        and thus were the Lamanites pursuing them with great vigor
        when **Helaman** came upon their rear with **his** two thousand
        and began to slay them exceedingly
        insomuch that the whole army of the Lamanites halted
        and turned upon **Helaman**

□ *1st or 3rd person*

53   now when the people of Antipus saw that the Lamanites had turned them about
        they gathered together their men and came again upon the rear of the Lamanites

□ *1st person*

54   and now it came to pass that **we** the people of Nephi
        —the people of Antipus and **I** with **my** two thousand—
        did surround the Lamanites and did slay them

Interestingly, when Oliver Cowdery copied verse 52 into the printer's manuscript, he started to write *I* before *Helaman* at the beginning of the *when*-clause ("when **I** Helaman came upon their rear"), but before writing *Helaman,* Oliver tried to correct the *I* by overwriting it with an *H* (the first letter of *Helaman*). But the result was unclear, so he crossed out the *I/H* and wrote *Helaman* immediately following inline. Oliver expected the first-person narrative to continue, but obviously the original manuscript read in the third person here since Oliver intentionally corrected to the more difficult reading where the whole sentence is in the third person. Although there is a

rather long lacuna in the original manuscript right after the *when* (so we cannot be sure whether the *I* was in 𝒪 or, for that matter, whether at the end of the line there was a *his* in "with his two thousand"), the text is extant at the end of the verse and reads "and turned upon **Helaman**"—that is, without any preceding *me:*

Alma 56:52−53 (lines 5−7, page 347′ of 𝒪)

```
-it(t s) persueing them with great vigor when (                          )
    E                                 HELAMAN  CAME  UPON  THEIR  REAR  WITH  HIS

two thousand & began to slay them excedingly in(so                       )
                                    MUCH  THAT  THE  WHOLE  ARMY  OF  THE

Lamanites halted & turned upon Helaman now whe(n                          )
                                    THE  PEOPLE  OF  ANTIPUS  SAW  THAT  THE
```

Of course, the printer's manuscript clearly has the *his* and both instances of *Helaman* without any first person pronoun. The correction in 𝒫 of the *I Helaman* to *Helaman* is an immediate one; thus the occurrence of *Helaman* without any *I* undoubtedly reflects the difficult, but not impossible, reading of the original manuscript.

Stan Larson, on page 569 of his article "Conjectural Emendation and the Text of the Book of Mormon", *Brigham Young University Studies* 18/4 (1978): 563−569, suggests that this sentence in verse 52 be emended to the first person; he also suggests that 𝒪 itself might have read *I Helaman* since this is what Oliver Cowdery initially wrote in 𝒫. But as we have seen, 𝒪 is extant for the last part of verse 52, and it reads "and turned upon **Helaman**" (without any *me*), so there is evidence that in 𝒪 this sentence read in the third person. Larson's suggestion amounts to rewriting the text (which is acceptable, of course, as a revision, but not as a restoration of the original text).

The best solution here is to simply accept verse 52 (and maybe even the surrounding verses 51 and 53) as a third-person summary given by Mormon rather than as a direct quote from Helaman's letter that somehow got messed up in the early transmission of the English-language text. There is no particular difficulty in reading this passage as it switches from first person to third, then back to first person (although the shift is clearly unexpected).

In a footnote to his discussion, Larson refers to another example of person shifting later on in the text:

Helaman 13:25
and now when ye talk ye say
if our days had been in the days of our fathers of old
[*ye* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLNP | *we* MOQRST] would not have slain the prophets
[*ye* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLNP | *we* MOQRST] would not have stoned them
and cast them out

In this case, we seem to have a case where an original *we* was twice misheard as *ye,* most likely prompted by the preceding use of *ye* in this verse: "and now when **ye** talk **ye** say". There is good reason to accept the emended text in Helaman 13:25 (introduced into the LDS text in 1905 and into the RLDS text in 1953). But in Alma 56:52, there is no real possibility for simultaneously mishearing *I Helaman* as *Helaman, my* as *his,* and *me Helaman* (or simply *me*) as *Helaman.*

Summary: Accept in Alma 56:52 the original third-person usage in this verse; it is fully supported in 𝓟 and partially in 𝓞; the third person here seems to represent Mormon's decision to briefly summarize rather than directly quote this part of Helaman's letter.

■ **Alma 56:57**

and the remainder I took and joined them
to my stripling [*Amonites > Ammonites* 0 | *Ammonites* 1ACGHIJKLMNOPQRST |
   Ammorites BDE | *Ammorites > Ammonites* F]

The correct reading here, of course, is *Ammonites*. This is the first occurrence of the word *Ammonite(s)* in the text. Oliver Cowdery started to write *Amonites,* but only as a scribal slip; immediately after writing *Amo,* Oliver caught his error, overwrote the *o* with an *m,* and then continued inline with the rest of the name, *onites*. Of course, the double *m* is correct since the name *Ammonite* derives from *Ammon.* The name also appears later in the next chapter of Alma, and there it is written in 𝓞 without correction as *Ammonites:*

> Alma 57:6
> besides sixty of the sons of the [*Ammonites* 01ACGHIJKLMNOPQRST |
>   *Ammorites* BDE | *Ammorites > Ammonites* F]

In the 1837 edition, both instances of *Ammonites* were replaced by *Ammorites,* perhaps unintentionally. The name *Ammorite* is not found in the Book of Mormon, nor is it a biblical name, at least with two *m*'s. But *Amorite,* with one *m,* is found in the Bible (87 times) and seems to be the unintended source for the error in the 1837 edition. The change was not made by Joseph Smith (it is not marked in 𝓟) but probably by the compositor, someone who was more familiar perhaps with the Bible than with the Book of Mormon text he was setting. There is also the possibility that *Ammorite* was influenced by the Book of Mormon name *Ammoron,* which occurs 24 times in this part of the text (from Alma 52:3 through Helaman 1:16).

The 1840 edition restored the correct *Ammonites* in these two verses, but the 1837 reading continued in the 1841 British edition, the 1849 LDS edition, and the first printing of the 1852 LDS edition. Finally, in the second 1852 printing, apparently after the 1840 edition had been consulted, the correct *Ammonites* was restored to the LDS text. Of course, the critical text will maintain *Ammonites.*

Summary: Maintain the name *Ammonite,* which derives from *Ammon* and occurs twice in the text (in Alma 56:57 and Alma 57:6).

Alma 57

■ **Alma 57:2**

but I sent an epistle unto the king that we were sure
[*that* 0 | 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *our* **forces** *were sufficient to take the city of Antiparah*
by our [*forces* >% *force* 0 | *force* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]

The original manuscript has the subordinate conjunction *that* after the word *sure*. While copying to the printer's manuscript, Oliver Cowdery accidentally omitted the *that.* There is only one other example in the text of *sure* followed by a finite clause, and that example has the subordinate conjunction *that:*

> Alma 32:31 (𝓞 is extant)
> and now behold are ye sure **that** this is a good seed

This example provides support for the reading of 𝓞 in Alma 57:2.

On the face of it, there is some redundancy in this passage when it refers to "**our forces** were sufficient to take the city Antiparah **by our force**". The repeated reference to *force(s)* is, it would appear, intended, especially since it is extant in 𝓞. Initially in 𝓞, Oliver Cowdery wrote "by our **forces**" (that is, in the plural), precisely like the use of *our forces* at the beginning of the *that*-clause. Oliver's correction to the singular shows that Joseph Smith actually dictated the singular *force,* that Oliver didn't just accidentally repeat an earlier reference to forces. David Calabro also points out (personal communication) that the repeated reference sounds less redundant if we interpret the second instance, *force,* as an abstract noun meaning 'strength', in contrast to the earlier *forces* with its meaning 'troops'. Nonetheless, for most instances in the text, singular *force* refers to troops and is virtually interchangeable with the plural *forces,* as in the following pair of examples:

> Alma 53:5   and he desired **all his forces** when he should make an attack
>   upon the Lamanites
> Alma 59:10   therefore he retained **all his force** to maintain those places
>   which he had recovered

Don Brugger points out (personal communication) that there's another possibility here. Perhaps the clause-final phrase "by our force" is a mistake for "by force". In other words, the earlier "our forces" led Oliver to not only initially write the plural *forces* in 𝓞 but also the determiner *our.* When he corrected the *by*-phrase by erasing the plural *s* for *forces,* Oliver may have neglected to cross out the *our.* A common enough phrase, "by force" occurs six times in the King James Bible, with five occurring with the verb *take* (just like here in Alma 57:2):

Genesis 31:31	peradventure thou wouldest take **by force** thy daughters from me
1 Samuel 2:16	and if not / I will take *it* **by force**
Matthew 11:12	the kingdom of heaven suffereth violence and the violent take it **by force**
John 6:15	that they would come and take him **by force**
Acts 23:10	and to take him **by force** from among them

On the other hand, there is no independent evidence in the Book of Mormon for either phrase, "by one's force(s)" or "by force". Since the immediately corrected reading in 𝓞, "by our force", will work, the critical text will maintain it, even though the *our* may be an error.

Summary: Restore the subordinate conjunction *that* in Alma 57:2 ("we were sure **that** our forces were sufficient"); also maintain the seemingly redundant phrase "by our force" (the immediately corrected reading in 𝓞), although there is a possibility that the *our* in this phrase is an error introduced by the earlier "our forces".

■ **Alma 57:3**

and [*as* >+ NULL 0| 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *Ammoron refused mine epistle*
[01|, ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
for he would not exchange prisoners
[01|; ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
therefore we began to make preparations to go against the city of Antiparah

The original manuscript initially had the subordinate conjunction *as* at the beginning of this passage. Later Oliver Cowdery crossed out the *as* with a distinctly heavier ink flow. His crossout appears to be the result of editing.

This kind of construction (an initial subordinate *as*-clause with an intervening parenthetical clause and then the main clause beginning with *therefore*) is quite common in the Book of Mormon text. And although for some examples the *as* has been edited out, others remain. For some examples and discussion, see under 1 Nephi 8:7. Here is a nearby example of this *as-therefore* construction:

> Alma 56:57
>   and **as** we had no place for our prisoners
>   that we could guard them to keep them from the armies of the Lamanites
>   **therefore** we sent them to the land of Zarahemla

The critical text will restore the original *as* in Alma 57:3. Since that *as* had been removed earlier by Oliver Cowdery, the original *as*-clause was now a main clause, and thus the 1830 typesetter placed a semicolon before the main clause beginning with *therefore*. In restoring the original *as*, the critical text will simply place dashes around the parenthetical *for*-clause:

> Alma 57:3 (proposed punctuation)
>   and as Ammoron refused mine epistle
>   —for he would not exchange prisoners—
>   therefore we began to make preparations to go against the city of Antiparah

Summary: Restore the subordinate conjunction *as* at the beginning of Alma 57:3; remove the 1830 typesetter's semicolon at the end of the parenthetical *for*-clause; dashes should be placed around this clause so that the following main clause (which begins with *therefore*) completes the sentence-initial subordinate *as*-clause.

■ **Alma 57:4**

and [*thus* 01ABDEFIJLMNOPQRST | CGHK] *the city of Antiparah fell into our hands*

The 1840 edition accidentally deleted the *thus* here in Alma 57:4. This change is not due to editing since no other instances of *thus* were ever deleted in the 1840 edition. Moreover, there would have been no motivation for deleting the *thus* here. The 1908 RLDS edition restored the original *thus* to the RLDS text.

Summary: Maintain the *thus* in Alma 57:4; the deletion of this particular *thus* in the 1840 edition was not due to Joseph Smith's editing but was simply a typo.

■ **Alma 57:6**

we received a supply of provisions and also an addition to our army
from the land of Zarahemla and from the land round about
to the number of six thousand men
[*besides* 01ABDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST | *beside* C] *sixty of the sons of the Ammonites*

The 1840 edition has *beside* instead of *besides*. This is undoubtedly a typo and not an example of Joseph Smith's editing for that edition. Elsewhere in the current text, there are two occurrences of *besides* with the meaning 'in addition to' (but none of *beside* with this meaning):

> 2 Nephi 27:12
> save it be that three witnesses shall behold it by the power of God
> **besides** him to whom the book shall be delivered

> Mormon 3:21
> and also that the Jews the covenant people of the Lord
> shall have other witness **besides** that which they saw and heard

Interestingly, in the last instance, the 1906 LDS edition accidentally replaced *besides* with *beside*, but that error was not continued since that edition never served as a copytext for subsequent LDS editions.

Originally there was a *beside* in 1 Nephi 2:6 ("he pitched his tent in a valley **beside** a river of water"), but this unique instance of *beside* was edited by Joseph Smith to *by the side of* (see the discussion under that passage). Of course, this instance of *beside* does not mean 'in addition to'.

Summary: The 1840 change in Alma 57:6 of *besides* to *beside* is a typo rather than the result of editing by Joseph Smith; a similar change occurred in the 1906 LDS edition for Mormon 3:21; the critical text will maintain all three original instances of *besides,* each of which has the meaning 'in addition to'.

■ **Alma 57:6**

yea and we had also [als >% *a plenty* ᴏ | *a plenty* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRS | *plenty* ᴛ]
of provisions brought unto us

In the original manuscript, Oliver Cowdery initially started to write *also* a second time in this passage (that is, he almost created a dittography for the word *also*). He wrote the initial *als* but apparently not the letter *o;* then he erased most of the *l* and all of the *s* and overwrote the erased portion with the initial *p* of the following word, *plenty.* The corrected reading in Ο definitely reads *a plenty,* but it is possible that the original text itself read *plenty* rather than *a plenty*—in other words, the *a* was simply the initial *a* of *also* left accidentally unerased.

This interpretation of Ο could be used in support of the 1981 LDS emendation, where *a plenty* was replaced by *plenty.* This emended reading, of course, is what modern English readers expect. Furthermore, it agrees with one other instance of *plenty* in the text: "our women did give **plenty** of suck for their children" (1 Nephi 17:2). Nonetheless, there is one other instance where *plenty* takes the indefinite article:

> Helaman 6:9
> and they did have **an exceeding plenty** of gold
> and of silver and of all manner of precious metals

In this case, the use of the indefinite article seems required. But this last example also suggests that the use of *a plenty* in Alma 57:6 is intended.

We can find ample support for *a plenty* in earlier English, beginning with the following example from John Wycliffe's 1388 translation of the Bible:

> Acts 22:6
> at midday suddenly from heaven **a great plenty** of light shone about me

Here the accidentals are regularized in accord with W. R. Cooper's transcription on page 446 of *The Wycliffe New Testament* (London: The British Library, 2002). This example, with its adjective, seems to require the indefinite article, like the example in Helaman 6:9. But under definition 2b of the noun *plenty,* the Oxford English Dictionary lists a number of examples of *a plenty of* with the meaning 'an abundance of' (again accidentals are regularized):

> George Shelvocke (1726)
> this soil produces **a plenty of** wood

> Manasseh Cutler (1787)
> the river where **a plenty of** several kinds of fish may be caught

> Henry Wadsworth Longfellow (1849)
> remember to let it have **a plenty of** gravel in the bottom of its cage

> William Makepeace Thackeray (1855)
> **a plenty of** smoke was delivered from the council of three

Literature Online <lion.chadwyck.com> has a couple of examples of the specific phrase "a plenty of provision(s)", both dating from the 1600s (once more the accidentals are regularized):

> Wenceslaus Hollar (1643)
>> as it were to pour out **a plenty of** provision

> Fabian Philipps (1663)
>> and make **a plenty of** provisions to be as a scarcity

There is no reason, then, for considering "a plenty of provisions" an unacceptable reading in Alma 57:6. The critical text will restore this instance of the indefinite article.

The 1981 change from *a plenty* to *plenty* may have been prompted by a list of problems in the LDS text vaguely identified by Paul Cheesman on page 163 (Appendix 1) of his book *The Keystone of Mormonism: Little Known Truths about the Book of Mormon* (Salt Lake City, Utah: Deseret Book, 1973). We cannot be sure what Cheesman actually meant since for each problem he lists only the chapter and verse without actually identifying what the problem is except to categorize the problem as related to grammar, usage, spelling, meaning, punctuation, or construction—or as a redundancy, excess word, or archaic word. Here under Alma 57:6, Cheesman was apparently worried about the indefinite article *a* before *plenty* since he claims there is an "excess word" in this verse. The *a* before *plenty* appears to be the only possible "excess word" in this verse; in current English, readers expect "plenty of provisions" rather than "a plenty of provisions". The editors for the 1981 LDS edition may have followed Cheesman's suggestion here. It is worth pointing out, though, that the 1981 edition implemented no substantive textual changes based on any of the other problematic passages listed by Cheesman (although there is the 1981 change of the spelling *plead* to *pled* in Alma 22:20 that may have come from Cheesman's list). In general, the 1981 edition avoided the editing out of other unusual instances of the indefinite article *a,* as in the following two examples that were left unchanged in the 1981 edition (and were also not listed by Cheesman as problematic):

> Alma 32:6   they were in **a preparation** to hear the word
> Alma 39:6   it is not easy for him to obtain **a forgiveness**

Since the editing for the 1981 edition was very carefully controlled, it appears that the omission of the *a* from *a plenty* was fully intended rather than being a typo.

Summary: Restore the original indefinite article *a* before *plenty* in Alma 57:6 ("a plenty of provisions") since such usage can be found in earlier English.

■ **Alma 57:6**

yea and we had also a plenty of provisions brought
[*to* > *unto* 1 | *unto* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *us*

The original manuscript is not extant here. In this particular case, spacing between extant portions of 𝒪 is sufficiently long that it is difficult to tell whether *unto* or *to* would fit best in the lacuna. Oliver Cowdery initially copied the text into 𝒫 as *to;* then he crossed out the *to* and supralinearly inserted *unto*. The correction appears to be virtually immediate since there is no change in the level of ink flow. Elsewhere in the text, there are ten occurrences of "brought (un)to X", where X is a person, and in all cases but one (which is marked below with an asterisk) the preposition is *unto*:

Jacob 5:75	and it hath brought **unto** me again the natural fruit
Omni 1:20	there was a large stone brought **unto** him
Alma 34:31	immediately shall the great plan of redemption be brought about **unto** you
Alma 42:18	and a just law given which brought remorse of conscience **unto** man
* Alma 54:4	the same who had brought an epistle **to** Moroni
Alma 56:27	there was brought **unto** us many provisions
3 Nephi 17:9	as they were brought forth **unto** him
3 Nephi 17:12	till they had all been brought **unto** him
3 Nephi 26:8	that they may be brought again **unto** this people
Ether 10:3	which brought peace again **unto** his father

Either *unto* or *to* is possible, but the archaically styled *unto* is preferred. For a list of places in the manuscripts where Oliver Cowdery accidentally wrote *to* in place of *unto,* see under Jacob 2:17.

Summary: Accept in Alma 57:6 the corrected reading in 𝒫 of "brought **unto** us".

■ **Alma 57:7**

and it came to pass [NULL >? *that* 0| *that* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
it was our desire to wage a battle with the army
which was placed to protect the city Cumeni

The original manuscript is not extant here, but spacing between extant fragments suggests that the subordinate conjunction, if it was in 𝒪, was inserted supralinearly. The printer's manuscript and all the printed editions have the *that*.

There is some evidence that Oliver Cowdery occasionally omitted the *that* after "it came to pass". For a clear example where he omitted the *that* as he copied the text from 𝒪 into 𝒫, see under 1 Nephi 7:7. But there is also evidence that Oliver sometimes added the *that* after "it came to pass", at least momentarily; for an example, see under 2 Nephi 1:1. Oliver could have intentionally added a *that* here in Alma 57:7 in order to eliminate the awkwardness of "and it came to pass it was our desire to wage a battle".

As discussed under Alma 55:14, there are a couple of instances in the earliest text where there is no *that* between "it came to pass" and an immediately following main clause. Theoretically, the original text could have read without the *that* here in Alma 57:7, despite its awkwardness. There are seven other occurrences in the text of "it came to pass **that** it . . ." but none without the *that*. Here in Alma 57:7, the critical text will follow the earliest extant reading, namely, the reading of 𝒫 with the *that*.

Summary: Accept in Alma 57:7 the reading of the printer's manuscript: "and it came to pass **that** it was our desire to wage a battle".

■ **Alma 57:11**

therefore it became expedient that we should take
[*these > those* O | *those* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *provisions and send them to Judea*

Here in O, Oliver Cowdery initially wrote "these provisions". Virtually immediately, he corrected *these* to *those* by overwriting the *e* with an *o* (there is no difference in the level of ink flow). Here the critical text will maintain the corrected reading in O. Elsewhere in this chapter, Oliver Cowdery twice mixed up *these* and *those* when he copied the text from O into P. For these examples, see under verses 16 and 20. For a general list of cases where Oliver switched these demonstratives, see under Alma 3:25. The critical text will in each case of *these*/*those* follow the earliest textual sources.

Summary: Maintain in Alma 57:11 the corrected reading in O, "those provisions".

■ **Alma 57:12**

therefore they yielded up the city
[*into our hands* OABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQS | NULL >+ *into our hand > into our hands* 1 | *unto our hands* RT]

There has been some variation here in the preposition and number for the phrase "into our hands". Initially, Oliver Cowdery omitted this phrase when he copied the text from O into P. Later, probably when he proofed P against O, Oliver supralinearly inserted the phrase, which is extant in O. Yet for his correction in P, he initially wrote "into our hand" but then virtually immediately added the plural *s*. The entire supralinear "into our hands", including the correcting *s,* is written with slightly heavier ink flow. For a list of other cases where Oliver wrote *hand,* perhaps only momentarily, rather than the correct *hands,* see under Alma 5:4. For two instances of "into the **hands** of the Lamanites", Oliver Cowdery initially wrote "into the **hand** of the Lamanites" (see the discussion under Alma 52:10). Elsewhere the Book of Mormon text has 23 instances of the plural "into one's hands" but none of the singular "into one's hand". We get similar results for "into the hand(s) of X", with 31 instances in the text of the plural "into the hands of X" but only one instance of "into the hand of X" (namely, in 2 Nephi 8:23, which is a quote from the King James Bible).

In the 1920 LDS edition for Alma 57:12, the preposition *into* was changed to *unto,* probably accidentally since this change was not marked in the 1920 committee copy. In no other case of the prepositional phrase "into . . . hands" did the 1920 edition change *into* to *unto.*

Summary: Restore in Alma 57:12 the original reading "into our hands" (the extant reading in O as well as the corrected reading in P).

■ **Alma 57:13**

but it came to pass that
our prisoners were [*so* 01ABDEFIJLMNOPQRST | CGHK] *numerous that . . .*

The 1840 edition deleted the *so* before *numerous;* this is undoubtedly a typo. There are six other occurrences of "so numerous that" in the original text:

Mosiah 22:2	the Lamanites being **so numerous that** it was impossible for . . .
Alma 2:35	they were **so numerous that** they could not be numbered
Alma 58:2	they were **so** exceeding more **numerous** . . . **that** we durst not go forth
Alma 59:8	their armies were **so numerous that** the remainder of the people of Nephihah were obliged to flee before them
Helaman 4:19	for **so numerous** was the Lamanites **that** it became impossible for . . .
3 Nephi 2:11	the Gaddianton robbers had become **so numerous** . . . **that** it became expedient that . . .

The *so* has never been omitted from any of these instances, although the *that* was removed from the example in Mosiah 22:2 (for discussion, see under that passage). To be sure, here in Alma 57:13 the secondary construction "our prisoners were numerous that . . ." is quite unacceptable as it stands; yet even then it was maintained in the RLDS textual tradition until the 1908 RLDS text restored the original *so*. The critical text will, of course, maintain the *so* in this phrase.

Summary: The 1840 edition's loss of *so* in Alma 57:13 was clearly a typo; the critical text will maintain the original phraseology ("our prisoners were so numerous that . . .").

■ **Alma 57:13**

notwithstanding the [*enormity* 0ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST | *enumerority* > *enormity* 1]
  of our [*number* 0 | *numbers* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
we were obliged to . . .

As discussed under Alma 56:10, Oliver Cowdery accidentally replaced *enormity* with the impossible *enumerority* here in Alma 57:13. The original manuscript is extant here, and it reads *enormity*.

In this verse, the original manuscript clearly has the singular *number,* but Oliver Cowdery miscopied it as *numbers* in the printer's manuscript. Elsewhere in the text, there is one other occurrence of "enormity of one's number(s)", and this example also has *number* rather than *numbers:* "and also seeing the enormity of their **number** / Teancum thought it was not expedient that he should attempt to attackt them in their forts" (Alma 52:5). More generally, either *number* or *numbers* is possible; for discussion of this point, see under Alma 30:2.

Summary: In accord with the reading of the original manuscript, restore the singular *number* in Alma 57:13 ("notwithstanding the enormity of our number"); the original *enormity* will also be maintained rather than the problematic *enumerority* that Oliver Cowdery initially wrote in 𝒫.

■ **Alma 57:13**

we were obliged to employ all our force to keep them
or [*to* >% *put* 0 | *to put* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *them to death*

In the original manuscript, Oliver Cowdery started to write *to* after the conjunction *or,* but then he erased the partially written *to* and wrote down *put,* with his *p* overwriting the erased *to.* Quite clearly, Oliver expected a repetition of the infinitival *to,* but the original text lacked it. Nonetheless, when he copied the text from 𝒪 into 𝒫, he once more inserted the repeated *to.* This time he

didn't catch his error, with the result that the printed editions all read "**to** keep them or **to** put them to death".

Usually the text has the repeated *to* with conjunctive infinitives involving *or* (consistently in 16 different passages), as in Alma 52:36: "and the remainder of them being much confused knew not whither **to** go or **to** strike". However, there are other cases where the infinitival *to* is not repeated; in all three of the following instances, the text without the repeated *to* is supported by ◠:

> Alma 11:2
>> and thus the man is compelled
>> **to** pay that which he oweth
>> or be striped
>> or be cast out from among the people as a thief and a robber

> Alma 41:7
>> for behold they are their own judges
>> whether **to** do good or do evil

> Alma 56:17
>> and now they were determined **to** conquer in this place or die

There is also one case of mixture, in Moroni 6:9, where the *to* is repeated but only for some of the infinitive conjuncts; for discussion, see under that passage. Also see the more general discussion under CONJUNCTIVE REPETITION in volume 3.

Summary: Remove the repeated *to* in Alma 57:13 since originally Oliver Cowdery erased this *to* as he was taking down Joseph Smith's dictation.

■ **Alma 57:14**

for behold they would break out in great numbers
and would fight with stones and with clubs
or whatsoever [*thing* 0FIJLMNOQRT | *things* 1ABCDEGHKPS] *they could get into their hands*

The singular *whatsoever thing,* the reading in ◠, was changed, probably accidentally, to the plural *whatsoever things* when Oliver Cowdery copied the text into ℗. The plural could have been prompted by the preceding plural nouns in the prepositional phrase "with stones and with clubs". Interestingly, the 1852 LDS edition restored the singular *whatsoever thing,* but probably unintentionally. ◠ was definitely not the source for the change since at that time ◠ was still in the cornerstone of the Nauvoo House.

Elsewhere in the original text, there are 10 occurrences of "whatsoever thing" and 11 of "whatsoever things", so either the singular or the plural is possible. For an example where Oliver Cowdery made the opposite change when he copied the text from ◠ into ℗ (that is, he changed an original *whatsoever things* to *whatsoever thing*), see under 1 Nephi 18:6. For all other cases of "whatsoever thing(s)", the earliest textual sources agree with the current reading; in each case we let the earliest textual sources determine the reading. Therefore the singular *whatsoever thing* should be retained in Alma 57:14.

Summary: Maintain in Alma 57:14 the singular *whatsoever thing,* the reading of the original manuscript.

■ **Alma 57:16**

it became a very serious matter to determine
concerning [those 0 | *these* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *prisoners of war*

The original manuscript reads "those prisoners of war". Oliver Cowdery accidentally changed *those* to *these* when he copied the text from 𝒪 into 𝒫. We have already seen numerous examples of scribes and typesetters mixing up *these* and *those* while copying the text (for those examples where Oliver made the error, see under Alma 3:25). For each case of *these* versus *those*, the critical text will follow the reading of the earliest textual sources.

Summary: In accord with the reading of the original manuscript, restore *those* in Alma 57:16: "those prisoners of war".

■ **Alma 57:17**

for behold [Ammoron 01BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST | *Ammon* A] *had sent to their support*
a new supply of provision and also a numerous army of men

Here the 1830 compositor accidentally set *Ammoron* as *Ammon,* the more common Book of Mormon name (which occurs 174 times, compared to 24 times for *Ammoron*). The correct name was restored in the following (1837) edition. One other example of this mix-up between the two names occurred momentarily in 𝒪:

> Alma 52:3
> thus king [*Ammon > Ammoron* 0 | *Ammoron* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
> the brother of king Amalickiah
> was appointed to reign in his stead

In this case, Oliver Cowdery immediately corrected *Ammon* by overwriting the *n* with an *r* and then writing the final *on* inline.

Summary: Maintain the name *Ammoron* in Alma 57:17 and elsewhere, despite the marginal tendency to replace it with the more common name *Ammon.*

■ **Alma 57:17**

for behold Ammoron had sent to their support
a new supply of [provision 1 | *provisions* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
and also a numerous army of men

The original manuscript is not extant here; spacing between extant fragments cannot indicate whether the plural *s* was there or not (although in the transcript of 𝒪 for this passage I conjectured that 𝒪 read in the plural). Oliver Cowdery wrote the singular *provision* in the printer's manuscript, but the 1830 compositor set the plural, which is what we expect in current English. Elsewhere there are three occurrences of "a supply of provisions" (that is, with the plural *provisions*) but none with the singular:

Alma 57:6	we received a supply of **provisions**
Alma 57:8	a little before they were to receive a supply of **provisions**
Alma 58:3	that we might receive more strength from the land of Zarahemla and also a new supply of **provisions**

The Book of Mormon has 33 more occurrences of *provisions* but only one more of *provision:*

3 Nephi 4:18	because of their **much provision** which they had laid up in store

𝓞 is not extant for *much provision,* but both the 1830 edition and 𝓟 (which in 3 Nephi are first-hand copies of 𝓞) have the singular *provision,* so 𝓞 probably read as such. (The original text allowed *much* to modify plural nouns; for discussion of this point, see under Enos 1:21.) Elsewhere we have two occurrences of *much provisions* and two of *many provisions:*

Alma 56:27	there was brought unto us **many provisions**
Alma 58:5	for the Lamanites were also receiving great strength from day to day and also **many provisions**
Alma 63:6	and did sail forth with **much provisions**
Alma 63:7	and they also took **much provisions**

These last two examples suggest the possibility that the singular *much provision* in 3 Nephi 4:18 is an error (originating in 𝓞) for *much provisions*. This emendation would mean that the original Book of Mormon text contained no other examples of the singular *provision,* which suggests that the one example of "supply of provision" in 𝓟 for Alma 57:17 also originally read "supply of provisions". This result would be in complete contrast with the King James Bible, which has examples of only the singular *provision* (11 times).

Ultimately, there is nothing wrong with the singular *provision* here in Alma 57:17 ("a new supply of provision") or in 3 Nephi 4:18 ("because of their much provision"). For each case of *provision(s),* the critical text will follow the reading of the earliest textual sources, even in those cases where modern English speakers expect the plural.

Summary: Restore in Alma 57:17 the singular *provision* in "a new supply of provision", the reading of the earliest extant source (𝓟); similarly, the text will maintain the singular *provision* in 3 Nephi 4:18 ("because of their much provision"), again the reading of the earliest textual sources (𝓟 and the 1830 edition).

■ **Alma 57:20**

and as the [*remainder* 01ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRT | *reminder* S] *of our army*
were *about to give way before the Lamanites . . .*

The compositor for the 1953 RLDS edition accidentally set *remainder* as *reminder,* an obvious typo. The critical text will, of course, retain *remainder*.

Notice the use of the plural *were* for the subject *remainder.* Semantically, the text here is referring to the remaining individuals in the army, so the plural *were* is possible. In fact, the text consistently uses a plural verb form when referring to the remainder of a group of people, including these five other cases where the plural verb form is distinct from the singular in the past tense (only with the verb *be*):

Alma 2:11   and the remainder **were** called Nephites

Alma 46:33   and the remainder **were** delivered up into the hands of Moroni
         and **were** taken back into the land of Zarahemla

Alma 51:20   and the remainder of those dissenters . . . **were** compelled
         to hoist the title of liberty upon their towers

Alma 59:8   that the remainder of the people of Nephihah **were** obliged to flee

3 Nephi 4:27   and the remainder of them **were** slain

Thus there is nothing wrong with the plural *were* in Alma 57:20.

Summary: Maintain in Alma 57:20 and elsewhere in the text the plural *were* for the noun *remainder* when it refers to the remainder of a group of people.

■ **Alma 57:20**

behold [*these* 0 | *those* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *two thousand and sixty were firm and undaunted*

Once more we have an example where *these* and *those* have been switched in the history of the text; for a nearby example of the opposite change, see under verse 16. Here in verse 20, Oliver Cowdery changed *these* to *those* when he copied the text from 𝒪 into 𝒫. In this letter of Helaman's, we have two other examples of *these* or *those* occurring with *two thousand:*

Alma 56:9 (𝒪 is extant)
     I Helaman did march at the head of **these** two thousand young men

Alma 56:27 (𝒪 is not extant)
     there was brought unto us many provisions
     from the fathers of **those** my two thousand sons

Either reading is theoretically possible in Alma 57:20, so the best solution is to follow the earliest textual sources (in this case the original manuscript). For further discussion of mix-ups between *these* and *those,* see under Alma 3:25.

Summary: In accord with the reading of the original manuscript, restore *these* in Alma 57:20: "these two thousand and sixty".

■ **Alma 57:22**

for it was they who did [*meet > beat* 0 | *beat* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *the Lamanites*

Here is a good example of Oliver Cowdery initially mishearing Joseph Smith's dictation. In 𝒪, Oliver first wrote *meet,* which is phonetically very similar to the correct word here, *beat* (the only phonemic difference between the words is the nonnasal labial *b* versus the nasal labial *m*). Semantically, *meet* will also work here, which helps to explain why Oliver made this mistake. Elsewhere the text has examples of both *meeting* and *beating* an opposing army, including the following passage where both verbs are used: "we did pursue them with our armies and did **meet** them again and did **beat** them" (Mormon 2:26).

Here in Alma 57:22, Oliver Cowdery crossed out the incorrect *meet* and supralinearly inserted the correct *beat*. There is no change in the level of ink flow, which suggests a virtually immediate correction.

Summary: Accept in Alma 57:22 the corrected reading in 𝒪, where *beat* replaces the phonetically similar *meet*.

■ **Alma 57:23**

nevertheless we had suffered [*great* 0ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST | *a > great* 1] *loss*

The original manuscript reads *great loss* without a preceding indefinite article *a*. But when Oliver Cowdery copied this phrase into the printer's manuscript, he started to write "a great loss"; he actually wrote only the *a,* but then he immediately overwrote it with the initial *g* of *great* and continued inline with the rest of the word, *reat*.

Elsewhere in the text, there are two occurrences of *great loss* without the indefinite article *a*:

Alma 31:4	and that it would be the means of **great loss**
	on the part of the Nephites
Alma 63:15	in the which they were beaten and driven back again
	to their own lands suffering **great loss**

In the first example, we can see Oliver Cowdery's tendency to insert the indefinite article before *great loss:* Oliver initially wrote *a greater loss* in 𝒪, but then he immediately corrected the noun phrase to *great loss* by erasing the indefinite article *a* and the *-er* ending. The second example, in Alma 63:15, provides specific support for *great loss* in Alma 57:23 since both passages refer to "suffering great loss". Thus the use of *great loss* without the indefinite article is supported by usage elsewhere in the Book of Mormon text.

It should be noted that there are three instances of *great loss* where there is a determiner but never the indefinite article *a:*

Alma 49:25	concerning **their** great loss
Alma 51:11	notwithstanding **this** great loss
Helaman 4:11	**this** great loss of the Nephites

Summary: Accept Oliver Cowdery's deletion of the indefinite article *a* before *great loss* in Alma 57:23, the reading in 𝒪 and the corrected reading in 𝒫.

■ **Alma 57:25**

nevertheless according to the goodness of God
and to our great astonishment
and also the [*joy* 01PST | *foes* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOQR] *of our whole army*
there was not one soul of them which did perish

The word *joy* was accidentally set as *foes* in the 1830 edition. The 1908 RLDS edition restored the original *joy* to the RLDS text (in accord with the reading in 𝒫); the 1981 LDS edition probably also relied on 𝒫 in restoring the original word to the LDS text (𝒪 is extant for *joy* but is difficult to read).

Interestingly, the word *foe* does not occur in the Book of Mormon text at all, but *joy* does. In fact, there are some other specific references to Helaman's joy over his army's preservation:

Alma 56:56   to my great joy there had not one soul of them fallen to the earth
Alma 57:36   I was filled with exceeding joy because of the goodness of God
              in preserving us that we might not all perish

Summary: Maintain in Alma 57:25 the correct *joy* ("the joy of our whole army"), not the *foes* that accidentally entered the text in the 1830 edition.

■ **Alma 57:27**

now this was the faith of [*these* 01ABCDEFGHIJKLMOPQRST | *those* N] *of which I have spoken*

This chapter has quite a few instances where *these* and *those* have been mixed up in the history of the text. There are three examples where the mix-up occurred in the manuscripts (see the examples discussed under verses 11, 16, and 20). Here in verse 27 we have a case where the 1906 LDS edition made the switch, in this instance from *these* to *those*. Since this edition was never used as a copy-text, subsequent LDS editions have retained the correct *these*.

Summary: Maintain the original *these* in Alma 57:27: "now this was the faith of **these** of which I have spoken".

■ **Alma 57:27**

and they do put
their [*trusts > trust* 0 | *trust* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
in God continually

In the original manuscript, Oliver Cowdery was near the end of a line when he started to write *trust*. He initially wrote *trut,* then overwrote the incomplete second *t* with an *s*. By then he had reached the end of the line, so he inserted his correction somewhat above the line. But instead of writing just a *t,* he wrote *ts,* which forced him to cross out the extra *s*. The plural *trusts* was undoubtedly not intended, but the plural *s* was accidentally written because of the problem Oliver was having with the order of the *s* and the *t* at the end of *trust*.

The rather remote possibility that the original text could have read *trusts* here in Alma 57:27 makes one think of the case of *mights* in the Book of Mormon text. As discussed under Jacob 1:19, the original text favors the plural *mights* over the singular *might* (the singular noun is, of course, what we expect in modern English). But the case of *trust* is different: the noun *trust* occurs only in the singular in the Book of Mormon (18 times) and always in the phrase "put one's trust in X". Eight of these refer to more than one individual (five with "their trust", two with "your trust", and one with "our trust"). Thus there is no reason to suppose that in Alma 57:27 *trusts,* which is what Oliver initially wrote in ⊙, actually represents the original text; it is simply the result of a scribal slip at the end of a line.

Summary: Maintain the singular *trust* in Alma 57:27; although Oliver Cowdery ended up writing *trusts* in ⊙, he immediately corrected it to the singular *trust*.

■ **Alma 57:29**

now Gid was the chief captain over the band
[*which* 01APS | *who* BCDEFGHIJKLMNOQRT] **was** *appointed to guard them down to that land*

The 1837 edition changed the relative pronoun *which* to *who*. However, the following singular verb *was* was kept, which makes it seem like there was only one person in the band ("who was appointed"). One could suppose that the *who was* refers to Gid rather than to the band, although that too seems odd. If the *who* is to be retained in the standard text, the *was* should probably be changed to *were*.

One question here is whether *band* should be considered a unity or a group of individuals. Earlier, under Mosiah 23:25, I considered whether *army* should be semantically viewed as a singular or a plural. Under Alma 43:35, I considered whether the relative pronoun *who* can be used to refer to *army*. Those analyses suggest that for Alma 57:29 the standard text could read either as "the band which was appointed" (where *band* is treated as a unity) or as "the band who were appointed" (where *band* is treated as a group of individuals). The critical text will, of course, restore the original reading, "the band which was appointed", but with the understanding that either of the two interpretations is possible.

For some other cases of *band,* a change of the relative pronoun *which* to *who* after *band* was marked by Joseph Smith in the printer's manuscript. The use of *who* is semantically appropriate when the text refers to making a covenant:

> Helaman 1:12
> and Kishcumen and his band [*which* 0A | *which* >js *who* 1 |
>   *who* BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] had covenanted with him
> did mingle themselves among the people
> in a manner that they all could not be found

> Helaman 2:3
> and he was upheld by his band [*which* 0A | *which* >js *who* 1 |
>   *who* BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] had entered into a covenant
> that no one should know his wickedness

There is one example in the earliest text where *who* rather than *which* refers to the members of a band making a covenant:

> Helaman 6:22
> that whatsoever wickedness his brother should do
> he should not be injured by his brother
> nor by those who did belong to his band
> **who** had taken this covenant

But there are two cases where the 1837 change from *which* to *who* seems inappropriate:

> Helaman 6:18
> and now behold those murderers and plunderers were a band
> [*which* >js *who* 1 | *which* A | *who* BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] had been formed
>   by Kishcumen and Gaddianton

Helaman 11:2
and it was this secret band of robbers
[*which >*js *whom >*js *who* 1 | *which* A | *who* BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
did carry on this work of destruction and wickedness

In Helaman 6:18 the band, not its individuals, was formed by Kishcumen and Gaddianton. In Helaman 11:2, because of the preceding *robbers,* Joseph Smith interpreted the *which* as referring to the individual robbers rather than to the band itself, but the emphasis in this case seems to be on the band itself as the source of "this work of destruction and wickedness". There is one case in the text that refers to a band acting as a unity where an original *which* has been left unchanged:

Helaman 7:25
woe be unto you because of that great abomination
which hath come among you
and ye have united yourselves unto it
yea to that secret band **which** was established by Gaddianton

In the critical text, *which* will be restored in all those cases involving grammatical emendation, no matter whether the relative pronoun refers to the band as a unity or as a group of individuals. For further discussion, see under WHICH in volume 3.

Summary: Restore the original *which* in Alma 57:29 ("the band **which** was appointed to guard them down to that land"); also maintain the original singular verb form *was;* even though the original text reads *which was* in this passage, the word *band* can be interpreted as either a unity or a group of individuals; similarly, other uses of *which* in reference to a band will be either restored or maintained in accord with the reading of the earliest textual sources.

■ **Alma 57:29**

*now Gid was the chief captain over the band which was appointed
to* [*guard* 0ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST | *guide >– guard* 1] *them down to that land*

Here the original manuscript is extant, and it reads *guard,* not *guide.* Oliver Cowdery, when copying to the printer's manuscript, accidentally misread *guard* as the visually similar (and semantically plausible) *guide* and initially wrote *guide* in 𝒫. Somewhat later, with a sharper quill, he crossed out *guide* and supralinearly inserted *guard;* the ink flow for the correction is uneven and weaker in some spots, which suggests that Oliver made this correction while proofing 𝒫 against 𝒪. We note that this error is visual and not phonetic (at least as far as Oliver's dialect is concerned), unlike the phonetic, nonvisual error of *meet* for *beat* nearby in verse 22. 𝒪 shows signs of phonetic mishearings, while 𝒫 shows signs of visually miscopying.

Summary: In Alma 57:29 𝒪 reads *guard,* not *guide* (Oliver Cowdery's initial error in 𝒫), in the relative clause "which was appointed to **guard** them down to that land".

■ **Alma 57:29**

now Gid was the chief captain over the band
which was appointed to guard them down
to [*that land* 0 | *the land of Zarahemla > that land* 1 | *the land* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]

The original manuscript is extant here and reads *that land.* The reference is to "the land of Zara-hemla", found near the end of the previous verse: "we did inquire of Gid concerning the prisoners which they had started to go down to **the land of Zarahemla** with" (verse 28). When Oliver Cow-dery copied verse 29 into the printer's manuscript, he initially wrote "the land of Zarahemla", probably because of the preceding "the land of Zarahemla". He may have also been influenced by the use of the same full phrase in the next line of 𝒪, in verse 30: "we did start to go down to **the land of Zarahemla**". For verse 29 Oliver caught his error in 𝒫: he overwrote the *e* of *the* with an *a* and inserted a *t* inline. He also crossed out *of Zarahemla.* However, the 1830 compositor set the incorrect *the* instead of *that,* thus giving the current text: "which was appointed to guard them down to **the** land". The phrase *the land* definitely sounds incomplete. The critical text will, of course, restore the original *that land,* which is extant in 𝒪.

Summary: In accord with the reading of 𝒪 and the corrected reading in 𝒫, restore the determiner *that* in Alma 57:29: "to guard them down to **that** land".

■ **Alma 57:31**

behold the armies of the Lamanites
are [NULL > *a* >js NULL 1 | *a* A | BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *marching*
towards the city of Cumeni

Although "a marching" is not extant in 𝒪, there is room in the lacuna for the prepositional *a.* When Oliver Cowdery copied the text from 𝒪 into 𝒫, he initially omitted the *a* before *marching;* but virtually immediately he supralinearly inserted the *a* in 𝒫 (there is no change in the level of ink flow for the correcting *a*). Later, in his editing for the 1837 edition, Joseph Smith removed the *a* from the text. The critical text will restore the *a* here in Alma 57:31. As explained under 1 Nephi 8:28, the original text had quite a few instances of this archaic form of the progressive. For a com-plete discussion, see under PREPOSITIONAL A in volume 3.

Summary: Restore the prepositional *a* in Alma 57:31: "the armies of the Lamanites are **a** marching towards the city of Cumeni".

■ **Alma 57:31**

and behold they will fall upon them
[NULL > *yea* 1 | *yea* ABDEFIJLMNOPQRST | CGHK]
and will destroy our people

The original manuscript is not extant here. Spacing between extant fragments suggests that *yea* was probably there, although one could argue that maybe it was missing in 𝒪 and instead there was

a subject *they* before *will destroy.* In copying to the printer's manuscript, Oliver Cowdery initially wrote "& will destroy" (that is, without the *yea*). He then supralinearly inserted the *yea* with no change in the level of ink flow. There is no grammatical or semantic reason for inserting the *yea* here, so Oliver was most probably correcting to the reading in 𝒪. Later, in the 1840 edition, the *yea* was once more lost from the text. It was restored to the RLDS text in 1908; the LDS text has consistently maintained the *yea* in this passage.

Elsewhere there is definite support for having the transitional *yea and* followed by a subject-less predicate. I have found seven other examples in the text, including these four where the ellipted subject is a third person plural:

> Alma 28:12
>> yet **they** rejoice and exult in the hope
>> **yea and** even know according to the promises of the Lord
>> that they are raised to dwell at the right hand of God

> Alma 44:18
>> yea behold **they** were pierced and smitten
>> **yea and** did fall exceeding fast before the swords of the Nephites

> 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
>> **yea and** had dissented from their church and had left them
>> and had gone to destroy them by joining the Lamanites

> Helaman 4:14
>> and also **Nephi and Lehi** which were the sons of Helaman
>> did preach many things unto the people
>> **yea and** did prophesy many things unto them concerning their iniquities

In fact, for the example in Alma 28:12, the *yea* was omitted, just like here in Alma 57:31 except that the omission occurred in the 1830 edition rather than in the 1840 edition (for discussion, see under "Alma 28:12"). In any event, there is nothing wrong with having this kind of syntactic construction, where *yea and* heads a subjectless finite predicate.

Summary: Accept in Alma 57:31 the *yea and* followed by a subjectless finite predicate, the reading here in the earliest extant sources (𝒫 and the first two editions).

■ **Alma 57:32**

and they did
[*raise* 0 | *raise* > *rise* 1 | *rise* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *up in rebellion against us*

As discussed under 2 Nephi 3:24, the original text had a number of instances where the verb *raise* was used intransitively. Some of these have never been emended to *rise,* but this one here in Alma 57:32 was changed to *rise* by Oliver Cowdery when he copied the text from 𝒪 into 𝒫. He started to

write *raise* in 𝔓; but having written the *a* vowel, he caught himself and overwrote the *a* with an *i* and then finished the rest of the word by writing the final *se* inline. In this case, Oliver made an immediate correction of *raise* to *rise* in 𝔓. 𝒪 is extant here and definitely reads *raise,* the verb form that will be restored in the critical text. In the earliest text, there are four instances of "rise up in rebellion" and four of "raise up in rebellion" (each case of *raise* is marked with an asterisk):

*	Alma 57:32	and they did **raise** up in rebellion against us
	Alma 61:3	insomuch that they have **risen** up in rebellion against me
	Alma 61:7	those which have **rose** up in rebellion against us
	Alma 61:11	if they would not **rise** up in rebellion
	Helaman 1:7	to **rise** up in rebellion against their brethren
*	Helaman 1:8	for he had **raised** up in rebellion
*	Ether 10:8	the people did **raise** up in rebellion against him
*	Ether 10:14	and his brother did **raise** up in rebellion against him

For a complete discussion of *rise* versus the intransitive *raise,* see under RAISE in volume 3.

Summary: Restore in Alma 57:32 the original intransitive use of the verb *raise,* the reading of the earliest textual sources (in 𝒪 and initially in 𝔓): "and they did **raise** up in rebellion against us".

■ **Alma 57:33**

and the remainder [NULL >? *of them* 0 | *of them* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *brake through and fled from us*

𝒪 is not extant for the first part of this sentence; there is no room in the lacuna for *of them* except by supralinear insertion. One wonders, then, if perhaps 𝒪 actually read "and the remainder brake through and fled from us", not "and the remainder **of them** brake through and fled from us" (the reading in 𝔓). Since the postmodifying *of them* is unnecessary, the most likely possibility is that in 𝒪 Oliver Cowdery initially omitted the prepositional phrase *of them* and supralinearly restored it later, perhaps when he read the text back to Joseph Smith. Elsewhere in the text, there are 12 instances of the noun phrase *the remainder* without any postmodifying *of*-phrase, while the remaining 44 instances of the noun phrase *the remainder* are of the form "the remainder of X", of which seven read "the remainder **of them**". (There is also one instance of *the remainder part* in the original text, in Alma 43:25.) For each case of *the remainder,* we will let the earliest extant sources determine the reading, thus "the remainder of them" here in Alma 57:33 (the reading in 𝔓). There is no explicit scribal evidence that Oliver Cowdery tended to omit the phrase *of them* in the manuscripts or, on the other hand, that he tended to emend the text by adding that phrase.

Summary: Maintain in Alma 57:33 the phrase "the remainder of them", the earliest extant reading (in 𝔓); 𝒪 is not extant here, but apparently the postmodifying *of them* was supralinearly inserted in 𝒪.

■ **Alma 57:33**

and the remainder of them [*brake* o | *broke* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *through
and fled from us*

◯ is sufficiently extant here that we can read all but the initial *b* of the verb form *brake*. The
vowel is definitely an *a*; although there is an extra stroke closing off the top of the *a*, the vowel is
an *a* and not an *o*. When Oliver Cowdery copied this verb into ℗, he replaced *brake* with *broke*.
As discussed under Alma 14:26, the original text had a number of instances of *brake* that have
been changed to the modern *broke*. Whenever the earliest extant sources support an original
brake, as here in Alma 57:33, the critical text will restore that archaic verb form.

Summary: Restore in Alma 57:33 the archaic past-tense verb form *brake*, the reading in ◯.

■ **Alma 57:34**

we took our march with speed towards the city
[*of* >? NULL o | 1ABCDEGHKPRST | *of* FIJLMNOQ] *Cumeni*

◯ is not extant here, but there is room in the lacuna for an *of* in the phrase "the city (of) Cumeni",
although such an *of* could have been crossed out in ◯. There is no *of* in ℗, although it was added
to the LDS text in the 1852 edition. The extra *of* was removed in the 1920 LDS edition, in accord
with the reading of the early editions. This change was fully intended since the 1920 editors marked
it in the committee copy.

As with most instances of "city (of) X" in the Book of Mormon, there are examples of both
"city **of** Cumeni" and "city Cumeni" in the text; here the two instances with *of* are each marked
with an asterisk:

*	Alma 56:14	and the city of Zeezrom and the city **of** Cumeni
		and the city of Antiparah
	Alma 57:7	to protect the city Cumeni
	Alma 57:8	we did surround by night the city Cumeni
	Alma 57:12	in obtaining the city Cumeni
	Alma 57:23	and we retained our city Cumeni
*	Alma 57:31	the armies of the Lamanites are a marching towards the city **of** Cumeni
	Alma 57:34	we took our march with speed towards the city Cumeni

The critical text will follow the earliest extant sources in determining whether the *of* is in the phrase
"city (of) Cumeni". Here in Alma 57:34, there is no *of* in the earliest extant source, the printer's
manuscript. For another example of the variability of the *of* in "city (of) X", see the nearby dis-
cussion under Alma 56:14 regarding "city (of) Antiparah".

Summary: Maintain the instance of "the city Cumeni" in Alma 57:34, the reading of ℗ (the earliest
extant source).

Alma 58

■ **Alma 58:2**

and they were so [exceeding 01 | exceeding A | much BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] more numerous than was our army

The 1837 edition replaced *exceeding* with *much* here in Alma 58:2. This change is probably due to Joseph Smith's editing, although the change is not marked in the printer's manuscript. If *exceeding* had been retained in the text, it would have been edited to *exceedingly* in the 1981 LDS edition (if not earlier in the 1920 LDS edition). See the discussion under 1 Nephi 2:16 as well as more generally under EXCEEDING in volume 3.

The phrase "so exceeding more <adjective>" is unique in the Book of Mormon text. However, there are examples in the text of "exceeding more numerous" without the initial *so:*

| Jarom 1:6 | they were **exceeding more numerous** than were they of the Nephites |
| 4 Nephi 1:40 | the more wicked part of the people . . . became **exceeding more numerous** than were the people of God |

There is also an example in the earliest text where the word order is reversed: "they saw that the Lamanites were **more exceeding numerous** than they" (Helaman 4:25); for discussion of the word order in that sentence, see under that passage. In addition, there are examples in the text of "so exceeding <adjective>":

| Mosiah 4:20 | **so exceeding great** was your joy |
| Ether 12:19 | there were many whose faith was **so exceeding strong** |

The only difference in Alma 58:2 is that the adjective takes the comparative form, *more numerous.* Thus the original reading, "so exceeding more numerous", will be restored in Alma 58:2.

Summary: Restore in Alma 58:2 the original *exceeding* in place of the secondary *much* (thus "they were so exceeding more numerous than was our army").

■ **Alma 58:2**

that we durst not go forth and attackt them
in their [strong holds 01ABCD | strongholds EFIJLMNOPQRST | strong hold GHK]

Here the 1858 Wright edition accidentally changed the plural *strong holds* to the singular *strong hold.* This reading was followed by the first two RLDS editions. The 1908 RLDS edition restored the correct plural (though not the original two-word spelling). The singular *strong hold* was undoubtedly a typo since the plural in the immediately preceding verse was left unchanged:

Alma 58:1

> therefore we could not decoy them away
> from their [*strong holds* 01ABCDGHK | *strongholds* EFIJLMNOPQRST]

The change to the singular in the second verse thus contradicts the plural reading in the preceding verse. (For the spelling *strong hold*—that is, as two words—see the discussion under Alma 50:6.)

Summary: Maintain the plural *strong holds* for both occurrences of the noun phrase in Alma 58:1–2.

■ **Alma 58:3**

yea and it became expedient that we should employ our men
to the maintaining [*these > those* 0 | *those* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *parts of the land . . .*

In the original manuscript for Alma 58:3, Oliver Cowdery initially wrote *these;* but then he immediately corrected the *these* to *those* by overwriting the *e* with an *o* (the level of ink flow for the overwriting is unchanged). We have many examples where Oliver mixed up these two demonstratives (most recently in verses 11, 16, and 20 of the previous chapter). For a general list, see under Alma 3:25.

In this passage we have another example of the mixed gerundive construction: "to the maintaining those parts of the land". For some discussion of this complex construction, see under Alma 55:19 or, more generally, under GERUNDIVES in volume 3.

Summary: Accept in Alma 58:3 Oliver Cowdery's virtually immediate correction in 𝒪 of *these* to *those*.

■ **Alma 58:3**

yea and it became expedient that we should employ our men
to the maintaining those parts of the land
[*of the* 01ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQS | RT] *which we had retained of our possessions*

Here in Alma 58:3, the editors for the 1920 LDS edition removed the clause-initial *of the* from the rather awkward relative clause "**of the** which we had retained of our possessions". One could argue that the extra *of the* was due to the *of the* in the preceding noun phrase, "those parts **of the** land". The 1920 change is probably the best possible minimal emendation for making the text conform to standard literary English.

Despite the 1920 emendation, the resulting relative clause still reads awkwardly. Another possible emendation would have been more drastic: change the relative clause by replacing the phrase "of our possessions" with the simple noun *possession,* thus "those parts of the land of the which we had retained possession" or (more smoothly) "those parts of the land which we had retained possession of", as elsewhere in the text:

> Alma 52:5
>
> > and now Teancum saw that the Lamanites were determined
> > to maintain those cities which they had taken
> > and those parts of the land **which they had obtained possession of**

Alma 56:13

and now these are the cities **which the Lamanites have obtained possession of**

Alma 57:4

but the people of Antiparah did leave the city
and fled to their other cities **which they had possession of**

Alma 58:3 is extant in the original manuscript. As explained under 2 Nephi 3:14, there are similar examples of this kind of awkward usage in the original text, so the usage here in Alma 58:3 may be intended and will therefore be restored in the critical text.

Summary: Restore in Alma 58:3 the original reading with its awkward *of the which* at the beginning of the relative clause ("those parts of the land **of the which** we had retained of our possessions"); although awkward, other examples in the original text support this usage, which in this case is extant in ○.

■ **Alma 58:3**

yea and it became expedient that we should employ our men
to the maintaining those parts of the land
of the which we had [*retained* 01ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQS | *regained* RT] *of our possessions*

As explained under Alma 44:11, the verb *retain* in the original text sometimes means 'take back' rather than 'keep'. In fact, there are seven instances in the text where an original *retain* has been edited to *regain* (including this example in Alma 58:3). In each case, the meaning of the verb *retain* is indeed 'regain' (that is, 'take back').

The 1920 LDS edition is responsible for most of the seven instances of the change to *regain*, as here in Alma 58:3 and in the following four instances:

Alma 59:3

insomuch that he might with ease maintain that part of the land
which he had been so miraculously prospered
in [*retaining* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQS | *regaining* RT]

Alma 60:24

that he may support those parts of our country
which he hath [*obtained* >% *retained* 1 | *retained* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQS | *regained* RT]

Alma 62:30

and having [*retained* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQS | *regained* RT] many
of the Nephites which had been taken prisoners

Helaman 4:9

and it came to pass in the sixtieth year of the reign of the judges
Moronihah did succeed with his armies in **obtaining** many parts of the land
yea they [*retained* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQS | *regained* RT] many cities
which had fallen into the hands of the Lamanites

Notice that in Alma 60:24 Oliver Cowdery initially wrote *obtained* in ℗, which he immediately corrected to *retained* (the correction involves erasure). ○ undoubtedly read *retained,* despite the

unusualness of its meaning here. Also notice that in Helaman 4:9 there is evidence that the verbs *retain* and *obtain* are semantically related since *retain* is used in the *yea*-clause that explains what has just been written ("Moronihah did succeed with his armies in **obtaining** many parts of the land / yea they **retained** many cities which had fallen into the hands of the Lamanites"). Here the verb *retain* must mean 'take back' (or 'regain').

For the last two instances where *retain* has been emended to *regain,* two earlier 20th-century LDS editions introduced the emended reading with *regain:*

> Helaman 4:10 (1906 LDS large-print edition)
> > and it came to pass in the sixty and first year of the reign of the judges
> > they succeeded in [*retaining* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMPS | *regaining* NOQRT]
> > even the half of all their possessions

> Helaman 4:16 (1907 LDS vest-pocket edition)
> > for when Moronihah saw that they did repent
> > he did venture to lead them forth from place to place and from city to city
> > even until they had [*retained* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNPS | *regained* OQRT]
> > the one-half of their property and the one-half of all their lands

There are also some examples of *retain* with the meaning 'take back' that have never been emended to *regain* or its equivalent:

> □ *Alma 57:23*
> > and we **retained** our city Cumeni and were not all destroyed by the sword
> > nevertheless we had suffered great loss

Earlier, in Alma 57:12, the text indicates that the city of Cumeni had been retaken by the Nephites: "therefore they yielded up the city into our hands and thus we had accomplished our designs in obtaining the city Cumeni".

> □ *Helaman 13:31*
> > and behold the time cometh that he curseth your riches
> > that it becometh slippery that ye cannot hold them
> > and in the days of your poverty ye cannot **retain** them

The word *retain* here can mean either 'take back' or 'keep'. However, the following parallel example in Mormon 1:18 makes it fairly clear that here in Helaman 13:31 there is an intended contrast between holding (that is, keeping) one's riches and trying to get them back (or "retain" them) when they are needed ("in the days of your poverty").

> □ *Mormon 1:18*
> > and these Gaddianton robbers which were among the Lamanites did infest the land
> > insomuch that the inhabitants thereof began to hide up their treasures in the earth
> > and they became slippery because the Lord had cursed the land
> > that they could not hold them nor **retain** them again

The negative conjunction *nor* and the added *again* shows the clear contrast between holding one's treasures and getting them back again.

For another example of unedited *retain* with the meaning 'take back' (in Alma 44:12), see the discussion under Alma 44:11.

Here is an example that can be interpreted either way, as either 'maintain' or 'take back':

◻ *Alma 61:9*

> I Parhoron do not seek for power
> save only to **retain** my judgment seat

Parhoron, the chief judge, has been driven from Zarahemla, and Pachus has declared himself king. One could interpret *retain* here as meaning that Parhoron desires to get back the judgment seat or simply to keep it (since he is the lawfully elected chief judge). The verb *retain* is also used in Alma 51:7 when Parhoron wins his recall election: "and Parhoron retained the judgment seat", and quite clearly in Alma 51 Parhoron never loses his judgment seat. Given this example, I would be inclined to interpret *retain* in Alma 61:9 as meaning 'keep'.

For two other cases where *retain* may be interpreted as either 'take back' or 'keep', see under Alma 54:10 (there the instance of *retain* in Alma 58:10 is also discussed); for a third ambiguous case, see the discussion under Alma 44:11 regarding the meaning of *retain* in Alma 44:8.

Finally, there are some examples where *retain* could be interpreted as 'take back' but the context shows that it simply means 'keep':

◻ *Alma 61:14*

> let us resist them with our swords that we may **retain** our freedom

Although the Nephites are under strong attack, they still have their freedom. In several other places, Moroni refers to their desire to "maintain" their freedom and liberties; for instance, in Alma 46:28 ("all the people which were desirous to maintain their liberty").

◻ *Moroni 7:8*

> for behold if a man being evil giveth a gift / he doeth it grudgingly
> wherefore it is counted unto him the same as if he had **retained** the gift

The context here implies that it would be as if the man never gave the gift in the first place—that is, as if he kept it.

To be sure, there are numerous instances in the text where *retain* definitely has the expected meaning 'keep', 'maintain', 'hold back', and so on, as in the following sampling:

Jacob 1:11	the people were desirous to retain in remembrance his name
Mosiah 4:12	and always retain a remission of your sins
Alma 4:18	but he retained the office of high priest unto himself
Alma 11:25	when thou had it in thy heart to retain them [six onties] from me
Alma 17:20	to slay them or to retain them in captivity
Alma 20:24	and also that Lamoni may retain his kingdom
Alma 24:13	let us retain our swords
Alma 25:16	they did retain a hope through faith unto eternal salvation

Alma 37:5	they [the plates of brass] must retain their brightness
Alma 37:27	I command you that ye retain all their oaths
Alma 43:40	Lehi retained his armies upon the bank of the river Sidon
Alma 52:8	that he should retain all the prisoners which fell into his hands
Alma 59:10	he retained all his force to maintain those places

The critical text will maintain or restore, as the case may be, each instance of original *retain,* no matter whether its meaning is 'keep', 'maintain', 'hold back', 'take back', 'regain', or some other related meaning.

Summary: Restore all seven original instances of *retain* that have been emended to *regain* in the LDS text: Alma 58:3, Alma 59:3, Alma 60:24, Alma 62:30, Helaman 4:9, Helaman 4:10, and Helaman 4:16.

■ **Alma 58:4**

*and it came to pass that I thus did send an embassy
to the* [*great* 0 | 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *governor of our land*

The original manuscript reads "the great governor of our land". When copying to the printer's manuscript, Oliver Cowdery accidentally skipped the adjective *great,* perhaps because the next word, *governor,* also begins with a *g.*

This use of *great* is not an honorific but instead distinguishes between the head governor and lesser governors. There are several other examples in the text where *great* is used in this way:

Alma 60:24
> behold it will be expedient that we contend no more with the Lamanites
> until we have first cleansed our inward vessel
> yea even the **great** head of our government

Helaman 9:10
> and it came to pass that on the morrow
> the people did assemble themselves together to mourn and to fast
> at the burial of the **great** and chief judge which had been slain

3 Nephi 3:18
> now the chiefest among all the chief captains
> and the **great** commander of all the armies of the Nephites
> was appointed and his name was Gidgiddoni

Summary: Restore in Alma 58:4 the adjective *great* in "the great governor of our land", the reading of the original manuscript; the use of *great* here is to distinguish the main governor from lesser ones.

■ **Alma 58:5**

but behold this did [*not* 01ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQS | RT] *profit us but little*

As discussed under 1 Nephi 14:28, the critical text will restore the original *not* in this sentence. The LDS text has removed the multiple negation, but the RLDS text has not (which shows that there is only a weak sense of multiple negation in this construction involving *but*). For a complete discussion regarding negation in the Book of Mormon text, see under NEGATION in volume 3.

Summary: Restore the original *not* in Alma 58:5, "this did **not** profit us but little".

■ **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 to our assistance*

𝒪 reads "with an army of two thousand men". When he copied the text from 𝒪 into 𝒫, Oliver Cowdery changed the preposition *with* to *by,* probably accidentally. The syntax in this sentence is complex, but the intent of the passage is that the food was sent along "**with** an army of two thousand men". Both the food and the extra men were supplements to the larger army. The preposition *by* is expected, but *with* certainly works. Interestingly, there is a similar passage involving the verb *guard* where the original text read *by,* but that was changed to *with:*

> Alma 27:24
> and we will guard them from their enemies
> [*by* 01 | *with* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] our armies

See under Alma 27:24 for a comparative discussion of these two passages.

Summary: In accord with the reading of the original manuscript, restore the preposition *with* in Alma 58:8 ("**with** an army of two thousand men").

■ **Alma 58:9**

lest by any means the [*Judgments* 1 | *judgements* A | *judgments* BCDEFIJLMNOPQRST | *judgment* GHK] *of God should come upon our land to our overthrow and utter destruction*

In this instance the original manuscript is not extant for the end of the word *judgment(s),* but the printer's manuscript has the plural *judgments* (with a capitalized *J*). The 1858 Wright edition accidentally replaced the plural with the singular *judgment.* This appears to be a typo introduced by the New York typesetter, who was probably influenced by the prominence in English of the phrase "the judgment of God". Note that the singular form of this phrase occurs five times in Paul's epistles, but there are no instances of the plural form in the King James text. For further discussion of the phrase "the judgment(s) of God", see under 1 Nephi 18:15.

Summary: Maintain the plural "the judgments of God" in Alma 58:9.

■ **Alma 58:10**

that we might retain **our** *cities and* **our** *lands*
and [NULL > *our* 0 | *our* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *possessions*
for the support of our people

Here in the original manuscript, Oliver Cowdery initially omitted the repeated *our* before *posses-sions*. Virtually immediately he caught his error and supralinearly inserted the *our* (there is no change in the level of ink flow for the correction). Such repetition is characteristic of the Book of Mormon text; see the general discussion under CONJUNCTIVE REPETITION in volume 3. Nearby we have the following example of conjunctive repetition involving *our:*

    Alma 58:12
        and to maintain **our** lands and **our** possessions
        and **our** wives and **our** children and the cause of our liberty

There is some possibility that Oliver initially omitted the *our* before *possessions* in verse 12 as well. Spacing between extant fragments of 𝓞 for verse 12 indicates that one of the *our*'s in "our lands and our possessions and our wives" was probably initially omitted in 𝓞 (see the transcript in volume 1 of the critical text for line 18 on page 351′ of 𝓞).

Summary: Maintain the repeated *our* in Alma 58:10: "that we might retain our cities and our lands and **our** possessions"; similar repetition occurs in Alma 58:12.

■ **Alma 58:11**

and did grant unto us [01BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST | *as* A] *great faith*

The 1830 typesetter accidentally inserted the word *as* in this sentence. As might be expected, the subsequent 1837 edition removed this typo from the text. What we seem to have here is a kind of dittography where John Gilbert correctly set *us* from 𝓟 but then misread the *us* in 𝓟 as *as* and ended up inserting that word after the *us*.

Summary: Maintain the original text in Alma 58:11, that is, without *as* before *great faith*.

■ **Alma 58:13**

and thus we did go forth with [NULL > *all* 1 | *all* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
our [*might* 0ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST | *mights* >% *might* 1]

Here in the printer's manuscript, Oliver Cowdery initially wrote "with our mights". He immediately corrected the *mights* to *might* by erasing the plural *s*. At the same time, it would appear, he supralinearly inserted the word *all* (there is no change in the level of ink flow for the *all*). The original manuscript is extant for the last part of the word *might,* and the reading is *might,* not *mights.* In addition, spacing between extant fragments strongly supports the occurrence of the *all* in 𝓞.

    As explained under Jacob 1:19, the plural usage "with our mights" is actually characteristic of the original text of the Book of Mormon; although the plural "with one's mights" is not required,

it is much more frequent in the original text than "with one's might" (11 occurrences to 2 in plural contexts). On the other hand, we always get the singular *might* when *all* is a premodifier, as in Jacob 7:25: "the people of Nephi did fortify against them with their arms and with **all their might**". (In all there are five examples of "with all one's might", including the one here in Alma 58:13).

Summary: In accord with the corrected reading in 𝒫 as well as with what is extant in 𝒪, maintain in Alma 58:13 the earliest extant reading "with all our might"; for this phrase, the singular *might* is consistent with usage elsewhere in the text.

■ **Alma 58:13**

and we did pitch our tents by the wilderness side
which was near [NULL >+ *to* 1 | *to* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *the city*

The original manuscript is not extant here, but spacing between extant fragments has room for the preposition *to*. Of course, the normal way to express this relative clause in modern English is "which was near the city"—that is, without the preposition *to*. When copying to the printer's manuscript, Oliver Cowdery initially wrote the more expected phraseology ("near the city"), but then later (perhaps when he proofed 𝒫 against 𝒪) he supralinearly inserted the *to* with heavier ink flow.

Elsewhere in the earliest text, there are 28 occurrences of "near X" (plus one of "nearer X"). One of these examples is found nearby in Alma 58:14 ("which was near the city"), and it is extant in 𝒪. But there are also two other instances of "near **to** X" in the Book of Mormon:

> Mosiah 9:4
> we pitched our tents in the place where our brethren were slain
> which was **near to** the land of our fathers

> 3 Nephi 24:5
> and I will come **near to you** to judgment

The second one is a quote from Malachi 3:5. In fact, the King James Bible has 29 instances of "near to X" in addition to the one in Malachi, as in John 3:23: "and John also was baptizing in Aenon **near to** Salim because there was much water there". So the occasional occurrence of "near to X" in the Book of Mormon is quite possible. In fact, there are also six examples in the Book of Mormon text of the equally unexpected "near **unto** X"—that is, with the preposition *unto* rather than *to*, as in Helaman 7:10: "Nephi had bowed himself upon the tower which was in his garden which tower was also **near unto** the garden gate". This usage can also be found in the King James text (34 times), as in 1 Kings 21:2: "give me thy vineyard that I may have it for a garden of herbs because it *is* **near unto** my house".

Summary: Accept the use of *near to* in Alma 58:13 (as well as in Mosiah 9:4 and 3 Nephi 24:5); also accept the use of *near unto* in the Book of Mormon text.

■ **Alma 58:14**

and it came to pass [01 | *that* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *on the morrow*
that when the Lamanites saw that we were in the borders by the wilderness
    which was near the city
[NULL > *that* 0 | *that* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *they sent out their spies round about us*
that they might discover the number and the strength of our army

In the printed editions, this passage contains five occurrences of the subordinate conjunction *that;*
three of these are related to the initial "it came to pass" clause:

> Alma 58:14 (printed text, schematized)
> and it came to pass **that** on the morrow
> **that** when the Lamanites saw <nominal *that*-clause>
> **that** they sent out their spies round about us
> <resultive *that*-clause>

Normally, such *that*'s are repeated only once. And in fact, in the earliest text the first *that* is lacking;
that is, the *that* immediately following "it came to pass" is secondary and was added by the 1830
typesetter. When Oliver Cowdery wrote down this passage in ⊙, he supralinearly supplied the
repeated *that* (the one that comes after the *when*-clause). There is no change in the level of ink
flow for the supralinear *that* itself, although the insert mark was written with heavier ink flow.
The critical text will restore the earliest reading here in Alma 58:14, where there is a *that* both
right before and after the long *when*-clause but not immediately after "it came to pass".

Elsewhere in the text, we have the following cases of "it came to pass (that) on the morrow
(that) S", where S is a finite clause:

> 1 Nephi 18:6 (*that,* NULL; ⊙ is extant)
> and it came to pass **that** on the morrow
> after that we had prepared all things . . .
> we did go down into the ship

> Jacob 7:17 (*that, that;* ⊙ is extant; Joseph Smith removed the repeated *that*
>   in his editing for the 1837 edition)
> and it came to pass **that** on the morrow
> **that** the multitude were gathered together

> Mosiah 7:3 (*that,* NULL; ⊙ is not extant)
> and it came to pass **that** on the morrow
> they started to go up

> Mosiah 7:17 (NULL, *that;* ⊙ is not extant)
> and now it came to pass on the morrow
> **that** king Limhi sent a proclamation among all his people

> Alma 2:23 (*that,* NULL; ⊙ is not extant)
> and it came to pass **that** on the morrow
> they returned into the camp of the Nephites in great haste

> Alma 47:31 (NULL, NULL; ⊙ is extant)
> and it came to pass on the morrow
> he entered the city Nephi with his armies

Alma 57:17 (*that,* NULL; ☾ is extant)
> but it came to pass **that** on the morrow
> they did return

Helaman 9:10 (*that,* NULL; ☾ is not extant)
> and it came to pass **that** on the morrow
> the people did assemble themselves together to mourn and to fast

3 Nephi 26:16 (NULL, *that;* ☾ is not extant, but 𝓟 and the 1830 edition agree)
> behold it came to pass on the morrow
> **that** the multitude gathered themselves together

Ether 15:17 (*that,* NULL; ☾ is not extant)
> and it came to pass **that** on the morrow
> they did go again to battle

In the last example (Ether 15:17), spacing between surviving fragments suggests that ☾ may have had, at least initially, the repeated *that* (that is, ☾ may have read "it came to pass **that** on the morrow **that** they did go again to battle"). The second of these *that*'s was either crossed out in ☾ or was accidentally dropped when Oliver Cowdery copied the text into 𝓟. The textually correct solution will be to follow the earliest extant reading (namely, the reading of 𝓟, without the repeated *that*).

Including the example from Alma 58:14, we get the following statistics in the earliest text for the construction "it came to pass (that) on the morrow (that) S":

that . . . NULL	6 times
NULL . . . that	3 times
that . . . that	1 time
NULL . . . NULL	1 time

Joseph Smith's editing changed the one original example, in Jacob 7:17, of the repeated *that* (designated above as *that . . . that*) to an example of the most frequent case (*that . . .* NULL). Of course, here in Alma 58:14, the 1830 typesetter created an example of the infrequent repeated *that*. There is considerable variation, so in each case the critical text will follow the evidence from the earliest extant text. For a complete discussion of the repeated subordinate conjunction *that,* see under THAT in volume 3. For another case of the repeated *that,* see nearby under Alma 58:26.

Summary: Remove in Alma 58:14 the intrusive *that* added by the 1830 typesetter, thus restoring the earliest text as well as indirectly removing one of the repeated *that*'s in this passage (giving "it came to pass on the morrow **that** when the Lamanites saw . . .").

■ **Alma 58:15**

therefore they began to make preparations
to come [NULL > *out* 1 | *out* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *against us to battle*

The original manuscript is not extant for the word *out* here in Alma 58:15, but spacing between extant fragments indicates that *out* was probably in ☾. In the printer's manuscript, Oliver Cowdery initially wrote "to come against us to battle"; but then virtually immediately he inserted the *out*

supralinearly (there is no change in the level of ink flow). The original text probably had the *out,* just as it does earlier in this verse: "except they should come **out** to battle against us".

There are six other occurrences in the text of "come **out** . . . to battle". On the other hand, there are 14 occurrences in the earliest attested text where no adverbial element such as *out, up,* or *down* appears in this expression. In fact, one of these examples appears nearby in this chapter: "nevertheless we could not come to battle with them" (Alma 58:6). So either reading, with or without the *out,* is theoretically possible here in Alma 58:15.

In general, we have the following statistics in the original text for adverbs of location in the expression "come . . . to battle":

"come to battle"	14 times
"come **down** to battle"	8 times
"come **out** to battle"	7 times
"come **up** to battle"	4 times

Since there is considerable variation with respect to choice of an adverbial in this expression, we let the earliest textual sources determine the correct reading for each case, thus *out* here in Alma 58:15.

Summary: Accept the reading with *out* in Alma 58:15 ("to come **out** against us to battle"), the corrected reading in 𝒫.

■ **Alma 58:16–17**

behold I caused that Gid with a small number of men
(1) *should secrete* **himself** *in the wilderness*
and also that Teomner [*should* 01ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQS | RT]
[*with* 01ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQS | *and* RT] *a small number of men*
[1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQS | *should* RT] *secrete*
(2) [*themselves* > *himself* >+ *themselves* 1 | *themselves* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
also in the wilderness

now Gid and his men [*was* 0A | *were* > *was* >js *were* 1 | *were* BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
on the right and the [*other* 1 | *others* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *on the left*
and when **they** *had thus secreted* **themselves**
behold I remained with the remainder of my army in that same place . . .

Here in Alma 58:16, the original manuscript is not extant for either occurrence of the reflexive pronoun *himself* / *themselves* (listed above as 1 and 2), but spacing between extant portions of 𝒪 indicates that the original manuscript probably read *himself* in both instances. When copying from 𝒪 into 𝒫, Oliver Cowdery wrote the first *himself* correctly, but the second one he initially wrote as the plural *themselves*. He immediately caught his error and by supralinear insertion corrected *themselves* to *himself* (the level of ink flow is unchanged for this first correction). But at some later time, Oliver apparently decided to accept the plural *themselves* that he had originally written in 𝒫. This second correction was done with a different quill (or one that had been resharpened); the writing is somewhat sharper, and the ink appears slightly blacker.

This editing is odd because the first occurrence of *himself* in verse 16 was left unchanged. Except for the placement of the auxiliary verb *should,* the two clauses are parallel:

> Gid   with a small number of men **should** secrete himself
>
> Teomner **should** with a small number of men   secrete himself

Perhaps the nonparallel *when*-clause in the next verse is the source of the *themselves:* "and when **they** had thus secreted **themselves**" (Alma 58:17). The committee for the 1920 LDS edition, of course, inherited a grammatically contradictory clause for Alma 58:16 ("Teomner should with a small number of men secrete **themselves**"), but instead of replacing *themselves* with *himself* (in accord with the earlier clause regarding Gid), the 1920 editors changed the preposition *with* to the conjunction *and,* which then forced the *should* to be moved after "and a small number of men" (giving "Teomner and a small number of men should secrete themselves").

The original text treats each unit of the army (under Gid and Teomner) as a singular. Thus in verse 17, the earliest text reads "Gid and his men **was** on the right and the **other** on the left". The singular *other* is the reading of the earliest extant source—that is, 𝒫 since 𝒪 is not extant for the word *other(s)*. The ellipted form of the *be* verb for "the other on the left" would be the same singular *was* found in the preceding "Gid and his men **was** on the right". Unfortunately, the 1830 typesetter missed the significance of the singular *other* and replaced it with the plural *others*.

One possible emendation in verse 17 would be to replace the *and* in "Gid **and** his men" with the preposition *with,* thus "Gid **with** his men **was** on the right". This emendation is supported by the original usage in verse 16: "Gid **with** a small number of men should secrete himself " and "Teomner should **with** a small number of men secrete himself ". Of course, the nonstandard use of the singular *was* with plural subjects is found in the original text, as in Alma 14:23: "unto the prison where Alma and Amulek **was** bound with cords". For some discussion as well as examples of such usage, see under 1 Nephi 4:4. Thus there is no strong need for emending "Gid **and** his men" to "Gid **with** his men" in Alma 58:17.

The earliest reading in Alma 58:16–17 means that in the following clause ("when **they** had thus secreted **themselves**"), the plural pronouns *they* and *themselves* actually refer to these two units: (1) Gid and his men and (2) Teomner and his men. The plural usage does not refer to the individual soldiers themselves, which is what one might expect from the secondary *themselves* in verse 16 and the secondary *others* in verse 17. Thus the critical text will restore in every instance here the earliest extant reading, which makes perfect sense:

> Alma 58:16–17 (original text)
>> behold I caused that Gid with a small number of men
>> should secrete **himself** in the wilderness
>> and also that Teomner should with a small number of men
>> secrete **himself** also in the wilderness
>> now Gid and his men **was** on the right
>> and the **other** on the left
>> and when **they** had thus secreted **themselves**
>> behold I remained with the remainder of my army in that same place . . .

As already noted several times, there is considerable evidence in the original text for using the name of a military leader to stand not only for himself but also for the men under his command. See, for instance, the discussion and the examples listed under Alma 43:53.

Summary: The original text in Alma 58:16–17 treats each unit of Helaman's army as a singular; the critical text will restore all the original singular noun forms as well as the original syntax: "and also that Teomner **should with** a small number of men secrete **himself** also in the wilderness / now Gid and his men **was** on the right and the **other** on the left"; there is no strong motivation for emending "Gid **and** his men" to "Gid **with** his men" since in the original text the verb form *was* can occur with plural subjects.

■ **Alma 58:17**

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

Here the original text reads "in **that** same place where we had first pitched our tents". When Oliver Cowdery initially copied this phrase from 𝒪 into 𝒫, he wrote "in **the** same place". Virtually immediately he crossed out the *the* and supralinearly inserted the correct *that* (there is no change in the level of ink flow). The same mistake was made in the 1911 LDS edition, but the subsequent 1920 LDS edition, by reference to earlier editions, restored the correct *that*.

There is one occurrence of "in **the** same place" elsewhere in the text but none of "in **that** same place":

> Alma 3:20
> there was another army of the Lamanites came in upon the people of Nephi
> in **the** same place where the first army met the Amlicites

Either reading is theoretically possible in Alma 58:17, so the reading of the earliest textual sources should be followed. For discussion of other places in the text where Oliver Cowdery replaced "**that** same <noun>" with "**the** same <noun>" (if only momentarily), see under Alma 47:34.

Summary: Maintain in Alma 58:17 the current reading "in **that** same place", which is the reading in 𝒪 and the corrected reading in 𝒫.

■ **Alma 58:18**

and when they had come
and were about to fall upon us with the sword
I caused that my men
[*or* >? NULL 0 | 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *those which were with me*
should retreat into the wilderness

The original manuscript is not extant here for "that my men those which were with" (which is how 𝒫 and all the printed editions read). Yet this reading is a little too short for the space between the extant portions of 𝒪. In the transcript of 𝒪, I proposed that 𝒪 had the conjunction *or:* "I caused that my men **or** those which were with me should retreat into the wilderness". There is definitely room for the word *or* in 𝒪, and Oliver Cowdery could have dropped it in his copying from 𝒪 into 𝒫. Under Alma 1:30, I list a number of cases in the text where an original *or*

was omitted in the early transmission in the text, sometimes permanently and other times only momentarily.

The use of *or* seems appropriate here in Alma 58:18. The text is trying to correct the idea that all of Helaman's men were with him; from verses 16 and 17 we know that Helaman has split his army up into three units, with Gid, Teomner, and himself as commanders. Elsewhere in the text, there are examples where *or* introduces a similar kind of correcting clause:

1 Nephi 19:4

wherefore I Nephi did make a record upon the other plates
which gives an account **or** which gives a greater account
of the wars and contentions and destructions of my people

Jarom 1:14

for behold upon them the records of our wars are engraven
according to the writings of the kings **or** that which they caused to be written

Alma 11:1

now it was in the law of Mosiah that every man
which was a judge of the law **or** which was appointed to be judges
should receive his wages according to the time
which they labored to judge those which were brought before them to be judged

Alma 46:10

and to destroy the foundation of liberty which God had granted unto them
or which blessing God had sent upon the face of the land for the righteous' sake

Alma 54:5

I have wrote unto you somewhat concerning this war
which ye have waged against my people
or rather which thy brother hath waged against them
and which ye are still determined to carry on after his death

Helaman 4:22

and that they had altered and trampled under their feet the laws of Mosiah
or that which the Lord commanded him to give unto the people

3 Nephi 3:2

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 do call so

Mormon 6:10

and it came to pass that my men were hewn down
yea **or** even my ten thousand which were with me
and I fell wounded in the midst

In the last example, the 1830 compositor omitted the *or* when he set the type (in this case, from 𝓞 rather than from 𝓟). There is also one example where the text has "I mean", which is semantically equivalent to a correcting *or:*

Alma 6:3

> and it also came to pass that whomsoever did belong to the church
> that did not repent of their wickedness and humble themselves before God
> —I mean those which were lifted up in the pride of their hearts—
> the same were rejected and their names were blotted out

On the other hand, there is one case in the text of an appositive ending in a relative clause that lacks the correcting *or* or another kind of correcting word or phrase, yet the semantics clearly imply a correction:

Alma 52:38

> and it came to pass that when the Lamanites had heard these words
> their chief captains—all those which were not slain—
> came forth and threw down their weapons of war

The original manuscript is extant for Alma 52:38, and the *or* is definitely not there, nor does it seem necessary. This example shows that the *or* is not required in Alma 58:18. Although spacing considerations in 𝒪 support its occurrence in that manuscript, there could be some other cause for the extra length in the lacuna. The critical text will therefore follow the earliest extant source, the printer's manuscript, which reads without the *or*.

Summary: Maintain in Alma 58:18 the reading of the earliest textual source (𝒫) where there is no *or* before the corrective appositive ending in a relative clause (thus "I caused that my men—those which were with me—should retreat into the wilderness"); nonetheless, there is some chance that there was an *or* originally in 𝒪, especially since there is space for it in the lacuna.

■ **Alma 58:23**

and it came to pass that Gid and Teomner by this means had obtained possession of their [*City > strong hold* 1 | *strong holds* ABCDGHK | *strongholds* EFIJLMNOPQRST]

Here the original manuscript is not extant for the end of "strong hold(s)". In the printer's manuscript, Oliver Cowdery initially wrote the singular *City,* then crossed out *City* and wrote *strong hold,* with *strong* written in supralinearly but *hold* written inline as part of the continuing text (which means that the correction was immediate); as expected, there is no difference in the level of ink flow for the correction. The 1830 typesetter, however, changed the singular *strong hold* to the plural *strong holds,* probably unintentionally. The context definitely implies a singular usage. Earlier, in verse 21, the text refers to Gid and Teomner (with their men) taking "possession of the city"—that is, the city of Manti.

Generally speaking, the text refers to a single fortified city as "a strong hold", not in the plural as "strong holds":

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

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

 and now when Coriantumr saw

 that he was in possession of the city of Zarahemla . . .

 and that he had obtained the possession of **the strongest hold** in all the land . . .

There is also one plural example that implies each city is a strong hold:

Mormon 5:4

 and there were also **other cities** which were maintained by the Nephites

 which strong holds did cut them off

 that they could not get into the country which lay before us

 to destroy the inhabitants of our land

Thus the singular reading *strong hold* in 𝒫 for Alma 58:23 is fully acceptable. Since it is the reading of the earliest textual source, the critical text will restore the singular *strong hold* to this passage. (For discussion of the need to spell *stronghold* as two words in the Book of Mormon text, see under Alma 50:6.)

Summary: Restore the singular *strong hold* in Alma 58:23, the reading of the earliest extant text; the passage here clearly refers to the city of Manti as a strong hold.

■ **Alma 58:24**

they were exceeding [*fraid* 01ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQS | *afraid* RT]

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 58:24**

therefore they began to retreat
[*back* > *into* 1 | *into* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *the wilderness again*
yea even **back** *by the same way which they had come*

Here in 𝒫, Oliver Cowdery initially wrote *retreat back*. He immediately crossed out the adverb *back* and supralinearly inserted *into* (there is no change in the level of ink flow); then he continued inline with the following text ("the wilderness again"). 𝒪 is not extant for this part of the sentence, but there is no room for this extra *back* in the lacuna except by supralinear insertion. The source for the intrusive *back,* of course, is its occurrence in the following *yea*-clause ("yea even **back** by the same way which they had come"). This correction does not mean that "retreat back" is impossible; this expression is found elsewhere in the text:

Helaman 1:29 insomuch that they began to **retreat back**

       towards the land of Zarahemla

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

And, to be sure, there are other examples of the verb *retreat* without *back* (six more of them), including this nearby one in Alma 58:18: "I caused that my men . . . should retreat into the wilderness".

Summary: Maintain in Alma 58:24 the corrected reading without the adverb *back:* "they began to retreat into the wilderness again".

■ **Alma 58:25**

for the chief captains of the Lamanites
[*& supposeing* >+ *had supposed* 1 | *had supposed* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
that the Nephites were weary because of their march
[*& supposeing* 0 | *& supposing* 1 | *and supposing* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
that they had driven their whole army
therefore they took no thought concerning the city of Manti

When Oliver Cowdery copied the text from 𝓞 into 𝓟, his eye apparently skipped down to the following line and he initially copied "& supposeing" (rather than the correct "had supposed") from the immediately following line in 𝓞. The transcript for this part of 𝓞 shows that the first instance of the verb *suppose* would have been almost right above the second one:

Alma 58:25 (lines 22−23, page 352′ of 𝓞)

```
(                                      ) were weary because of their march <that t>
   -NITES HAD SUPPOSED THAT THE NEPHITES

(                              h)eir whole army therefore they took no thought
   & SUPPOSEING THAT THEY HAD DRIVEN T
```

Oliver soon corrected his error in 𝓟 by crossing out "& supposeing" and supralinearly inserting "had supposed". Oliver's correction in 𝓟 was probably later (perhaps when he proofed 𝓟 against 𝓞) since the ink flow for the *had* is somewhat heavier and for the *supposed* slightly heavier.

It is worth noting that the original text here could have read with both instances of the present participial *supposing* but with only the second *and:*

Alma 58:25 (proposed emendation)
for the chief captains of the Lamanites
supposing that the Nephites were weary because of their march
and supposing that they had driven their whole army
therefore they took no thought concerning the city of Manti

But the fact that Oliver Cowdery initially wrote "& supposeing" in 𝓟 argues that this *and* was secondary and that its source was the following "& supposeing". The critical text will assume that the initial "& supposeing" was a simple copying error and will maintain the corrected reading in 𝓟, "had supposed".

Summary: Retain in Alma 58:25 the corrected reading in 𝓟: "for the chief captains of the Lamanites **had supposed** that the Nephites were weary because of their march".

■ **Alma 58:25**

therefore they took no thought
concerning the [1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRT | *one* s] *city of Manti*

This is an interesting typo in the 1953 RLDS edition that is apparently the result of adding foot-notes to that edition. In this instance, the number 1 was placed as a superscript right before the word *city* but was apparently written out as *one* in the 1953 typesetter's copytext. The result was that the 1953 typesetter added the word *one* as well as the superscript 1 in the last line of type for verse 150 in chapter XXVI (following the RLDS chapter and versification system):

> they took no thought concerning the one ¹city of Manti.

(At the bottom of the page, footnote 1 refers the reader to "Verse 134".) Of course, there are no examples in the Book of Mormon text of "the **one** city of X".

Summary: Retain in Alma 58:25 the original phraseology "the city of Manti".

■ **Alma 58:26**

now it came to pass **that** *when it was night*
[*that* 01ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQS | RT] *I caused*
[NULL > *that* 1 | *that* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *my men should not sleep*
but **that** *they should march forward by another way towards the land of Manti*

As discussed under verse 14, the original text allows the repetition of the subordinate conjunction *that* in complex sentences. Here in the original text for verse 26, we have a repeated *that* for the *when*-clause immediately following the initial "it came to pass" clause ("now it came to pass **that** when it was night **that** I caused . . ."). The 1920 LDS text removed the repeated *that,* but the criti-cal text will restore it.

The editing out of repeated *that*'s is quite uneven in the history of the text. Elsewhere in the original text, we have the following cases of the repeated *that* for a *when*-clause immediately fol-lowing "it came to pass that", and in only two cases has the repeated *that* been removed, both in the editing for the 1837 edition (each of these is marked below with an asterisk):

> Mosiah 4:1
> and now it came to pass **that**
> **when** king Benjamin had made an end of speaking the words
> which had been delivered unto him by the angel of the Lord
> **that** he cast his eyes round about on the multitude
>
> Mosiah 7:18
> and it came to pass **that**
> **when** they had gathered themselves together
> **that** he spake unto them in this wise saying . . .
>
> Mosiah 17:1
> and now it came to pass **that**
> **when** Abinadi had finished these sayings
> **that** the king commanded that the priests should take him

Mosiah 20:9
  and it came to pass **that**
  when the Lamanites had come up
  that the people of Limhi began to fall upon them from their waiting places

Alma 2:35
  and it came to pass **that**
  when they had all crossed the river Sidon
  that the Lamanites and the Amlicites began to flee before them

* Alma 15:11 ("it came to pass that" also removed in the 1837 editing)
  and it came to pass **that**
  when Alma had said these words
  that Zeezrom leaped upon his feet and began to walk

Alma 20:1
  and it came to pass **that**
  when they had established a church in that land
  that king Lamoni desired that Ammon should go with him to the land of Nephi

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

* Alma 30:30
  and it came to pass **that**
  when he was brought before Alma and the chief judge
  that he did go on in the same manner as he did in the land of Gideon

Alma 31:36
  now it came to pass **that**
  when Alma had said these words
  that he clapped his hands upon all they which were with him

Alma 47:13
  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

One reason the 1920 editors may have noticed the repeated *that* in Alma 58:26 is that there the *when*-clause is quite short ("when it was night"). When the *when*-clause is longer, as in the examples that escaped the 1837 editing, it is harder to notice the repeated *that*. In any event, the repeated *that* is very common in spoken English as well as in unedited writing (and even edited writing, as these examples show). For further discussion regarding the repeated *that*, see under THAT in volume 3.

Also here in Alma 58:26, Oliver Cowdery initially omitted in 𝓟 the subordinate conjunction *that* which comes after the past-tense verb form *caused*. Virtually immediately he supralinearly inserted the *that* (there is no change in the level of ink flow). 𝓞 is not extant here, but there is clearly room for it in the lacuna. Elsewhere in the text, a finite clause complementing the verb *cause* always takes the subordinate *that* (see the discussion under 1 Nephi 17:46). Here in Alma 58:26,

there is a conjoined finite clause that follows the first one, and it too is headed by *that:* "but **that** they should march forward by another way towards the land of Manti".

Summary: Restore in Alma 58:26 the original repeated *that* which follows the *when*-clause; this kind of redundancy is common in the original (and current) text; also maintain the *that* which follows *caused*.

■ **Alma 58:27**

we did arrive before them [*to* 01ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQS | *at* RT] *the city of Manti*

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 complete discussion of this change, see under 1 Nephi 17:14.

Summary: Restore in Alma 58:27 the preposition *to* in the phrase "arrive . . . **to** the city of Manti".

■ **Alma 58:31**

and [*those/the* 0 | *the* >+ *those* 1 | *those* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *cities*
    which had been taken by the Lamanites—
all of them are at this period of time in our possession

Here we have an example where *the* and *those* have been mixed up in the early transmission of the text. The original manuscript may have read either "**those** cities which had been taken by the Lamanites" or "**the** cities which had been taken by the Lamanites". 𝓞 is highly fragmented near the end of the line, and it is difficult to tell if the line ends with *tho* or *the*. If *tho,* then presumably a hyphenated *se* should be found at the beginning of the next line. But the first couple of words at the beginning of the next line are not extant. Spacing in the lacuna favors the slightly longer "-se cities which", but "cities which" would also fit.

When Oliver Cowdery copied this passage into the printer's manuscript, he initially wrote "**the** cities which had been taken by the Lamanites"; later, with a slightly sharper quill, he overwrote the *e* of the *the* with an *o* and then supralineally inserted *se*. The ink appears to be slightly blacker than the original ink, implying that this correction was made later—at about the same time the correct *himself* in verse 16 was changed in 𝓟 to *themselves* on the preceding page of 𝓟 (see the earlier discussion under Alma 58:16–17). In any event, the correction here in verse 31 was definitely not immediate. All the printed editions have continued with the corrected reading in 𝓟, "**those** cities which had been taken by the Lamanites".

Elsewhere in the text, we can find evidence for both *those* and *the* in this context. For instance, there are four occurrences of "the cities which" and five others of "those cities which". This variation suggests that there wouldn't have been any tendency for Oliver Cowdery to consciously edit *the* to *those* in Alma 58:31. Therefore, the corrected reading in 𝓟 is most likely a correction to the reading of 𝓞. When Oliver copied the text into 𝓟, he may have misread the line-final *tho* as *the*. See under Alma 11:21 for other cases in copying from 𝓞 into 𝓟 where Oliver misread words at the ends of lines in 𝓞.

In a similar example earlier in the book of Alma, Oliver Cowdery initially replaced an original *those* (extant in 𝓞) with *the* in 𝓟. In that case, his correction in 𝓟 was virtually immediate (there is no change in the level of ink flow); he overwrote the *e* with an *o* and inserted the *se* inline:

Alma 27:1

Now it came to pass that
when [*those* 0ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST | *the > those* 1] Lamanites
which had gone to war against the Nephites . . .

For another example where *those* was replaced by *the,* see under Alma 63:10. There the 1830 compositor mis-set "**those** people which had gone forth into that land" as "**the** people which had gone forth into that land".

Summary: Maintain *those* in Alma 58:31, the corrected reading in 𝑃 and the probable reading in 𝒪: "**those** cities which had been taken by the Lamanites".

■ **Alma 58:33**

but behold we trust [*that* 01ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQS | *in* RT] *our God*
who hath given us victory over those lands
insomuch that we have obtained those cities and those lands which were our own

The original manuscript is extant here for the words "behold we trust **that** our God". The resulting text is clearly a sentence fragment. The editors for the 1920 LDS edition minimally revised the text here by replacing the *that* with *in*: "we trust in our God". Another possible emendation would be to omit the original *that,* which would give "we trust our God". Yet both these emendations seem inappropriate for the context. Helaman is not simply declaring his trust in God. Perhaps what he intends to say here is "we trust that **it is** our God who hath given us victory over those lands". One could thus propose emending this passage by inserting *it is.* Another possibility would be to omit the relative pronoun *who*: "we trust that our God hath given us victory over those lands". It seems very possible that here in the early transmission of the text some error occurred.

Besides the sentence fragment, the relative clause itself ("who hath given us victory over those lands") seems strange in referring to victory over lands per se rather than over the Lamanites (Alma 46:7) or one of their armies (Alma 53:6). No part of this relative clause in Alma 58:33 is extant in 𝒪. Even so, it is difficult to see how any kind of reasonable emendation could avoid referring to victory over lands; however strange, the reading seems to be intended. Taking back lands and holding them is, to be sure, a part of being victorious, as suggested in a nearby passage:

Alma 55:27–28

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
and also **maintain all the ground** and the advantage **which they had retaken**
and it came to pass that the Nephites began again to be **victorious**
and to reclaim their rights and their privileges

The Book of Mormon text has three basic types of phrases involving the word *trust;* for each basic type, I provide some typical examples (here NP stands for a noun phrase and S for a finite clause):

(1)   "to put one's trust in NP" (18 times)

> Alma 57:27   and they do put their trust in God continually

(2a) "to trust that S" (8 times)

> Alma 57:36   yea and I trust that the souls of them which has been slain
>   have entered into the rest of their God

(2b) "to trust S" (2 times)

> Alma 58:37   we trust God will deliver us

(3)   "to trust in NP" (6 times)

> Jacob 7:25   trusting in the God and the rock of their salvation

There are two examples that combine the second and third types to form instances of "to trust in NP that S":

> Alma 17:13   trusting in the Lord that they should meet again
>   at the close of their harvest
> Moroni 9:22   and I trust in Christ that thou wilt be saved

Instead of the finite clause complement S, we can have an infinitive clause as the complement:

> Mosiah 23:13   and that ye trust no man to be a king over you
> Mosiah 23:14   and also trusting no one to be your teachers nor your ministers
>   except he be a man of God

There are three examples where the complement is verbless:

> Mosiah 21:19   and the king himself did not trust his person without the walls
>   of the city
> Alma 19:23   therefore Mosiah trusted him unto the Lord
> Alma 37:32   trust not those secret plans unto this people

And finally, there are a couple of oddities found only in Isaiah quotes from the King James Bible, one with a different preposition and one without any complement at all for the verb *trust:*

> 2 Nephi 8:5   and on mine arm shall they trust
> 2 Nephi 22:2   I will trust and not be afraid

As far as Alma 58:33 is concerned, the earliest text appears to be of the second basic type, "to trust (that) S", except that the S is an NP.

   As noted above, one possible emendation would be to insert the words *it is* between *that* and *our God,* even though the original manuscript is extant here and *it is* is definitely not there. This emendation adds another occurrence of a finite *that-*clause after the verb *trust.* Such a minimal emendation makes very good sense and also avoids a shift in the meaning. Moreover, the phraseology equivalent to "it is God who . . ." occurs in a number of places in the Book of Mormon:

> Alma 5:48   and behold **it is he that** cometh to take away the sins of the world
> Alma 39:15   behold I say unto you that **it is him that** surely shall come
>   to take away the sins of the world

Alma 44:9	we do not believe that **it is God that** hath delivered us into your hands
Alma 57:35	for behold **it is he that** hath delivered us
Alma 60:28	yea behold I do not fear your power nor your authority but **it is my God whom** I fear
Helaman 5:26	for behold **it is God that** hath shown unto you this marvelous thing
Mormon 9:11	and **it is that same God which** created the heavens and the earth
Moroni 10:8	and there are different ways that these gifts are administered but **it is the same God which** worketh all in all

In fact, three of these (Alma 44:9, Alma 57:35, and Helaman 5:26) have the present perfective *hath* in the relative clause (just as in Alma 58:33).

There is also some evidence in the early transmission of the text for the loss of existential subjects with their *be* verb form (see under each of these passages for discussion):

Alma 26:1 (initial loss of *these are* in ౧)

and now [NULL >+ *these are* ౦ | *these are* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
the words of Ammon to his brethren which saith thus . . .

Alma 28:2 (probable loss of *there was* during the original dictation; conjectural emendation supplied by Joseph Smith in his editing for the 1837 edition)

and thus [౦A | NULL >js *there was* 1 | *there was* BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
a tremendious battle

Alma 32:40 (loss of *it is* during the typesetting of the 1830 edition)

and thus [*it is* 01PS | ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOQRT] if ye will not nourish the word

The last example shows the loss of *it is,* the same loss that is being proposed here in Alma 58:33. Also see under Alma 60:12 for another case where an original *it is* may have been lost during the dictation of the text; in the 1840 edition, the phrase *it is* was added to the text (presumably by Joseph Smith), thus emending the reading there to "do ye suppose that because so many of your brethren have been killed **it is** because of their wickedness".

In contrast to these errors, there is no evidence in the history of the text for accidentally inserting extra relative pronouns such as *who* or *which*. Nor is there any evidence for mixing up *in* with *that* (or vice versa, for that matter). It is true that one can find some evidence for the occasional unintended addition of the subordinate conjunction *that* (see, for instance, under 2 Nephi 1:1). But as we have already seen, the proposed emendation "we trust our God" seems inappropriate here, as does "we trust in our God". The most reasonable conjecture is that during the dictation of Alma 58:33, *it is* was accidentally lost. The critical text will accept this emendation since the earliest extant reading (the sentence fragment, "we trust that our God who hath given us victory over those lands") seems unacceptable while the conjectural emendation *it is* seems the most successful in achieving the intended meaning for this sentence.

Summary: Emend Alma 58:33 by inserting *it is* before *our God,* thus supplying an existential subject and verb for the noun phrase *our God;* also restore the original preceding subordinate conjunction *that;* evidence from usage and errors elsewhere in the text supports this conjectural emendation ("we trust that **it is** our God who hath given us victory over those lands").

■ **Alma 58:35–36**

behold we do not know but what ye are unsuccessful
and ye have drawn away the forces into that quarter of the land
if so we do not desire to murmur

[NULL > & 1 | *And* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *if it is not so*
behold we fear that there is some faction in the government
that they do not send more men to our assistance

The original manuscript is not extant for the beginning of verse 36. There is a fairly large portion of text missing between extant portions of 𝒪 (namely, "desire to murmur & if it is not"). There is room for the ampersand in the lacuna, although the fit is better if the ampersand was lacking in 𝒪, at least initially.

When copying to the printer's manuscript, Oliver Cowdery initially wrote the *if*-clause at the beginning of verse 36 without an ampersand. Oliver soon inserted an ampersand supralinearly—and without any change in ink flow, which suggests a virtually immediate correction. Most likely 𝒪 had the ampersand. There doesn't seem to be much motivation here for Oliver deciding on his own to add an *and* to the text.

Summary: Retain in Alma 58:36 Oliver Cowdery's virtually immediate correction in 𝒫, the *and* at the beginning of the verse ("**and** if it is not so").

■ **Alma 58:36**

behold we [*feel* >+ *fear* 0 | *fear* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
that there is some faction in the government . . .

Oliver Cowdery initially wrote *feel* in the original manuscript; then somewhat later he corrected *feel* to *fear* (the supralinear *fear* was written with heavier ink flow). This correction probably occurred when Oliver read back the text to Joseph Smith. He probably misheard Joseph's *fear* as *feel,* two phonetically similar words (identical except for the final liquid, /r/ versus /l/).

Usage elsewhere in the text favors *fear that;* there are 13 other occurrences of *fear* complemented by a *that*-clause, including one earlier in this chapter: "fearing that we should cut them off from their support" (Alma 58:15). There are no instances in the text of *feel* complemented by a *that*-clause; nonetheless, such an expression is not impossible since there are instances of *feel* with other types of complements:

Alma 5:26	and if ye have felt **to sing** the song of redeeming love . . .
Alma 43:46	that which they felt **it was** the duty which they owed to their God
Alma 54:2	Moroni felt **to rejoice** exceedingly at this request

Here in Alma 58:36, the verb *fear* seems to better express Helaman's uncertainty about what was actually happening in the land of Zarahemla. The critical text will accept Oliver Cowdery's corrected reading in 𝒪, *fear* ("behold we **fear** that there is some faction in the government").

Summary: Accept in Alma 58:36 Oliver Cowdery's correction of *feel* to *fear;* he probably misheard Joseph Smith's *fear* as *feel.*

■ **Alma 58:36**

behold we fear that
there is some [*fraction* 0 | *fartion* > *farction* 1 | *faction* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
in the government

The word *faction* is considerably less frequent in spoken English than *fraction;* indeed, *faction* is generally restricted to more educated speakers and writers. I myself recall first learning the word as a junior in high school (when I was 16 years old), in an American history class discussion of James Madison's *Federalist* paper number 10. The word *faction* is definitely an "adult" word. This is particularly clear in *Word Frequency Book,* edited by John B. Carroll, Peter Davies, and Barry Richman (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1971), which gives the frequencies of words in published texts written for grade-school children. There the word *fraction* occurs 100 times more frequently than *faction.* According to more general samplings of texts from American English, *fraction* occurs about four times more frequently than *faction;* see, for instance, the current count from <www.google.com> and the earlier one in the Brown Corpus (dating from the early 1960s), as found in W. Nelson Francis and Henry Kučera, *Frequency Analysis of English Usage: Lexicon and Grammar* (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1982). But in more literary and historically based databases, such as the online Oxford English Dictionary and *Literature Online* <lion.chadwyck.com>, we get about equal frequencies for *fraction* and *faction.*

Here in Alma 58:36, Oliver Cowdery definitely wrote *fraction* in the original manuscript. Either he or Joseph Smith in his dictation seems to have been unaware of the difference between *fraction* and *faction* and thus substituted the more common word, *fraction,* for *faction.* This confusion continued when Oliver copied this word into the printer's manuscript, initially writing the impossible *fartion,* then correctly inserting the *c* but without deleting the *r* (thus producing the equally impossible *farction*), which leads one to think that once more Oliver intended the word *fraction.* The 1830 typesetter correctly emended the word to *faction,* and all subsequent editions have followed the 1830 reading.

Although *fraction* will theoretically work in Alma 58:36, its use there is really quite unusual. In various historical databases of the English language, the words *fraction* and *government* rarely collocate and then only accidentally. For instance, the online Oxford English Dictionary has only one instance of *fraction* and *government* occurring within ten words of each other, but that example refers to the government using "the last **fraction** of the sum reserved for the redemption of the public debt". In contrast, the online OED lists eight instances of *faction* collocating with *government,* and there the examples use *faction* like it is used here in Alma 58:36, as in the following:

> Richard Mead (1720)
>> Such counter-steps will happen in a government, where there is too much of **faction**, and too little publick spirit.

Even more striking are the rare instances of the specific phrase "fraction in the government" on <www.google.com>, with only three examples when accessed on 23 July 2007:

> "Use of mobile devices"
>> They were taken along with the biggest **fraction** in the government four years ago, which used them during the elections.

"Baroda Medical College Youth 4 Equality"
> We do understand that doing so many lead to a **fraction** in the government
> so we are ready for discussions and finding out a common solution . . .

Rainer Klump (professor at the University of Frankfurt, in Germany)
> . . . equipped to assist this reform-oriented **fraction** in the government.

The first example of *fraction* appears to mean 'proportion (of people)' and can be considered a correct use of the word *fraction* (although unusual). In the second example, the word *fraction* seems to mean 'fracture', while the third example appears to be an actual instance where *fraction* means 'faction'. The last two examples seem to have been written by nonnatives. In contrast, <www.google.com> gives an overall estimate (although unreliable except in the broadest measure) of tens of thousands for the specific phrase "faction in the government".

It therefore seems very doubtful that "some fraction in the government" is the correct reading for Alma 58:36 in the original text of the Book of Mormon. We have already seen a number of cases where Oliver Cowdery (or perhaps Joseph Smith) substituted a more common word for an unfamiliar one; see the discussion and list of examples under Jacob 6:13. The critical text will accept *faction* as the correct reading here in Alma 58:36.

Summary: The word *faction* in Alma 58:36 is most probably the reading of the original text, even though the original manuscript reads *fraction* (a possible but unlikely reading); it appears that at the time of the translation, Oliver Cowdery (if not Joseph Smith) was unfamiliar with the word *faction* and substituted *fraction* for it.

■ **Alma 58:38**

and we are in the possession
of our [*lands* / *land* 0 | *land* > *lands* 1 | *lands* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
and the Lamanites have fled to the land of Nephi

Multispectral imaging of the original manuscript for *land(s)* at the beginning of the manuscript line indicates a faint *s;* thus the original text seems to have read *lands* here. Oliver Cowdery's virtually immediate correction of the singular *land* to *lands* in the printer's manuscript (there is no change in the level of ink flow) seems to be a correction to the actual reading of 𝓞 rather than the result of editing on Oliver's part. Elsewhere in the text, there are eight instances that refer to the "possession of lands". There is nothing wrong with the plural *lands* here in Alma 58:38.

Summary: Maintain in Alma 58:38 the plural *lands* ("we are in the possession of our lands"), the apparent reading in 𝓞 and the corrected reading in 𝓟.

■ **Alma 58:41**

and now my beloved brother Moroni

☐ 01ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQS

that *the Lord our God*
who hath redeemed us and made us free
may *keep you continually in his presence*
yea and **that** *he* **may** *favor this people*

☐ RT

may *the Lord our God*
who hath redeemed us and made us free
keep you continually in his presence
yea and **may** *he favor this people*

even that ye may have success
in obtaining the possession of all that
which the Lamanites hath taken from us
which was for our support

Here Helaman's letter ends with a fragmented resultive clause (actually, two of them conjoined together). It's as if there is an understood independent clause equivalent to "let it be such" (or "I wish" or "I pray") coming after the closing salutation "and now my beloved brother Moroni". The original manuscript is extant here, and there is no evidence of any missing phrase. Nor is there any evidence that the construction itself, "that <subject> may <verb phrase>", is somehow an error. Although this construction seems unacceptable in English, David Calabro points out (personal communication) that it would be acceptable if it began with a rhetorical *O,* thus "**O that** the Lord our God . . . **may** keep you". Elsewhere, there are examples in the text of personal wishes with the form "O that S" where the finite verb in the clause S is a modal, either *might* or *would:*

> 1 Nephi 2:9–10
>> and when my father saw that
>> the waters of the river emptied into the fountain of the Red Sea
>> he spake unto Laman saying :
>> **O that** thou **mightest** be like unto this river
>> continually running into the fountain of all righteousness
>> and he also spake unto Lemuel saying :
>> **O that** thou **mightest** be like unto this valley
>> firm and steadfast and immovable in keeping the commandments of the Lord

> 2 Nephi 1:12–13
>> wherefore my sons I would that ye would remember
>> yea I would that ye would hearken unto my words
>> **O that** ye **would** awake / awake from a deep sleep
>> yea even from the sleep of hell
>> and shake off the awful chains by which ye are bound

> Jacob 2:15–16
>> **O that** he **would** show you that he can pierce you
>> and with one glance of his eye he can smite you to the dust
>> **O that** he **would** rid you from this iniquity and abomination
>> and **O that** ye **would** listen unto the word of his commands
>> and let not this pride of your hearts destroy your souls

We should note here that there are other examples in the text of "O that S", but these are different in that the finite verb in the clause S is a subjunctive verb form, either *were* or *had.* In those

cases, the meaning is hypothetical and conditional (with the meaning 'if only'), as in the following examples:

1 Nephi 20:18	**O that** thou **hadst** hearkened to my commandments
Alma 29:1	**O that** I **were** an angel and could have the wish of mine heart
Helaman 13:33	**O that** we **had** remembered the Lord our God
3 Nephi 8:24	**O that** we **had** repented before this great and terrible day

Here in Alma 58:41, Helaman's closing wish does not begin with a rhetorical *O*, nor does it seem like it is missing. Instead, what we apparently have here is a fully intended rhetorical device characteristic of Nephite discourse. Despite the difficulty of this construction, the critical text will restore it since it is obviously intended.

The unacceptability of this construction in English led the editors for the 1920 LDS edition to revise the two cases of "that <subject> may <verb phrase>" to "may <subject> <verb phrase>", with the result that the current LDS text reads acceptably as an imperative-like wish. The last clause (beginning "even that ye may have success") is a resultive clause for the preceding "that he may favor this people". Of course, the 1920 editors did not revise this last clause to read "even may ye" since it is a resultive clause and is not part of the preceding wish-clause. Similar resultive clauses are quite common in the Book of Mormon text, as in Alma 62:38: "and they did flee / even that they did not return at that time against the Nephites".

Summary: Restore in Alma 58:41 the two instances of the original rhetorical expression "that <subject> may <verb phrase>"; although these form a sentence fragment in the original text, their use at the end of Helaman's epistle appears to be fully intended.

Alma 59

■ **Alma 59:3**

insomuch that he might with ease maintain that part of the land
which he had been so miraculously prospered
in [*retaining* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQS | *regaining* RT]

As discussed under Alma 58:3, the critical text will restore all original instances of the verb *retain,*
including seven instances that have been emended in the LDS text to *regain.*

■ **Alma 59:8**

and their armies were so numerous
that the remainder of the people of Nephihah were obliged to flee before them
and they came **even** *and joined the army of Moroni*

The original manuscript is extant here and reads *even* ("they came **even** and joined the army of
Moroni"). Paul Huntzinger (personal communication, 10 December 2003) suggests that here *even*
is an error for the visually similar *over.* He notes, for instance, that nearby in the previous chapter
we get the same expression but with *over* rather than *even:*

> Alma 58:6
>> yea even those which had been compelled
>> to flee from the land of Manti and from the land round about
>> **had came over and joined** the Lamanites in this part of the land

In fact, there are two more examples that refer to "coming over and joining a people":

> Alma 25:13
>> and many of them **came over** to dwell in the land of Ishmael and the land of Nephi
>> **and did join** themselves to the people of God
>> which was the people of Anti-Nephi-Lehi

> Alma 47:29
>> they were frightened again and fled into the wilderness
>> and **came over** into the land of Zarahemla **and joined** the people of Ammon

Besides these examples, there are 17 additional examples of "come over" that deal with geograph-
ical movement.

On the other hand, there are no examples in the text where *even* modifies the verb *come.*
There are occurrences of "come even" that refer to a geographic place, but in these cases *even*
does not refer to the verb *come* but to the place:

Alma 15:1	and they departed and came out **even** into the land of Sidom
Mormon 2:16	and they were pursued until they came **even** to the land of Jashon
Ether 2:7	but he would that they should come forth **even** unto the land of promise

In fact, for the first of these examples, Huntzinger proposes that this instance of *even* could also be an error for *over.* But as discussed under Alma 15:1, internal evidence elsewhere in the text argues that in that passage no emendation from *even* to *over* should be made. But here in Alma 59:8, internal evidence strongly supports the emendation.

When we consider scribal practice, we find considerable evidence that the scribes sometimes mixed up *o* and *e* as well as *n* and *r.* More specifically, there is one clear example of a mix-up between *over* and *ever:*

> 2 Nephi 18:8
> and he shall pass through Judah
> he shall overflow and go [*ever* 1|*over* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]

This is a biblical quotation from Isaiah 8:8, which has *over:* "and he shall pass through Judah / he shall overflow and go **over**". ⊙ is not extant for 2 Nephi 18:8 but probably read *over,* which Oliver Cowdery must have miscopied as *ever.* There are considerably more examples of mix-ups between *ever* and *even.* For a list, see under Alma 56:46. But there are no examples of mix-ups between *over* and *even* except, it would appear, here in Alma 59:8. Since there is only one instance of mixing up *over* and *ever,* the lack of specific evidence for mixing up *over* and *even* is not that surprising. We should note here that since *even* is the reading in ⊙ for Alma 59:8, Joseph Smith himself was probably responsible for the error. It seems unlikely that *even* was the result of Oliver Cowdery mishearing Joseph's dictation of *over.* Instead, Joseph probably misread the original *over* as the visually similar *even.*

Summary: Emend *even* in Alma 59:8 to *over:* "and they came **over** and joined the army of Moroni"; usage elsewhere in the text strongly supports this conjectural emendation; there is independent evidence in the manuscripts for mix-ups of *ever* and *even* as well as mix-ups of *over* and *ever,* although none specifically of *over* and *even.*

■ **Alma 59:9**

and now as Moroni had supposed that there should be
[*men/more* 0|*men* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *sent to the city of Nephihah*
to the assistance of the people to maintain that city . . .

The original manuscript is extant here, but it is difficult to determine whether it reads *men* or *more.* The sense of this passage supports *men* since the following phrase "to the assistance of the people to maintain that city" implies that without sending these men there would be no soldiers in the city of Nephihah for defense besides the local inhabitants. If the text had intended 'more', it probably would have used the noun phrase "more men", as in the following nearby example:

> Alma 58:36
> behold we fear that there is some faction in the government
> that they do not send **more men** to our assistance

The use of *more* alone as a noun phrase does occur in the text, but only once:

> Alma 39:13
>> that ye lead away the hearts of no **more** to do wickedly

Even for that passage, as speakers of modern English, we prefer that *more* be followed by a head noun, such as *people*. Excluding the case here in Alma 59:9, the text has 15 occurrences of "send . . . men" and 6 of "send . . . more X" (where X is a noun) but none of "send . . . more". Thus internal evidence supports *men* here in Alma 59:9, which is how Oliver Cowdery copied the word into 𝔓.

Summary: Accept in Alma 59:9 the word *men,* the reading in 𝔓, as the correct interpretation of the unclear *men/more* in 𝒪.

■ **Alma 59:9**

and now as Moroni had supposed that
there should be men sent to the city of Nephihah
to the assistance of the people to maintain that city
and knowing that it was easier to keep the city
from falling into the hands of the Lamanites
[NULL >+ *than to retake it from them* 01 | *than to retake it from them* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
he supposed that they would easily maintain that city

The problem here in Alma 59:9 is that in both manuscripts Oliver Cowdery initially wrote the text without the comparative clause "than to retake it from them". And in both manuscripts, this clause was later inserted supralinearly. In the original manuscript, the level of ink flow for the correction is somewhat blacker and unevenly applied, and the quill was sharper. In the printer's manuscript, the ink flow is also uneven, with the heavier ink flow blacker; and once more, the quill used for the insertion was slightly sharper. The unevenness of the ink flow suggests that the ink in the quill was drying out. These similarities in the ink argue that both corrections were made at the same time, yet some time after the text had been initially written down in 𝔓. In fact, we can be more specific: the correction in 𝔓 looks like it was made when 𝔓 was proofed against 𝒪. There are two nearby examples of corrections made in 𝔓 during proofing where the ink for those corrections looks very much like the ink here in 𝔓 for Alma 59:9, that is, slightly sharper and darker than the inline writing (see the discussion regarding the emendation of *himself* to *themselves* in Alma 58:16 and the correction of *the* to *those* in Alma 58:31). What seems to have happened here in Alma 59:9 is that as Oliver was proofing 𝔓 against 𝒪, he decided to emend the text by inserting the words "than to retake it from them". Other examples where Oliver later corrected both manuscripts suggest that he first inserted the clause in 𝔓, then inserted it in 𝒪.

Corrections like this in both manuscripts are almost always instances of scribal intervention (where the scribe himself creates a secondary reading). It seems highly unlikely that Oliver Cowdery would have missed inserting this rather long comparative clause both times, especially when copying the text from 𝒪 into 𝔓 since the supralinearly inserted text, had it already been there in 𝒪, would have been distinctly noticeable.

It is possible that the original text had a clause here in Alma 59:9 that was accidentally missed when Oliver Cowdery took down Joseph Smith's dictation (although there is little evidence elsewhere for such a loss of this many words during dictation). As far as the inserted words are concerned

("than to retake it from them"), they agree with usage elsewhere in the text. For instance, cities can be retaken:

> Alma 52:15–16
>
> > 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

In addition, the use of *than to* in "than to retake it from them" seems like a marked usage (that is, modern English speakers would prefer simply *than*). But this occurrence of *than to* is supported by usage elsewhere in the Book of Mormon text:

> 1 Nephi 17:20   and it would have been better that they had died . . .
> > **than to** have suffered these afflictions
>
> Mosiah 7:15   for it is better that we be slaves to the Nephites
> > **than to** pay tribute to the king of the Lamanites
>
> Alma 29:6   why should I desire more **than to** perform the work
> > to which I have been called

But a different issue to consider here is whether Oliver Cowdery's inserted *than*-clause is contextually correct. In my opinion, a more appropriate textual revision would be to insert something equivalent to "by sending men to the city". In other words, what Moroni is thinking here is that it would have been easier to have maintained the city of Nephihah by sending some extra men to supplement the forces already in the city:

> Alma 59:9–10 (revised text)
>
> > and now as Moroni had supposed that
> > there should be men sent to the city of Nephihah
> > to the assistance of the people to maintain that city
> > and knowing that it was easier to keep the city
> > from falling into the hands of the Lamanites
> > **by sending men to the city**
> > he supposed that they would easily maintain that city
> > therefore he retained all his force
> > to maintain those places which he had recovered

These extra words set in bold (or something like them) were not in the original text, nor were they lost from it. Rather, they are implied by the context.

Don Brugger points out (personal communication) that Moroni was not thinking of sending his own men to maintain the city of Nephihah. Instead, he was relying on Parhoron to send those extra men. Verses 9 and 10 act as a whole, with the result that the initial clause in verse 9 is explained by the *therefore*-clause in verse 10: "and now as Moroni had supposed that there should be men sent to the city of Nephihah to the assistance of the people to maintain that city . . . therefore he retained all his force to maintain those places which he had recovered". This passage is not contradictory. Instead, it assumes that Parhoron rather than Moroni would be the one sending the extra men, which explains the use of the passive "there should be men sent". Moreover, the modal *should* here means 'would'. Unfortunately, no such men ever arrived, and thus much to

Moroni's distress that city was lost when it could have been easily maintained. The implied phrase "by sending men to the city" (based on the preceding "there should be men sent to the city of Nephihah") is the intended meaning, but it is recoverable from the context itself and does not need to be inserted into the text.

This interpretation also explains the sorrow and anger Moroni (and his chief captains) felt over the seeming wickedness and indifference of the Nephite people, especially since the responsibility for the loss of the city of Nephihah could be directly assigned (or so it seemed) to Parhoron and the government:

> Alma 59:11, 13
>> and now when Moroni saw that the city of Nephihah was lost
>> he was exceeding sorrowful and began to doubt
>> because of the wickedness of the people
>> whether they should not fall into the hands of their brethren . . .
>> and it came to pass that Moroni was angry with the government
>> because of their indifference concerning the freedom of their country

Thus Moroni is now fully motivated to write a scathing and threatening letter to Parhoron (which is found in Alma 60, the next chapter).

Oliver Cowdery thought that the comparative clause in Alma 59:9 required some kind of *than*-clause, which he supplied on his own. The problem is that Oliver's conjectural emendation ("than to retake it from them") goes beyond what the text actually intends to say. The critical text will follow the initial manuscript reading here, without any added *than*-clause, but with the understanding that Moroni thought that sending men to the city of Nephihah, presumably by Parhoron, would have made it easy to maintain that city.

Stan Larson, in his work on the text dating from the 1970s, came to the same conclusion regarding the status of the *than*-clause, namely, that this clause is secondary to the text and was supplied by Oliver Cowdery on his own; see footnote 13 on page 28 of Larson's article "Textual Variants in Book of Mormon Manuscripts", *Dialogue: A Journal of Mormon Thought* 10/4 (1977): 8–30.

Summary: In the original text for Alma 59:9 there was no explicit comparison completing the statement "it was easier to keep the city from falling into the hands of the Lamanites"; on his own initiative, Oliver Cowdery emended both manuscripts by adding a secondary *than*-clause, "than to retake it from them"; the context itself implies that what would have made it easier would have been the sending of men to help maintain the city; the critical text will not add any explicit explanation since there was none in the original text, nor is it required.

■ **Alma 59:10**

[*&* > NULL 0 | 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *therefore he retained all his force to maintain those places which he had recovered*

In most instances, *therefore* begins sentences in the Book of Mormon text, but there are 18 cases where the *therefore* is preceded by the conjunction *and.* Here in 𝒪 for Alma 59:10, Oliver initially wrote "& therefore", but then he crossed out the ampersand. There is one other case where Oliver Cowdery accidentally added an *and* before *therefore* in the text, but again only momentarily:

Alma 37:28

[*&* >% NULL 0 | 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] therefore I desire
that this people might not be destroyed

For each instance of *therefore,* the critical text will follow the earliest extant reading, thus *therefore* without a preceding *and* in Alma 59:10.

Summary: Maintain in Alma 59:10 the corrected reading in ℗, *therefore* without any preceding *and.*

■ **Alma 59:10**

therefore he [*retained* 01ABCDEFGHIJKLMOPQRST | *obtained* N] *all his force*
to maintain those places which he had recovered

Here the 1906 LDS large-print edition replaced *retained* with *obtained*. This is undoubtedly a typo caused by visual similarity between the two words and possibly the influence of the following occurrence of *maintain*. The semantics for the verb *obtain* don't really work in this passage, but *retain* works well enough with its normal meaning 'keep'. The 1906 edition was never used as a copytext; thus the secondary *obtained* was never copied into any subsequent LDS edition.

For many cases in the original text, the verb *retain* had the meaning 'take back' or 'regain' (although not here in Alma 59:10). For most of these other cases, *retain* has been emended to *regain* or to verbs similar in meaning, especially in the LDS text. For an extensive discussion, see under Alma 58:3.

Summary: Maintain in Alma 59:10 the use of the verb *retain,* with its meaning here of 'keep'.

■ **Alma 59:13**

because of [*the* > *their* 1 | *their* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *indifference*
concerning the freedom of their country

Here in the printer's manuscript, Oliver Cowdery initially wrote "**the** indifference concerning the freedom of their country"; but then virtually immediately he corrected the *the* to *their* by crossing out the *the* and writing *their* supralineally. The original manuscript is not extant for the determiner here, but spacing between extant fragments favors the longer *their*. Moreover, *their* works better. Quite possibly, the following *the* in "the freedom" may have led Oliver to mistakenly write "the indifference" initially in ℗. For a list of other cases where Oliver miswrote *their* as *the,* see under Alma 27:23.

Summary: Accept Oliver Cowdery's immediate correction in ℗ (giving "because of **their** indifference concerning the freedom of their country"), also the most likely reading in ℗.

Alma 60

■ **Alma 60:2**

*ye have been appointed to gather together men
and arm them with swords and with scimitars
and all manner of weapons of war
[& > of 1 | of ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] every kind
and send forth against the Lamanites*

Here in the printer's manuscript, Oliver Cowdery initially wrote *and* (as an ampersand) instead of the correct *of.* Extant portions of 𝒪 indicates that page 354′ of 𝒪 ended with the phrase "& all manner of weopons of war", which apparently led Oliver as he was copying from 𝒪 into 𝒫 to assume that this was the end of the phrase and that the following word was *and.* Oliver's correction in 𝒫 of the ampersand to *of* was virtually immediate: he crossed out the ampersand and supralinearly inserted the *of* without any change in the level of ink flow.

Elsewhere the text has 13 examples of "all manner of X of every kind", including two more instances of "all manner of weapons of war of every kind" (in Alma 2:12, 14). More generally, there are 98 examples of "all manner of X" without any postmodifying "of every kind", including three examples of "all manner of weapons of war" (in Alma 43:18, Mormon 6:9, and Ether 10:27). Thus it is not surprising that Oliver Cowdery could have assumed that "all manner of weapons of war" in Alma 60:2 was not followed by "of every kind". For each case of "all manner of X (of every kind)", the critical text will follow the earliest textual sources, thus "all manner of weapons of war of every kind" here in Alma 60:2.

Summary: Maintain in Alma 60:2 the phraseology "all manner of weapons of war of every kind", the corrected reading in 𝒫.

■ **Alma 60:5**

*but behold great has been the slaughter
among [the >+ our 1 | our ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] people*

The original manuscript is not extant here. In the printer's manuscript, Oliver Cowdery initially wrote "among the people"; he later corrected the *the* to *our,* probably when he was checking 𝒫 against 𝒪 (the quill was duller and the level of ink flow heavier for the supralinear *our* in 𝒫). In theory the text could read either way, although elsewhere "among the people" is considerably more frequent (occurring 62 times in the text); there is only one other occurrence of "among our

people", in Jacob 1:7: "wherefore we labored diligently among our people". Clearly, there was no grammatical or semantic reason for Oliver to have edited the text from "among **the** people" to "among **our** people" here in Alma 60:5.

Summary: Accept Oliver Cowdery's corrected reading in 𝒫, "among **our** people", as the original reading of the text for Alma 60:5.

■ **Alma 60:5**

yea great has been your neglect [*towards* 01ABCDEFGHIJKLMOPQRST | *toward* N] *us*

As discussed under 1 Nephi 5:22, the critical text will follow the earliest sources for each instance of *toward(s),* thus *towards* (the more frequent form in the text) here in Alma 60:5. The 1906 LDS edition accidentally replaced *towards* with *toward* (elsewhere that edition consistently maintained instances of *towards*). The 1906 edition never served as a copytext for any subsequent LDS edition, so this instance of *toward* was not passed on.

Summary: Maintain in Alma 60:5 the form *towards,* the reading in 𝒪 and all the other earliest sources.

■ **Alma 60:7**

can [*you* 1ABCDEFGHIJKMNOPQRST | *ye* L] *think to sit upon your thrones in a state of thoughtless stupor*

Once more we have the issue of *ye* versus *you* as subject pronoun. In this instance, the 1902 LDS missionary edition introduced the biblically styled *ye,* but this pronominal form was not transmitted into any subsequent LDS edition since the 1902 edition never served as a copytext. Normally, the Book of Mormon text has *ye* as the subject pronoun form, but *you* does occur, although considerably less frequently (see the discussion under Mosiah 4:14 and, more generally, under YE in volume 3).

Here in Alma 60:7 the original manuscript is not extant for the subject of *can,* so an error from *ye* to *you* could have occurred in copying from 𝒪 into 𝒫. Elsewhere in the text, there are 21 occurrences of *can ye* but 3 more of *can you,* including one nearby in Alma 60:32: "behold **can you** suppose that the Lord will spare you". 𝒪 is not extant for that example either. Nonetheless, *you* does occur as a subject pronoun in the original text (although relatively infrequently), so it will be retained here in Alma 60:7 (and in Alma 60:32). In each instance, we let the earliest textual sources determine the correct form, *ye* or *you.*

Summary: Maintain in Alma 60:7 *you* as the subject pronoun, the reading of 𝒫 (here the earliest extant source).

■ **Alma 60:12**

do ye suppose that
[1|, ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
because so many of your brethren have been killed
[1EPRST|, ABCDGHIJKLMNOQ|NULL > , F]
[1ABDEPS|*it is* CGHIJKLMNOQRT|NULL > *it is* F]
because of their wickedness

The current punctuation here in Alma 60:12 incorrectly breaks up this complex construction. The *that* after *suppose* is a subordinate conjunction; by placing a comma after the *that,* the 1830 type-setter made the *that* read like a pronoun. There is really no need for a comma after *suppose that.*

The more significant problem in this passage is that there are two occurrences of *because* but no finite verb; we therefore have a sentence fragment. For the 1840 edition, Joseph Smith eliminated the fragment by inserting *it is* before the second *because.* The editors for the 1852 LDS edition, following the 1840 edition, also added these words to the corrected plates for the second printing of the 1852 edition. Thus the current LDS and RLDS editions follow the 1840 emendation. In this instance, 𝒪 is not sufficiently extant for the word immediately following *killed* for us to be sure that *it is* was not originally in 𝒪. Only the beginning of the first letter of the following word is extant, and it could be either a *b* (for *because*) or an *i* (for *it*). As it is, there is not enough space in the lacuna of 𝒪 for the text of 𝒫 (the transcript for 𝒪 supralinearly inserts the *their,* for instance, but follows 𝒫 in assuming that there is no *it is*).

There are no instances elsewhere in the text of this kind of complex structure, namely, "suppose that because S it is because of NP" (here S stands for a finite clause and NP for a noun phrase). But we can find evidence for more general forms of this construction. There are, for instance, 89 examples of "suppose that S" in the earliest extant text, including one where the subject and main verb in the finite clause S is the existential expression *it is:*

> Alma 42:1
> > for ye do try to **suppose that it is** injustice
> > that the sinner should be consigned to a state of misery

The clause "it is because" is fairly frequent elsewhere in the text (occurring 15 times), with one clear example of "it is because of NP":

> Moroni 7:37
> > wherefore if these things have ceased
> > woe be unto the children of men
> > for **it is because of unbelief**
> > and all is vain

And finally, there is independent evidence that a subordinate *that*-clause can start out with a subordinate *because*-clause, as in these examples:

> Mosiah 2:16
> > behold I say unto you **that**
> > **because** I said unto you that I had spent my days in your service
> > I do not desire to boast

Mosiah 29:16

now I say unto you **that**
because all men are not just
it is not expedient that ye should have a king or kings to rule over you

Alma 8:12

and now we know **that**
because we are not of thy church
we know that thou hast no power over us

Alma 32:14

and now as I said unto you **that**
because ye were compelled to be humble
ye were blessed
do ye not suppose that they are more blessed
who truly humble themselves because of the word

Putting all these possibilities together, we can get "suppose that because S it is because of NP", the structure for Joseph Smith's 1840 conjectured reading here in Alma 60:12.

There is some evidence for the loss of *it is* elsewhere in the text. Here is one clear example:

Alma 32:40 (loss of *it is* in the 1830 edition)

and thus [*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

A second example is conjectured:

Alma 58:33 (no *it is* in either manuscript or in any of the editions)

but behold we trust that **it is** our God
who hath given us victory over those lands

(See the discussion under each of these passages.) So here in Alma 60:12, we may very well have another instance where *it is* was lost early on in the transmission of the text, in this case most likely when Joseph dictated the text to Oliver.

Another possible emendation in Alma 60:12 would be to remove the first *because:*

Alma 60:12 (alternative emendation)

do ye suppose that so many of your brethren have been killed
because of their wickedness

One could argue that the first *because,* partially extant in ⊙, was accidentally inserted into the text as Joseph Smith dictated the text to Oliver Cowdery. There is one instance in the history of the text where Oliver accidentally inserted an extra *because,* although in that case it was a preceding *because* that prompted the repetition, not a following one, and the insertion occurred during the copying of the text rather than during its dictation:

2 Nephi 17:5 (initial error in 𝒫)

because Syria Ephraim and the son of Remaliah
[*because* > NULL 1| ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
have taken evil counsel against thee

Moreover, this particular error in 𝒫 was only momentary. On the other hand, the evidence for the loss of short existential expressions during the early transmission of the text is stronger. For some other examples (such as the loss of *these are* and *there was*), see the discussion under Alma 58:33. Here in Alma 60:12 it seems more likely that during the dictation of the text *it is* was accidentally lost than an extra *because* was inserted. Ultimately, the earliest text for Alma 60:12, given its two instances of *because* without any verb, seems quite unacceptable. The most reasonable emendation appears to be Joseph Smith's conjectured *it is*.

Summary: Accept in Alma 60:12 Joseph Smith's conjectural emendation that added *it is* to the impossible earliest reading (giving "do ye suppose that because so many of your brethren have been killed / **it is** because of their wickedness"); another possible emendation would be to remove the first *because* (giving "do ye suppose that so many of your brethren have been killed because of their wickedness").

■ **Alma 60:12**

for I say unto you [*that* > NULL 1| ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
there are many which have fallen by the sword

In the printer's manuscript, Oliver Cowdery initially wrote "for I say unto you **that** there are many which have fallen by the sword"; then virtually immediately he crossed out the *that.* The original manuscript is not extant here, but the text fits best (although still imperfectly) within the lacuna if there was no *that* in 𝒪. Ultimately, there would have been no motivation to edit the text here since both readings are possible (see the discussion under 2 Nephi 30:2 for *that* after "I say unto you"). Earlier in this verse, we have an example without the *that:* "I say unto you : if ye have supposed this / ye have supposed in vain" (Alma 60:12).

Summary: Follow in Alma 60:12 the corrected reading in the printer's manuscript, namely, the removal of the *that* after "I say unto you" (𝒪 is not extant here).

■ **Alma 60:14**

and now behold I say unto you
I fear exceedingly that the judgments of God will come
upon [*you* > *this* 1| *this* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *people*
because of their exceeding slothfulness

Initially in the printer's manuscript, Oliver Cowdery wrote "I fear exceedingly that the judgments of God will come upon **you**". Oliver immediately corrected the *you* here by crossing it out, supralinearly inserting *this,* and then writing *people* inline. As one might suspect, there was no change in the level of ink flow for this correction. Here we cannot consider spacing between extant fragments since 𝒪 is missing for seven complete lines. Oliver's momentary error here in 𝒫 for verse 14 was probably the result of the *you* in the preceding "and now behold I say unto **you**". Of course, the following "because of **their** exceeding slothfulness" supports the reading *this people.*

Summary: Accept the corrected reading in 𝒫 for Alma 60:14: "I fear exceedingly that the judgments of God will come upon **this people**".

■ **Alma 60:14**

yea even the slothfulness of our government
and their exceeding great neglect **towards** *their brethren*
yea [NULL > *towards* 1 | *towards* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *those which have been slain*

> Here in the printer's manuscript, Oliver Cowdery initially omitted the *towards* that occurs after the *yea*. Virtually immediately he supralinearly inserted the *towards* (there is no change in the level of ink flow). He was probably correcting to 𝕆 since either reading, with or without the *towards,* is theoretically possible (although in my speech I would prefer the repetition of the *towards*). There are no other examples in the text where a *towards* phrase is amplified upon by a following *yea-* clause. Nor will spacing between extant fragments of 𝕆 help here since the lacuna in 𝕆 is too long (a full seven manuscript lines are missing).

Summary: Accept in Alma 60:14 the corrected reading in 𝓅, which repeats the *towards:* "and their exceeding great neglect **towards** their brethren yea **towards** those which have been slain".

■ **Alma 60:16**

yea had it not been for the war which **broke** *out among ourselves*

> Here in the original manuscript, only the first two letters of the verb *broke* are extant, so there is a distinct possibility that 𝕆 here actually read *brake,* which is what I conjectured when I produced the transcript for 𝕆 (see volume 1 of the critical text). The printer's manuscript itself reads *broke.* There is one clear example where Oliver Cowdery, as he copied from 𝕆 into 𝓅, changed an original *brake* to *broke* (namely, nearby in Alma 57:33), so one could argue that Oliver made the same mistake here in Alma 60:16. But as explained under Alma 14:26, for each case of *brake* versus *broke* the critical text will follow the earliest extant reading, thus *broke* here in Alma 60:16.

Summary: Maintain the verb form *broke* in Alma 60:16, the reading of 𝓅 (the earliest extant source).

■ **Alma 60:16**

yea were it not
for [*those* 01PS | *these* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOQRT] *kingmen*
which caused so much bloodshed among ourselves . . .

> Here the 1830 typesetter replaced *those* with *these,* a very common error in the transmission of the text. Both manuscripts read *those.* The 1908 RLDS edition restored the original *those* (by reference to 𝓅) while the LDS text has maintained the secondary *these.* For a list of other cases where the 1830 typesetter mixed up these two demonstratives, see under Mosiah 28:1. For each case of *those* versus *these,* we follow the earliest extant reading, thus *those* here in Alma 60:16. The rest of the text has instances of only "those kingmen" (six times). In fact, two of these come right after this one:

> > Alma 60:16
> > yea had it not been for the desire of power and authority
> > which **those** kingmen had over us . . .

Alma 60:17

    and this because of the great wickedness of those
    who are seeking for power and authority
    yea even **those** kingmen

These other examples show that the 1830 change near the beginning of verse 16 was undoubtedly a typo rather than the result of editing.

Summary: According to the reading of the two manuscripts, restore in Alma 60:16 the *those* in "were it not for **those** kingmen"; this correction makes the use of "those kingmen" consistent throughout the text.

■ **Alma 60:16**

if we **had** *united our strength*
as we [0ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST | *had* > NULL 1] *hitherto*
[NULL > *have* 0 | *have* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *done*
yea **had** *it not been for the desire of power and authority*
which those kingmen **had** *over us . . .*

There are two problems here with the current text. First, the present-tense perfect *have* was inserted in the original manuscript when what we expect is the past-tense perfect *had*. Whenever *hitherto* is used in the text, we always get a perfect auxiliary, either a present-tense form of *have* or the past-tense *had*. Yet there is a consistent difference that holds everywhere else in the text: on the one hand, the present-tense form shows up when the surrounding verbs refer to present time (15 occurrences), as in Mosiah 2:31: "I would that ye should do as ye **hath** hitherto done"; on the other hand, the past-tense *had* shows up when the surrounding verbs refer to past time (9 occurrences), as in Alma 58:1: "for behold they remembered that which we **had** hitherto done".

It is therefore quite possible that here in Alma 60:16 Oliver Cowdery accidentally changed the original text by inserting *have* in 𝙊 rather than *had*. Even so, when Oliver copied the text from 𝙊 into 𝙋, he started to write "as we **had** hitherto done". But shortly after writing the *had* in 𝙋, Oliver crossed it out and then continued inline with the rest of the text ("hitherto have done"). In other words, he ended up faithfully copying the corrected reading in 𝙊, even though that may have been a mistake for "had hitherto done" (see below for discussion of the placement of *have* after *hitherto*).

Despite these considerations, we should note that the present-tense *have* here in Alma 60:16 may be precisely what Moroni intended to write to Parhoron. Up to the present situation, Moroni is arguing, they have been united in strength. Given this interpretation, *have* will work. The critical text will maintain in Alma 60:16 the present-tense *have* despite its uniqueness when compared with other instances of *hitherto*.

The second problem here in Alma 60:16 has to do with the placement of the inserted perfect auxiliary. Elsewhere in the text, *hitherto* almost always comes between the perfect auxiliary and the past participle, as in the two examples cited above, in Mosiah 2:31 ("as ye hath hitherto done") and in Alma 58:1 ("that which we had hitherto done"), and in 21 other cases. The only other exception to the word order is in Alma 51:16: "for behold this **had been hitherto** a cause of all

their destructions". In that case, the *hitherto* is placed at the end, after the past participle. The original manuscript is extant for Alma 60:16 and reads with *hitherto* before the perfect *have,* so either we have a primitive error in Alma 60:16 or we just have to accept the possibility of some occasional variation in the position of *hitherto* with respect to its nearby verbs. The critical text will therefore accept the occasional variation in word order for the word *hitherto,* here in Alma 60:16 (before *have done*) and in Alma 51:16 (after *had been*).

Summary: Maintain in Alma 60:16 the earliest phraseology, the corrected reading in both manuscripts, "as we hitherto have done"; the present-tense *have* will work here because up to that moment the Nephites have been united in their strength; and although the placement of the perfect auxiliary *have* after *hitherto* is unexpected, it is possible.

■ **Alma 60:16**

for it would have been [*done* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLNOPRST | MQ]
according to the fulfilling of his word

The original manuscript is not extant here, but there is definitely room for *done* in the spacing between extant portions. The 1905 LDS Chicago edition accidentally deleted the *done* in this passage. The subsequent 1911 LDS Chicago edition followed this shorter reading since the copytext for that edition derived from the third corrected printing (in 1907) of the 1905 edition. The 1920 LDS edition restored the original *done.*

Elsewhere in the text, there are five other occurrences of *done according* (where *done* is a past participle):

2 Nephi 31:18	ye have **done according** to the commandments of the Father and the Son
Jacob 5:75	and thou beholdest that I have **done according** to my will
Alma 29:17	and may God grant that it may be **done according** to my words
Helaman 11:5	and so it was **done according** to the words of Nephi
Helaman 11:13	wilt thou . . . cause that it may be **done according** to my words

The expression "it would have been according to the fulfilling of his word" is not impossible, as in the following example: "and all things that he spake **hath been and shall be** / even according to the words which he spake" (3 Nephi 23:3). So either reading is theoretically possible here in Alma 60:16. Of course, the critical text will maintain the *done* of the earliest textual sources.

Summary: Retain *done* in Alma 60:16, the reading of the earliest extant text: "for it would have been **done** according to the fulfilling of his word".

■ **Alma 60:17**

▫ 01ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQS	▫ RT
but behold now	*but behold now*
the Lamanites are coming upon us	*the Lamanites are coming upon us*
	taking possession of our lands
and they are murdering	*and they are murdering*
our people with the sword	*our people with the sword*
yea our women and our children	*yea our women and our children*
taking possession of our lands	
and also carrying them away captive	*and also carrying them away captive*

Here in his epistle, Moroni put together the two instances of Lamanite seizure: taking possession of the Nephites' lands and carrying away their women and children. The original reading, however, is a difficult reading, which led the editors for the 1920 LDS edition to move the participial phrase "taking possession of our lands" away from the middle of Moroni's list of Lamanite attacks upon the Nephite people. This is particularly helpful in resolving the pronominal reference for *them* in the following participial phrase "and also carrying **them** away captive"; clearly it is not the lands that are being carried away. Although the critical text will retain the more difficult, original sequencing, the 1920 emendation is appropriate for the standard text. ℧ is almost completely extant here, and the word order is established. It is very unlikely that Joseph Smith somehow mixed up the clausal order so radically as he dictated the text to Oliver Cowdery.

Elsewhere the text allows for considerable shifting in the referent for the third person plural pronouns, as in the following passage that involves three different referents:

> Alma 35:9
> and now the people of Ammon did not fear **their** words
> therefore **they** did not cast **them** out

The *their* refers to the Zoramites, *they* to the people of Ammon, and *them* to the Zoramite refugees. Even in Alma 60:17 one cannot be sure that the *them* in the present participial clause "and also carrying **them** away captive" refers to the women and children alone or more generally to the people mentioned earlier in the passage ("and they are murdering **our people** with the sword yea **our women and our children** . . . and also carrying **them** away captive"). Other passages describing Lamanite attacks against the Nephites shows that the pronoun *them* in Alma 60:17 probably refers to women and children:

Alma 54:3	the Lamanites had taken many women and children
Alma 58:30	they have carried with them many women and children out of the land
Helaman 11:33	and did carry away others captive into the wilderness yea and more especially their women and their children

Summary: Restore the original clausal order in Alma 60:17, where "taking possession of our lands" comes right before "and also carrying them away captive".

■ **Alma 60:17**

causing them that they should suffer all manner
of [*affliction* >+ *afflictions* O | *afflictions* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]

Here in the original manuscript, Oliver Cowdery initially wrote the singular *affliction*. He then redipped his quill in the ink and started to write the following text inline with somewhat heavier ink flow: "& this because of the great wickedness". The ink level for Oliver's correction of *affliction* to *afflictions* shows the same level of increased ink flow; quite possibly after redipping his quill, Oliver inserted inline the plural *s* for *afflictions*. Most likely, Joseph Smith dictated the plural *afflictions*.

The text has eight other instances of "all manner of afflictions" but none of the singular "all manner of affliction". Nearby, in Alma 60:3, we have this example: "and all manner of **afflictions** of every kind". In modern English, we expect the singular, and this may have been the source for Oliver Cowdery initially writing the singular in ℗. Here the corrected reading in ℗ appears to be fully intended, so the critical text will maintain it. As noted in the discussion under 1 Nephi 16:35, the critical text will in each case of *affliction(s)* look to the earliest textual evidence. Here in Alma 60:17, that evidence supports the plural.

Summary: Maintain the plural *afflictions* in all examples of "all manner of affliction(s)", including Alma 60:17.

■ **Alma 60:17**

and this because of the great wickedness of those
who [*are* 1ABCDEFGIJLMNOPQRST | *were* HK] *seeking for power and authority*

The typesetter for the 1874 RLDS edition accidentally set *are* as *were*. Clearly, Moroni is referring to the current situation, as he does in the following verse when he refers to the possibility that Parhoron himself may be seeking power:

Alma 60:18
for we know not but what ye yourselves **are** a seeking for authority
we know not but what ye **are** also traitors to your country

The present-tense *are* in verse 17 was restored to the RLDS text in 1908. The critical text will, of course, maintain the present-tense verb forms throughout the larger passage.

Summary: Retain in Alma 60:17 the original present-tense *are* in "those who **are** seeking for power and authority".

■ **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

Here are three instances in the original text (the first of which is extant in 𝒪) where the past-participial form for the verb *forget* is *forgat,* not *forgot* or *forgotten.* The 1830 compositor replaced each of these instances of *forgat* with *forgot.* Of course, in standard English the past participle is *forgotten,* which the 1906 LDS large-print edition introduced into the LDS text. The 1907 LDS vest-pocket edition adopted the first two of these emendations but accidentally left the third one as *forgot.* From 1911 on, the LDS text has consistently read *forgotten* for this passage.

In the original text, there are many instances where the past-participial form is the same as the simple past-tense form. (See, for instance, the example of *had came* under 1 Nephi 5:1, 4. For a general discussion, see under PAST PARTICIPLE in volume 3.) In the original Book of Mormon text, both *forgat* and *forgot* are acceptable as the simple past-tense forms for *forget;* and thus both are also acceptable as past-participial forms. We therefore follow the earliest textual sources here in Alma 60:20, the reading of the manuscripts, *forgat.* For evidence that the original text had instances of both *forgat* and *forgot* as the simple-past tense form (although usually *forgot*), see under Alma 37:41.

Summary: Restore in Alma 60:20 the original three instances of the past-participial form *forgat,* which is morphologically equivalent to the archaic simple past-tense form *forgat.*

■ **Alma 60:20**

have ye forgat the commandments of the Lord your God
yea have ye forgat the captivity of [*our* 1ABCGHIJKLMNOPQRST | *your* DE | *your* > *our* F] *fathers*

The 1841 British edition accidentally replaced *our* with *your,* probably because of the use of *your* in the immediately preceding parallel question in this verse: "have ye forgat the commandments of the Lord **your** God". The original *our* was restored to the LDS text in the second printing of the 1852 edition, probably as a result of consulting the 1840 edition.

Summary: Maintain in Alma 60:20 the original *our* in "have ye forgat the captivity of **our** fathers".

■ **Alma 60:22**

yea will ye sit in idleness while ye are surrounded with thousands of those
yea and tens of thousands [*of those* > *which do* 1 | *which do* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
　　also sit in idleness
while there are thousands round about in the borders of the land
which are falling by the sword / *yea wounded and bleeding*

𝒪 is not extant here for 11 lines of text, including the last line on page 356′ of 𝒪 (where this part of the text would have originally occurred). When copying from 𝒪 into 𝒫, Oliver Cowdery initially

wrote "yea & tens of thousands **of those**" (he seems to have been prompted by the *of those* in the immediately preceding "while ye are surrounded with thousands **of those**"). Virtually immediately Oliver crossed out the extra *of those* in 𝓟 and supralinearly inserted *which do* (there is no change in the level of ink flow for the correction).

The question here is whether the *do* was actually in the original text (and in 𝓞). The reading without the *do* ("yea and tens of thousands which also sit in idleness") seems more natural than the one with the *do* ("yea and tens of thousands which **do** also sit in idleness"). Even so, there are 21 additional instances of "do also <verb>" in the text (all take the past-tense form *did*), including this one occurring in a relative clause:

> Helaman 1:3
> now these are their names which did contend for the judgment seat
> **which did also cause** the people to contend : Parhoron Paanchi and Pacumeni

In contrast, there are ten cases in the text where *also* immediately follows the relative pronoun (*which, who,* or *whom*), as in Alma 51:7: "which also put the kingmen to silence". But since "which **do** also sit" is possible, the critical text will maintain the occurrence of the helping verb *do* in Alma 60:22.

Summary: Maintain the auxiliary verb *do* in Alma 60:22: "which **do** also sit in idleness"; *do* is found in the corrected reading in 𝓟, the earliest extant source for this passage.

■ **Alma 60:23**

now I would that ye should remember that God hath said that
the **inward** *vessel shall be cleansed first*
and then shall the [*outer* 1ABCDEFGHIKLMNOPQRST | *outward* J] *vessel be cleansed also*

■ **Alma 60:24**

behold it will be expedient that we contend no more with the Lamanites
until we have first cleansed our [*inner >+ inward* 1 | *inward* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *vessel*

There is some minor variation here regarding *inner* versus *inward* and *outer* versus *outward,* in both instances with regard to the word *vessel*. The earliest textual sources favor "inward vessel" but "outer vessel". Note that *inward* and *outer* do not match morphologically (*inward* and *outward* would form a matching pair as would *inner* and *outer*). The textual tendency, although minor, has been to create morphologically matching pairs. In the 1888 LDS edition, *outer* was replaced by *outward* in verse 23, thus matching the *inward* of the previous clause ("the inward vessel shall be cleansed first"). And in verse 24, we have some confusion in the printer's manuscript, where Oliver Cowdery initially wrote "inner vessel", which matches the "outer vessel" of verse 23; then later (perhaps while proofing against 𝓞, no longer extant here) Oliver corrected *inner* to *inward* with somewhat heavier ink flow. There would have been no motivation for Oliver to make this correction towards the morphologically nonmatching *inward* except that 𝓞 itself read *inward*. The critical text will maintain the corrected reading in 𝓟 for Alma 60:24, "inward vessel".

The reference here in Alma 60:23–24 to God's statement that the inward vessel should be cleansed first is similar to Christ's words in the Gospels, which read as follows in the King James Bible:

Matthew 23:25–26

woe unto you scribes and Pharisees hypocrites
for ye make clean the **outside** of the cup and of the platter
but **within** they are full of extortion and excess . . .
cleanse first that *which is* **within** the cup and platter
that the **outside** of them may be clean also

Luke 11:39–40

now do ye Pharisees make clean the **outside** of the cup and the platter
but your **inward** part is full of ravening and wickedness . . .
did not he that made that which is **without** make that which is **within** also

Obviously, Moroni is not directly quoting Christ's version, but the metaphor is the same. Further note that in the King James Bible the Matthew passage pairs *outside* against *within* while the Luke passage pairs *outside* against *inward*. Both pairs of words do not match morphologically and are in that respect like the Book of Mormon's nonmatching *outer* and *inward*, although in Luke 11:40 there is the matching *without* and *within*. (In the Greek original, the pairs of words match morphologically. Similarly, modern English translations such as the Revised Standard Version and the New International Version consistently translate these word pairs as *outside* and *inside*.)

Summary: Accept the use of the morphologically nonmatching *inward* and *outer* in Alma 60:23–24, the reading of the earliest textual sources.

■ **Alma 60:24**

that he may support those parts of our country
which he hath [*obtained* >+ *retained* 1 | *retained* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQS | *regained* RT]

As explained under Alma 58:3, the original text here read *retained*, which means 'regained'. In order to avoid confusion, the 1920 LDS edition emended this instance of *retained* to *regained*. The critical text will restore the original *retained* here in Alma 60:24. Also note here that Oliver Cowdery initially wrote the word in 𝔓 as *obtained*, which is visually similar to *retained* and semantically related. Yet here the text is referring to Helaman taking back lands that the Lamanites had seized during the war; it is more than just obtaining those lands. For another example where Oliver may have initially replaced *retain* with *obtain* (but this time in 𝔒), see under Alma 25:16.

Summary: Restore the original *retained* in Alma 60:24; here the verb means 'take back'.

■ **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

Here we have two *that*-clauses that initially in 𝔓 had no *and* separating them. Virtually immediately Oliver Cowdery supralinearly inserted an ampersand; the ink flow is uneven, but it is the

same as the ink flow for the immediately preceding correction of *obtained* to *retained* (see the previous discussion). Oliver's correction here probably occurred when he proofed 𝔓 against 𝔒. Either reading, with or without the *and,* is possible, so the original text probably had the *and.* The critical text will assume as much. For other cases where Oliver initially omitted the *and* between *that*-clauses, see the discussion under Alma 30:35.

Summary: Maintain in Alma 60:24 the *and* that Oliver Cowdery inserted in 𝔓 (the earliest extant source) between the two *that*-clauses.

■ **Alma 60:29**

yea the time is
[NULL > *now* 1| *now* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *at hand*

Oliver Cowdery initially wrote "the time is at hand" in 𝔓, then supralinearly inserted *now* (without any change in the level of ink flow). It is doubtful that he was editing the text here since elsewhere in the Book of Mormon we have no other occurrences of "the time is **now** at hand", but there are seven occurrences of "the time is at hand". In other words, Oliver initially wrote the expected phraseology in 𝔓, then corrected 𝔓 to agree with the reading of 𝔒 (no longer extant here, but which undoubtedly had the *now*). The use of the adverb *now* in this phrase is supported by the occurrence of another adverb of time, *soon,* in Alma 10:23: "the time is **soon** at hand".

Summary: Accept in Alma 60:29 Oliver Cowdery's corrected reading in 𝔓, the adverb *now* in "the time is **now** at hand".

■ **Alma 60:30**

behold I come unto you
even [*into* 1APS| *in* BCDEFGHIJKLMNOQRT] *the land of Zarahemla*

Here the 1837 edition accidentally replaced the motion preposition *into* with *in.* Of course, *in* can be used as a motion preposition in English, as in "he came **in** the house". Yet the Book of Mormon text typically avoids such motion uses of *in,* as explained in some detail under 1 Nephi 4:33. Also under that passage, I list a number of instances in the history of the text where a correct *into* has been replaced by *in.* Based on usage elsewhere in the text, *into* is definitely correct here in Alma 60:30; this passage refers to entering the land of Zarahemla, not traveling around in it. The 1908 RLDS edition restored the original *into* here, the reading in 𝔓 (𝔒 is not extant).

Summary: Restore the preposition *into* in Alma 60:30 ("even **into** the land of Zarahemla"), the reading in 𝔓; usage elsewhere in the text strongly supports the preposition *into* in references to entering a land.

■ **Alma 60:30**

behold I come unto you even into the land of Zarahemla and smite you with the sword
insomuch that ye can have no [*more* 1ABCDEFGHIJLMNOPQRST | K] *power*
to impede the progress of this people in the cause of our freedom

> The 1892 RLDS edition omitted the modifier *more* before *power*. The 1908 RLDS edition restored
> the correct reading with *more*. There is a slight difference in meaning here: with *more*, Moroni is
> saying that Parhoron has had power to impede the progress of the Nephite armies—but no longer.

Summary: Maintain in Alma 60:30 the occurrence of *more* before *power,* the reading of the earliest
extant text.

■ **Alma 60:34**

and now behold I Moroni am constrained
according to the covenant which I have made
to keep the commandments of [NULL > *my* 1 | *my* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *God*

> The expected phrase is "the commandments of God", which occurs 70 times in the text. There
> are no other occurrences in the text of "the commandments of **my** God". Thus there would have
> been no motivation here in Alma 60:34 to edit the text by adding *my*. Oliver Cowdery virtually
> immediately corrected what he had initially written here in 𝔓 by supralinearly inserting the *my*
> without any change in the level of ink flow.
>
> As might be expected, the postmodifying phrase "of my God" does occur in the text (seven
> more times), as in the following examples:

> | | |
> |---|---|
> | 2 Nephi 9:49 | and I will praise the holy name **of my God** |
> | Alma 36:14 | the very thoughts of coming into the presence **of my God** |
> | | did rack my soul with inexpressible horror |
> | Alma 60:36 | I seek not for honor of the world but for the glory **of my God** |

> Note that the last example occurs just two verses after Alma 60:34.

Summary: Accept in Alma 60:34 the corrected reading in 𝔓, "the commandments of **my** God"; this
unique reading is undoubtedly the original reading.

■ **Alma 60:36**

I seek not for power but to pull it down
I seek not for **honor** *of the world but for the glory of my God*
and the freedom and welfare of my country

> One might wonder here in Alma 60:36 if the definite article *the* shouldn't precede *honor* ("I seek
> not for **the** honor of the world"), especially since this sentence has *the* before *glory* and also
> before the phrase *freedom and welfare,* each of which is postmodified by a prepositional phrase
> headed by *of* ("**the** glory **of** my God and **the** freedom and welfare **of** my country"). In general,

the definite article *the* is expected before a noun postmodified by "of NP" (where NP is a noun phrase). The King James Bible has six examples of the expression "the honor of NP" but none without the definite article before *honor.*

The original manuscript is not extant for any portion from Alma 60:23 through Alma 61:10 (that is, more than an entire leaf of 𝔒 is missing here), so spacing considerations are of no help in determining whether a *the* preceded *honor* in 𝔒. Another possibility is that the singular *honor* is an error for the plural *honors* ("I seek not for **honors** of the world") or even an error for *the honors* ("I seek not for **the honors** of the world").

It should be noted that parallelism with the preceding clause suggests that the definite article is not necessary here in Alma 60:36:

> I seek not **for power** but . . .
> I seek not **for honor** of the world but . . .

Of course, one could argue that an original *the* before *honor* was lost because the preceding *power* lacks the definite article.

The noun *honor* is relatively infrequent in the Book of Mormon; there are only two other instances of it in the text; one has the *the,* the other does not:

| three-witness statement | and **the honor** be to the Father and to the Son and to the Holy Ghost |
| Alma 1:16 | and this they did for the sake of riches and **honor** |

Given this paucity of evidence, the critical text will follow the earliest textual source, the printer's manuscript, in Alma 60:36, which reads without any definite article for *honor*. The parallelism of the preceding clause can be taken as evidence that the *the* is lacking before both *power* and *honor.*

Summary: Maintain in Alma 60:36 the reading of all the extant textual sources, namely, *honor* without the determiner *the* ("I seek not for honor of the world").

■ **Alma 60:36**

and thus I close [*mine* 1ABCEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST | *my* D] *epistle*

Here the 1841 British edition replaced the archaic, biblically styled use of *mine* with the modern use of *my*. In Early Modern English, forms like *mine* were expected before vowel-initial nouns such as *epistle*. In this case, the subsequent LDS edition (1849) restored the original *mine*. As described under Omni 1:10, the 1841 edition frequently made this change from *mine* to *my*.

Overall the text has four instances of *my epistle* and seven of *mine epistle* (including this one here in Alma 60:36). The four instances with *my* occur first (from Alma 54:11 through Alma 55:2), followed by all seven of the instances with *mine* (from Alma 55:3 through Alma 61:21). The critical text will in each case of *mine* versus *my* follow the reading of the earliest textual sources, thus *mine epistle* here in Alma 60:36.

Summary: Maintain in Alma 60:36 the archaic use of *mine* before *epistle,* the reading of the earliest textual sources, including 𝔓 (𝔒 is not extant here).

Alma 61

■ **Alma 61:2**

I Parhoron [*which art >*js *who am* 1 | *which art* A | *who am* BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
the chief governor of this land . . .

There are three instances in the original text where *art* occurs rather than the expected *am,* in
each case in a relative clause modifying a preceding first person pronoun, as here in Alma 61:2:
"I . . . which **art** the chief governor". In his editing for the 1837 edition, Joseph Smith emended the
art to *am* (in addition to replacing the relative pronoun *which* with *who*). As explained under Alma
36:18, the critical text will restore the original usage here, "I Parhoron **which art** the chief governor".

■ **Alma 61:2–3**

behold I say unto you Moroni
that I do not joy in your great afflictions
yea it grieves my soul
[*but behold* 1 | *But behold* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRT | *Behold* S]
there are those who do joy in your afflictions

The 1953 RLDS edition omitted the conjunction *but* here. This change appears to be accidental
since the original reading is perfectly fine. Elsewhere in the original text, there are 242 occur-
rences of *but behold,* none of which were ever reduced to *behold* in any printed edition (including
the 1953 RLDS edition). Oliver Cowdery had a slight tendency to omit *but* in the manuscripts—
but only momentarily. Interestingly, the first of these is an instance of *but behold:*

> Alma 45:19 (error in 𝒪 immediately corrected)
> [*Behold >% but* 0 | *but* 1 | *But* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
> [*Behold* 0 | *behold* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] the scripture saith . . .

> Alma 52:31 (error in O virtually immediately corrected)
> [NULL > *but* 0 | *but* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
> the Lamanites were wearied because of their long march

The critical text will maintain all the instances of original *but behold.*

Summary: Maintain in Alma 61:3 the *but* that the 1953 RLDS edition omitted, apparently accidentally.

■ **Alma 61:7**

and they have come unto us insomuch that those
which have [*rose* >js *risen* 1 | *rose* A | *risen* BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *up in rebellion against us*
are set at defiance

> Here we have another example of the simple past-tense form serving as the past-participial form,
> namely, *rose* instead of the standard *risen.* This is the only example of *rose* being used as a past
> participle in the text. All the other instances of the past participle for the verb *rise* take the stan-
> dard *risen;* five refer to Christ rising from the dead, but there are two more that refer to rising up
> in rebellion, and they are found earlier in this chapter:

> > Alma 61:3
> > > yea insomuch that they have **risen** up in rebellion against me
> > > > and also those of my people which are freemen
> > > yea and those which have **risen** up are exceeding numerous

> The critical text will restore in Alma 61:7 the single instance of past-participial *rose.* Such non-
> standard usage is quite common in the original text (see the example of *had came* under 1 Nephi
> 5:1, 4 as well as the general discussion under PAST PARTICIPLE in volume 3).

> *Summary:* Restore in Alma 61:7 the original past-participial form *rose* ("those which have **rose** up in
> rebellion against us"), the reading of the earliest extant text.

■ **Alma 61:8**

they have got possession of the land
[*of* >+ *or* 1 | *or* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *the city*
[*of* 1ABDEFIJKLMNOPQRST | CGH] *Zarahemla*

> There are two variants here involving the word *of.* In the printer's manuscript, Oliver Cowdery
> initially wrote "of the land **of** the city of Zarahemla", an obvious error since only the city was in
> the hands of these rebels: "they do fear us and durst not **come out** against us to battle" (verse 7)
> and "he hath agreed to maintain the **city** of Zarahemla" (later in verse 8). Oliver probably expected
> "of the land **of** Zarahemla". Later, possibly when he proofed 𝔓 against 𝔒, he crossed out the *of*
> and supralinearly inserted the *or* (the level of ink flow is somewhat heavier). The critical text will,
> of course, maintain the corrective *or.*

> The second variant deals with the loss in the 1840 edition of the preposition *of* in "the city
> **of** Zarahemla". The omission was not the result of Joseph Smith's editing for that edition; other
> instances of the *of* in that phrase have been left unchanged in the 1840 edition, including one
> more in this same verse: "he hath agreed to maintain the city **of** Zarahemla". Besides these two
> examples, there are 14 examples of the specific phrase "the city **of** Zarahemla" in the original text
> but none of "the city Zarahemla". In one of these other examples, the *of* was omitted in more
> than one edition (as well as initially in 𝔓):

> > Helaman 1:22
> > > he was in possession of the city
> > > [*of* 0ABCEGHIJKNOPRST | NULL > *of* 1 | DLMQ | *of of* F] Zarahemla

Here the 1841 British edition and independently the 1902 LDS missionary edition omitted the *of*. It is also probable that the 1905 LDS missionary edition omitted the *of* here without reference to the 1902 edition since the copytext for the 1905 edition was the 1879 LDS edition.

So the text is fully systematic for the specific phrase "the city of Zarahemla"—the *of* always occurs. But there is variation for the occurrence of the *of* when *great* occurs in this phrase. When the determiner is *this,* we get the *of,* although there is only one occurrence of "**this** great city **of** Zarahemla" (in Helaman 13:12). On the other hand, when the determiner is *that,* the *of* is consistently lacking, thus "**that** great city Zarahemla" (in Helaman 1:18, 3 Nephi 8:24, 3 Nephi 9:3, and 4 Nephi 1:8). Thus there is some systematicity here, but ultimately the critical text will in each case determine whether the *of* occurs in the phrase "city (of) X" on the basis of the earliest textual sources, as explained under 1 Nephi 11:13 for the phrase "city (of) Jerusalem".

Here in Alma 61:8, the *of* in "the city of Zarahemla" was restored to the RLDS text in the second edition (1892), which is rather surprising since that edition closely follows the first RLDS edition (1874), being set from that edition without hardly any intentional substantive changes. Perhaps the restoration of the *of* in the 1892 edition was simply an accident.

Summary: Maintain in Alma 61:8 the *of* in "the city of Zarahemla", the reading of the earliest textual sources; also maintain the corrective *or* in "the land **or** the city of Zarahemla".

■ **Alma 61:8**

and he hath written unto the king of the Lamanites
in the which *he hath joined an alliance with him*
in the which *alliance he hath agreed to maintain the city of Zarahemla*
[*inthe which* 1 | *in the which* a | *which* bcdefghijklmnopqrst] *maintenance*
he supposeth will enable the Lamanites to conquer the remainder of the land

Joseph Smith, in his editing of the text for the 1837 edition, emended half the instances of "in the which", usually to "in which". In some cases, he replaced the preposition *in* with some other preposition. But here in Alma 61:8, the *in* as well as the *the* has been removed. Although this change was not marked by Joseph in 𝓟, he was probably the one responsible for it. (For a brief analysis of this editing, see under 1 Nephi 3:2. See under IN THE WHICH in volume 3 for a complete analysis.)

The motivation for making the change here in Alma 61:8 is that there is a need for a subject in the relative clause. By removing the *in* (and the *the*), *which maintenance* becomes the subject, thus "which maintenance . . . will enable the Lamanites to conquer the remainder of the land". In fact, one could propose that the occurrence in the earliest extant text (in 𝓟) of "in the which maintenance" was an error prompted by the preceding use of "in the which", especially the closer instance of "in the which alliance". Notice, in particular, how "in the which alliance" refers back to the noun *alliance* ("he hath joined an **alliance** with him **in the which alliance** he hath agreed . . ."). Since the proposed original *which maintenance* refers back to the verb *maintain* ("he hath agreed to **maintain** the city of Zarahemla **which maintenance**. . ."), it is quite possible that an extra *in the* was added during the early transmission of the text. The *in the* would be intrusive, just as it would be in the following passage where "which <noun>", not "in the which <noun>", refers to a preceding verb:

Helaman 5:8
> I have somewhat more to **desire** of you
> **which desire** is that ye may not do these things that ye may boast

In this verse from Helaman we also have an example involving the verb *suppose* that further supports Joseph Smith's emendation in Alma 61:8:

Helaman 5:8
> yea that ye may have that precious gift of eternal life
> which **we have reason to suppose** hath been given to our fathers

The intervening clause "we have reason to suppose" could be omitted and the result would be grammatical ("which . . . hath been given to our fathers"), just as in Joseph's emendation for Alma 61:8 ("which maintenance . . . will enable the Lamanites to conquer the remainder of the land"). One difficulty with this emendation, however, is that there is no explicit evidence that the relative pronoun *which* has ever been expanded to "in the which", either in isolation or under the influence of a nearby "in the which", as this emendation in Alma 61:8 implies happened.

A related problem with the earliest text for Alma 61:8 is that in all other cases of "in the which <noun>", the subject for the relative clause follows the noun:

1 Nephi 5:5	in the which **things I** do rejoice
1 Nephi 7:7	in the which **rebellion they** were desirous to return
Alma 56:10	in the which **strength Antipus** did rejoice exceedingly
Alma 61:8	in the which **alliance he** hath agreed to maintain the city of Zarahemla
3 Nephi 4:4	in the which **time they** did hope to destroy the robbers
Ether 13:31	in the which **time all the people** . . . were a shedding blood

These examples suggest another possible emendation for Alma 61:8, namely: add a subject pronoun for the relative clause, such as *he:* "in the which maintenance he supposeth **he** will enable the Lamanites to conquer the remainder of the land". One could argue that this second *he* was readily lost in the early transmission of the text, especially in the context of the preceding *he* of "he supposeth". For this emendation, there is considerable evidence that the scribes, including Oliver Cowdery, sometimes omitted the subject pronoun *he;* for a list of examples, see under Jacob 5:1.

Also in support of this second emendation are examples where the verb *suppose* is complemented by a finite clause without the expected *that:*

1 Nephi 4:28	for they supposed it was Laban
2 Nephi 9:28	for they set it aside supposing they know of themselves
3 Nephi 15:22	for they supposed it had been the Gentiles

In each of these, of course, *that* could be supplied, which is also the case in Alma 61:8 if an extra *he* is supplied (thus hypothetically we could have "in the which maintenance he supposeth **that he** will enable the Lamanites to conquer the remainder of the land").

As far as the verb *enable* is concerned, either emendation will work. The subject for *enable* can be an abstract concept or a person, as exemplified by the following:

☐ *learning enables:*

Alma 10:15

now these lawyers were learned in all the arts and cunning of the people
and this was to enable them that they might be skillful in their profession

[as in "which **maintenance** . . . **will enable** the Lamanites
to conquer the remainder of the land of Zarahemla"]

☐ *people enable:*

Helaman 3:9–11

and the people which were in the land northward
did dwell in tents and in houses of cement
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 . . .
and it came to pass as timber was exceeding scarce in the land northward
they did send forth much by the way of shipping
and thus **they** did enable the people in the land northward
that they might build many cities both of wood and of cement

[as in "in the which maintenance . . . **he will enable** the Lamanites
to conquer the remainder of the land of Zarahemla"]

As part of this analysis, we need to consider the intervening clause "he supposeth" here in Alma 61:8. As noted above in the example from Helaman 5:8, an intervening clause can break in seamlessly between the subject and verb: "which **we have reason to suppose** hath been given to our fathers" (that is, "which . . . hath been given to our fathers"). When we compare this example and the one here in Alma 61:8 with other intervening clauses in the text, we find that the intervening clause is typically followed by an infinitival clause, as in these examples:

Jacob 1:2	a few of the things which **I considered to** be most precious
3 Nephi 3:2	in maintaining that which **ye suppose to** be your right and liberty
3 Nephi 3:5	because of your firmness in that which **ye believe to** be right

Examples like these suggest that Alma 61:8 could have originally read "in the which maintenance he supposeth **to** enable the Lamanites to conquer the remainder of the land"; that is, the infinitival *to* occurs in place of the modal *will*. However, there are no instances in the history of the text where a modal has been mixed up with the infinitival *to*. (There are some examples in Joseph Smith's editing where he consciously replaced an infinitival *to* with a modal verb; see, for instance, under 1 Nephi 10:2–3 and Alma 55:6–8.)

Finally, there is the possibility, suggested by David Calabro (personal communication), that the original text here read "the which maintenance he supposeth will enable the Lamanites to conquer the remainder of the land". In other words, only an extra *in* was added in the early transmission of the text. Adding only an extra *in*, triggered by the two preceding occurrences of "in the which", seems more easily done than accidentally adding the longer *in the*. One problem with this proposal is that there is no evidence elsewhere in the Book of Mormon text for the expression "the which <noun>". There are plenty of instances of "which <noun>" (54 of them). Elsewhere in the text, the definite article *the* can occur before "which <noun>" but only in

a prepositional phrase; besides the six cases where the preposition is *in* (listed earlier in this discussion), we have these three other cases in the original text:

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
for the which holiness O God we thank thee

Ether 9:11

wherefore the sons of Akish did offer them money
by the which means they drew away the more part of the people after them

Ether 13:6

and that New Jerusalem should be built up upon this land
unto the remnant of the seed of Joseph
for the which things there has been a type

There are also three cases of "<preposition> which <noun>" in the original text—that is, without any *the*:

Alma 56:10

for behold his army had been reduced by the Lamanites
because of the enormity of their forces
having slain a vast number of our men
for which cause we have to mourn

Mormon 9:13

yea this is wherein all men are redeemed
because the death of Christ bringeth to pass the resurrection
which bringeth to pass a redemption from an endless sleep
from which sleep all men shall be awoke by the power of God

Ether 7:9

he returned to the city Nehor and gave battle unto his brother Corihor
by which means he obtained the kingdom and restored it unto his father Kib

So if the original text in Alma 61:8 read without the preposition *in,* we would have a unique reading for the Book of Mormon text: "to maintain the city of Zarahemla / **the which maintenance** he supposeth will enable the Lamanites to conquer the remainder of the land". Of course, the unexpectedness of this expression could have been the reason for the intrusion of the preposition *in,* prompted in particular by the preceding occurrence of "**in the which alliance** he hath agreed to maintain the city of Zarahemla".

In the King James Bible, there is only one example of the phrase "<preposition> the which <noun>":

2 Timothy 1:12   **for the which cause** I also suffer these things

There is considerable support for the phrase "<preposition> the which" (with 40 occurrences), as in the following sampling for the more common prepositions:

Genesis 19:29	when he overthrew the cities **in the which** Lot dwelt
Jonah 4:10	thou hast had pity on the gourd **for the which** thou hast not labored
James 2:7	do not they blaspheme that worthy name **by the which** ye are called

There are also four examples of "the which" without any preposition:

Jeremiah 19:3

I will bring evil upon this place
the which whosoever heareth his ears shall tingle

Jeremiah 25:1–2

The word that came to Jeremiah concerning all the people of Judah . . .
the which Jeremiah the prophet spake unto all the people of Judah

Matthew 13:44

again the kingdom of heaven is like unto treasure hid in a field
the which when a man hath found he hideth

John 21:25

and there are also many other things which Jesus did
the which if they should be written every one
I suppose that even the world itself could not contain the books
   that should be written

But there are no examples of "the which <noun>" in the King James Bible. The Book of Mormon text has evidence for only two of the types, "<preposition> the which" and "<preposition> the which <noun>".

Despite the lack of evidence for "the which <noun>" in the scriptures, such examples can be found from Middle English up into the 19th century; the Oxford English Dictionary (under definition 13a of *which*) cites the following examples where "the which" is used to modify a noun (here I maintain the original accidentals but provide glosses for the older citations):

Cursor Mundi (about 1300)

þe whilk lawe was forbed Adam.
'the which law was forbidden Adam'

John Shillingford (1447–48)

The whiche copies all y pray yow avysely to over rede.
'the which copies all I pray you advisedly to read over'

Edward Topsell (1607)

There was a lionesse which had whelpes in her den,
the which den was obserued by a Beare,
the which Beare on a day finding the den vnfortified,
. . . entred . . . and slew the Lions whelpes.

George Gordon Byron (1820)

Finished copying August . . . 1820;
the which copying makes ten times the toil of composing.

So the reading "the which maintenance" is possible here in Alma 61:8. (I wish to thank Don Chapman for help in providing the glosses for the two Middle English citations.)

Under definition 13b for *which,* the OED provides examples of "the which" used as a relative pronoun (that is, without any following noun), as in this example from John Bunyan (1682) without any preceding preposition: "He told too, **the which** I had almost forgot, how Diabolus had put the Town of Mansoul into Arms." As noted above, this kind of expression does occur in the King James Bible (four times) but not in the Book of Mormon.

Ultimately, it is difficult to decide between these emendations. It appears easier to have the unexpected "**the** which maintenance" (rather than "which maintenance") change to "**in the** which maintenance" since that change involves adding only *in* (rather than *in the*). Unfortunately, we can find no independent evidence in the manuscripts for either kind of change. In any case, the two preceding instances of "in the which" here in Alma 61:8 appear to be the source for ending up with "in the which maintenance" as the earliest reading. One problem with "the which maintenance" as an emendation is that there are no examples of "the which <noun>" elsewhere in the Book of Mormon or, for that matter, in the King James Bible (although such usage did occur in earlier English). On the other hand, we do have evidence for "which <noun>" in the Book of Mormon text. Consequently, the critical text will accept "which maintenance", Joseph Smith's emendation, as the most probable reading for the original text, although "**the** which maintenance" is clearly possible despite the fact that as an emendation it creates a unique reading in the text.

Other emendations, such as inserting a *he* or changing *will* to *to* are also possible but seem less likely. There is, for instance, no scribal evidence for replacing *to* with *will*. And although there is scribal evidence that an original *he* could have been lost from "in the which maintenance he supposeth **he** will enable the Lamanites to conquer the remainder of the land", this emendation nonetheless places an inordinate emphasis on the rebel Nephite king, Pachus, as enabling the Lamanites.

Summary: Accept in Alma 61:8 Joseph Smith's emendation of the text from "**in the** which maintenance" to "which maintenance"; this emendation implies that during the early transmission of the text Oliver Cowdery or Joseph Smith accidentally added the extra *in the* to the original "which maintenance", prompted by the two preceding occurrences of "in the which" in the passage ("**in the which** he hath joined an alliance with him / **in the which** alliance he hath agreed to maintain the city of Zarahemla").

■ **Alma 61:9**

and now in your epistle
[*ye hath* 1A | *you have* BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *censured me*

As noted under Alma 41:9, the original text had a few instances of "ye hath", including here in Alma 61:9. In the editing for the 1837 edition, the *hath* was emended to the standard *have,* but at the same time the archaic plural pronoun *ye* was replaced by standard *you.* In only one other place did the 1837 edition replace *ye* with *you:*

> Mormon 8:38
>
> why do [*you* >% *ye* 1 | *ye* ART | *you* BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQS] not think that . . .

There's also one example of the 1837 edition replacing a *you* with *ye;* see under Alma 7:17 for discussion. These rare 1837 mix-ups all appear to be accidental. For a general discussion, see under YE in volume 3. The critical text will, of course, restore the original *ye hath* here in Alma 61:9.

Summary: Restore in Alma 61:9 the original *ye hath;* although nonstandard, such usage is found elsewhere in the original text.

■ **Alma 61:9**

my soul standeth fast in that liberty
in the which God hath made [*me* >+ *us* 1 | *us* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *free*

Here in 𝓟, Oliver Cowdery initially wrote "in the which God hath made **me** free"; Oliver's choice of *me* was probably influenced by the occurrence of *my soul* at the beginning of the sentence as well as the use of *I* and *my* earlier in the verse ("**I** Parhoron do not seek for power save only to retain **my** judgment seat that **I** may preserve the rights and the liberty of **my** people"). Somewhat later, probably when he proofed 𝓟 against 𝓞, Oliver crossed out the *me* and supralinearly inserted the *us* (the correction was written with somewhat heavier ink flow). Notice that Parhoron, as the chief judge, does not emphasize in the preceding sentence his own personal rights and liberties, but rather "the rights and the liberty of my people". The use of *us* in the following sentence is consistent with that expression of the people's freedom.

David Calabro points out (personal communication) that other scriptural references to standing fast in liberty also refer to the freedom of entire groups of people, not to single individuals:

> Mosiah 23:13
> even so I desire that **ye** should stand fast in this liberty
> wherewith **ye** have been made free

> Alma 58:40
> nevertheless **they** stand fast in that liberty
> wherewith God hath made **them** free

> Alma 61:21
> for God will deliver them
> yea and also **all those** who stand fast in that liberty
> wherewith God hath made **them** free

This same plural relationship holds in one of Paul's letters:

> Galatians 5:1 (King James translation)
> stand fast therefore in the liberty
> wherewith Christ hath made **us** free

But Calabro also notes that in each of these other cases the subject is plural while here in Alma 61:9 the subject of the clause is singular ("**my soul** standeth fast in that liberty"). This use of the singular subject *my soul* suggests that the singular *me* could be correct and that Oliver Cowdery's change of *me* to *us* was the result of conscious editing on his part.

Although the singular *me* is theoretically possible here in Alma 61:9, it seems much more reasonable that Parhoron, in such a politically sensitive reply, would want to emphasize the freedom that God has granted to his people, not just himself. In my mind, it is much more reasonable to assume that Oliver Cowdery's initial *me* was a scribal error. The critical text will assume as much.

Summary: Maintain the use of *us* here at the end of Alma 61:9 ("in that liberty in the which God hath made **us** free"), the corrected reading in 𝒫.

■ **Alma 61:12**

we would subject ourselves to the yoke of bondage
if it [*was* >+ *were* 0 | *were* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *requisite with the justice of God*
or if he should command us so to do

In the original manuscript, Oliver Cowdery seems to have initially written "if it **was** requisite with the justice of God". (For the possibility that he may have written *requisite* as *requisites,* at least initially, see under Alma 41:2.) Sometime later, with heavier ink flow, Oliver corrected the indicative *was* to the subjunctive *were*. The *was* is not actually extant in 𝒪, but the final *ere* of the *were,* as a supralinear correction, is extant. As discussed under Mosiah 10:14, Oliver's scribal practice argues that he did not intentionally emend *was* to *were*. He did, however, frequently write *was* instead of the textually correct *were* and then would later correct his error. Here in Alma 61:12, Oliver seems to have made the correction when he read the text back to Joseph Smith. The critical text will accept the corrected *were* of 𝒪 as the original reading in Alma 61:12.

In the construction "if it was/were", the earliest text prefers *were* over *was* (29 to 2, excluding the case here in Alma 61:12). The two instances with *was* are not extant in 𝒪, but in both cases Oliver Cowdery was the scribe in 𝒫 and he did not replace the *was* with *were:*

| Helaman 14:3 | insomuch that it shall appear unto man as if it **was** day |
| 3 Nephi 8:6 | insomuch that it did shake the whole earth
   as if it **was** about to divide |

In two other cases of "if it was/were", an original *were* was changed to *was* but not permanently: in Mosiah 29:13, Hyrum Smith apparently thought to revise an original *were* to *was,* but Oliver, in proofing 𝒫 against 𝒪, restored the original *were* in 𝒫; the other case of change involves the 1906 and 1907 LDS editions and is discussed under Alma 17:22.

Summary: Maintain in Alma 61:12 the corrected reading in 𝒪, "if it **were** requisite"; Oliver Cowdery's correction to *were* appears to have been made when he read back the text to Joseph Smith.

■ **Alma 61:15**

therefore come unto me speedily with a few of your men
and leave the remainder in [*the* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMOPQRST | N] *charge of Lehi and Teancum*

Here we have the accidental loss of the definite article *the* in the 1906 LDS edition. This omission of the *the* reverses the meaning. The remainder of the men were definitely not "in charge of Lehi and Teancum". The definite article *the* is required here and will be maintained.

Summary: Maintain in Alma 61:15 the definite article *the* in the phrase "in **the** charge of Lehi and Teancum".

■ **Alma 61:17**

and we will go
[NULL > *speedily* 1 | *speedily* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *against those dissenters*
in the strength of our God

The original manuscript is not extant here. In the printer's manuscript, Oliver Cowdery initially wrote "go against those dissenters"; then he supralinearly inserted *speedily* without any change in the level of ink flow. He was undoubtedly restoring the reading in 𝒪 since either reading works and there would have been no need to emend the text here. Parhoron used the word *speedily* earlier in his epistle: "therefore come unto me **speedily** with a few of your men" (Alma 61:15). Apparently he wished to emphasize the need to act speedily, just as Moroni in his epistle had emphasized the need for speedy action, although more as a threat to Parhoron.

> Alma 60:34 and send **speedily** unto me of your provisions and of your men
> Alma 60:35 and behold if ye will not do this / I come unto you **speedily**

Thus *speedily* is quite appropriate in Parhoron's reply to Moroni.

Summary: Accept in Alma 61:17 the corrected reading in 𝒫, "and we will go **speedily** against those dissenters"; Parhoron seems to emphasize the word *speedily* in his reply to Moroni, although Moroni had used the word more to threaten Parhoron.

■ **Alma 61:19**

and now Moroni I do [1ABCDEFGIJLMNOPQRST | *not* HK] *joy in receiving your epistle*

The 1874 RLDS edition introduced the negative *not* here, giving "I do **not** joy in receiving your epistle". The original manuscript is not extant at all for this part of the text, but nonetheless there is really no need to inject a *not* here. Perhaps the typesetter (or the editors) for the 1874 edition were influenced by Parhoron's initial statement at the beginning of his epistle: "I do **not** joy in your great afflictions" (Alma 61:2). Or perhaps the unusualness in modern English of *do joy* led someone to think that a *not* was missing here. (For another example of incorrectly inserting a *not* after the auxiliary verb *do,* see under Mosiah 26:7−9.)

At the end of his epistle, Parhoron admits that he was relieved to have gotten a letter from Moroni since he "was somewhat worried" concerning what should be done against the rebels; in fact, Parhoron wasn't even sure "whether it should be just in us to go against our brethren" (Alma 61:19). Moroni made sure that this indecision on Parhoron's part did not continue; it seems here that we have somewhat of a confession from Parhoron that he had not been that active in opposing the rebels; in other words, Moroni had been justified in threatening Parhoron. Although it is possible that Parhoron did not "joy in Moroni's epistle", he definitely did "joy in **receiving** Moroni's epistle".

Summary: Maintain the lack of *not* in Alma 61:19; Parhoron, in his positive reply to Moroni, wanted to emphasize that he was happy to receive a communication from Moroni.

■ **Alma 61:20**

but ye have said
except they repent the Lord hath [1ABCDEFGHKPRST | *also* IJLMNOQ] *commanded you*
that ye should go against them

The word *also* was added here in the 1879 LDS edition. It was removed from the LDS text in the 1920 edition, undoubtedly by reference to earlier editions. Parhoron here is obliquely referring to Moroni's earlier threat (although one notes that in Alma 61:20 Parhoron has turned Moroni's threat away from himself and towards the rebels). In any event, there was no *also* in Moroni's original statement:

> Alma 60:33
>> behold the Lord saith unto me
>> if those whom ye have appointed your governors
>> do not repent of their sins and iniquities
>> ye shall go up to battle against them

Nor was there originally any *also* in Parhoron's paraphrase of that statement.

Summary: Maintain in Alma 61:20 the original text without the *also* that was added in the 1879 LDS edition (but removed from the LDS text in 1920); the original basis for this verse comes from Alma 60:33, which also lacks the *also*.

Alma 62

■ **Alma 62:1**

his heart did take courage and was filled
with exceeding [NULL > *great* 1 | *great* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *joy*

> The original manuscript is not extant for any part of the text near this passage. Oliver Cowdery initially wrote "with exceeding joy" in the printer's manuscript, then corrected the text by supralinearly inserting *great* with no change in the level of ink flow. Elsewhere in the text there are ten occurrences of "exceeding great joy" and three of "exceeding joy", so either reading is possible, but the use with *great* is favored. Since either reading is acceptable, Oliver was undoubtedly correcting to the reading in 𝓞. (The 1981 LDS edition changed all these instances of "**exceeding** great joy" to "**exceedingly** great joy"; for discussion of that editing, see under 1 Nephi 2:16 or, more generally, under EXCEEDING in volume 3.)

Summary: Follow the corrected reading in 𝓟 for Alma 62:1 ("with exceeding great joy"), which was undoubtedly the reading in 𝓞 (no longer extant here).

■ **Alma 62:1**

that he was not also a traitor
to the freedom and [1ABCDEFGHIJKMNOPQRST | *the* L] *cause of his country*

> The original manuscript is not extant here. There is no repeated *the* in the earliest textual sources, but the 1902 LDS missionary edition accidentally inserted the *the*. This secondary *the* was not transmitted into any subsequent LDS edition since the 1902 edition never served as a copytext.
>
> Generally speaking, "cause of X" is preceded by *the* (47 times) or *a* (3 times). The only time it is not immediately preceded by a determiner is here in Alma 62:1. In conjunctive phrases, when the final noun conjunct is "cause of X", we get *the* before *cause* (except, of course, here in Alma 62:1). There are two examples:

Alma 54:10	yea and we will maintain **our** religion and **the** cause of our God
Alma 58:12	and to maintain **our** lands and **our** possessions and **our** wives and **our** children and **the** cause of our liberty

> But in each of these examples, the preceding noun conjuncts take the determiner *our;* thus omitting the determiner before *cause* in these two passages would create an anomalous conjunct (as in "we will maintain our religion and cause of our God", as if the text read "we will maintain our cause of our God").

We should also note that there is another conjunctive example where the first conjunct is *the freedom* (as here in Alma 62:1), and in that case the *the* is not repeated for the following noun conjunct:

> Alma 60:36
>> I seek not for honor of the world
>> but for the glory of my God
>> and **the** freedom and welfare of my country

So it seems possible that the *the* does not have to be repeated in such conjunctive phrases. The critical text will maintain the earliest extant reading in Alma 62:1 ("that he was not also a traitor to the freedom and cause of his country"), that is, without a repeated *the* before *cause*.

Summary: Although the lack of a repeated *the* before *cause* in Alma 62:1 ("the freedom and cause of his country") may seem a little odd when compared with the normal Book of Mormon style, there is another example where the noun conjunct following *the freedom* does not repeat the definite article (in Alma 60:36, which reads "the freedom and welfare of my country").

■ **Alma 62:2**

but he did also mourn exceedingly because of the iniquity of those
who [had 1ABCDEFGHIJLMNOQRST | *have* KP] *driven Parhoron from the judgment seat*
yea in fine because of those who **had** *rebelled against their country and also their God*

The 1892 RLDS edition replaced *had* with *have* in the first relative clause in this passage, but this was undoubtedly a typo since the *had* was retained in the following relative clause (which parallels the first): "yea in fine because of those who **had** rebelled against their country and also their God". The copytext for the 1908 RLDS edition was the 1892 edition; thus this error was carried over into that edition. But the 1953 RLDS edition restored the correct *had*.

Summary: Maintain the past perfect auxiliary *had* in both relative clauses in Alma 62:2 ("who **had** driven Parhoron from the judgment seat . . . who **had** rebelled against their country and also their God").

■ **Alma 62:5**

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*

Here the 1874 RLDS edition removed the definite article *the* from the phrase "in **the** defense of their freedom". This determiner was restored in the 1908 RLDS edition. A similar error occurred in the 1874 RLDS edition for Alma 53:13, but in that instance the shorter reading has persisted in the RLDS text. As discussed under Alma 53:13, the critical text will maintain these original instances of "in the defense of X". For a nearby example of "in the defense of X" where the *the* was momentarily lost in 𝒫, see below under Alma 62:9.

Summary: Maintain in Alma 62:5 the definite article *the* in the phrase "in **the** defense of their freedom", the reading of the earliest extant text.

■ **Alma 62:6**

and uniting his forces with [*that* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQS | *those* RT] *of Parhoron's they became exceeding strong*

Here the original text reads "uniting his **forces** with **that** of Parhoron's"—that is, the plural *forces* is used to refer to Moroni's troops, but the singular *force* is implied in referring to Parhoron's troops, as if the text read "with that of Parhoron's force". When we look at the entire text (but excluding this one case of ellipsis), we find that it is equally divided between *force* and *forces* when referring to troops; there are 11 instances of the singular and 11 of the plural, among them the following contrastive pairs:

□ *small force(s)*

| Mosiah 19:2 | the **forces** of the king were small |
| Alma 58:12 | we did take courage with our small **force** which we had received |

□ *all one's force(s)*

| Alma 53:5 | he desired all his **forces** when he should make an attackt |
| Alma 59:10 | he retained all his **force** to maintain those places |

□ *a part of one's force(s)*

| Alma 52:13 | to draw away a part of their **forces** |
| Alma 57:8 | or with a part of our strong **force** |

There is considerable evidence that Oliver Cowdery tended to write the plural *forces* in place of the singular *force,* at least momentarily in 𝒪 as he took down Joseph Smith's dictation; in each case, Oliver immediately corrected his error by erasure:

Alma 57:2 (the first *forces* is extant in 𝒪)
  we were sure that our **forces** were sufficient to take the city of Antiparah
  by our [*forces* >% *force* 0 | *force* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]

Alma 57:8 (the second *force* is not extant in 𝒪)
  yea with our strong [*forces* >% *force* 0 | *force* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
  or with a part of our strong **force**
  we did surround by night the city Cumeni

Alma 57:13
  we were obliged to employ
  all our [*forces to* >% *forc to* 0 | *force to* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
  keep them or put them to death

The first of these passages contains both a singular and a plural instance of *force*, although the singular *force* in that passage may mean 'strength' (as explained under Alma 57:2). Here in Alma 62:6, the editors for the 1920 LDS edition decided to remove the implied difference in number for *force(s)* by grammatically emending the singular *that* to the plural *those*.

One question here is whether the demonstrative pronoun *that* might represent some primitive error in the text. We note that there is one case in the early transmission of the text where

Oliver Cowdery started to write either "**that** part of the land" or simply "**that** land" instead of the correct "**those** parts of the land":

> Alma 50:32
>> and thus he would obtain possession
>> of [*those* 0ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST | *that* > *those* 1] parts of the land

Oliver's correction in 𝒫 for Alma 50:32 was immediate since he never wrote the entire originally intended noun phrase, either "that land" or "that part of the land". But it is very unlikely that the original *that* in Alma 62:6 is an error for *those,* especially since the use of *that* is so striking yet Oliver did not remove it. The critical text will restore this instance of original *that.*

Summary: Restore the original singular demonstrative *that* in Alma 62:6: "and uniting his forces with **that** of Parhoron's"; elsewhere the text allows either the singular *force* or the plural *forces* to refer to troops, in some cases interchangeably.

■ **Alma 62:6**

he came to the land of Gideon and uniting his forces
with that of [*Pahorons* 1 | *Pahoran* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
they became exceeding strong

The question here is whether the genitive *s* at the end of *Pahoron,* the reading in 𝒫, should be retained in the text. The 1830 compositor apparently thought otherwise and omitted the genitive *s* when he set the type. 𝒪 is not extant here but probably read like 𝒫. As discussed under Alma 46:24, there are four instances of the double genitive in the earliest extant text, including this one here in Alma 62:6. All of these will be restored in the critical text.

Summary: Restore in Alma 62:6 the possessive *s* that originally occurred for the name *Parhoron,* thus "and uniting his forces with that of **Parhoron's**"; the double genitive can be found elsewhere in the earliest text.

■ **Alma 62:6**

they became exceeding strong
even [NULL > *stronger* 1 | *stronger* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *than the men of Pachus*

The original manuscript is not extant here. In the printer's manuscript, Oliver Cowdery inserted *stronger* supralinearly and without any change in the level of ink flow. His correction most probably reflects the reading of the original manuscript. Without the comparative *stronger,* the ellipted text definitely seems to be defective. Elsewhere, we get a comparative word between *even* and *than* when there is some difference with respect to the preceding text:

> Mosiah 3:7
>> and lo he shall suffer temptations and pain of body hunger thirst and fatigue
>> even **more** than man can suffer except it be unto death

Mosiah 4:2
> and they had viewed themselves in their own carnal state
> even **less** than the dust of the earth

3 Nephi 26:14
> and they did speak unto their fathers **great** and marvelous things
> even **greater** than he had revealed unto the people

Note that in the last example the preceding text has the base form of the adjective (namely, *great*); thus the form *greater* is required in comparison. Similarly, here in Alma 62:6, the comparison is between the base adjective *strong* and the comparative *stronger*. On the other hand, if the preceding text already has the comparative form, then ellipsis of that form can occur:

1 Nephi 4:1
> for behold he is **mightier** than all the earth
> then why not **mightier** than Laban and his fifty
> yea or **even than** his tens of thousands

In other words, "yea or even **mightier** than his tens of thousands" allows for ellipsis of the word *mightier* since the preceding text already has the comparative form *mightier*.

Summary: Maintain the comparative *stronger* in Alma 62:6: "they became exceeding strong / even **stronger** than the men of Pachus"; the comparative is needed to make the contrast with the preceding *strong*.

■ **Alma 62:6**

which was the king of those dissenters
which had driven [*out* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQS | RT] *the freemen*
out *of the land of Zarahemla*

The 1920 LDS edition removed the repeated adverbial *out* here in Alma 62:6. Such adverbial repetition, however, is characteristic of the original text and will be restored in the critical text. For discussion of this kind of repetition, in both the Book of Mormon and the King James Bible, see under Jacob 7:8.

Summary: Restore the redundant occurrence of the adverb *out* in Alma 62:6; such usage occurs in the original text of the Book of Mormon.

■ **Alma 62:9**

and the men of Pachus [1ABCDEFGHIJKLMOPQRST | *who* N] *received their trial*
    according to the law
and also those kingmen [*which* 1A | *who* BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *had been taken*
    and cast into prison
and they were executed according to the law

Here we have an instance of the delayed conjoined subject. There are two groups of people who received their trial, "the men of Pachus" and "those kingmen which had been taken and cast into

prison". The longer conjoined subject is delayed, thus allowing for a simpler syntax than the complicated and almost obtuse nondelayed form: "the men of Pachus and also those kingmen which had been taken and cast into prison received their trial according to the law". As described under 1 Nephi 3:28, the delayed conjoined subject is common in the Book of Mormon text. Also see the full discussion of this construction under HEBRAISMS in volume 3.

Here in Alma 62:9, the typesetter for the 1906 LDS edition accidentally changed the main predicate into a relative clause by inserting *who,* thus "the men of Pachus **who** received their trial according to the law". The result is a sentence fragment. The typesetter was undoubtedly influenced by the relative clause that occurs in the delayed conjoined subject "and also those kingmen **who** had been taken and cast into prison". (The copytext for the 1906 LDS edition was the 1879 LDS edition; for Alma 62:9, *who* had replaced the original *which* since the 1837 edition.) This 1906 typo was never transmitted into any subsequent LDS edition since the 1906 edition was never used as a copytext.

Summary: In agreement with the earliest extant text, maintain the initial main clause in Alma 62:9: "and the men of Pachus received their trial according to the law"; this clause is followed by the delayed conjoined subject "and also those kingmen which had been taken and cast into prison".

■ **Alma 62:9**

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

Here we have another example in this chapter where the correct phrase "in **the** defense of X" was changed (although only momentarily) to what is expected in modern English, "in defense of X". In an earlier instance, discussed under Alma 62:5, the 1874 RLDS omitted the definite article. Here in verse 9, Oliver Cowdery, the scribe in 𝒫, initially omitted the *the,* then virtually immediately inserted it supralinearly (there is no change in the level of ink flow for the correction). For further discussion of the phrase "in the defense of X" and the tendency to omit the *the* from this phrase, see under Alma 53:13.

Summary: Maintain the original *the* in the phrase "in **the** defense of their country" in Alma 62:9.

■ **Alma 62:10**

yea and whosoever was found
[*a* 1| ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *denying their freedom*
was speedily executed according to the law

In the original Book of Mormon text, the prepositional *a* is usually found as part of the main verb phrase, as in 1 Nephi 8:28: "those that were **a** scoffing at them". The 1830 typesetter typically removed these instances of the prepositional *a*. There are a couple instances of the prepositional *a*

after the past-tense or past-participial verb form *found,* here in Alma 62:10 and also once earlier in the text:

> Alma 21:11
>> and there he found Muloki [*a* 1A| BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] preaching
>> the word unto them

In that case, the 1830 typesetter did not remove the *a;* the removal of the *a* occurred in the subsequent (1837) edition. The critical text will restore these two instances of "find someone **a** doing something". On the other hand, there are four instances in the earliest text of "find someone doing something"—that is, where the text is lacking the prepositional *a:*

> Mosiah 24:11 (not "whosoever should be found **a** calling upon God")
>> that whosoever should be found calling upon God
>> should be put to death

> Alma 47:27 (not "and found the king **a** lying in his gore")
>> and when they had come to the spot
>> and found the king lying in his gore
>> Amalickiah pretended to be wroth and said . . .

> Alma 56:15 (not "and his men **a** toiling with their mights")
>> and I found Antipus and his men toiling with their mights
>> to fortify the city

> 3 Nephi 5:5 (not "as many as were found **a** breathing out threatenings")
>> yea as many as were found breathing out threatenings against their brethren
>> were condemned and punished according to the law

So either construction, with or without the prepositional *a,* is possible in the original text. For further discussion, see under PREPOSITIONAL A in volume 3.

Summary: Restore the prepositional *a* in Alma 62:10 ("whosoever was found **a** denying their freedom") as well as in Alma 21:11 ("he found Muloki **a** preaching the word").

■ **Alma 62:14**

Moroni and Parhoron . . . took their march with a large body of men
[*towards* 1ABCDEFGIJLMNOPQRST| *toward* HK] *the land of Nephihah*

Here the 1874 RLDS edition replaced *towards* with *toward;* the 1908 RLDS edition restored the original *towards.* As discussed under 1 Nephi 5:22, the critical text will follow the earliest extant sources in choosing between *towards* and *toward.*

Summary: Maintain in Alma 62:14 the form *towards,* the reading of the earliest extant source, the printer's manuscript.

■ **Alma 62:15**

and it came to pass [NULL > *that* 1 | *that* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
as they were marching towards the land
they took a large body of men of the Lamanites
and slew many of them

The original manuscript is not extant here. Initially in the printer's manuscript, Oliver Cowdery omitted the subordinate conjunction *that,* but virtually immediately he inserted it supralinearly (there is no change in the level of ink flow). His correction undoubtedly reflects the reading of the original manuscript. As discussed under Alma 21:10, the text is fairly evenly divided between "it came to pass **that as** . . ." and "it came to pass **as** . . .", so either reading is possible here in Alma 62:15. Thus there would have been no motivation for Oliver to edit the text either way in this passage. For a similar case where Oliver initially omitted the *that* in this expression, see under Alma 62:28.

Summary: Accept in Alma 62:15 the corrected reading in 𝒫, the subordinate conjunction *that* before the *as*-clause ("it came to pass **that** as . . .").

■ **Alma 62:15–16**

and it came to pass that
as they were marching towards the land
*they **took** a large body of men of the Lamanites*
and slew many of them
and took their provisions and their weapons of war
and it came to pass after they had took them
they caused them to enter into a covenant

Keith and Joan Skousen (personal communication, 2 April 2001) suggest that there may be some mistake here in Alma 62:15: namely, the first *took* (set in bold) could be an error for *met* (thus "they **met** a large body of men of the Lamanites and slew many of them"). To be sure, there is something strange about the phraseology "they **took** a large body of men of the Lamanites". Of course, one army can meet another one, as in Alma 43:41: "Moroni and his army **met** the army of the Lamanites in the valley on the other side of the river Sidon". Overall, the verb *meet* is used 29 times in the text to refer to military forces confronting each other in battle, but never once in the sense of accidentally coming upon each other, as seems to be the meaning here in Alma 62:15. Perhaps this army of Lamanites was being sent to the city of Nephihah as reinforcements and was carrying extra provisions for the city, which would mean that this Lamanite army had no intention, at least at that time, of attacking the Nephites (I owe this suggested interpretation to Alison Coutts).

Another possible emendation for *took* is *overtook*. A misreading of *overtook* as *took* could have readily occurred when Oliver Cowdery was copying the text from 𝒪 into 𝒫. We don't have 𝒪 for this particular passage, but it could have read as follows:

> Alma 62:15–16 (reconstructed 𝒪 as emended)
> & it came to pass that as they were marching towards the land they **overtook**
> a large body of men of the Lamanites & slew many of them & **took** their pro
> -visions & their weopons of war & it came to pass after they had **took** them
> they caused them to enter into a covenant that they would no more take up

The length of the line here is based on the reconstructed lines for a nearby fragment of 𝄐 for Alma 62:17–18 (on page 361′ of 𝄐). The reconstruction for Alma 62:15–16 shows that for each of the next two lines in 𝄐, underneath the proposed *overtook,* there would have been an occurrence of *took* (as indicated above in bold). So when Oliver copied the text from 𝄐 into 𝄐, his eye could have easily glanced down one or two lines, thus prompting him to replace *overtook* with *took.* (For discussion of the later grammatical emendation of *had took* to *had taken,* see under Alma 47:1.)

There are a number of examples in the text of the verb *overtake* being used to refer to pursuing and then slaying a foe:

> Mosiah 19:10
>> the Lamanites did pursue them and did **overtake** them
>> and began to **slay** them

> Alma 56:40
>> lest they should **overtake** me
>> and we could not stand against them but be **slain**

> Alma 58:19
>> for they were exceedingly desirous to **overtake** us
>> that they might **slay** us

> 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
>> he was **overtaken** and **slain**

In fact, every instance of the verb *overtake* in the Book of Mormon text refers to catching up with someone who is being pursued. There are 17 occurrences that deal with an actual physical chase, including the four listed above; in addition, there are a couple of passages where the verb *overtake* metaphorically refers to the impossibility of escaping God's justice and judgments (3 Nephi 29:4 and Mormon 4:5). For none of these examples is there any sense of a chance meeting out in the open, as seems to be the case in Alma 62:15: Moroni and Parhoron just happened to come upon this large body of Lamanite soldiers; they had not been pursuing them. Thus the restricted use of the verb *overtake* everywhere else in the text makes the emendation of *took* to *overtook* in Alma 62:15 less attractive and has made me reconsider my earlier idea that *overtook* was the original reading here.

Often the verb *take* is used in contrast to *slay*—that is, enemy combatants are either slain or taken as prisoners:

> Alma 50:35
>> a battle commenced between them
>> in the which Teancum did **slay** Morionton
>> and defeat his army and **took** them prisoners

> Alma 51:19
>> and those of their leaders which were not **slain** in battle
>> were **taken** and cast into prison

> Alma 52:40
>> and now the number of prisoners which were **taken**
>> exceeded more than the number of those which had been **slain**

Alma 62:8

   and behold Pachus was **slain** and his men were **taken** prisoners

Alma 62:25

   he did cause that his men should march forth against them
   and they **slew** many and surrounded many others and **took** them prisoners

Helaman 1:22

   the Nephites had fled before them and were **slain**
   and were **taken** and were cast into prison

3 Nephi 5:4

   and now it came to pass that when they had **taken** all the robbers prisoners
   insomuch that none did escape which were not **slain**
   they did cast their prisoners into prison

Mormon 4:2–3

   the Lamanites did take possession of the city Desolation
   and did **slay** many of the Nephites and did **take** many prisoners
   and the remainder did flee and join the inhabitants of the city Teancum

There are two passages where the verb *take* is used in conjunction with the verb *slay,* but these cases refer to taking hold of people who are in buildings rather than out in the open:

Alma 22:19

   she was angry with them and commanded that her servants
   —or the servants of the king—should **take** them and **slay** them

Helaman 5:22

   behold they went forth into the prison to **take** them
   that they might **slay** them

Since neither *met* nor *overtook* works that well as an emendation for *took,* it is probably best to accept the verb *take* as appropriate for seizing a large body of men in the open. We can find two similar uses of the verb *take* with the meaning 'seize', although in both these cases the clear intention of the leader is to seek after a group of people:

Alma 46:30

   now Moroni thought it was not expedient
   that the Lamanites should have any more strength
   therefore he thought to cut off the people of Amalickiah
   or to **take** them and bring them back and put Amalickiah to death

Helaman 2:10–11

   and it came to pass that Helaman did send forth
   to **take** this band of robbers and secret murderers
   that they might be executed according to the law
   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
   and thus when Helaman sent forth to **take** them
   they could nowhere be found

We should also note that the occurrence of *took* in Alma 62:16 provides direct support for the original first *took* in verse 15. Verse 16 states that "after they had took **them** / they caused **them** to enter into a covenant". Both occurrences of the object pronoun *them* refer to the Lamanites who had been taken prisoners, not to the provisions and weapons that were also taken ("and took their provisions and their weapons of war"). If the original verb in verse 15 had been either *met* or *overtook,* then the reader could interpret the *them* in "after they had took **them**" as referring to the provisions and weapons, which would seem odd given the following "they caused **them** to enter into a covenant".

The Oxford English Dictionary, under definition 8b for the verb *take,* lists the obsolete meaning 'to come upon suddenly, overtake, catch'. The OED lists the following example from the 1611 King James Apocrypha where the verb *take* has a meaning that is similar to the one used in Alma 62:15:

> Ecclesiasticus 36:26
>> so who will believe a man that hath no house
>> and lodgeth wheresoever the night **taketh** him

In other words, the verb *take* can have the meaning 'overtake'. Nonetheless, it should be pointed out that all the citations listed under definition 8b in the OED, dating from about 1533 through 1890, refer to some act of nature (such as wind, storm, or night) as "taking someone". There are no citations listed that refer to a person "taking someone". Even so, the OED refers to certain set expressions that can be used in this way, such as the phrase "to take someone by surprise".

Thus the original first *took* in Alma 62:15 seems to be correct, despite the tendency for modern readers to find its use here unexpected. The critical text will accept the earliest extant reading for this passage, namely, the verb *take* in "they **took** a large body of men of the Lamanites and slew many of them".

Summary: Despite its unusualness, the first occurrence of *took* in Alma 62:15 will be maintained; even though Moroni and Parhoron had not been pursuing this large body of Lamanites soldiers prior to coming upon them, they did seize these soldiers, with the result that the verb *take* will work; based on usage elsewhere in the text, possible emendations such as *met* and *overtook* would create readings that would be even more exceptional in usage.

■ **Alma 62:18**

and it came to pass that when they had come
to the city [1ABCDEFGPS | *of* HIJKLMNOQRT] *Nephihah*
they did pitch their tents in the plains of Nephihah
which is near the city [1ABCDEFGHKPS | *of* IJLMNOQRT] *Nephihah*

As with most names of cities, the *of* is optional in the phrase "the city (of) Nephihah". Here we have two examples where the *of* was lacking in the earliest text. In both cases, the *of* was added to the LDS text in the 1879 edition. And the LDS text has continued with the *of* in both these cases. The *of* was also added to the RLDS text in the 1874 edition but only in the first case. In that instance, the 1908 RLDS edition removed the extra *of* from the RLDS text, probably by reference to 𝓟.

There are eight other instances in the text of "the city of Nephihah" but none of "the city Nephihah". In one of these cases, Oliver Cowdery initially omitted the *of* in 𝓟. Virtually immediately he supplied the *of* by supralinear insertion (there is no change in the level of ink flow):

> Alma 62:30
> now it came to pass that Moroni after he had obtained possession
> of the city [NULL > *of* 1|*of* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] Nephihah . . .

𝓞 is not extant here but presumably had the *of*. The critical text will, in each case, follow the earliest textual sources, thus restoring the two original occurrences of "the city Nephihah" here in Alma 62:18.

Summary: Restore the two original occurrences of "the city Nephihah" in Alma 62:18 (in accord with 𝓟, the earliest textual source for these two occurrences); maintain the *of* in "the city **of** Nephihah" for all other instances in the text, including Alma 62:30.

■ **Alma 62:19**

but the Lamanites **knowing** *of their exceeding great courage*
and [*knowing* > *beholding* 1|*beholding* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *the greatness*
    of their numbers
therefore they durst not come out against them

Here in 𝓟, we have a momentary perseverance of the present participle *knowing,* prompted by the *knowing* in the preceding "the Lamanites knowing of their exceeding great courage". Elsewhere the text has five passages where a conjoined present-participial clause begins with *and knowing,* including one where the preceding present-participial clause also begins with *knowing:*

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

Thus the initial text in Alma 62:19 is not impossible, which argues that Oliver Cowdery's correction from *knowing* to *beholding* was not due to editing but was rather the result of him making sure he copied the text correctly from 𝓞 into 𝓟.

Summary: Accept the corrected reading in 𝓟 for Alma 62:19: "and **beholding** the greatness of their numbers".

■ **Alma 62:20**

and when the night came
Moroni went forth in the darkness of the night
and came upon the top of the wall to spy out
[*in* 1ABCDEFGIJLMNOPQRST | HK] *what part of the city*
the Lamanites did camp with their army

Here the 1874 RLDS edition accidentally omitted the preposition *in* from the phrase "in what part of the city". The 1908 RLDS edition restored the *in* to the RLDS text. The critical text will here follow the earliest extant reading, "**in** what part of the city".

Summary: Maintain in Alma 62:20 the preposition *in* in the phrase "**in** what part of the city".

■ **Alma 62:21**

and it came to pass that they were on the east by the entrance
and they were [*all* 1ABCDEFGHIKLMNOPQRST | J] *asleep*

The 1888 LDS edition accidentally omitted the word *all* here, perhaps because the preceding text reads without any *all* ("they were on the east by the entrance"). Another possibility (suggested by Don Brugger) is that the typesetter's eye skipped from *all* to the visually similar first part of the following word, *asleep*. The word *all* emphasizes that the Lamanites were all asleep: no one was on guard—or if some were, they were asleep. The use of the *all* thus explains how Moroni could enter the city without being observed. This error was not transferred to any subsequent LDS edition because the 1888 edition never served as a copytext.

Summary: Maintain in Alma 62:21 the original *all* in the clause "they were **all** asleep"; the use of *all* means that no one was awake, not even the guards.

■ **Alma 62:22**

and it came to pass that Moroni caused
that his men should march forth
and come [*up* 1 | ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *upon the top of the wall*
and let themselves down into that part of the city

Here the 1830 typesetter inadvertently omitted the adverb *up*, undoubtedly because the following preposition, *upon*, also begins with *up*. There are a number of cases in the original text of *up upon*, and for several of these the *up* has been accidentally omitted in the printed editions (see the discussion and list of examples under Alma 2:15). The critical text will restore the original instance of *up upon* here in Alma 62:22.

Summary: Restore the adverbial *up* in Alma 62:22; it was accidentally dropped by the 1830 typesetter since the following word, *upon*, began with the same *up*.

■ **Alma 62:22**

and let themselves down into that part of the city / yea even on the west
where the Lamanites did not camp [*with* 1ABCEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST | D] *their armies*

The 1841 British edition omitted the preposition *with* from this clause. The expression "to camp one's army" seems problematic. It is not surprising that the subsequent LDS edition (in 1849) restored the *with*. Moreover, the preceding text provides additional support for the preposition *with*: "to spy out in what part of the city the Lamanites did camp **with** their army" (Alma 62:20). In any event, the earliest text for Alma 62:22 has the *with,* and the critical text will follow that reading.

Summary: Maintain in Alma 62:22 the preposition *with* in "where the Lamanites did not camp **with** their armies".

■ **Alma 62:24**

and [*now* 1ABCDEFHIJKLMNOPQRST | G] *when the Lamanites awoke*
and saw [*that* 1ABCDEFGHIJLMNOPQRST | K] *the armies of Moroni were within the walls . . .*

Here we have two minor losses in later 19th-century editions of the Book of Mormon. In the first case, the 1858 Wright edition accidentally omitted the adverb *now* from "and **now** when the Lamanites awoke". In this case, the subsequent 1874 RLDS edition followed the 1840 reading, which had the *now.*

The second case involves the loss in the 1892 RLDS edition of the subordinate conjunction *that* after the verb *saw.* Once more, the subsequent RLDS edition (1908) restored the correct word (probably by reference to 𝒫, although in this case the 1874 RLDS edition would have also worked).

Summary: Maintain the original words *now* and *that* in Alma 62:24 since they are found in the earliest extant text (in this case, 𝒫).

■ **Alma 62:24**

and now when the Lamanites awoke
and saw that the armies of Moroni were within the walls
they were [*affrightened* 1 | *affrighted* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *exceedingly*

Here in the printer's manuscript, we have *affrightened,* the past participle for the verb *affrighten.* The 1830 compositor set this as *affrighted,* the past participle for the verb *affright.* There are no other instances in the text of the verb *affrighten,* but there is one of *affright:*

> Alma 52:2
>   and now when the Lamanites saw this
>   they were [*affrighted* 01ABDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST | *afrighted* C]

Thus the verbs *affright* and *affrighten* each occur only once in the Book of Mormon. In the King James Bible, there are ten instances of *affright* but none of *affrighten.* According to the Oxford English Dictionary, the verbs *affright* and *affrighten* are both archaic and date from Early Modern English, with *affrighten* deriving from *affright.* Although there are citations of these verbs up into

the 1800s, by that time they are archaic, dialectal, or restricted to poetry. For each of these verbs, I provide the earliest and the latest citation as listed under each of these verbs in the OED (with spelling regularized and other accidentals ignored):

◻ *affright*

Thomas Nashe (1589)
> so terrible was his style . . . as would have **affrighted**
> our peaceable poets from intermeddling hereafter
> with that quarreling kind of verse

Bayard Taylor (1878)
> never a wolf **affrights** them here in the pasture's peace

◻ *affrighten*

John Taylor (1630)
> the whilst her tongue doth thunder and **affrighten**

Walter Landor (1828)
> wherefore in God's name are you **affrightened**

As far as the Book of Mormon text is concerned, either verb is theoretically possible. The critical text will in each case follow the earliest textual sources, thus *affright* in Alma 52:2 and *affrighten* here in Alma 62:24.

The Book of Mormon text prefers the verb *frighten* over *affright* and *affrighten*. There are 13 occurrences of *frighten* in the original text. In Alma 47:29, *frighten* was accidentally replaced by the archaic verb *fright* in the 1837 edition, but the original *frighten* has now been restored to both the LDS and RLDS texts (see under Alma 47:29 for discussion). According to the OED, the verb *frighten* is a later formation and dates from the middle of the 1600s, which may explain why the King James Bible has no instances of *frighten,* only *affright.*

Summary: Restore in Alma 62:24 the archaic verb *affrighten,* according to the reading in 𝒫: "they were **affrightened** exceedingly"; this verb was replaced by the archaic verb *affright* in the 1830 edition, although the more common verb in the Book of Mormon text is *frighten;* on the other hand, *affright* was the verb used in the King James Bible.

■ **Alma 62:25**

> *and now when Moroni saw that they were fleeing before him*
> *he did cause that his men should march forth against them*
> **and slew many** *and surrounded many others and took them prisoners*

In this passage the subject pronoun *they* seems to be missing before *slew.* The previous clause refers to Moroni sending his men out after the fleeing Lamanites, with the implication that his men, not Moroni himself, "slew many and surrounded many others and took them prisoners". The original manuscript is not extant for this passage. It is clearly possible that Oliver Cowdery, in his copying from 𝒪 to 𝒫, accidentally dropped the pronoun *they* from the original text.

This kind of syntactic causative is found elsewhere in the text, namely, when a leader causes others to do something; and in every instance, the pronoun *they* is explicitly stated:

> Mosiah 17:5
>
> and it came to pass that
> the king **caused** that **his guards** should surround Abinadi and take him
> and **they** bound him and cast him into prison

> Mosiah 27:22
>
> and he **caused** that **the priests** should assemble themselves together
> and **they** began to fast and to pray . . .

> Alma 47:22
>
> Amalickiah **caused** that **his servants** should go forth to meet the king
> and **they** went forth and bowed themselves before the king

> Alma 50:7
>
> Moroni **caused** that **his armies** should go forth into the east wilderness
> yea and **they** went forth and drave all the Lamanites . . .

> Alma 53:4
>
> and he **caused** that **they** should build a breastwork of timbers
>   upon the inner bank of the ditch
> and **they** cast up dirt out of the ditch against the breastwork of timbers

> Alma 55:24
>
> he took them prisoners of war and took possession of the city
> and **caused** that **all the prisoners** should be liberated which were Nephites
> and **they** did join the army of Moroni

> 3 Nephi 3:24–25
>
> now Lachoneus did **cause** that **they** should gather themselves together
>   in the land southward . . .
> and **they** did fortify themselves against their enemies

In each of these cases, we have a single leader causing a group of people to do something, followed by a clause that refers to what that group does as a result—and the subject pronoun *they* for that group is never ellipted.

On the other hand, it is true that the Book of Mormon text sometimes refers to the actions of a military unit in the name of its leader only. For instance, with expressions referring to slaying the enemy or to taking them as prisoners, we have examples that, if taken literally, would imply that the leader alone is doing everything:

> Alma 50:35
>
> a battle commenced between them
> in the which Teancum did slay Morionton
> and defeat his army and took them prisoners

> Alma 51:23
>
> therefore Amalickiah did drive them slaying many

Alma 52:34

>therefore Jacob was determined to slay them
>and cut his way through to the city of Mulek

Alma 55:24

>now behold this was the desire of Moroni
>he took them prisoners of war
>and took possession of the city

Alma 62:30

>now it came to pass that Moroni
>after he had obtained possession of the city of Nephihah
>having taken many prisoners . . .

Ether 14:5

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

Ether 14:17

>and it came to pass that Shiz pursued after Coriantumr
>and he did overthrow many cities
>and he did slay both men women and children
>and he did burn the cities thereof

Thus one could analyze the current text in Alma 62:25 as follows: even though the text seems to be saying that Moroni alone "slew many and surrounded many others and took them prisoners", the name *Moroni* is actually being used to refer to both Moroni and his men. (See under Alma 43:53 for additional discussion of this possible interpretation.)

Nonetheless, there is a significant and systematic difference between these two sets of examples: the verb *cause* never occurs in the second set. Whenever a leader causes his men to do something, then the text refers to what those men did as distinct from the leader. Thus there is a distinct need for the subject pronoun *they* in Alma 62:25.

The subject pronoun *they* was occasionally omitted in the manuscripts, sometimes only initially. See under 2 Nephi 18:22 for some examples where the scribes omitted the subject pronoun *they*. There is one other example where Oliver Cowdery appears to have omitted an original *they* during the early transmission of the text without ever correcting it. And just like here in Alma 62:25, the *they* was immediately preceded by an *and*:

2 Nephi 27:6 (earliest extant reading, in 𝓟)

>and it shall come to pass that
>the Lord God shall bring forth unto you the words of a book
>**and shall** be the words of them which have slumbered

In that instance, the 1830 compositor, John Gilbert, supplied the expected *they* by conjectural emendation; all the printed editions read, quite correctly, as "and **they** shall be the words of them which have slumbered". (For further discussion of that example, see under 2 Nephi 27:6.) It appears that here in Alma 62:25 the missing *they* has never been supplied. The critical text will make this conjectural emendation.

Summary: Emend Alma 62:25 by supplying the subject pronoun *they:* "he did cause that his men should march forth against them and **they** slew many and surrounded many others and took them prisoners"; internal evidence and scribal errors support the emendation.

■ **Alma 62:25**

and the remainder of them fled into the land of Moroni
which was in the borders
[*by* 1ABCDEFGHIJLMNOQRT | *of* KPS] *the seashore*

> Here the 1892 RLDS edition replaced the preposition *by* with *of.* Surprisingly, the 1908 RLDS edition did not restore the original *by.* The critical text will here maintain the original *by.* For a complete discussion, see under Alma 50:25. For the same change of *by* to *of* later in this chapter but in a different edition, see under Alma 62:34.

■ **Alma 62:26**

thus had Moroni and Parhoron obtained
[*the* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMOPQRST | N] *possession of the city of Nephihah*
without the loss of one soul

> Here the 1906 LDS large-print edition accidentally dropped the definite article *the* before *possession.* But since that edition never served as a copytext, the shorter reading has never been transmitted into any subsequent LDS edition. As explained under Alma 52:26, the normal phraseology in the Book of Mormon, as well as in current English, is not to have an article (either *a* or *the*) before *possession* in the phrase "possession of something". Nonetheless, there are four instances elsewhere in the text of "**the** possession of something", where the something is either lands or strong holds (which belong to the same semantic class as cities do). For the list, see under Alma 52:26. The critical text will therefore maintain the definite article *the* before *possession* in the phrase "**the** possession of the city of Nephihah".

Summary: Maintain in Alma 62:26 the use of the definite article *the* before *possession* in "**the** possession of the city of Nephihah"; although unusual, such usage does occur elsewhere in the text.

■ **Alma 62:27**

now it came to pass that as many of the Lamanites
[*that* 1ABCDEFGHIJLMNOQRT | *who* KPS] *were prisoners*
were desirous to join the people of Ammon and become a free people . . .

> Normally in the Book of Mormon we expect the relative pronouns that begin with *wh* (such as *which* and *who*) rather than *that.* Still, *that* does occur as a relative pronoun, though infrequently. And not surprisingly, there has been some tendency to accidentally replace actual cases of *that* with *who* or *which.* Here in Alma 62:27, the 1892 RLDS edition replaced the *that* with *who,* a change that was not reversed in the 1908 RLDS edition but has continued in the RLDS text. A similar example is found in the LDS text in a quotation from Matthew 7:13:

3 Nephi 14:13
> and broad is the way
> [NULL > *that* 1 | *that* ABCDEGHKPS | *which* FIJLMNOQRT] leadeth to destruction

In this instance, the *that* is in the King James text, but the 1852 LDS edition has *which,* a grammatical variant that has persisted in the LDS text. There are also cases where the opposite change has occurred—cases where an original *which* has been emended to *that* (for an example, see under 1 Nephi 13:23). In general, the critical text will restore each original instance of the relative pronoun *which, who, that,* and so forth. For a complete discussion, see under WHICH in volume 3.

Summary: In accord with the reading of the earliest textual sources, accept the infrequent use of the relative pronoun *that* wherever it occurs, including cases in Alma 62:27 and 3 Nephi 14:13.

■ **Alma 62:27–28**

now it came to pass that
[as 1 | ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] many of the Lamanites that were prisoners
were desirous to join the people of Ammon and become a free people
and it came to pass that
as many as were desirous
unto them it was granted according to their desires

The reading of the printer's manuscript here in Alma 62:27–28 is rather difficult to deal with. There are two ways to interpret how Mormon starts out here in verse 27. Both interpretations deal with the word *as*. One possibility is that the *as* is a subordinate conjunction that introduces the idea that many of the Lamanite prisoners wanted to join the people of Ammon. In this case, *as* can be interpreted as meaning 'since'. Under this interpretation, we end up with a sentence fragment. But there is clear evidence for this kind of incomplete *as*-construction elsewhere in the original (and current) text:

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—
> and as he went forth amongst them
> behold he was ran upon and trodden down

Helaman 2:6–7
> and it came to pass
> **as** he went forth towards the judgment seat to destroy Helaman
> behold one of the servants of Helaman
> having been out by night
> and having obtained through disguise a knowledge of those plans
> which had been laid by this band to destroy Helaman—
> and it came to pass that
> he met Kishcumen and he gave unto him a sign

3 Nephi 27:1
  and it came to pass that
  as the disciples of Jesus were journeying
  and were preaching the things which they had both heard and seen
  and were baptizing in the name of Jesus—
  it came to pass that
  the disciples were gathered together
  and were united in mighty prayer and fasting

The 1830 typesetter dealt with the awkward construction here in Alma 62:27–28 by deleting the *as* in verse 27, which produced a main clause and thus allowed him to place a period at the end of "to join the people of Ammon and become a free people". In other words, the 1830 typesetter treated the *as* as an extraneous use of the subordinate conjunction *as*. Although the current text retains some of these examples, many have been removed in later editing of the text. For some discussion of this editing, see under 1 Nephi 8:7.

Don Brugger (personal communication) indicates that there is another way to interpret the use of *as many* here in Alma 62:27, one that does not lead to a sentence fragment but instead means 'all'. He suggests that what we actually have in this passage is a form of the phrase "as many as". The text uses the phrase "as many as" to refer to all that meet some stated conditions; in other words, there is an implied universal quantifier ('every one'). In most cases, the specific form of the phrase is simply *as many as* (49 times), as later on in Alma 62:28: "as many as were desirous" (meaning 'all who were desirous'). In five instances, the *many* modifies a noun, as in the following example:

  Alma 61:5
    and I have fled to the land of Gideon
    with **as many** men **as** it were possible that I could get

In nine cases, there is a postmodifying prepositional phrase headed by *of,* as in this example:

  Alma 23:6
    as many of the Lamanites **as** believed in their preaching
    and were converted unto the Lord never did fall away

In two cases, there is a displaced prepositional phrase that is directly associated with the verb rather than with "as many as":

  Alma 54:3 ("to obtain . . . from the Lamanites")
    therefore Moroni resolved upon a stratagem
    to obtain **as many** prisoners of the Nephites from the Lamanites
    as it were possible
      [The phrase "prisoners of the Nephites" here means 'prisoners who were Nephites', not 'prisoners taken by the Nephites'.]

  3 Nephi 28:18 ("uniting . . . to the church")
    they did go forth upon the face of the land
    and did minister unto all the people
    uniting **as many** to the church **as** would believe in their preaching

But the most interesting type is when the postmodifying phrase includes a relative clause. There are two cases of this construction in the original text, here in Alma 62:27 and earlier in Alma 3:3. In each instance, the relative pronoun takes the place of the second *as,* but the intended meaning is 'all', just as with the normal cases of "as many as". The first example of this construction has never been edited:

> Alma 3:3
>> and now **as many** of the Lamanites and the Amlicites
>> **which** had been slain upon the bank of the river Sidon
>> were cast into the waters of Sidon
>> and behold their bones are in the depths of the sea

The first sentence is equivalent to "and now **all** of the Lamanites and the Amlicites which had been slain upon the bank of the river Sidon were cast into the waters of Sidon". We could just as well replace the *which* with *as* to get the following equivalence: "and now **as many** of the Lamanites and the Amlicites **as** had been slain upon the bank of the river Sidon were cast into the waters of Sidon". Note that it would be wrong here to omit the *as,* giving "and now **many** of the Lamanites and the Amlicites . . . were cast into the waters of Sidon"; instead, all of them were cast into the river. The same universal interpretation holds for the original language here in Alma 62:27:

> Alma 62:27 (original text)
>> now it came to pass that
>> **as many** of the Lamanites **that** were prisoners
>> were desirous to join the people of Ammon and become a free people

In other words, "**all** of the Lamanites that were prisoners were desirous to join the people of Ammon" or "**as many** of the Lamanites **as** were prisoners were desirous to join the people of Ammon". Thus the 1830 omission of the *as* in Alma 62:27 is a mistake since it turns out that all of these Lamanite prisoners wanted to join the people of Ammon. Although the language in verse 28 might imply that not all were desirous, verse 29 makes it clear that indeed all were desirous (just as the original text in verse 27 states):

> Alma 62:29
>> therefore **all** the prisoners of the Lamanites did join the people of Ammon

It would appear that the point of verse 28 is to emphasize that each individual Lamanite soldier retained his free choice in the matter ("as many as were desirous / unto them it was granted according to their desires").

In conclusion, this second interpretation (where *as many* means 'all') appears to be the correct one here in Alma 62:27. The first interpretation (where *as* means 'since') is not correct since all of the Lamanite soldiers that survived desired to join the people of Ammon, not just many of them. The critical text will therefore restore the original *as* in this passage since it is precisely correct under the second interpretation.

Summary: Restore the original *as* in Alma 62:27; the intended meaning of *as many* in this sentence is 'all'; the construction here is supported by the language in Alma 3:3 as well as the text in Alma 62:29, which explicitly refers to "all the prisoners of the Lamanites" as joining the people of Ammon.

■ **Alma 62:28**

and it came to [NULL > *that* >% NULL 1| ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *pass*
[NULL > *that* 1| *that* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *as many as were desirous*
unto them it was granted according to their desires

Here in the printer's manuscript, Oliver Cowdery initially omitted the subordinate conjunction *that* after "it came to pass". Virtually immediately he caught his error and supralinearly inserted the *that,* although initially he placed his insert mark before *pass* rather than after it. He caught this error immediately, erasing the improperly placed insert mark and placing it after the *pass.* As explained under Alma 21:10, *that* is optional after "it came to pass" when there is a following *as*-clause. Earlier in Alma 62 (see under verse 15), Oliver made the same error in 𝓟 (that is, he initially omitted the *that*). Note here in Alma 62:28 that the preceding verse also originally began "now it came to pass **that** as . . ." (Alma 62:27); although in verse 27 the *as* was omitted by the 1830 typesetter, the *that* has been maintained.

Summary: Accept in Alma 62:28 the corrected reading in 𝓟 with the subordinate conjunction *that* before the *as*-clause ("and it came to pass **that** as . . .").

■ **Alma 62:29**

and thus were the Nephites relieved
from a great [*burthen* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMOPQRS| *burden* NT]

As noted under Jacob 2:23, all original instances of the archaic word form *burthen* have been replaced by the standard *burden* in the LDS text (but not in the RLDS text). The change to *burden* here in Alma 62:29 was first made in the 1906 LDS edition, but that instance of *burden* never entered the LDS text permanently until the 1981 LDS edition. The critical text will restore the archaic *burthen* wherever the earliest text supports it.

■ **Alma 62:29**

and **thus** *were the Nephites relieved from a great burthen*
yea insomuch that they were [*thus* > NULL 1| ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *relieved*
 from all the prisoners of the Lamanites

Here in the printer's manuscript, Oliver Cowdery initially wrote "they were **thus** relieved". Oliver crossed out the *thus* with no change in the level of ink flow. The original manuscript is not extant here but probably read without the *thus*. The source for Oliver's error in 𝓟 is the immediately preceding clause, which reads "and **thus** were the Nephites relieved"—the similarity of that expression with "they were relieved" led Oliver to accidentally repeat the *thus* later on in the verse.

Summary: Follow in Alma 62:29 the corrected reading in the printer's manuscript ("yea insomuch that they were relieved"), the most probable reading of the original manuscript (not extant here).

■ **Alma 62:30**

now it came to pass that Moroni after he had obtained possession
of the city [NULL > *of* 1 | *of* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *Nephihah* . . .

> As discussed under Alma 62:18, the critical text will maintain here in Alma 62:30 the corrected reading in 𝓟, "the city **of** Nephihah".

■ **Alma 62:30**

and having [*retained* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQS | *regained* RT] *many of the Nephites*
which had been taken prisoners . . .

> As discussed under Alma 58:3, the critical text will restore the original *retained* here, which in the original text sometimes meant 'take back'.

■ **Alma 62:34**

insomuch that the Lamanites were encircled about
in the borders [*by* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMOPQRST | *of* N] *the wilderness on the south*
and in the borders **by** *the wilderness on the east*

> Here the 1906 LDS large-print edition replaced the preposition *by* with *of*. This error was not copied into subsequent LDS editions since the 1906 edition never served as a copytext. The critical text will here maintain the original *by*. For a complete discussion, see under Alma 50:25. For the same change of *by* to *of,* see earlier in this chapter under Alma 62:25.

■ **Alma 62:35**

for behold the Nephites and the Lamanites also were weary
because of the greatness of [*the* 1ABCDEFGIJLMNOPQRST | *their* HK] *march*

> The 1874 RLDS edition changed *the march* to *their march* in the original phrase "because of the greatness of **the** march". The 1908 RLDS edition restored the original *the march.* Although the 1874 change may be accidental, it is consistent with other usage in the text; that is, elsewhere in the text, we always get a possessive pronoun as the determiner for *march* (providing there is no postmodifying prepositional phrase):

"their march"	12 times
"our march"	5 times
"his march"	4 times
"your march"	1 time

> There are also quite a number of cases where Oliver Cowdery wrote *the* in place of *their* (for a list, see under Alma 27:23). Thus the earliest reading in Alma 62:35, *the march,* could be an error for *their march.*
>
> Nonetheless, there is a clear contextual difference between Alma 62:35 and all 22 examples of "<possessive pronoun> march": all those examples involve a single military unit, either an army

or a band of robbers. Here in Alma 62:35, the march refers to the march of two armies, a Nephite one and a Lamanite one. For that reason, *their* seems less appropriate than *the* since each army has its own separate march. But since both have marched the same distance, the use of *the march* works very nicely and avoids the potential confusion of *their march* referring to the march of only one of the armies. Moreover, a plural like *their marches* seems strained in this context.

Summary: Retain the original phrase *the march* in Alma 62:35 since in this passage the text is referring to the separate marches of two armies and thus the definite article *the* works better than *their*.

■ **Alma 62:36**

and it came to pass that
Teancum in his anger did go forth into the camp of the Lamanites
and did let himself down over the walls of the city
and he went forth **with a cord** *from place to place*
insomuch that he did find the king

Robert Baer (personal communication, 20 July 1989) wonders here if the phrase "with a cord" hasn't been misplaced. It seems more reasonable that Teancum would have used a cord to "let himself down over the walls of the city". As support for this interpretation, we note that earlier on in this same chapter Moroni had his men use cords and ladders to descend the walls of the city Nephihah:

> Alma 62:21
>
> > and now Moroni returned to his army
> > and caused that they should prepare in haste strong cords and ladders
> > to be let down from the top of the wall into the inner part of the wall
>
> Alma 62:23
>
> > and it came to pass that they were all let down into the city by night
> > by the means of their strong cords and their ladders

The original manuscript is not extant for the first part of Alma 62:36, but theoretically it could have read quite naturally in one of the following ways:

> (1) and **with a cord** did let himself down over the walls of the city
> (2) and did let himself down **with a cord** over the walls of the city
> (3) and did let himself down over the walls of the city **with a cord**

Then somehow in the early transmission of the text the phrase "with a cord" was shifted to the following clause, giving "and he went forth **with a cord** from place to place". David Calabro points out (personal communication) a fourth possible emendation, namely, "with a cord" originally occurred even earlier in the verse, as in the following possibility:

> (4) Teancum in his anger did go forth **with a cord** into the camp of the Lamanites

Calabro points out that this fourth suggestion has "with a cord" shift from after *did go forth* in one manuscript line to after *went forth* in the next manuscript line. Another possible scenario is

that "with a cord" could have been shifted when Joseph Smith dictated the text to Oliver Cow-
dery, the presumed scribe in 𝔒 for this passage (extant portions later on in this verse are in
Oliver's hand).

One problem with all of these proposals is that we find very little if any evidence for phrase
shifting of this nature in the manuscripts. In general, phrase shifting occurred within the same
clause, but not between separate clauses. And if a phrase in one manuscript line accidentally influ-
enced the text in an adjacent manuscript line, that phrase was duplicated rather than transferred.

There is strong reason to believe that the earliest (and current) placement of the phrase "with
a cord" is correct. Joel Skousen has suggested (personal communication) the following explana-
tion: since Ammoron was encamped within the main walls of the city, Teancum may have been
using his cord (with an attached grappling hook) to scale smaller walls and houses within the
city. The current text in Alma 62:36 implies that Teancum was using the cord to help him find
Ammoron ("and he went forth with a cord from place to place insomuch that he did find the
king"). Unlike Teancum's assassination of Amalickiah (Ammoron's brother), there is no mention
here of Ammoron sleeping in a tent. Amalickiah was slain in his own tent; his armies were
encamped in tents "in the borders on the beach by the seashore" and not within any city (Alma
51:32–52:1). On the other hand, Ammoron's camp was within city walls, and in fact Ammoron
might very well have been sleeping inside a house in the city. If guards were stationed at the gate
or door of the house, the use of a cord would have been very helpful in Teancum's search for
Ammoron and gaining access to him. The critical text will therefore accept the placement of
"with a cord" in the clause "and he went forth **with a cord** from place to place insomuch that he
did find the king". Teancum could have well used the same cord to descend the walls of the city—
but if he did, the text merely assumes it.

Summary: Accept in Alma 62:36 the use of "with a cord" in the clause "and he went forth **with a cord**
from place to place insomuch that he did find the king", the reading of all the extant textual sources
(from 𝔓 on); although the phrase "with a cord" seems fully appropriate for descending the walls of
the city, Teancum was probably using his cord to scale houses and smaller walls within the city in his
search for king Ammoron.

■ **Alma 62:36**

but behold the king did [*awake* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRS | *awaken* T] *his servants
before he died*

Here the 1981 LDS edition replaced the main verb *awake* with a different verb, *awaken*. The change
appears to be intentional, although the change was not made in the parallel passage in Alma 51:34:
"he did not awake his servants". As explained under Alma 5:7, there are examples of both verbs
throughout the original text of the Book of Mormon. (For the restricted use of the alternative
verbs without the *a* prefix, *wake* and *waken,* see the discussion under 2 Nephi 27:3.) In all, there
are 38 instances of *awake* and 5 of *awaken* in the original text. In each case, the critical text will
accept the earliest reading, thus *awake* here in Alma 62:36.

Summary: Restore in Alma 62:36 the original verb, *awake,* the reading in 𝔓 (the earliest extant source).

■ **Alma 62:36**

> *but behold the king did awake his* [*servant* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRS | *servants* T]
> *before he died*
> *insomuch that* [*they* 1ABDEFIJLMNOPQRST | *he* CGHK] *did pursue Teancum and slew him*

Here the earliest extant text, the printer's manuscript, seems to read contradictorily: "the King did awake his **servant** before he died insomuch that **they** did pursue Teancum & slew him". In the 1840 edition, probably as a result of Joseph Smith's editing for that edition, the plural *they* was replaced with the singular *he*. The RLDS textual tradition followed this emendation until the 1908 RLDS edition restored the *they,* the reading in 𝓟. In other words, the RLDS text reintroduced the seemingly contradictory reading that has both the singular *servant* and the plural *they.* David Calabro points out (personal communication) that one could argue that the *they* here is simply a more generic reference to the Lamanites and that Teancum was pursued by the servant and other Lamanite soldiers.

The 1981 LDS edition removed the contradiction by emending *servant* to *servants*. The main reason for accepting such an emendation is that it is supported by the earlier use of the plural *servants* to describe Teancum's assassination of Amalickiah, Ammoron's brother:

> Alma 51:34
> and he did cause the death of the king immediately
> that he did not awake his **servants**

In the Book of Mormon, kings and queens each had servants (see, for instance, the discussion under Alma 22:22−23). Another reason, but less conclusive, is that the odds are considerably greater that the plural *s* could have been accidentally dropped from *servants* than *he* could have been replaced by *they,* although both are possible. There are about 300 cases in the manuscripts where Oliver Cowdery either omitted or added the plural *s,* including the following passage involving the word *servant* where the accidental addition of the *s* occurred in both 𝓞 and 𝓟 (and with the immediate erasure of the *s* in both manuscripts):

> Alma 47:34
> and it came to pass that Amalickiah took
> that same [*servants* >% *servant* 01 | *servant* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
> that slew the king . . .

On the other hand, the number of passages where Oliver Cowdery mixed up *they* and *he* in the manuscripts is seven, but each was momentary and immediately replaced by the correct pronoun. Statistically, these factors argue that if there is an error in the text here, the original text in Alma 62:36 most likely read in the plural, with *servants* and *they.*

Ultimately, the question here in Alma 62:36 is whether the unspecified *they* can refer to Lamanite soldiers in general. Such a use of *they* appears to be unique for the text, which helps explain why the 1840 and 1981 emendations were made in the first place. Elsewhere there are 79 instances of "insomuch that they" (where the *they* requires some referent), and in each case the referent for the *they* is easily recoverable from the preceding text. The same finding holds for all instances involving other pronouns that require antecedents, as in "insomuch that **he**" (17 times)

and "insomuch that **it**" (4 times). There is one case, only two verses later, where *they* refers to Moroni and his men even though the preceding text specifies only Moroni:

> Alma 62:38
>> Moroni marched forth on the morrow and came upon the Lamanites
>> insomuch that **they** did slay them with a great slaughter

However, the text frequently uses a military leader's name to stand for that leader and his men (as is common in English); for a list of examples and some discussion, see nearby under Alma 62:25. In such cases, the referent for the plural *they* remains directly determinable. This is not the case here in Alma 62:36; there is no preceding referent for the *they* in "but behold the king did awake his servant before he died insomuch that **they** did pursue Teancum and slew him". Thus the use of *they* in Alma 62:36 is unique. The most reasonable solution is that the referent for the *they* is a plural *servants*. The earliest extant reading in Alma 62:36 is defective, and the critical text will accept the 1981 emendation of *servant* to *servants* as the original reading.

Summary: Accept in Alma 62:36 the 1981 LDS emendation of *servant* to *servants,* which is supported by the parallel use of *servants* in Alma 51:34 (which describes the assassination of Amalickiah, Ammoron's brother); the plural *servants* is also supported by the original *they* in the following clause, "insomuch that **they** did pursue Teancum and slew him".

■ **Alma 62:41**

insomuch that they did humble themselves before God
even in the [*debths* >%? *debth* 0 | *debth* 1 | *depth* ABDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST | *dephth* C]
of humility

Here in the original manuscript, Oliver Cowdery wrote "in the debths of humility" (in the manuscripts Oliver consistently spelled the *p* in *depth* with a *b,* thus *debth*). However, for the word following *debths* (namely, *of*), Oliver started to write a different letter, which he erased, and then he overwrote the erasure with the *o* of *of.* When he erased that unidentifiable letter, he accidentally smeared the final *s* of *debths,* which made the word look like the singular *debth.* The result was that he copied this word into 𝒫 in the singular, ending up with "in the debth of humility". The printed editions have maintained the singular *depth* here.

Elsewhere in the text, for the phrase "the depth(s) of humility" we have only the plural *depths:*

2 Nephi 9:42	and come down in the **depths** of humility
Mosiah 4:11	and humble yourselves even in the **depths** of humility
Mosiah 21:14	and they did humble themselves even in the **depths** of humility
Helaman 6:5	unto the bringing down many of them into the **depths** of humility
3 Nephi 12:2	and come down into the **depths** of humility

𝒪 is not extant for any of these five other occurrences, although for the last one both the 1830 edition and 𝒫 are firsthand copies of 𝒪 (no longer extant for 3 Nephi 12), and both these sources have the plural. Given this support from all other examples in the text, it is clear that the original reading in 𝒪 for Alma 62:41, the plural *depths,* should be restored. (For additional discussion of the variation between *depth* and *depths,* see under 1 Nephi 8:32.)

Summary: Restore in Alma 62:41 the plural *depths,* which is what Oliver initially wrote in the original manuscript before he accidentally erased the plural *s* while trying to write the following word *of;* the Book of Mormon text consistently reads *depths* in the phrase "the depth(s) of humility".

■ **Alma 62:44**

and Helaman did take upon him again to preach unto the people the word of God

As discussed under 2 Nephi 5:9, all other instances of "to take upon oneself to do something" have an expletive *it* immediately after the verb *take*—that is, all the others read "to take **it** upon oneself to do something":

1 Nephi 16:37	and also our brother Nephi who hath taken **it** upon him to be our ruler and our teacher
2 Nephi 5:9	and all they which were with me did take **it** upon them to call themselves the people of Nephi
Jacob 1:8	I Jacob take **it** upon me to fulfill the commandment of my brother Nephi
Alma 39:10	and I command you to take **it** upon you to counsel your elder brothers
Helaman 5:4	and took **it** upon him to preach the word of God

(See under Alma 39:9–10 for the possibility of a sixth example of this expression, in Alma 39:9.) Only here in Alma 62:44 is the *it* lacking from this expression. One therefore wonders if perhaps the text originally had an *it* here in Alma 62:44 as well but that it was accidentally lost during the early transmission of the text. 𝓞 is sufficiently extant here to determine that there was no *it* inline, nor is there any insert mark to indicate that the pronoun was supralinearly inserted. So if there is a loss of *it* here, it would have occurred during the dictation of the text. There is one clear example in the manuscripts where the pronoun *it* was omitted (but only momentarily):

Alma 51:25 (initial error by Oliver Cowdery in 𝓟)

leaving men in every city to maintain
and defend [*it* 0ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST | NULL > *it* 1]

There is also good reason to believe that an original *it* was lost in Jacob 5:24. In addition, an expletive *it* in the clause "and it must needs be" appears to have been omitted by scribe 2 of 𝓟 in 3 Nephi 28:37; but the error there is complicated by the apparent loss of *must* as the text was being dictated. (See under these two passages for discussion.)

In contrast to these five examples of "to take **it** upon oneself to do something", there is never an expletive *it* when the complement for the verb is a regular noun phrase ("to take upon oneself something"). There are 40 instances of this second type, 15 of which refer to taking upon oneself the name of Christ. As we might expect, the *it* occurs only when the complement is an infinitive clause. The only question then is whether the *it* is required. One difference between the five other examples and the one here in Alma 62:44 is that the word *again* occurs ("Helaman did take upon him **again** to preach unto the people the word of God"), although it doesn't seem like *again* could be the crucial reason why the *it* is lacking in Alma 62:44. Note that the *it* does occur in the

otherwise similar example in Helaman 5:4: "and took **it** upon him to preach the word of God all the remainder of his days".

Ultimately, what we need to recognize here is that there is nothing especially wrong with the missing *it* in Alma 62:44. Note that there has been no tendency in the history of the text to add the *it* to this passage. Moreover, for one of the five cases with the expletive *it,* the *it* was removed by Joseph Smith in his editing for the 1837 edition, thus showing that the expletive *it* is not crucial:

> 2 Nephi 5:9
> and all they which were with me
> did take [*it* >js NULL 1 | *it* A | BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] upon them
> to call themselves the people of Nephi

Given the invariance in the reading for Alma 62:44, the critical text will assume that the expletive *it* is intentionally lacking here.

Summary: Maintain in Alma 62:44 the invariant reading of all the textual sources, including ℧, which lacks the expletive *it* in "Helaman did take upon him again to preach unto the people the word of God".

■ **Alma 62:45**

therefore Helaman and his brethren went forth
and did declare the word of [*God* 0BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST | *Gid* 1A] *with much power*

Here in the printer's manuscript, Oliver Cowdery accidentally wrote "the word of Gid" in place of the obviously correct "the word of God". His scribal slip was influenced by the preceding occurrences of the personal name *Gid* in Alma 57–58; interestingly, there is one instance of "these words of Gid" (in Alma 57:36). What makes this scribal error in Alma 62:45 especially striking is that the 1830 compositor did not catch the error and ended up setting *Gid* instead of the correct *God*. We should add that even in proofing this error was not caught. The 1837 edition, undoubtedly without much effort, restored the correct *God* (which happens to be extant in ℧, as if that would have made any difference).

Summary: Maintain the obviously correct reading "the word of God" in Alma 62:45; scribal slips like "the word of Gid" will occur and are sometimes copied.

■ **Alma 62:49**

they **were** *not lifted up in the pride of their eyes*
neither [*was* >+ *were* 0 | *were* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *they slow*
to remember the Lord their God

Here in the original manuscript, Oliver Cowdery initially wrote "neither **was** they slow". Somewhat later, perhaps when he read back the text to Joseph Smith, Oliver emended the *was* to *were*. In ℧ the supralinear *were* was written with slightly heavier ink flow, but the crossout and the insert mark were written with heavier ink. Another possibility, of course, is that the change from *was* to *were* was a case of conscious editing on Oliver's part. Note that the sentence begins with

a *were* ("they **were** not lifted up in the pride of their eyes"), which agrees with the corrected read-
ing for the following clause ("neither **were** they slow"). More generally, when we consider other
cases in the text where Oliver changed *was* to *were,* we find that changes like these appear to be
the result of his attempt to get the text down correctly rather than the result of a desire to gram-
matically emend the text. We generally find that Oliver sometimes mistakenly wrote *were* instead
of *was,* which he corrected, but he did not emend genuine cases of *was* (even if ungrammatical).
For a thorough discussion of this point, see under Mosiah 10:14; also see under SUBJECT-VERB
AGREEMENT in volume 3. The critical text will accept the corrected reading in 𝒪 for this passage:
"neither **were** they slow".

Summary: Maintain the plural *were* in Alma 62:49: "neither **were** they slow"; although Oliver Cow-
dery initially wrote "neither **was** they slow" in 𝒪, this reading appears to be a scribal error on his part
that he later corrected after reading the text back to Joseph Smith.

■ **Alma 62:50**

yea they did remember how great things
[*he > the Lord* 1 | *the Lord* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *had done for them*
that **he** *had delivered them from death and from bonds and from prisons*
    and from all manner of afflictions
and **he** *had delivered them out of the hands of their enemies*

The original manuscript is not extant here, but spacing between extant fragments clearly supports
the longer *the Lord.* Oliver Cowdery accidentally wrote *he* initially in the printer's manuscript,
but then virtually immediately he corrected the *he* to *the Lord* (there is no change in the level of
ink flow). He may have been influenced by the two following instances of *he* in this sentence
("that **he** had delivered them from death . . . and **he** had delivered them out of the hands of their
enemies"). Elsewhere the text usually has the full subject, *the Lord,* in this expression (there are
five instances of "how great things **the Lord** hath/had done for X"). But there is one instance
where we get the pronoun *he:* "how great things **he** hath done for them" (Mosiah 27:16). In each
case, we therefore follow the earliest textual evidence; here in Alma 62:50, we follow the corrected
reading in 𝒫, "how great things **the Lord** had done for them".

Summary: Follow in Alma 62:50 the corrected reading in 𝒫, "how great things **the Lord** had done for
them"; spacing between extant fragments of 𝒪 supports *the Lord* rather than the pronoun *he.*

Alma 63

■ **Alma 63:3**

and it came to pass that Moroni died also
and [thus/this 1| thus ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *ended*
the thirty and sixth year of the reign of the judges

The original manuscript is not extant here for the word *thus*. The printer's manuscript reads *thus*, but there is a definite *i*-dot over the *u* of *thus*, which means that this word could also be read as *this*. The 1830 printer set *thus*, which is in accord with the rest of Book of Mormon usage: elsewhere there are 41 instances in the original text of "thus ended the Xth year" but none of "this ended the Xth year". There are two instances in the text of *this end*, where *end* is a noun; but there are no instances where *this* is followed by a form of the verb *end*. This implies that *this ended* would be highly unexpected, although one could interpret "this ended the Xth year" as meaning 'this event ended the Xth year'.

The manuscripts show numerous places where *this* and *thus* have been mixed up (see under Alma 11:21 for a list). In two other places, Oliver Cowdery initially wrote *this* in place of *thus* in the phrase "thus ended the Xth year":

> Alma 35:12 (initial error in 𝒫)
>
>> and [*thus* 0ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST| *this > thus* 1] ended
>> the seventeenth year of the reign of the judges over the people of Nephi
>
> Alma 49:29 (initial error in 𝒪)
>
>> and [*this > thus* 0| *thus* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] ended
>> the nineteenth year of the reign of the judges over the people of Nephi

Here in Alma 63:3, it is quite clear that the extra *i*-dot for *thus* is a scribal slip.

Summary: In Alma 63:3 the printer's manuscript could be read as either *thus ended* or *this ended*, but the *i*-dot over the *u* of *thus* is undoubtedly an error; elsewhere in the text *this* is not followed by the verb *end*, while "thus ended the Xth year" is very common.

■ **Alma 63:4**

and it came to pass [NULL >? *that* 0| *that* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
in the thirtieth and seventh year of the reign of the judges . . .

The original manuscript is not extant here, but spacing between existing fragments indicates that initially in 𝒪 the *that* was probably not there, although it could have been supralinearly inserted

by Oliver Cowdery. In the printer's manuscript, Oliver wrote this passage with the *that*. It is possible that he accidentally added the *that* during the copying process. The critical text will follow the earliest extant evidence (the reading of 𝒫), thus maintaining the *that* here in Alma 63:4.

Summary: Maintain in Alma 63:4 the *that* after "and it came to pass", the reading of 𝒫 (here the earliest extant source).

■ **Alma 63:4**

and it came to pass that
in the [*thirtyeth* 0 | *thirty* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *and seventh year*
of the reign of the judges . . .

> 𝒪 reads "**thirtyeth** & seventh year". This nonstandard compound ordinal number may actually be original to the Book of Mormon text (although it could also be a scribal error). As discussed under Alma 52:15, the critical text will restore the earliest reading, "in the thirtieth and seventh year", here in Alma 63:4.

■ **Alma 63:4**

there was a large company of men
even to the amount of five thousand and four hundred
[NULL > *men* 1 | *men* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
with their wives and their children
departed out of the land of Zarahemla

> The original manuscript is not extant for the word *men* after the number "five thousand and four hundred". However, spacing between extant portions of 𝒪 indicates that *men* was probably there. Oliver Cowdery's supralinear insertion of *men* in the printer's manuscript was written without any change in the level of ink flow, which further supports the reading with *men*. Of course, one could argue that the *men* is redundant here since it has just been mentioned in the preceding "there was a large company of **men**". And there are instances in the text where women and children are referred to without any specific prior reference to *men,* as in the following example:

>> Helaman 11:33
>> yea for they did visit many parts of the land
>> and did do great destruction unto them
>> yea did kill many and did carry away others captive into the wilderness
>> yea and more especially their women and their children

> Here in Alma 63:4, the probable reason Oliver initially dropped the second *men* was simply because it is not necessary. The critical text will, of course, maintain the occurrence of *men* after the number.

Summary: Maintain in Alma 63:4 the word *men* that occurs after the number "five thousand and four hundred"; the repetition of *men* in this passage is the corrected reading in 𝒫 as well as the probable reading in 𝒪 (based on spacing considerations).

■ **Alma 63:5**

therefore he went forth
and built [*him* 01ABCDEFGIJLMNOPQRST | HK] *an exceeding large ship*

The original text here reads "built **him** an exceeding large ship". The use here of the reflexive indirect object *him* is characteristic of the biblical style, with ten examples in the King James Bible, all of which refer to building a house, as in Genesis 33:17 ("and Jacob journeyed to Succoth and built him an house") and in Acts 7:47 ("but Solomon built him an house"). There are also a few examples with the reflexive indirect object *them,* such as Nehemiah 12:29: "for the singers had builded them villages round about Jerusalem". There is also one example earlier in the Book of Mormon text with *him:* "and he also built **him** a spacious palace" (Mosiah 11:9).

Here in the 1874 RLDS edition, the *him* was omitted, perhaps intentionally; modern English speakers do not expect the indirect object *him* in references to building something. The 1908 RLDS edition restored the *him,* probably by reference to 𝔓. The critical text will, of course, maintain the original *him* (the reading in both 𝒪 and 𝔓 as well as in all the early editions).

The typesetter for the 1874 RLDS edition omitted a number of minor words in this part of the text. Besides the *him* here in verse 5, the 1874 typesetter skipped *also* in verse 6 and *again* twice in verses 14–15. He also replaced *more* with *other* in verse 7. In each case, the 1908 RLDS edition restored the correct reading to the RLDS text.

Summary: Maintain the original reflexive pronoun *him* in Alma 63:5 ("and built **him** an exceeding large ship").

■ **Alma 63:6**

and behold there were many of the Nephites which did enter therein
and did sail forth with much provisions
and [*also* 01ABCDEFGIJLMNOPQRST | HK] *many women and children*

Here the original *also* was omitted in the 1874 RLDS edition but restored in the 1908 RLDS edition. The *also* shows that these emigrants intended to settle in the land since they also brought their families along.

Summary: Maintain the *also* in Alma 63:6 ("and did sail forth with much provisions and **also** many women and children").

■ **Alma 63:7**

and many [*more* 01ABCDEFGIJLMNOPQRST | *other* HK] *people did enter into it*

The 1874 RLDS edition replaced *more* with *other,* a semantically related substitution but not fully equivalent since the point here is that the number of emigrants continued to increase. The 1908 RLDS edition restored the original *more.*

Summary: Maintain the original use of *more* in Alma 63:7 ("and many **more** people did enter into it").

■ **Alma 63:8**

and it came to pass that
they [*never were*   0 | *were never*   1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *heard of more*

Oliver Cowdery, when copying to the printer's manuscript, switched the order of *never were* to *were never,* which represents the more common word order in modern English. Elsewhere the text has examples of *never* before the finite verb as well as after it, although the first type is more prevalent in the Book of Mormon text. Here are the 13 examples where the subject is the pronoun *they* (including Alma 63:8):

◻ *never* precedes the finite verb

Alma 24:18	that they **never would** use weapons again
Alma 27:28	and they **never could** be prevailed upon to take up arms
Alma 27:28	and they **never did** look upon death with any degree of terror
Alma 44:19	that they **never would** come to war again
Alma 53:11	that they **never would** shed blood more
Alma 53:17	that they **never would** give up their liberty
Alma 53:19	as they **never had** hitherto been a disadvantage to the Nephites
Alma 56:47	now they **never had** fought
Alma 63:8	they **never were** heard of more
Helaman 15:15	that they **never would** again have dwindled in unbelief

◻ *never* follows the finite verb

1 Nephi 15:24	they **would never** perish
2 Nephi 1:7	they **shall never** be brought down into captivity
Alma 24:30	as though they **had never** known these things

In one of these cases (Alma 44:19), the 1874 RLDS edition shifted the *never* to after the finite verb (see the discussion under that passage). Since either word order is possible, the critical text will restore the original order here in Alma 63:8, "they **never were** heard of more".

Summary: In accord with the reading of the original manuscript, restore the order *never were* in Alma 63:8 ("they never were heard of more").

■ **Alma 63:8**

and we suppose that they [*are*   0 | *were*   1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *drowned up*
in the depths of the sea

The original manuscript has the present-tense *are,* which Oliver Cowdery copied as *were* into the printer's manuscript. Nonetheless, the whole sentence is in the present tense; the *are* is consistent with the preceding present-tense *suppose.* The present-tense *are* provides an immediacy to the historical account here.

Summary: Restore the original present-tense *are* in Alma 63:8 ("they **are** drowned up in the depths of the sea"); this use of the present tense is consistent with the preceding present-tense *suppose.*

■ **Alma 63:8**

and we suppose that they are drowned [*up* 01ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQS| RT]
in the depths of the sea

The editors for the 1920 LDS edition apparently thought that the adverbial *up* (which is extant in the original manuscript) was inappropriate here, so it was deleted from the 1920 edition. The change was intentional since it was marked in the committee copy.

This editing is consistent with usage elsewhere in the text referring to drowning; that is, the adverbial *up* does not occur with the expected *in* preposition:

1 Nephi 4:2	and the armies of Pharaoh did follow and were **drownded in** the waters of the Red Sea
1 Nephi 8:32	many were **drowned in** the depths of the fountain
1 Nephi 17:27	the Egyptians were **drowned in** the Red Sea
1 Nephi 18:13	lest they should be **drowned in** the sea
3 Nephi 10:13	and they were not **drowned in** the depths of the sea

Nonetheless, one could argue for the *up* here in Alma 63:8 since one can think of the ocean waves rising up to cover the ship and its passengers.

There is evidence for the expression in American dialectal speech, as in the following example from the late 19th century:

Joanna Mathews (1878)
so Noah he threw that pig out of the ark
to be **drownded up** in the water with the bad people

Literature Online <lion.chadwyck.com> lists a few examples of *drowned up* dating from the 1600s (here I regularize the spelling and ignore all other accidentals):

Samuel Rutherford (1648)
all our sins all our sufferings are so **drowned up**
swallowed and nothinged in Christ

Arthur Wilson (1653)
if Tilly had not been **drowned up** in his trenches

George Abbot (1664)
whereby he marvelously annoyed
and **drowned up** a great part of the country of Egypt

For each of these 17th-century examples, the meaning seems to be a metaphorical 'covered up' (usually with water). On the other hand, the instance of *drowned up* in Alma 63:8 literally refers to death by drowning (as do all the other instances of the verb *drown* in the Book of Mormon). Despite these differences, it does appear that the *up* is intended in Alma 63:8. Moreover, there just isn't that much of a problem having the *up* in this sentence. The critical text will restore the *up.*

Summary: In accord with the reading of the original manuscript, restore the *up* in Alma 63:8: "and we suppose that they are drowned **up** in the depths of the sea"; this use of *up* with *drown* is unique for the text but appears to be fully intended.

■ **Alma 63:8**

and it came to pass that one other ship also did sail forth
and [*whither* 0ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST | *whether* 1] *she did go*
we know not

> Here we have a clear example of where Oliver Cowdery mistakenly wrote *whether* in place of the correct *whither*—namely, in 𝒫, when he copied the text from 𝒪 (which is extant here and reads *whither*). As explained under 1 Nephi 22:4, Oliver tended to mix up the spelling of these two words. Here in Alma 63:8 the text is referring to where the other ship went, not whether she went.

Summary: Maintain in Alma 63:8 the use of *whither* in "and whither she did go we know not".

■ **Alma 63:9**

and it came to pass that in this year there were many people
[NULL >+ *which* 0 | *which* >js *who* 1 | *which* A | *who* BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *went forth*
into the land northward

> Here in the original manuscript, Oliver Cowdery initially skipped the relative pronoun *which*, thus writing "there were many people went forth". Later, with somewhat heavier ink flow, Oliver supralinearly inserted the *which;* his correction could have been made when he read the text back to Joseph Smith. (Later in his editing for the 1837 edition, Joseph emended the *which* to *who,* a grammatical change that is fully discussed under WHICH in volume 3.)
>
> Examples of existential *there-*clauses for which the relative pronoun is lacking can be found elsewhere in the text but virtually always with some postmodifying prepositional phrase for the delayed subject (and possibly other parenthetical elements), as in the following nearby example:

> > Alma 63:4
> > there was a large company of men
> > —even to the amount of five thousand and four hundred men
> > with their wives and their children—
> > → departed out of the land of Zarahemla
> > into the land which was northward

> In other words, "there was a large company of men . . . departed out of the land of Zarahemla". Under Enos 1:23, I list additional examples of this kind of construction in the text. But there are also numerous examples of the existential *there-*clause where the relative pronoun does occur, especially when the delayed subject is short, as nearby in Alma 63:6: "there were many of the Nephites **which** did enter therein", not "there were many of the Nephites did enter therein". For each instance, the critical text will follow the earliest textual evidence, thus *which* here in Alma 63:9.

Summary: Maintain in Alma 63:9 the corrected reading in 𝒪, the relative pronoun *which* in the existential *there-*clause, "there were many people **which** went forth into the land northward".

■ **Alma 63:10**

and Corianton had gone forth to the land northward in a ship to carry forth provisions
unto [*those* 01 | *the* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *people which had gone forth into that land*

> Here in Alma 63:10 the original text uses two demonstratives, *those* and *that:* "unto **those** people which had gone forth into **that** land". These demonstratives connect the text to the previous verse: "and it came to pass that in this year there were many people which went forth into the land northward" (Alma 63:9). Here in verse 10, the 1830 typesetter accidentally replaced the first demonstrative, *those,* with *the,* and all the printed editions have continued with that secondary reading. The critical text will, of course, restore the reading of the two manuscripts. For two examples where Oliver Cowdery made this same mistake in the manuscripts, but only initially, see under Alma 58:31.

Summary: Restore the original demonstrative *those* in Alma 63:10 ("unto **those** people which had gone forth into that land").

■ **Alma 63:11**

therefore it became expedient for Shiblon
to confer those sacred things before his death upon the son of Helaman
[*who* 0ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST | *whose name* >+ *who* 1] *was called Helaman*
being [NULL > *called* 1 | *called* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *after the name of his father*

> Here in the printer's manuscript, Oliver Cowdery had some difficulty with how to refer to Helaman's name. He initially wrote in 𝒫 "the Son of Helaman whose name was called Helaman", but then he crossed out the *se* of *whose* and the word *name,* perhaps when he proofed 𝒫 against 𝒪 since the ink level for the crossouts is somewhat heavier. 𝒪 is extant here for the crucial part of the relative clause, and it reads "Son of Helaman who was". There is another example in the text of "who/which was called X" (where X is a person's name): "and now Cohor had a son **which was called** Nimrod" (Ether 7:22). More commonly the text uses the phraseology "whose name was X" (25 times), as in Alma 62:43: "and Moroni yielded up the command of his armies into the hands of his son **whose name was** Moronihah". But there are no examples of "whose name was called X". Even so, there is one example of "the name of Y was called X", in Ether 14:17: "now **the name of** the brother of Lib **was called** Shiz". So "whose name was called Helaman" is not impossible. But 𝒪 is extant and there is no question that the original text for Alma 63:11 read "who was called Helaman".
>
> A second variant in 𝒫 resulted when Oliver Cowdery initially omitted the second instance of the past-participial *called.* Oliver first wrote "being after the name of his father", then virtually immediately he inserted the missing *called* supralinearly (there is no change in the level of ink flow for this correction). 𝒪 is not extant here, but there is clearly room for the *called* in the lacuna. This expression is directly supported by the phraseology in Mosiah 24:3: "and now the name of the king of the Lamanites was Laman / **being called after** the name of his father". The critical text will follow the corrected reading in 𝒫 for Alma 63:11, "being called after the name of his father".

Summary: Maintain in Alma 63:11 the corrected reading in 𝒫, which agrees with the partially extant reading in 𝒪: "the son of Helaman **who was called** Helaman / **being called** after the name of his father".

■ **Alma 63:12**

save **it** *were those parts*
which [0ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST | *it* > NULL 1] *had been commanded by Alma*
should not go forth

𝌆 is extant here and reads "save it were those parts which had". When Oliver Cowdery copied from 𝌆 into 𝌅, he momentarily inserted an expletive *it* in the relative clause: "which **it** had been commanded by Alma should not go forth". Virtually immediately Oliver caught his error and crossed out the extra *it* (there is no change in the level of ink flow for the crossout). His error was probably prompted by the preceding *it* in "save **it** were those parts".

There are instances of original expletive *it* that have been removed from the text. For some examples, see the discussion under Alma 43:46. The critical text will retain all original instances of expletive *it,* but not the one that momentarily entered the text here in Alma 63:12.

Summary: Maintain the original reading in Alma 63:12 without any expletive *it* in the phrase "those parts which had been commanded by Alma should not go forth".

■ **Alma 63:14**

there were some [*dissensions* >– *dissenters* 1 | *dissenters* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
which had gone forth unto the Lamanites

The original manuscript is not extant here for the first part of this sentence. In the printer's manuscript, Oliver Cowdery initially wrote *dissensions,* but he later corrected this word to *dissenters* by crossing out the final *sions* and supralinearly inserting *ters.* The quill for this correction was sharper, which argues that this change was made later, probably when Oliver proofed 𝌅 against 𝌆. The lacuna in 𝌆 is large enough that we cannot tell for sure whether it read *dissenters* or *dissensions,* but usage elsewhere in the text argues strongly that it would have read *dissenters* since dissensions never "go forth" in the Book of Mormon but dissenters do:

Helaman 4:4	there were dissenters which went up from the Nephites unto the Lamanites
Helaman 5:17	they did confound many of those dissenters which had gone over from the Nephites
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
Helaman 11:25	inasmuch as there were dissenters that went forth unto them

In fact, the last example uses that same verb phrase, "to go forth".

Summary: Maintain in Alma 63:14 the corrected reading in 𝌅: "there were some **dissenters** which had gone forth unto the Lamanites".

■ **Alma 63:14–15**

> *and it came to pass also in this year that*
> *there were some dissenters which had gone forth unto the Lamanites*
> *and they were stirred up* [*again* 1ABCDEFGIJLMNOPQRST | HK] *to anger against the Nephites*
> *and also in this same year they came down with a numerous army*
> *to war against the people of Moronihah or against the army of Moronihah*
> *in the which they were beaten and driven back* [*again* 01ABCDEFGIJLMNOPQRST | HK]
> > *to their own lands*

> In these two verses, the 1874 RLDS edition omitted the word *again* both times. Each instance of
> the word was restored in the 1908 RLDS edition. The *again* is fully appropriate since the earlier
> war between the Lamanites and the Nephites was initiated by Amalickiah, a Nephite dissenter who
> had stirred up the Lamanites (as described in Alma 48:1–3). In the end of that war, the Nephites
> prevailed and the Lamanites were forced to return to their own lands (as described in Alma 62:38).

Summary: Maintain the two instances of *again* in Alma 63:14–15 since the author wants the reader
to connect the failed attacks described in this passage with the earlier ones instigated by Amalickiah,
a Nephite dissenter.

[THIS PAGE LEFT INTENTIONALLY BLANK]

Helaman

Helaman Preface

■ **Helaman preface**

An account of the Nephites
their wars and contentions and their [*dissensions* 1BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST | *dissension* A]
and also the prophecies of many holy prophets before the coming of Christ

Here the printer's manuscript has the plural form *dissensions* (𝓞 is not extant for the word). The plural form agrees with the preceding plural *wars* and *contentions* as well as with the following plural *prophecies*. The 1830 compositor set *dissensions* in the singular, but the 1837 edition restored the original plural. Elsewhere in the text, we always get the plural *dissensions* when conjoined nouns are in the plural (11 times), as in the following examples where *dissensions* is conjoined with both *wars* and *contentions*:

Jarom 1:13
    and it came to pass that two hundred and thirty and eight years had passed away
    after the manner of **wars** and **contentions** and **dissensions**
    for the space of much of the time

Helaman 3:14
    but behold a hundredth part of the proceedings of this people
    yea the account of the Lamanites and of the Nephites
    and their **wars** and **contentions** and **dissensions** . . .

Helaman 3:17
    and now I return again to mine account
    therefore what I have spoken had passed
    after there had been great **contentions** and disturbances
    and **wars** and **dissensions** among the people of Nephi

The critical text will follow the original plural reading, *dissensions,* in the preface to the book of Helaman.

Another question here in the Helaman preface is whether there might be a missing *their* in the conjunctive phrase "their wars and contentions and their dissensions". 𝓞 is sufficiently extant to determine that there was no *their* before *contentions*. Nonetheless, there is evidence that repeated *their*'s were sometimes omitted from the text, as in the following example involving this same phraseology:

Jacob 3:13 (Oliver Cowdery's initial omission of *their* in 𝓟)
    but many of their proceedings are written upon the larger plates
    and their wars and [NULL > *their* 1 | *their* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] contentions
    and the reigns of their kings

On the other hand, determiners for conjuncts of semantically close nouns are sometimes not repeated, even when the following conjoined noun does repeat the determiner, as in the following example:

> Mosiah 22:12
>> and they had taken all **their** gold and silver
>> and **their** precious things which they could carry
>> and also their provisions with them into the wilderness

The two nouns *wars* and *contentions* are closely associated, which means that the determiner is frequently not repeated for the phrase "wars and contentions" (as here in the Helaman preface):

1 Nephi 9:4	an account of . . . **the** wars and contentions of my people
Alma preface	an account of . . . **the** wars and contentions among the people
Alma 3:25	all **these** wars and contentions was commenced and ended in the fifth year of the reign of the judges
Alma 28:9	and this is the account of **the** wars and contentions among the Nephites
Alma 51:22	while Moroni was thus breaking down **the** wars and contentions among his own people
Helaman 3:22	**the** wars and contentions began to cease in a small degree

Note, in particular, that three of these examples specifically refer to an "account of **the** wars and contentions" without any repetition of the determiner (just like here in the Helaman preface). Thus there is no need to repeat the *their* in the Helaman preface, despite its being followed by "and their dissensions".

Summary: Accept in the Helaman preface the plural *dissensions* as well as the nonrepetition of *their* in the phrase "their wars and contentions"; both readings are supported by the earliest textual sources as well as by usage elsewhere in the text.

■ **Helaman preface**

according to the [Reckord 0 | Record 1 | record ABCDEGHKPS | records FIJLMNOQRT] of Helaman which was the son of Helaman

As explained under 1 Nephi 5:21, the Book of Mormon text can use either the singular *record* or the plural *records*. Here in the Helaman preface, the first reference is to "the record of Helaman", which the 1852 LDS edition changed to the plural "the records of Helaman". The critical text will restore the singular *record,* the reading of both the manuscripts as well as the earliest editions.

Later in this preface, we have a reference to "the records" of Helaman's sons—that is, the text reads in the plural:

> Helaman preface
>> and also according to the **records** of his sons

𝒪 is not extant for this instance of *record(s),* but 𝒫 reads *records*. Yet the final reference to these records here in the Helaman preface refers to "the **record** of Helaman and his sons". 𝒪 is extant for

this instance of *record(s),* and it reads in the singular; when Oliver Cowdery copied the text from 𝒪 into 𝒫, he initially wrote this singular as *records,* but then he immediately erased the plural *s:*

> Helaman preface
>
> according to the [*Reckord* 0 | *Records* >% *Record* 1 |
> *record* ᴀʙᴄᴅᴇғɢʜɪᴊᴋʟᴍɴᴏᴘǫʀsᴛ] of Helaman and his sons

The critical text will, in each case of *record(s),* follow the earliest extant reading. Thus here in the Helaman preface we have two instances of *record* and one of *records.* The singular *record* is generally used to refer to one's account in general while the plural *records* is generally used to refer to the actual physical documents.

Elsewhere in the text, we normally get "the record of X" (where X is a personal name):

Mosiah 9 preface	The record of Zeniff
Alma preface	according to the record of Alma
Alma 9 preface	according to the record of Alma
Alma 17 preface	according to the record of Alma
Alma 44:24	and thus ended the record of Alma
Alma 45 preface	according to the record of Helaman
3 Nephi 5:10	according to the record of Nephi
4 Nephi 1:49	and thus is the end of the record of Ammaron

We should note that the singular *record* occurs even if the personal name is conjoined with another noun that refers to another person or persons:

Helaman preface	according to the record of Helaman and his sons
Helaman 16:25	according to the record of Helaman and his sons
Ether 6:1	and now I Moroni proceed to give the record of Jared and his brother

We get "the records of X" (where X is a personal name) in only one place:

> Mosiah 25:5
>
> Mosiah did read and caused to be read **the records of Zeniff** to his people
> yea he read the records of the people of Zeniff
> from the time they left the land of Zarahemla until the time they returned again

In this instance, we also get the plural *records* in the following *yea*-clause: "yea he read the **records** of the people of Zeniff". In other words, the plural *records* in "the records of Zeniff" is supported by subsequent usage within the same verse. Generally speaking, the plural is possible (as in "the records of his sons" here in the Helaman preface). For each case of *record(s),* we follow the earliest textual sources.

Summary: Restore the singular *record* for the first occurrence of *record(s)* in the Helaman preface: "according to the **record** of Helaman"; elsewhere in the Helaman preface, the critical text will maintain the earliest readings, one instance of *records* and a second instance of *record:* "according to the **records** of his sons . . . according to the **record** of Helaman and his sons".

■ **Helaman preface**

an account of the righteousness of the Lamanites
and the wickedness and abominations of the Nephites
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]

The 1981 LDS edition omitted the *etc.* at the end of the Helaman preface, presumably because it seems unnecessary. But as explained under Alma 53:23, the *etc.* here may be an indicator of abridgment—that is, the book of Helaman is Mormon's abridgment of the record of Helaman and his sons, and the original record, as we would expect, covers other material in addition to what Mormon decided to include. Another possible interpretation of the *etc.* at the end of the Helaman preface is that there are other matters covered in the book of Helaman than what is listed in this preface. For instance, in this preface there is no mention of Samuel the Lamanite and his mission to the Nephites (described in chapters 13–16, covering almost the last fourth of the book). But no matter what the interpretation of the *etc.* here at the end of the Helaman preface, the critical text will restore this instance of *etc.* since it is in the earliest textual sources and it is clearly intended. For a complete analysis of the various uses of *etc.* in the text, see the discussion in volume 3 under ETC.

Summary: Restore the original *etc.* at the end of the Helaman preface; its purpose here may be to indicate an abridgment of the original record or that more follows in the book of Helaman than what is covered in the preface.

Helaman 1

■ **Helaman 1:2**

therefore there began to be [*a* 01ABCDEFGIJLMNOPQRST | HK] *serious contention*
concerning who should have the judgment seat

> The 1874 RLDS edition accidentally dropped the indefinite article *a* before *serious contention*. The 1908 RLDS edition restored the *a*. The critical text will maintain the original reading with the *a* here in Helaman 1:2. See under Alma 25:8 for some discussion on whether *contention* should take a determiner or not.

> *Summary:* Maintain in Helaman 1:2 the original reading with the indefinite article *a* in "a serious contention", the reading in ☉.

■ **Helaman 1:3**

now these are [*their* 01ABDEFIJLMNOPQRST | *the* CGHK] *names*
which did contend for the judgment seat

> The usage *their names* is rather strange here since this noun phrase is postmodified by a relative clause, "which did contend for the judgment seat". The 1840 edition replaced the *their* with a *the*, which is what we expect in modern English. The 1908 RLDS edition restored the original *their* to the RLDS text.
> Usage elsewhere in the text supports the *the* when the plural noun *names* is postmodified; there are 15 cases, of which six are of the form "the names <*of*-phrase> <restrictive relative clause>":

Mosiah 6:1	that he should take **the** names of all those who had entered into a covenant with God
Alma 31:7	but **the** names of those which he took with him were . . .
Alma 31:7	and these are **the** names of those which went with him
Helaman 5:6	behold I have given unto you **the** names of our first parents which came out of the land of Jerusalem
3 Nephi 19:4	now these were **the** names of the disciples whom Jesus had chosen
3 Nephi 28:25	behold I were about to write **the** names of those who were never to taste of death

On the other hand, the earliest text has 11 instances of *their names*, of which only this one here in Helaman 1:3 has any postmodification, namely, a relative clause without an *of*-phrase: "their

names which did contend for the judgment seat". One could argue that an original *the names* was here changed to *their names* in the early transmission of the text because one expects something like "their names were X, Y, . . .", as in these examples:

> Mosiah 7:6   and their names were Amaleki Helem and Hem
>
> Mosiah 27:34   and their names were Ammon and Aaron and Omner and Himni

On the other hand, one could argue that if *the names* was correct, then we should expect "the names **of those** which did contend for the judgment seat". These opposing expressions suggest that what we have here in Helaman 1:3 is a unique but intended reading in the text. The critical text will therefore maintain the reading of the earliest text, "**their** names which did contend for the judgment seat" (the reading in 𝒪).

Summary: Maintain the earliest reading in Helaman 1:3, "these are **their** names which did contend for the judgment seat", the reading of the original manuscript.

■ **Helaman 1:3**

now these are their names
which did contend for the judgment seat
which did also cause the people to contend :
Parhoron
[*Paachi > Paanchi* 0 | *Paanchi* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
and Pacumeni

In the original manuscript, Oliver Cowdery initially wrote the second name as *Paachi*. Virtually immediately he corrected the spelling to *Paanchi* by supralinearly inserting an *n* (there is no difference in the level of ink flow for the *n*). It seems reasonable to assume that Joseph Smith had to spell out this name even before Oliver's initial attempt to spell this difficult name (one wonders how to even pronounce it). The spelling *Paanchi* is supported by a second occurrence of the name (in Helaman 1:7), although there 𝒪 is not extant.

It should be noted that at this point in 𝒪, Oliver Cowdery spelled the name *Parhoron* as *Pahoron*. Although 𝒪 is not fully extant for this particular occurrence of *Parhoron*, it begins with *Pah;* nearby extant occurrences of the name in 𝒪 are all spelled *Pahoron.* For a complete discussion of the original spelling, *Parhoron,* see under Alma 50:40.

The name *Pacumeni* is extant in 𝒪 for four of its five occurrences (all here in Helaman 1), and it is consistently spelled this way without variation in 𝒪 or 𝒫. Most likely, this name was also spelled out for Oliver Cowdery the first time it occurred (here in Helaman 1:3).

Summary: Maintain the spelling *Paanchi,* the corrected spelling in 𝒪 for Helaman 1:3 (the first occurrence of the name in the text); the name is consistently spelled *Paanchi* in 𝒫 (here in verse 3 as well as in verse 7).

■ **Helaman 1:5**

Parhoron was appointed by the voice of the people
to be [*a* 01A| BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *chief judge and a governor over the people of Nephi*

The 1837 edition omitted the indefinite article *a* before *chief judge*. This omission was undoubtedly accidental. It was not marked by Joseph Smith in his editing of 𝓟 for the 1837 edition. Nearby the virtually identical expression has been left unchanged:

> Helaman 1:13
>> and now behold Pacumeni was appointed
>> according to the voice of the people
>> to be **a** chief judge and a governor over the people

The Book of Mormon text always repeats the article, if one exists, before both *chief judge* and *governor* in conjoined structures:

Alma 2:16	Alma he being **the** chief judge and **the** governor of the people of Nephi
Alma 50:39	he was appointed chief judge and governor over the people
Alma 60:1	which is **the** chief judge and **the** governor over the land
Helaman 1:5	to be **a** chief judge and **a** governor over the people of Nephi
Helaman 1:13	to be **a** chief judge and **a** governor over the people
3 Nephi 1:1	Lachoneus was **the** chief judge and **the** governor over the land

Thus the indefinite article *a* needs to be restored before *chief judge* in Helaman 1:5, making this passage specifically agree with Helaman 1:13 and, more generally, with usage elsewhere in the text.

Summary: Restore the indefinite article *a* before *chief judge* in Helaman 1:5; the *a* was accidentally deleted in the 1837 edition.

■ **Helaman 1:7**

but behold Paanchi and that part of the people
that were desirous that he should be their governor
was *exceeding wroth*

Here is an example of *was* in the earliest text that has never been grammatically emended to *were*. Basically the original text reads "Paanchi and that part of the people . . . **was** exceeding wroth". Although 𝓞 is not extant here, it probably read *was* (the reading in 𝓟). Of course, such nonstandard usage regularly occurred in the original text of the Book of Mormon, as explained under 1 Nephi 4:4.

Summary: Maintain the original nonstandard use of *was* in Helaman 1:7: "Paanchi and that part of the people . . . **was** exceeding wroth".

■ **Helaman 1:8**

for he had **raised** *up in rebellion*

> As explained under 2 Nephi 3:24, the original text had examples of intransitive *raise* (where standard English expects *rise*). Such usage was common in earlier English. The original text had four original instances of "raise up in rebellion" and four of "rise up in rebellion". This instance of *raise* in Helaman 1:8 has never been emended to *rise* (that is, the sentence has never been emended to "for he had **risen** up in rebellion"). The three other instances of "raise up in rebellion" (in Alma 57:32, Ether 10:8, and Ether 10:14) have been emended to "rise up in rebellion". For a list of all eight cases of "to raise/rise up in rebellion", see under Alma 57:32. It is worth noting that here in Helaman 1, in the preceding verse, we have one of those instances of *rise:* "to rise up in rebellion against their brethren" (Helaman 1:7).

> *Summary:* Maintain the intransitive use of *raise* in Helaman 1:8: "for he had **raised** up in rebellion".

■ **Helaman 1:9**

and behold they sent forth
one [*Kishcumen*/*Kishcamen*   0 | *Kishkumen*   1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
even to the judgment seat of Parhoron

> This is the first occurrence of the name *Kishcumen* in the Book of Mormon text. Throughout the original manuscript, this name is consistently written with a *c* for the second part of the name (that is, *-cumen*), but for some inexplicable reason Oliver Cowdery changed the spelling to *Kishkumen* when he copied the text into the printer's manuscript (all 19 times). There is no manuscript evidence in 𝔒 for such a change since every sufficiently extant occurrence of the spelling in 𝔒 (11 of them) has the *c*. Perhaps Oliver thought the *c* following the *sh* looked strange, or perhaps he was influenced by the initial *k* in *Kish-*. In any event, this change appears to be a conscious one.

> The form *-cumen* could be a separate morphological form—that is, the name could be made up of two separate morphemes (*Kish* and *Cumen*). The name *Kish* is used for a Jaredite king (Ether 1:18–19 and Ether 10:17–18); and there are two other Jaredite names that may end in a *-kish* morpheme, *Riplakish* (Ether 1,10) and *Akish* (Ether 8–9,14). *Cumeni* is used to refer to the name of a city seven times (in Alma 56–57); it is also found in the name of a Nephite general, *Cumenihah* (Mormon 6:14). Furthermore, the name *Pacumeni* (Helaman 1) may end in a *-cumeni* morpheme. On the other hand, *Kumen* itself is a separate name (in 3 Nephi 19:4), where it also occurs with the morphologically related name *Kumenonhi*. So the morphological evidence could be used to support either *Kish+Cumen* or *Kish+Kumen,* although there is strictly speaking no form *Cumen*, only *Cumeni*. It is very doubtful that Oliver Cowdery considered such morphological evidence when he changed the *c* in *Kishcumen* to a *k*.

> As far as the first vowel of *-cumen* is concerned, in the original manuscript 12 occurrences of the name are extant for that vowel, and ten of those clearly show a *u*. But in two instances the letter could be interpreted as either a *u* or an *a* (that is, the *u* is somewhat closed). Those two unclear cases include the very first occurrence (here in Helaman 1:9) as well as the 11th occurrence in the text (in Helaman 2:7). Nonetheless, in the printer's manuscript, Oliver Cowdery consistently wrote this vowel as a *u,* so there is no strong evidence for emending the first vowel in *-cumen* from *u*

to *a*. For another example of a name where *u* was misread as an *a,* see the discussion under Mormon 6:2 regarding the name *Cumorah*.

The change of *Kishcumen* to *Kishkumen* clearly demonstrates that Oliver Cowdery was occasionally willing to make an unsupportable change in the spelling of a name. Another example is the name *Morionton;* the first occurrence of that name is extant in 𝇋, yet Oliver changed the spelling to *Morianton* when he copied the text from 𝇋 into 𝇍 (see the discussion under Alma 50:25).

Summary: Restore throughout the text the original spelling *Kishcumen* (essentially the invariant spelling of the name in 𝇋); Oliver Cowdery systematically changed this name to *Kishkumen* when he copied the text from 𝇋 into 𝇍.

■ **Helaman 1:9**

and behold they sent forth one Kishcumen
even to the judgment seat of Parhoron
and murdered *Parhoron as he sat upon the judgment seat*

One wonders here if there might not be a missing subject pronoun *he,* so that the original text read "and **he** murdered Parhoron as he sat upon the judgment seat". There is evidence that the scribes sometimes omitted, if only momentarily, the subject pronoun *he* (for a list of examples, see under Jacob 5:1–2). 𝇋 is not extant here in Helaman 1:9 for this predicate, but spacing in the lacuna argues that the *he* was not in 𝇋.

We note especially that the subsequent text consistently refers to Kishcumen as the murderer of Parhoron:

Helaman 1:11	swearing by their everlasting Maker that they would tell no man that Kishcumen had murdered Parhoron
Helaman 1:12	for he was in disguise at the time that he murdered Parhoron
Helaman 2:3	Kishcumen who had murdered Parhoron . . .

In addition, one could compare this case to the one discussed under Alma 62:25, where it is proposed that an original subject *they* was omitted during the early transmission of the text:

Alma 62:25 (proposed original text)
  and now when Moroni saw that they were fleeing before him
  he did cause that his men should march forth against them
  and **they** slew many and surrounded many others and took them prisoners

But there is an important difference here in Helaman 1:9. Those that sent Kishcumen to murder Parhoron are, of course, also murderers, so one can say that "**they** murdered Parhoron as he sat upon the judgment seat". We can compare the situation here with the earlier case of the servant of Amalickiah who murdered the Lamanite king (described in detail in Alma 47:20–26). Later, in Alma 55:5 the text rightly refers to Amalickiah as the murderer of the king: "they found one whose name was Laman and he was one of the servants of the king which was murdered by Amalickiah". For this reason, the critical text will maintain the current text in Helaman 1:9 without any explicit subject pronoun for the verb *murdered* in "and murdered Parhoron as he sat upon the judgment seat". The correct subject is, by ellipsis, *they* rather than *he*.

Summary: Maintain in Helaman 1:9 the earliest extant text without an expressed subject for the con-joined predicate; the understood subject is *they* (not *he*) for "and murdered Parhoron as he sat upon the judgment seat".

■ **Helaman 1:12**

and Kishcumen and his band which had covenanted with him
did mingle themselves [1ABCEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST | *together* D] *among the people*

> The 1841 British edition added the word *together* here, thus creating a unique phrase in the Book of Mormon, "to mingle together". This added word makes no sense at all since these robbers would have hid themselves among the people by separating from one another rather than by staying together. The subsequent LDS edition (1849) removed the intrusive *together*. ℧ is not extant here, but there is no room for the *together* in the lacuna except by supralinear insertion.

Summary: Maintain in Helaman 1:12 the original text without the word *together* in the predicate "did mingle themselves among the people".

■ **Helaman 1:15**

and they were led by a man whose name was
[*Coriantummer* > NULL 0 | 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *Coriantumr*

> Here in the original manuscript, Oliver Cowdery initially wrote the name *Coriantumr* phonetically as *Coriantummer*. Then he immediately corrected the spelling of the name by rewriting the whole name inline as *Coriantumr*. There is clear evidence that Oliver was a little exasperated by the correct spelling since he wrote the final *r* of *Coriantumr* with a large flourish. He never wrote any of his other *r*'s this way in either of the two manuscripts. And this reaction on his part is not surprising since no name or word in English ends in *mr*.
>
> In order to get this spelling down correctly, Joseph Smith must have read off the spelling of the name letter by letter. (A careful syllable-by-syllable pronunciation of the name could not have distinguished between the alternative ways of spelling the last syllable of the name, as *mer, er,* or *r.*) This example provides strong support for what witnesses of the translation claimed, that Joseph would spell out the strange Book of Mormon names when they first appeared in the text since the scribes would not have known how to spell most of them. For a complete discussion of this evidence for the spelling out of Book of Mormon names (but not recognizable biblical names), see the section under volume 3 that deals with the spelling of names.
>
> The name *Coriantumr* appears 76 times in the text, 64 times in reference to the last king of the Jaredites (who is mentioned 62 times in the book of Ether and twice in the small plates of Nephi, namely, in Omni 1:21). There is another Coriantumr in the book of Ether, mentioned only once (in Ether 8:4). Here in Helaman 1, the name occurs 11 times in reference to the Coriantumr who led the Lamanites in attacking the city of Zarahemla; this Coriantumr was a Nephite dissenter and a descendant of Zarahemla (as explained here in Helaman 1:15). Under the assumption that the small plates of Nephi were translated last, this instance of *Coriantumr* in Helaman 1:15 is the

first occurrence of the name in the text. The end of the name is spelled as *mr* in the manuscripts (13 more times in extant portions of 𝓞 and every time in 𝓟).

This spelling suggests the possibility that one other name in the text could be in error—namely, the name *Moriancumer* may be a mistake for *Moriancumr:*

Ether 2:13
and they called the name of the place
[*Morian cumer* 1 | *Moriancumer* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]

𝓞 is not extant here. According to 𝓟, the earliest extant source, the name *Moriancumer* ends in *er,* not *r.* The critical text will assume that *Moriancumer* is correct, even though this could be an error for *Moriancumr.* For discussion of whether this name should be spelled as two names (as suggested by the spelling *Morian cumer* in 𝓟) or as one word (the spelling of all the printed editions), see under Ether 2:13.

Summary: Maintain throughout the text the spelling *Coriantumr,* the immediately corrected spelling in 𝓞 for Helaman 1:15; this occurrence of the name was apparently the first time Oliver Cowdery encountered this name as scribe for Joseph Smith's dictation; all other occurrences of this name in both manuscripts and in the 1830 edition are consistently spelled this way.

■ **Helaman 1:15**

and he was a large and [*a* 01ABCDEFHIJLMNOPQRST | GHK] *mighty man*

Here the 1858 Wright edition accidentally dropped the repeated indefinite article *a* in this sentence. The 1908 RLDS edition restored the *a* to the RLDS text. There are several other places in the text where a repeated *a* has been omitted from conjunctive phrases involving the adjective *large;* for a list, see under Mosiah 27:7. The critical text will maintain the repeated *a* here in Helaman 1:15. Also see the general discussion under CONJUNCTIVE REPETITION in volume 3.

Summary: Accept the repeated *a* in Helaman 1:15 ("he was a large and **a** mighty man"), the reading of both manuscripts and the early editions.

■ **Helaman 1:16**

now Tubaloth supposing that Coriantumr
he being a mighty man
could stand against the Nephites
[*insomuch* 01ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQS | RT]
with his strength and also with his great wisdom
[01ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQS | *insomuch* RT]
that by sending him forth he should gain power over the Nephites . . .

The editors for the 1920 LDS edition shifted the word order here in Helaman 1:6 by placing the connective *insomuch* after the two conjoined prepositional phrases, "with his strength and also with his great wisdom". English readers expect *insomuch* to be immediately followed by its *that-*

clause, thus the motivation for moving *insomuch* in this instance: "**insomuch that** by sending him forth he should gain power over the Nephites". Nonetheless, the Book of Mormon text often has examples of prepositional phrases that are displaced from their expected positions, as here in Helaman 1:16. For some other examples of displaced prepositional phrases, see under Mosiah 26:23.

In the original text, there are 176 occurrences of *insomuch that*. There is only one other case where *insomuch* is separated from its *that*-clause:

> 3 Nephi 19:3
> yea and even all the night it was noised abroad concerning Jesus
> and **insomuch** did they send forth unto the people **that** there were many
> —yea an exceeding great number—did labor exceedingly all that night
> that they might be on the morrow in the place
> where Jesus should shew himself unto the multitude

This example clearly shows that *insomuch* can occur considerably earlier than its associated *that*-clause. The text is firm for 3 Nephi 19:3: both the printer's manuscript and the 1830 edition read "insomuch did they send forth unto the people that there were many . . ." (for this part of the text, both 𝒫 and the 1830 edition are firsthand copies of 𝒪). The inverted verb phrase in that sentence, "did they send forth", also shows there must be some preceding adverbial or connective element (namely, *insomuch*). The meaning of *insomuch* in 3 Nephi 19:3 seems to be something like 'so much' or 'so extensively'.

Summary: Restore the difficult but original word order in Helaman 1:16, where *insomuch* is separated from its *that*-clause by the displaced prepositional expression "with his strength and also with his great wisdom"; such usage can be found elsewhere in the Book of Mormon text.

■ **Helaman 1:16–17**

therefore the king of the Lamanites
whose name was Tubaloth
who was the son of Ammoron—

□ 01*A	□ 1ᶜBCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST
now Tubaloth	
supposing that Coriantumr	*supposing that Coriantumr*
he *being a mighty man*	*being a mighty man*

could stand against the Nephites
insomuch with his strength and also with his great wisdom
that by sending him forth he should gain power over the Nephites—
[*he > therefore* 0 | *therefore* 1ABCDEFGHK | *Therefore* IJLMNOPQRST]
he did stir them up to anger

In his editing of this passage for the 1837 edition, Joseph Smith emended the complex and incomplete parenthetical statement "now Tubaloth supposing that Coriantumr he being a mighty man could stand against the Nephites". Joseph made two deletions here: he removed the clausal initiator, *now Tubaloth* (which repeats the preceding reference to Tubaloth, namely, "the king of the

Lamanites whose name was Tubaloth"), and he removed the pronoun *he* after *Coriantumr,* thus ending up with the following simplified present participial clause: "supposing that Coriantumr— being a mighty man—could stand against the Nephites". Cases of incompleteness resulting from parenthetical statements can be found elsewhere in the original text; for instance, the book of Enos (the first two verses) begins this way (see the discussion under Enos 1:3).

There are still examples in the text of the participial structure "X he being" (where X is a personal name), although other examples in the original text have been removed (again by Joseph Smith in his editing for the 1837 edition); see the discussion and examples under Alma 2:16.

Initially in 𝒪, Oliver Cowdery omitted the *therefore* that begins the completive statement in verse 17. 𝒪 is sufficiently extant that we can determine that Oliver originally wrote *he,* crossed it out, and supralinearly inserted *therefore.* Because he wrote the *he* once more inline, we can assume that this change was immediate (also note that there is no difference in the level of ink flow for the correction). The *therefore* is important here since it helps the reader overcome the incompleteness of verse 16.

Summary: In Helaman 1:16, the critical text will restore the incomplete parenthetical statement "**now Tubaloth** supposing that Coriantumr—**he** being a mighty man—could stand against the Nephites" (that is, the phrase *now Tubaloth* and the subject pronoun *he* will be restored to the text); the *therefore* that begins verse 17 will be maintained (the corrected reading in 𝒪).

■ **Helaman 1:18**

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

Here 𝒪 is sufficiently extant to determine that there is an *and* in the text: "the Lamanites dearst not come into the heart of their lands **&** attact that great City Zarahemla" (original accidentals based on 𝒪, where extant). When Oliver Cowdery copied from 𝒪 into 𝒫, he originally wrote *to* in place of the original *and:* "the Lamanites dearst not come into the heart of their lands **to** attackt that great City Zarahemla" (original accidentals). Virtually immediately Oliver caught his error in 𝒫, crossed out the *to,* then overwrote it with an ampersand (there is no change in the level of ink flow for the correction). But the 1830 compositor ended up setting the secondary *to,* which has been retained in all the printed editions. Here in Helaman 1:18, the critical text will, of course, restore the *and,* the reading of the manuscripts.

There are a number of places in the text where the infinitival *to* and the conjunction *and* have been mixed up. In each case, the critical text will follow the earliest extant reading. For discussion, plus a list of examples, see under Mosiah 21:18.

Summary: Restore in Helaman 1:18 the original *and* in "the Lamanites durst not come into the heart of their lands **and** attackt that great city Zarahemla"; the conjunction *and* is the reading in 𝒪 and the corrected reading in 𝒫.

■ **Helaman 1:22**

he was in possession of the city
[*of* 0ABCEGHIJKNOPRST | NULL > *of* 1 | DLMQ | *of of* F] *Zarahemla*

As discussed under Alma 61:8, the original text consistently read "the city **of** Zarahemla", without any examples of "the city Zarahemla" (although there are four instances of "that great city Zarahemla"). Here in Helaman 1:22, there has been a persistent tendency to omit the *of:* initially in 𝓟, in the 1841 British edition, in the 1902 LDS edition, and in the 1905 LDS edition. (In the last case, the *of* seems to have been omitted independently of the 1902 edition.) 𝓞 is extant here and has the *of*. In 𝓟, Oliver Cowdery supralinearly inserted the *of* almost immediately (there is no change in the level of ink flow). Here in Helaman 1:22, the critical text will follow the reading of the earliest textual sources, "the city **of** Zarahemla". (We can ignore, of course, the dittography in the 1852 LDS edition where the *of* was accidentally repeated.)

Summary: Maintain in Helaman 1:22 the *of* in "the city of Zarahemla", the reading in 𝓞 and the corrected reading in 𝓟.

■ **Helaman 1:22**

the Nephites had fled before them
and were slain
and were taken
and were cast into prison

In this passage, the 1830 compositor, John Gilbert, set commas between each conjoined predicate (that is, before each of the three *and*'s). All the subsequent printed editions have retained this punctuation. However, the last comma (the third one) is an error since it implies that there were four possibilities for the Nephites (fleeing, being slain, being taken, and being cast into prison) when in fact there are only three: fleeing, being slain, and being taken and cast into prison. Elsewhere the text treats being taken and being cast into prison as a single act:

Alma 9:33	the Lord did not suffer them that they should take me at that time and cast me into prison
Alma 20:30	and there they were taken and cast into prison
Alma 21:13	Aaron and a certain number of his brethren were taken and cast into prison
Alma 51:19	and those of their leaders which were not slain in battle were taken and cast into prison
Alma 62:9	and also those kingmen which had been taken and cast into prison
Helaman 5:21	they were taken by an army of the Lamanites and cast into prison
Helaman 9:9	and that the murderers had been taken and was cast into prison
Helaman 10:16	and they could not take him to cast him into prison

The last example directly shows the connection between being taken and being cast into prison. Sometimes the text also refers to binding those who have been taken (prior to casting them into prison):

Mosiah 17:5	the king caused that his guards should surround Abinadi and take him and they bound him and cast him into prison
Mosiah 21:23	he caused that they should be taken and bound and cast into prison
Alma 26:29	and we have been stoned and taken and bound with strong cords and cast into prison

The critical text will therefore treat the last two conjoined predicates in Helaman 1:22 as acting together as a single predicate in contrast to the two preceding conjoined predicates.

Summary: Remove in Helaman 1:22 the comma between the last two conjoined predicates since they represent a single act ("and were taken and were cast into prison").

■ **Helaman 1:22**

and that he had obtained the possession
of the strongest [*holds > hold* 0 | *hold* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *in all the land*

Here in the original manuscript, Oliver Cowdery initially wrote "the possession of the strongest **holds**". Virtually immediately he crossed out the plural *s,* giving "the possession of the strongest **hold**" (there is no difference in the level of ink flow for the crossout). As explained under Alma 58:23, the Book of Mormon text typically refers to a fortified city as a single strong hold. Thus the corrected reading in 𝒪 ("of the strongest hold") is undoubtedly the original reading here in Helaman 1:22.

Summary: Maintain in Helaman 1:22 the singular number for *strongest hold,* the corrected reading in 𝒪; elsewhere the text typically refers to a single city as a strong hold.

■ **Helaman 1:23**

for it was his determination to go forth and cut his way through with the sword
that he might obtain the [*North* 01 | *north* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *parts of the land*

One wonders here if the use of the simple noun *north* might not be a mistake for the adjective *northern,* as in Alma 22:29: "the Nephites had taken possession of all **the northern parts** of the land". Another possibility might be *northernmost,* as in 3 Nephi 7:12: "that they should take their flight into **the northernmost part** of the land". These three instances are the only examples of any cardinal direction occurring with the noun *part(s);* there are no examples of *part(s)* that are modified by the morphemes *east, south,* or *west.* Moreover, there is only a single example for each type based on the morpheme *north.* This means that there is no strong evidence for emending the text here in Helaman 1:23. In fact, the King James Bible has cases of *north parts* and *east parts:*

Numbers 10:5	then the camps that lie on the **east parts** shall go forward
Ezekiel 38:15	and thou shalt come from thy place out of the **north parts**
Ezekiel 39:2	and will cause thee to come up from the **north parts**

Here in Helaman 1:23, the original manuscript is sufficiently extant that we can clearly read the entire word *North* just before the lacuna, about two thirds of the way across the line of 𝒪:

Helaman 1:23 – 24 (line 21, page 367′ of ☉)

```
-rough with the sword that he might obtain the North (p                    )
                                                  ARTS OF THE LAND & SUPPOSE
```

The critical text will therefore maintain the reading in ☉, "that he might obtain **the north parts** of the land".

Summary: Accept *north parts* in Helaman 1:23 even though *northern parts* seems more appropriate in current English; the original manuscript reads *North,* and there is evidence for this usage in the King James Bible.

■ **Helaman 1:25**

but behold this march of [*Coriantumrs* 01 | *Coriantumr* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
   through the center of the land
gave Moronihah great advantage over them

As explained under Alma 46:24, the critical text will restore all instances of the double genitive "X of Y's" whenever there is support for it in the earliest textual sources (in all there are four instances, including this one in Helaman 1:25). For this passage, in both ☉ and 𝒫 the text reads "this march of Coriantumr's", which is how the critical text will read. (Oliver Cowdery did not supply the apostrophe in either manuscript for the singular possessive *Coriantumr's.* Oliver's general practice in the manuscripts was to omit the apostrophe, as explained for the phrase "three days' journey" in the discussion under the 1 Nephi preface.) Here in Helaman 1:25, the 1830 typesetter decided to remove the possessive *s,* giving "this march of Coriantumr" (the reading of all the printed editions).

Summary: Restore the singular possessive form *Coriantumr's* in Helaman 1:25, the reading in both manuscripts (although written there without the apostrophe, in accord with Oliver Cowdery's scribal practice); this use of the double genitive is supported by three other instances of that usage in the original text.

■ **Helaman 1:25**

but behold this march of Coriantumr's through the center of the land
gave Moronihah great [*advantage* 01ABCDEGHKPRST | *advantages* FIJLMNOQ] *over them*

The 1852 LDS edition accidentally changed the singular *advantage* to the plural *advantages.* The editors for the 1920 LDS edition restored the correct singular to the LDS text.

The singular seems more appropriate in English. The Book of Mormon text has nine other cases of the singular *advantage,* but only one of *advantages*—and that one is preceded by the plural quantifier *many:* "the Gaddianton robbers did gain **many advantages** over them" (3 Nephi 2:18). Since the singular is clearly preferred, there is no reason to reject it here in Helaman 1:25. The change to the plural in the 1852 LDS edition was very likely a typo.

Summary: Maintain the singular *advantage* in Helaman 1:25, especially since this is the reading of both manuscripts and all the early editions.

■ **Helaman 1:28–30**

> *but when Moronihah had discovered this*
> *he immediately sent forth Lehi with an army round about*
> *to head them before they should come to the land Bountiful*
> *and thus he did* [NULL >? *& he did* 0| *& he did* 1| *and he did* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
> *head them before they came to the land Bountiful and gave unto them battle*
> *insomuch that they began to retreat back towards the land of Zarahemla*
> *and it came to pass that Moronihah did head them in their retreat*
> *and did give unto them battle*

The repetition of *and he did* in the middle of this passage appears to be an accidental dittography that entered the text when Oliver Cowdery copied this passage from 𝒪 into 𝒫. The current text is excessively redundant, as we can clearly see when we supply the ellipsis:

> Helaman 1:28–29 (ellipted text supplied, shown with an arrow)
> to **head them** before they should come to the land Bountiful
> → and thus he did **head them**
> and he did **head them** before they came to the land Bountiful

Without the extra "and he did", we get a more parallelistic statement that avoids any excessive redundancy:

> Helaman 1:28–29 (parallelism in bold)
> to   **head them before they** should **come to the land Bountiful**
> and thus he did **head them before they**   **came to the land Bountiful**

Of course, the resulting parallelism is quite repetitious, as pointed out by David Calabro (personal communication). Even so, the first line refers to what Moronihah commanded Lehi to do, and the second line confirms that Lehi did precisely that. We get a similar kind of repetition, although not as parallelistic, later in the text when Gidgiddoni commanded his armies and they followed through:

> 3 Nephi 4:13
> and it came to pass that Gidgiddoni commanded
> that his armies should **pursue them** as far as **to the borders of the wilderness**
> and that they should not spare any that should fall into their hands by the way
> → and thus they did **pursue them** and did slay them **to the borders of the wilderness**
> even until they had fulfilled the commandment of Gidgiddoni

Here in Helaman 1, the original manuscript is not extant for the first part of verse 29, but spacing between extant fragments indicates that most likely Oliver simply wrote "& thus he did head them" in 𝒪; the transcript for this part of 𝒪 in volume 1 of the critical text reads accordingly:

Helaman 1:28–29 (lines 2–3, page 368′ of 𝒪)

```
(                                        )ad them before they should co(m        )
   FORTH LEHI WITH AN ARMY ROUND ABOUT TO HE                            E  TO  THE

(                                  m) before they came to the land Boun(t    )
   LAND BOUNTIFUL & THUS HE DID HEAD THE                               IFUL
```

If the extra "& he did" was in ◌, Oliver must have supralinearly inserted it, as follows:

Helaman 1:28–29 (reconstructed line 3 on page 368′ of ◌)

```
                              & he did
      land Bountiful & thus he did ^ head them before they came to the land Bountiful
```

Elsewhere in the text there are 33 occurrences of "and thus <subject pronoun> did <do something>", as in the following sampling:

1 Nephi 16:36	and thus they **did murmur** against my father
Mosiah 10:2	and thus I **did guard** my people and my flocks
Mosiah 10:5	and thus we **did prosper** in the land
Mosiah 11:13	and thus he **did do** with the riches which he obtained
Helaman 11:20	and thus it **did come** to pass that . . .

However, there is one clear example in the original text of "and thus <subject pronoun> did" where the main verb is ellipted:

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

Providing the ellipted text, we get "and thus they did march forth into the city and take possession of it", which causes no excessive redundancy. (For another possible example of "and thus they did", see the discussion under Alma 24:18.)

Although there is theoretically nothing wrong with "and thus he did" in Helaman 1:29, the redundancy is excessive. In addition, spacing considerations in ◌ argue against the earliest extant reading (in 𝒫), which is also the reading in all the printed editions. Here in Helaman 1:29, the critical text will accept the emended reading without the dittography. As explained under Mosiah 10:5, there are several cases of dittography that appear to have entered the text during its early transmission. Each one involves an unacceptable sort of redundancy.

Summary: Emend Helaman 1:29 by removing the apparent dittography ("and he did"), thus giving "and thus he did head them".

■ **Helaman 1:31**

and now behold the Lamanites could not retreat
[*neither* 01A | *either* BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *way*
neither on the north nor on the south nor on the east nor on the west

The two manuscripts, ◌ and 𝒫, and the 1830 edition read "neither way". The use of *neither* along with the preceding *not* creates a multiple negative ("the Lamanites could **not** retreat **neither** way"), which was removed in the 1837 edition by replacing *neither* with *either*. This change is in accord with standard English, but the critical text will restore the original multiple negative. For a general discussion of the use of multiple negatives in the original text, see under NEGATION in volume 3.

Summary: Restore in Helaman 1:31 the original *neither* even though it results in nonstandard usage: "the Lamanites could **not** retreat **neither** way"; instances of multiple negation were quite prevalent in the original text.

■ **Helaman 1:32**

[*& 01|And* ABCDEGHIJKLMNOPQRST|NULL *> and* F] *thus had Coriantumr plunged the Lamanites into the midst of the Nephites*

The first printing of the 1852 LDS edition omitted the *and* here before the word *thus*. The second printing restored the *and,* the reading of both manuscripts and the early editions, including the 1840 edition (the probable source for the 1852 correction). Either reading is theoretically possible; the critical text will maintain the earliest reading with the *and*. For another example where *and thus* was reduced to *thus,* see under Alma 28:5 (in that case, it was the 1840 edition that omitted the *and*).

Summary: Maintain the connective *and thus* that begins Helaman 1:32, the reading of both manuscripts and the early editions.

■ **Helaman 1:32**

and the Lamanites did yield themselves [*up* 0| 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *into the hands of the Nephites*

Here 𝒪 is extant and reads "did yield themselves **up** into the hands of the Nephites". When he copied the text from 𝒪 into 𝒫, Oliver Cowdery accidentally omitted the *up.* As explained under 1 Nephi 19:10, the text strongly supports the phraseology "to yield up". In fact, the loss of the *up* here in Helaman 1:32 provides evidence in support of emending 1 Nephi 19:10 to read "the God of Abraham . . . yieldeth himself **up** . . . into the hands of wicked men". The critical text will restore the original *up* here in Helaman 1:32.

Summary: Restore the adverb *up* in Helaman 1:32 ("and the Lamanites did yield themselves **up** into the hands of the Nephites"), the reading of the original manuscript.

Helaman 2

■ **Helaman 2:1**

after Moronihah had established again
[*the* 0A | *the* >js NULL 1 | BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *peace*
between the Nephites and the Lamanites . . .

Here Joseph Smith removed the definite article *the* since in English we expect the phraseology "to establish peace between X and Y"—that is, without the definite article *the*. If *peace* is postmodified by an *of*-prepositional phrase, we typically get *the* before *peace* in the Book of Mormon text:

Mosiah 29:10	and do that which will make for **the peace of** this people
Alma 7:27	and now may **the peace of** God rest upon you
3 Nephi 6:3	unto those robbers which had entered into a covenant to keep **the peace of** the land
3 Nephi 9:9	for it was they that did destroy **the peace of** my people
3 Nephi 22:13	and great shall be **the peace of** thy children

Moreover, there are three occurrences of "to keep the peace" without any postmodification, and in each case the definite article *the* has been retained:

Alma 46:31	and entered into a covenant to keep **the** peace
Alma 50:36	and upon their covenanting to keep **the** peace
Alma 50:39	and to keep **the** peace

Of course, the verb here is *keep* rather than *establish,* and we expect the *the* in that case.

There is no other example in the text quite like this one in Helaman 2:1. Here Joseph Smith's editing seems to deal with a question of style rather than grammar. The critical text will restore the original *the*.

Summary: Restore in Helaman 2:1 the definite article *the* before *peace* since the earliest text read this way and there is really nothing wrong with the expression "to establish **the** peace".

■ **Helaman 2:1**

therefore there began to be a contention
[*again* 01ABCDEFGIJLMNOQRT | HKPS] *among the people*
concerning who should fill the judgment seat

Here the earliest text has the word *again* in "there began to be a contention **again** among the people". ℧ is extant for only the final *n* of *again;* ℗ and all the early editions have the *again*. The

previous chapter (see Helaman 1:1–5) describes the original contention between three sons of Parhoron for the judgment seat, so the use of *again* here in Helaman 2:1 is fully appropriate.

The 1874 RLDS edition omitted the *again* here in Helaman 2:1, and the RLDS text has retained this shortened reading. (Normally the 1908 RLDS edition would have restored the *again* since that is the reading in 𝓟.) The 1874 edition shows a rather frequent tendency to omit *again,* twice in Alma 63:14–15 and once in Mormon 4:16. See under those passages for discussion.

Summary: Maintain the original occurrence of *again* in Helaman 2:1 ("there began to be a contention **again** among the people"); this is the second time in the book of Helaman where there has been a contention over the judgment seat.

■ **Helaman 2:4**

for there was one [*Gaddianton*/*Gadianton* 0 | *Gadianton* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *who was exceeding expert in many words*

The question here is whether to spell the name with two *d*'s or only one, as *Gaddianton* or *Gadianton.* The name appears 32 times in the text but is fully extant in 𝓞 for only two instances, the second and third occurrences (later here in Helaman 2):

> Helaman 2:11   [*Gaddianton* 0 | *Gadiantom* >% *Gadianton* 1 | *Gadianton* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
>
> Helaman 2:12   [*Gaddianton* 0 | *Gadianton* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]

There is one other occurrence of this name that is extant to some degree in 𝓞, but only for the last three letters, *ton* (the 24th occurrence, in 3 Nephi 2:12).

For the first occurrence of the name (here in Helaman 2:4), spacing between extant fragments of 𝓞 supports the longer spelling, *Gaddianton.* Everything is extant on the line except for the name, so the length of the missing text is sufficiently set out that we can make a clear judgment in favor of the longer spelling. The line below lines up 14 characters ("secret work of") with the missing name and its following space:

Helaman 2:4 (lines 23–24, page 368′ of 𝓞)

```
(            w)ho was exceding expert in many words & also in his craft to carry on the
   GADDIANTON

(      t) work of murder & of robery therefore he became the leader of the band of Kishcumen
   SECRE
```

The spelling with the best fit is definitely *Gaddianton,* although one cannot be sure that 𝓞 read that way; for instance, Oliver Cowdery could have initially written *Gaddianton* in 𝓞 but then corrected it to *Gadianton* by crossing out one of the *d*'s. If so, one then wonders why Oliver would have immediately forgotten the correct spelling when he came to the next two occurrences of the name, in verses 11 and 12; there he spelled the name in 𝓞 without correction or variation as *Gaddianton.*

In the printer's manuscript, Oliver Cowdery consistently spelled the name with one *d,* as *Gadianton* (27 times, from Helaman 2:4 through 3 Nephi 3:15). This spelling, of course, is the reading of the current text. For that portion of the text where both the 1830 edition and 𝓟 are firsthand copies of 𝓞 (from Helaman 13 through the end of Mormon), the 1830 edition has the

spelling *Gadianton* for the seven occurrences of the name in 3 Nephi 1–3. But for the five occurrences of the name in 4 Nephi and Mormon, the 1830 edition (as well as 𝓟, in scribe 2's hand) has the double-*d* spelling, *Gaddianton*. This spelling argues that for 4 Nephi and Mormon, at least, 𝓞 had the double-*d* spelling. These five occurrences of *Gaddianton* in the 1830 edition were eventually replaced by the spelling *Gadianton* in the printed editions:

4 Nephi 1:42 [*Gaddiaton* 1 | *Gaddianton* ABDE | *Gadianton* CFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]

4 Nephi 1:46 [*Gaddianton* 1ABDE | *Gadianton* CFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]

Mormon 1:18 [*Gaddianton* 1ABCDE | *Gadianton* FGHIJKLMNOPQRST]

Mormon 2:27 [*Gaddianton* 1ABDE | *Gadianton* CFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]

Mormon 2:28 [*Gaddianton* 1ABDE | *Gadianton* CFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]

Except for the third case, it was the 1840 edition that made the change to *Gadianton*. The 1852 LDS edition consistently made the change in the LDS text for all five cases. The 1858 Wright edition removed the final instance of *Gaddianton* from the RLDS textual tradition (the third case, in Mormon 1:18).

There doesn't seem to be any particular difficulty with *Gaddianton* that would have led Oliver Cowdery to change the spelling from *Gaddianton* to *Gadianton* when he copied from 𝓞 into 𝓟. Yet in the previous chapter (see under Helaman 1:9), there is definite evidence that Oliver made exactly that kind of textually unmotivated change in the spelling of a name when he copied the text from 𝓞 into 𝓟 (namely, his systematic change of *Kishcumen* to *Kishkumen*).

When we consider the spelling of other Book of Mormon names, we find examples with both the single and double-*d* spellings, as in the following that have a syllable or two of the form *gad* or *gid:*

- Ga**d**iandi, a city (3 Nephi 9:8)
  Ga**d**iomnah, a city (3 Nephi 9:8)
  Ga**d**, a city (3 Nephi 9:10)

- Amniga**dd**ah, a Jaredite claimant to the throne (Ether 1:14 – Ether 10:31)

- Gi**d**eon, a military leader (Mosiah 19:4 – Alma 14:16)
  Gi**d**eon, a place-name (Alma 2:20 – Helaman 13:15)
  Gi**d**anah, father of Amulek (Alma 10:2)
  Gi**d**, a city (Alma 51:26 – Helaman 5:15)
  Gi**d**, a military leader (Alma 57:28 – Alma 58:23)

- Amgi**d**, a Jaredite king (Ether 10:32)

- Gi**dd**onah, high priest in the land of Gideon (Alma 30:23)
  Gi**dd**ianhi, leader of the Gaddianton robbers (3 Nephi 3:9 – 3 Nephi 4:14)

- Gi**d**gi**dd**oni, a military leader (3 Nephi 3:18 – 3 Nephi 6:6)
  Gi**d**gi**dd**onah, a military leader (Mormon 6:13)

For the name *Gidanah,* a single *d* in the printer's manuscript was respelled as a double *d* in the 1830 edition; moreover, the second vowel, an *a,* was changed to an *o,* thus making the name identical with the *Giddonah* found in Alma 30:23 (see the discussion under Alma 10:2).

There are 13 occurrences in the text of the name *Giddianhi,* from 3 Nephi 3:9 through 3 Nephi 4:14. In two instances, the 1830 compositor set this name as *Gaddianhi* (in 3 Nephi 3:12 and 3 Nephi 4:9), undoubtedly under the influence of *Gaddianton,* especially since *Giddianhi* was "the governor of this the secret society of Gaddianton" (3 Nephi 3:9); perhaps there is some morphological connection between the governor's personal name and the name of the band that he led. In the first of the two 1830 misspellings (in 3 Nephi 3:12), the 1830 compositor caught his misspelling and made an in-press correction of the spelling, from *Gaddianhi* to *Giddianhi.* This initial confusion on the part of the printer suggests that 𝒪 (which he was using to set the type for 3 Nephi 3–4) had the double-*d* spelling *Gaddianton* in this part of the text, thus facilitating the error *Gaddianhi.*

In general, the extant evidence from 𝒪 argues for the spelling *Gaddianton;* although the first occurrence is not extant, spacing in the lacuna argues for the double *d.* Oliver Cowdery's systematic change to *Gadianton* seems to be the result of a decision on his own, but then so was his systematic change of the name *Kishcumen* to *Kishkumen* that he initiated in the previous chapter.

Summary: In accord with the two extant readings in the original manuscript, restore the spelling *Gaddianton* to the Book of Mormon text (32 times, beginning here in Helaman 2:4).

■ Helaman 2:4

to carry on the secret work of murder
and [of 01ABCEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST | D] robbery

The 1841 British edition removed the repeated preposition *of* in this postmodifying phrase, thus producing "the secret work of murder and robbery". The use of the repeated preposition is characteristic of the Book of Mormon text. For the phrase "work of", the *of* is typically repeated for a following conjoined noun phrase; there is only one case where it is not (marked below with an asterisk):

Mosiah 11:8	and he ornamented them with fine **work of** wood and **of** all manner of precious things
Helaman 6:29	to still carry on the **work of** darkness and **of** secret murder
* Helaman 11:2	and it was this secret band of robbers which did carry on this **work of** destruction and wickedness
Mormon 1:13	and the **work of** miracles and **of** healing did cease

The critical text will maintain the repeated *of* here in Helaman 2:4. For further discussion and examples of prepositional repetition, see under CONJUNCTIVE REPETITION in volume 3.

Summary: Maintain in Helaman 2:4 the repeated *of* in the conjunctive prepositional phrase "of murder and **of** robbery", the reading of both manuscripts and the first three editions.

■ **Helaman 2:6**

and it came to pass as **he** *went forth towards the judgment seat to destroy Helaman*
behold **one of the servants of Helaman** *having been out by night*
and having obtained through disguise a knowledge of those plans
which had been laid by [*this* 01ABCDEFGIJLMNOQRT | *his* HKPS] *band to destroy Helaman . . .*

Here the typesetter for the 1874 RLDS edition made an accidental change, replacing *this* with *his* in the phrase "by this band". The RLDS text has retained this secondary reading. (For another example where an 1874 error has been maintained in the RLDS text, see the nearby discussion regarding the missing *again* in Helaman 2:1.) For another instance where the 1874 typesetter replaced *this* with *his,* see under Alma 18:34 (in that instance, the 1908 RLDS edition restored the original *this* to the RLDS text).

The use of *his* does not work well here in Helaman 2:6 since the nearest possible antecedent for the *his* is "one of the servants of Helaman", not Gaddianton or Kishcumen. Even the preceding nearest possible antecedent, the pronoun *he* that refers to Kishcumen ("as **he** went forth towards the judgment seat"), may not be the referent for this secondary *his* since the preceding text refers to Gaddianton as having taken over as the leader of this band which was originally Kishcumen's:

> Helaman 2:4–5
> for there was one Gaddianton
> who was exceeding expert in many words and also in his craft
> to carry on the secret work of murder and of robbery
> **therefore he became the leader of the band of Kishcumen**
> therefore he did flatter them and also Kishcumen
> that if they would place him in the judgment seat
> he would grant unto those which belonged to **his band**
> that they should be placed in power and authority among the people
> therefore Kishcumen sought to destroy Helaman

The instance of *his band* in verse 5 of this passage is potentially ambiguous and could refer to either Gaddianton or Kishcumen, although I would normally read the *his* as referring to the preceding *he,* which does refer to Gaddianton ("**he** would grant unto those which belonged to **his** band"). Yet later in verse 8 the band is unambiguously referred to as being Kishcumen's:

> Helaman 2:8
> when the servant of Helaman had known all the heart of **Kishcumen**
> and how that it was his object to murder
> and also that it was the object of all those which belonged to **his band**
> to murder and to rob and to gain power . . .

In any event, if *his* were correct here in verse 6, we would be required to skip at least the reference to Helaman's servant and perhaps even the reference to Kishcumen in order to interpret the *his* as referring to Gaddianton. The use of *this* is definitely correct here in Helaman 2:6.

Summary: Maintain the original determiner *this* in Helaman 2:6 ("those plans which had been laid by **this** band to destroy Helaman").

■ **Helaman 2:8**

and it came to pass that
when the servant of Helaman had known all the heart of Kishcumen
and how that it was his object to murder
and also that it was the object of all those which belonged to his band
to murder and to rob and to gain power
and [1ABCDEFGHIKLMNOPQRST | *for* J] *this was their secret plan and their combination . . .*

The 1888 LDS edition added the preposition *for* at the beginning of the parenthetical clause in this passage (giving "and **for** this was their secret plan and their combination"). One could interpret "for this" as meaning 'for this intent'. No subsequent LDS edition has followed this reading since that edition was never used as a copytext.

There are no other examples in the text of the prepositional phrase "for this" at the head of a sentence. There are, to be sure, examples of "for this N", where *this* acts as modifier for an explicit noun N; in theory each of the following phrases could work here in Helaman 2:8:

"for this cause"	27 times
"for this intent"	6 times
"for this end"	2 times
"for this purpose"	1 time

The critical text will ignore the intrusive *for* in Helaman 2:8; if it were correct, we would expect a following noun such as *cause* or *intent*.

Don Brugger (personal communication) points out that the intrusive *for* in the 1888 LDS edition may have been intended as a replacement for the conjunction *and*. In other words, the 1888 typesetter momentarily thought to replace *and* with *for* in this parenthetical statement ("for this was their secret plan and their combination") but ended up adding the *for* without omitting the *and*.

Summary: Maintain in Helaman 2:8 the original reading, "and this was their secret plan and their combination", without the preposition *for* that the 1888 LDS edition introduced before the *this*.

■ **Helaman 2:8**

the servant of Helaman
[*sayeth* 1 | *saith* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQS | *said* RT] *unto Kishcumen . . .*

In his editing for the 1837 edition, Joseph Smith replaced most instances of the historical present-tense *saith* with the past-tense *said*. In a few cases, he failed to make the change. Typically, 20th-century editions have made the change to *said*, with the 1920 LDS edition being the most prominent in implementing this emendation:

2 Nephi 10:10 (1911 LDS edition)
but behold this land
[*saith* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPS | *said* QRT] God
shall be a land of thine inheritance

Helaman 2:8 (1920 LDS edition)
>
> the servant of Helaman
> [*sayeth* 1 | *saith* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQS | *said* RT] unto Kishcumen . . .

3 Nephi 20:10 (1874 RLDS and 1920 LDS editions)
>
> he [*sayeth* >js *said* 1 | *saith* ABCDEFGIJLMNOQ | *said* HKPRST] unto them . . .

3 Nephi 27:2 (1908 RLDS and 1920 LDS editions)
>
> and Jesus came and stood in the midst of them
> and [*sayeth* >js *said* 1 | *saith* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOQ | *said* PRST] unto them . . .

3 Nephi 27:33 (1906 LDS and 1920 LDS editions)
>
> he [*sayeth* 1 | *saith* ABCDEFGHIJKLMOPQS | *said* NRT] unto his disciples . . .

Mormon 9:22 (1920 LDS edition)
>
> for behold thus [*sayeth* 1 | *saith* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQS | *said* RT]
> Jesus Christ the Son of God unto his disciples which should tarry . . .

In the case of 3 Nephi 27:2, Joseph Smith marked the change from *saith* to *said* in 𝓟, but it was never implemented in the 1837 edition.

There are a few cases where the historical present tense has never been changed to the past tense. See, for instance, the discussion under 1 Nephi 17:53, 2 Nephi 6:11, and Jacob 5:8. Of course, the critical text will either restore or maintain, as the case may be, all the original instances of the historical present tense. For a brief discussion, see under 1 Nephi 2:1. For a complete list of where this editing has been implemented (as well as where it has never been implemented), see under HISTORICAL PRESENT in volume 3.

Summary: Restore the original instance of the historical present-tense *saith* in Helaman 2:8 and elsewhere in the text (in each case according to the reading of the earliest textual sources).

Helaman 3

■ **Helaman 3:1**

there was no contention among the people of Nephi
save it were a little pride which was in the church
which did cause some little [*dissensions >% dissension* 0 |
dissensions 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *among the people*
which affairs were settled in the ending of the forty and third year

Here Oliver Cowdery initially wrote the plural *dissensions* in the original manuscript, but then he erased the plural *s* and overwrote the last part of the erasure with the *a* at the beginning of the following word, *among*. Thus the singular *dissension* appears to have been the reading of the original text. But in the printer's manuscript, Oliver copied the text with the plural *dissensions,* which has been followed in all the printed editions. Perhaps one reason for the tendency to favor the plural is the plurality of the following clause ("which **affairs were** settled in the ending of the forty and third year").

There is one other example of "little dissension(s)" in the text, and it is in the plural:

> Alma 45:21
> for behold because of their wars with the Lamanites
> and **the many little dissensions** and disturbances
> which had been among the people . . .

In this case, the plural is supported by the quantifier *many*. Unfortunately, there are no other examples of *some* combined with *little*. More generally, when the determiner is *some*, we get only the singular if there is an intervening adjective:

1 Nephi 7:13	at some future period
1 Nephi 16:38	into some strange wilderness
Enos 1:13	some future day
Mosiah 5:10	by some other name
Alma 30:28	some unknown being
Alma 52:10	by stratagem or some other way
Helaman 16:20	in some great and marvelous thing
Helaman 16:21	some great mystery
3 Nephi 2:2	some vain thing
Moroni 1:4	in some future day

Of course, this restriction to the singular may be just accidental. For instances of "some <noun>" (that is, without an intervening adjective), the noun can be plural (thus "some dissenters" in Alma 63:14 and "some disputings" in 3 Nephi 6:10).

In any event, the singular *dissension* will work in Helaman 3:1, especially if *some* is interpreted as meaning 'a certain' or 'a particular'. That seems to be the meaning here, and the immediate correction in ℗ strongly supports the singular reading, "some little dissension".

Summary: In accord with the corrected reading in ℗, restore the singular *dissension* in Helaman 3:1 ("some little dissension").

■ **Helaman 3:3**

and it came to pass in the forty and sixth
[0|NULL >jg , 1|, ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
yea
[0|NULL >jg , 1|, ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
there were much contentions and many dissensions

The original manuscript is extant here and reads "& it came to pass in the forty & sixth **yea**". Both scribal practice and internal evidence argue that the word *yea* here is an error for *year,* that the original text read "and it came to pass in the forty and sixth **year**". The word *year* was not omitted in ℗; instead, Oliver Cowdery accidentally wrote *year* as *yea,* neglecting to supply the final *r*. He copied the *yea* into the printer's manuscript, and all the printed editions have continued with this bizarre reading. The preceding verse, as expected, explicitly uses the word *year* for specifying the two preceding years:

> Helaman 3:2
> and there was no contention among the people in the forty and fourth **year**
> neither was there much contention in the forty and fifth **year**

There are a few passages in the text where the word *year* is ellipted, but that occurs only if the word *year* has already been used within the clause:

> Alma 28:10
> and from the first **year**
> → to the fifteenth
> has brought to pass the destruction of many thousand lives

> 3 Nephi 5:7
> and thus had the twenty and second **year** passed away
> and the twenty and third **year** also
> → and the twenty and fourth
> → and the twenty and fifth
> and thus had twenty and five years passed away

> 4 Nephi 1:1
> and it came to pass that the thirty and fourth **year** passed away
> → and also the thirty and fifth

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
→   and also the fifty and first
→   and the fifty and second
>   yea and even until fifty and nine years had passed away

In my discussion regarding the ellipted *year* under Alma 48:21, I mistakenly cited only the first part of the last passage as if it were the only example of this kind of ellipsis in the text. Even so, the same basic finding holds: when there is only one numerical specification for a year within a sentence, the word *year* appears in the original text, although in two instances the earliest extant text has *yea,* here in Helaman 3:3 and also in Alma 48:2 (see below).

It should also be pointed out that there are a couple of cases of coordinated years in the text such that the first number occurs without the word *year,* but that is because the plural word *years* appears at the end of the coordination:

Helaman 4:8   and all this was done in the fifty and **eighth and ninth years**
3 Nephi 6:4   and the twenty and **sixth and seventh years** passed away

If we consider these cases as instances of ellipsis, we still find that both numbers occur within the same sentence.

Internal evidence shows that the word *yea* is inappropriately used here in Helaman 3:3; we expect *yea* either to amplify or to modify what has just been stated. The *yea* here in Helaman 3:3 stands out as an isolated use of the word, with no narrative purpose, except perhaps to sound biblical. Michael Parker and Thomas Uharriet, students in my textual criticism classes during the early 1990s, separately investigated the use of *yea* in the Book of Mormon text. Excluding cases where *yea* simply means 'yes', they discovered that in virtually all cases the word *yea* means 'in fact', 'more precisely', or 'in other words'. The exceptions include the two examples where the earliest extant text reads *yea* instead of the correct *year* (in Alma 48:2 and Helaman 3:3). In addition, there is one other problematic instance of *yea,* in Alma 12:14, that leads to an emendation in a noun rather than in the *yea* (see under Alma 12:12–14 for discussion regarding the current reading "our **words** will condemn us / yea all our **works** will condemn us").

There is considerable evidence in the manuscripts that Oliver Cowdery sometimes miswrote *year* as *yea*. In some cases, he caught his error; in others, he did not:

Alma 28:10 (*year* initially written as *yea* in 𝓟; 𝓞 is extant and reads *year*)
>   and from the first [*year* 0ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST | *yea* >+ *year* 1]
>   to the fifteenth

Alma 30:4 (*year* initially written as *yea* in 𝓞)
>   in all the sixteenth [NULL > *yea* >- *year* 0 | *year* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
>   of the reign of the judges over the people of Nephi

Alma 48:2 (*year* written as *yea* in 𝓟; 𝓞 is not extant)
>   in the latter end of the nineteenth [*yea* 1 | *year* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
>   of the reign of the judges

Alma 48:21 (*year* written as *yea* in 𝒫, not corrected; 𝒪 is extant)

in the latter end of the nineteenth [*year* 0 | *yea* 1ABCDGHKPS |
year yea EFIJLMNOQRT]

Alma 56:1 (*year* initially written as *yea* in 𝒪)

in the commencement of the thirtieth [*yea > year* 0 |
year 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] of the reign of the judges

The example in Alma 48:2 reads *yea* in the earliest extant source, 𝒫. But in that case, the 1830 typesetter could easily determine that *yea* was a mistake for *year* since the word appears in the middle of the common phrase "the Xth **year** of the reign of the judges".

The example in Alma 48:21 is interesting because it directly shows Oliver Cowdery making the error: 𝒪 is extant and reads *year,* yet he copied it into 𝒫 as *yea* without correction. That example is also interesting in that the editor for the 1849 LDS edition, Orson Pratt, tried to deal with the unusual syntax by adding the word *year* while keeping the *yea,* thus allowing that problematic instance of the word *yea* to remain in the text.

Oliver Cowdery's tendency to omit the final *r* can be found in the orthographically similar word *your.* There are 11 instances in the two manuscripts where he initially omitted the final *r* in *your.* But unlike *year,* Oliver always corrected the *you* to *your* in the manuscripts. In any event, Oliver's tendency to drop the final *r* in *year* is symptomatic of a more extensive tendency. (Three of these examples of initial *r*-loss for *your* occur at the end of a manuscript line and may therefore more accurately represent an attempt to fit the final *r* in at the end of the line instead of writing it at the beginning of the next line, as -*r*.)

There is no doubt that the *yea* here in Helaman 3:3 is an error for *year.* Moreover, it would be wrong to insert the word *year* and retain the *yea,* just as it was wrong to do so in Alma 48:21. This emendation of *year* for *yea* in Helaman 3:3 was first proposed by Stan Larson on page 567 of his article "Conjectural Emendation and the Text of the Book of Mormon", *Brigham Young University Studies* 18/4 (1978): 563–569. In footnote 17 on that page, Larson also mentions the convoluted textual history for the example in Alma 48:21.

Summary: Emend Helaman 3:3 to read "in the forty and sixth **year**" without any *yea;* the *yea* here in 𝒪 is an error for *year.*

■ **Helaman 3:3**

and it came to pass in the forty and sixth year
there [*were* 01ABCGHKPS | *was* DEFIJLMNOQRT]
much [*contentions* 1ABCEGHKPS | *contention* DFIJLMNOQRT] *and many dissensions*

The 1841 British edition changed the plural "there were much contentions" to the singular "there was much contention", probably under the influence of the singular *much,* yet in opposition to the following conjoined plural, "and many dissensions". The RLDS text has maintained the original plural phraseology. (The 1849 LDS edition restored the plural *contentions* but maintained the 1841 *was;* this may represent a typo rather than conscious editing. The 1852 LDS edition has "there was much contention", the 1841 reading.) For another example of the phraseology "much contentions

and many dissensions" and its editing, see under the Words of Mormon 1:16. For the general possibility of *much* modifying plural nouns, see under Enos 1:21.

A simpler grammatical emendation here in Helaman 3:3 would have been to change *much* to *many.* And actually there are quite a few examples of conjoined noun phrases where *many* is repeated:

1 Nephi 15:13	for the space of **many** years and **many** generations
Jacob 7:5	notwithstanding the **many** revelations and the **many** things
Helaman 1:27	taking possession of **many** cities and of **many** strong holds
Helaman 3:15	there are **many** books and **many** records of every kind
3 Nephi 6:11	and also **many** lawyers and **many** officers

There would really be nothing wrong with editing *much* to *many* rather than changing *were* to *was* and *contentions* to *contention.* But the earliest reading, with its mixed usage, is also textually possible and will be restored in the critical text.

Summary: Restore in Helaman 3:3 the original plural noun *contentions* along with its plural verb *were:* "there **were** much **contentions** and many dissensions"; such usage exists elsewhere in the text.

■ **Helaman 3:3**

in the which there were an exceeding great many
which departed out of the land of Zarahemla
and went forth [*unto* 01ABCEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST | *into* D] *the land northward*
to inherit the land

One wonders here if the change of *unto* to *into* (only in the 1841 British edition) might be correct, even though the original manuscript is quite clear in reading *unto.* It is possible that Oliver Cowdery, the scribe in 𝒪, mistakenly wrote *unto* instead of *into,* just as he often did in the manuscripts (for a list of examples, see under 2 Nephi 8:23), including the following one that occurs in a phrase referring to a land:

Alma 54:12 (Oliver Cowdery's initial error in 𝒫)
    and I will follow you
    even [*unto* > *into* 1 | *into* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] your own land

This change provides some evidence for a tendency to incorrectly write *unto* in place of *into* in the context of *land.*

Elsewhere in the text there are 17 examples of "go into a land". The only example with *unto* instead of *into* is here in Helaman 3:3. But when we consider other verbs besides *go,* we have additional evidence for an occasional *unto.* For example, when the verb is *come,* there are 27 examples with "into a land" but also 4 of "unto a land":

3 Nephi 6:25	a complaint came up **unto** the land of Zarahemla
Ether 2:7	but he would that they should come forth
	even **unto** the land of promise
Ether 7:5	he came up **unto** the land of Moron
Ether 14:11	Coriantumr came up **unto** the land of Moron

Since *come* and *go* are both very similar semantically (differing in directionality), it seems appropriate to accept the possibility of "and went forth **unto** the land northward" in Helaman 3:3.

Summary: Accept in Helaman 3:3 the reading of the original manuscript, "an exceeding great many . . . went forth **unto** the land northward".

■ **Helaman 3:5**

yea and even they did spread forth **into** *all parts of the land*
[*in* 0 | *into* >+ *in* 1 | *into* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *whatsoever parts it had not been rendered desolate*

The original manuscript has the preposition *in* ("in whatsoever parts"). When Oliver Cowdery copied the text from 𝓞 into 𝓟, he initially wrote *into* in 𝓟 (he was probably influenced by the *into* in the preceding "into all parts of the land"). Somewhat later, probably when proofing against 𝓞, Oliver crossed out the *to* part of *into* with heavier ink flow. Nonetheless, the 1830 compositor set *into,* undoubtedly under the influence (once more) of the preceding *into.* There are numerous cases in the textual history where *into* and *in* have been mixed up, if only momentarily; for a list, see under 1 Nephi 4:33.

There are other passages which support the use of either *in* or *into* in the environment of *whatsoever* and a verb of motion:

Alma 60:2   and **send forth** against the Lamanites **in** whatsoever parts
              they should **come** into our land

Helaman 6:7   insomuch that the Nephites did **go into** whatsoever part
              of the land they would

Generally in English, the preposition *in* can occur in contexts involving motion as well as non-motion (thus "he went **in** the house" versus "he was **in** the house"). Here in Helaman 3:5, either preposition is theoretically possible, so we follow the earliest reading, the reading in 𝓞 and the corrected reading in 𝓟. Here is a similar passage where both manuscripts (and all the printed editions) have *in* rather than *into:*

Alma 46:28
   he went forth and also sent forth **in** all the parts of the land
      where there were dissensions
   and gathered together all the people which were desirous to maintain their liberty

Summary: Restore in Helaman 3:5 the preposition *in,* the earliest reading for the phrase "**in** whatsoever parts it had not been rendered desolate".

■ **Helaman 3:5**

yea and even they did spread forth into all parts of the land
in [whatsoever 01 | whatever ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] parts
it had not been rendered desolate

> As discussed under Jacob 1:11, the original text had no instances of the word *whatever*. Here in Helaman 3:5, the 1830 compositor mistakenly set *whatsoever* as *whatever*. The critical text will restore the original *whatsoever*, the reading of the manuscripts.

■ **Helaman 3:5–6**

yea and even they did spread forth into all parts of the land
in whatsoever parts it had not been rendered
[desolates 0 | desolate 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] and without timber
because of the many inhabitants which had before inherited the land
and now no part of the land was [desolates 0 | desolate 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
save it were for timber

> There are 22 instances of the word *desolate* in the current text, of which six are extant in 𝒪. For three of the extant instances, Oliver Cowdery wrote a plural form *desolates* in 𝒪 instead of the expected *desolate*. Nor did Oliver correct any of these to *desolate* in 𝒪. But he consistently wrote all instances of *desolate* in 𝒫 without an *s* at the end (20 times), as did scribe 2 of 𝒫 (2 times). In other words, neither Oliver nor scribe 2 of 𝒫 ever wrote *desolates* in 𝒫.
>
> The third place where we have *desolates* in 𝒪 is found in the next book:

> > 3 Nephi 4:1
> > those armies of robbers . . . began to take possession of
> > all the lands which had been deserted by the Nephites
> > and the cities which had been left [*desolates* 0 |
> >   *desolate* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]

> The plural *s* of the original manuscript is weak, but it is not erased. For this portion of the text, the 1830 edition was set from 𝒪; in fact, the compositor's pencil marks are found on the two fragments of 𝒪 from 3 Nephi 4:1–2. Significantly, the compositor's period follows the final *s* of *desolates*. If the final *s* had been erased, we would expect the compositor's period to cover the erased *s*, but instead the period follows the *s*. In other words, the 1830 compositor read the manuscript as *desolates*, not *desolate*, even though he recognized the singular as the correct form in standard English and set *desolate* in the 1830 edition.
>
> The three other instances of *desolate(s)* that are extant in 𝒪 occur in biblical quotes from Isaiah 49 and read in the singular (just as in the King James Bible):

> > 1 Nephi 21:8   to cause to inherit the **desolate** heritages
> > 1 Nephi 21:19   for thy waste and thy **desolate** places
> > 1 Nephi 21:21   seeing I have lost my children and am **desolate**

> Of the 22 instances of *desolate(s)* in the text, half occur in King James quotes. Here I list the earliest extant reading for the 11 instances that occur in the nonbiblical parts of the text, with plural instances set in bold; in each instance, *desolate* occurs in predicative position:

Alma 16:10   but behold in one day it was left desolate (no ℧)

Alma 16:11   and their lands remained desolate (no ℧)

Helaman 3:5   in whatsoever parts it had not been rendered **desolates** (℧)

Helaman 3:6   and now no part of the land was **desolates** (℧)

Helaman 3:6   it was called desolate (no ℧)

Helaman 14:24   and many cities shall become desolate (no ℧)

Helaman 15:1   your houses shall be left unto you desolate (no ℧)

3 Nephi 4:1   and the cities which had been left **desolates** (℧)

3 Nephi 4:3   for the Nephites had left their lands desolate (no O)

3 Nephi 8:14   and the places were left desolate (no ℧)

3 Nephi 10:7   the places of your dwellings shall become desolate (no ℧)

In one of these examples, a plural *desolates* might actually work:

Helaman 3:6 (possible reading in ℧)
>   but because of the greatness of the destruction of the people
>   which had before inhabited the land
>   it was called **desolates**

Here *desolates* could be thought of as meaning 'desolate places'. In my transcript for ℧, I conjectured that ℧ read *desolates* here in this latter part of Helaman 3:6, just as it did earlier in the verse as well as even earlier in verse 5. Of course, 𝒫 has the singular *desolate* in all these cases. If such a conjecture were accepted, it could perhaps be capitalized ("it was called Desolates"), similar to how the standard text capitalizes *Desolation* in "the land (of) Desolation".

One possible explanation for why ℧ reads *desolates* is that Oliver Cowdery on his own added the extra *s* to *desolate*. In support of this possibility, we can cite several instances where Oliver added an extra *s* to the adjective *requisite,* which ends in the same unstressed syllable, /ət/. The word *requisite* occurs three times in Alma 41:2, and each time Oliver initially wrote *requisites* in ℧:

Alma 41:2
>   the plan of restoration is [*requisites* >% *requisite* 0 | *requisites* 1 |
>   *requisite* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] with the justice of God
>   for it is [*requisites* >% *requisite* 0 | *requisite* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
>   that all things should be restored to their proper order
>   behold it is [*requisites* >% *requisite* 0 | *requisite* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
>   and just according to the power and resurrection of Christ that . . .

In each case, Oliver erased the plural *s* in ℧, but in the first case, when he copied the text from ℧ into 𝒫, he once more wrote *requisites*—and this time he did not remove the plural *s*. As argued under Alma 41:2–3, Oliver is probably the one responsible for adding an extra *s* to the adjective *requisite*. We could have the same phenomenon with the form *desolates*.

Here are some nouns ending in /t/, mostly names, where Oliver Cowdery is responsible for adding an unacceptable plural *s:*

Alma 21:5 (uncorrected error in 𝒫)
>   there arose an [*Amalekites* 1 | *Amalekite* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]

Alma 22:32 (momentary error in 𝒫)
    and a day and a half's journey
    for a [*Nephite* 0ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST | *Nephites* >+ *Nephite* 1]

Alma 51:4 (uncorrected error in 𝒪)
    there arose a warm [*disputes* 0 | *dispute* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
    concerning the matter

Alma 52:33 (momentary error in 𝒪)
    Jacob being their leader
    being also a [*Zoramites* >% *Zoramite* 0 | *Zoramite* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] . . .

Alma 53:17 (momentary error in 𝒪)
    and they entered into
    a [*covenants* >% *covenant* 0 | *covenant* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]

Alma 55:4 (momentary error in 𝒪)
    that perhaps he might find a man
    which was a [*desendants* >% *desendant* 0 | *desendant* 1 |
        descendant ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] of Laman's among them

Alma 55:8 (momentary error in 𝒪)
    I am a [*Lamanites* >% *Lamanite* 0 | *Lamanite* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]

Helaman 4:7 (momentary error in 𝒫)
    it being a day's journey
    for a [*Nephites* >% *Nephi* 1 | *Nephite* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]

Helaman 5:35 (momentary error in 𝒫)
    now there was one among them
    who was a [*Nephites* > *Nephite* 1 | *Nephite* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] by birth

Helaman 14:1 (momentary error in 𝒫)
    Samuel the [*Lamanites* >% *Lamanite* 1 | *Lamanite* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
    did prophesy a great many more things

Helaman 16:1 (momentary error in both 𝒪 and 𝒫)
    the words of Samuel the [*Lamanites* >% *Lamanite* 0 | *Lamanites* > *Lamanite* 1 |
        Lamanite ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]

    A related explanation for the form *desolates* is that it reflects Joseph Smith's mispronunciation of *desolate* rather than Oliver Cowdery's, especially since Oliver (and scribe 2 of 𝒫) always wrote the singular *desolate* when they copied this word from 𝒪 into 𝒫. In other words, Joseph was actually dictating *desolates* even though it should have been *desolate,* and Oliver faithfully copied it down in 𝒪 as *desolates* (except perhaps when it was in a biblical quote). We have already seen one clear example where Joseph tended to mispronounce something—namely, his tendency to dictate "around about", at least initially, which Oliver himself never wrote in 𝒫. But unlike the case of *desolates,* Oliver usually corrected "around about" to "round about" in 𝒪. For discussion of this case, see under 1 Nephi 8:13.

Elsewhere in the original text, we have a few examples of words ending in *t* that typically take a plural form in the Book of Mormon, in opposition to what modern English readers expect:

☐ *mights* instead of *might*

"by laboring with our **mights**" (Jacob 1:19)

☐ *effects* instead of *effect*

"and the **effects** thereof is poison" (Mosiah 7:30)

☐ *respects* instead of *respect*

"having no **respects** to persons" (Alma 1:30)

In each of these cases, the critical text will maintain the unusual plural forms (see the discussion under each passage listed above).

The Oxford English Dictionary allows for the possibility of using *desolate* as a count noun, with the meaning 'a desolate place or person' (see section C under the participial adjective *desolate*). Three examples are given showing count usage—and for one of these examples the plural *desolates* occurs (original accidentals retained but also transcribed):

The Wars of Alexander (between 1400–1450)

Duells here **in disolatis**, in dennes &   in cauys
'dwells here in desolates, in dens   and in caves'

Another early example of the plural *desolates* (again with accidentals retained) is found on *Literature Online* <lion.chadwyck.com>:

Valentine and Orson (about 1503)

Alas said she, there is not in the world a more discomforted lady than I am,
for from syde to side I am euoyde of Ioye, of pleasure of myrthe,
and am replete with douloure and mysery, and of intollerable dystresse,
greued weth all trybulacyons, **and amonge all desolates**, the most desolate.

These examples of *desolates* are plural nouns, not adjectives. But as already pointed out, in the phrase "it was called Desolates" (in Helaman 3:6) this kind of plural could work. David Calabro (personal communication) also points out that the plural *desolates* could be treated as a kind of adverbial essive phrase with the meaning 'as desolate places' in two out of the three places where *desolates* is extant in 𝓞:

Helaman 3:5

in whatsoever parts it had not been rendered **desolates** (= 'as desolate places')

3 Nephi 4:1

and the cities which had been left **desolates** (= 'as desolate places')

This interpretation does not work that well for the extant case of *desolates* in Helaman 3:6 ("and now no part of the land was **desolates** save it were for timber"), although there is an implied plural here in this negative expression. Calabro notes that for this one case *desolates* is followed by an *s*-initial word, *save,* which could have led Oliver Cowdery to mishear *desolate* as *desolates,* especially since he had just heard a correct *desolates* in the previous verse:

Helaman 3:5–6 (possible original text)
> in whatsoever parts it had not been rendered **desolates** and without timber . . .
> and now no part of the land was **desolate save** it were for timber

In other words, the plural *desolates* in 𝒪 would be rejected in one case but retained in the two cases where the context is plural.

Extending this analysis to the cases where 𝒪 is not extant (and excluding the 11 cases where the text quotes from the King James Bible and reads *desolate*), one could emend *desolate* (the reading in 𝒫) to *desolates* whenever the context is plural, again with the understanding that *desolates* means 'as desolate places':

Alma 16:11	and their lands remained **desolates**
Helaman 14:24	and many cities shall become **desolates**
Helaman 15:1	your houses shall be left unto you **desolates**
3 Nephi 4:3	for the Nephites had left their lands **desolates**
3 Nephi 8:14	and the places were left **desolates**
3 Nephi 10:7	the places of your dwellings shall become **desolates**

In those remaining cases where the context is singular and 𝒪 is not extant, the singular *desolate* would be retained but with the meaning 'as a desolate place':

Alma 16:10	but behold in one day it was left **desolate**
Helaman 3:6	it was called **desolate**

As already noted, in the last instance the plural *desolates* might work as a name, thus "it was called Desolates".

Finally, one could argue that the three instances in 𝒪 of *desolate* rather than *desolates* in 1 Nephi 21 (quoting from Isaiah) shows that Oliver Cowdery (and perhaps also Joseph Smith) did not automatically add *s* to *desolate* when the original text was dictated. This would imply that at least two of the three instances of *desolates* in 𝒪 are fully intended (in Helaman 3:5 and 3 Nephi 4:1), that the only extant occurrence of *desolates* that is an error occurred when *desolate* was followed by the *s*-initial *save* (in Helaman 3:6). This interpretation would also explain why *desolates* was never emended to *desolate* in 𝒪 itself, unlike the three cases of *requisites* in Alma 41:2.

Thus we have an intriguing set of possible emendations for the word *desolate(s),* and it is difficult to decide whether to make all these emendations or to accept the systematic *desolate* (what we expect in modern English). Another solution, of course, would be to accept in each case the reading of the earliest extant source, which would give us a mixture of *desolate* and *desolates.* Because of the difficulty of this problem, the safest solution is probably to retain what we expect in modern English, namely, the singular *desolate* in all cases, but with the realization that in some cases the original text may have read *desolates.* The few cases of *desolates* in 𝒪 will be treated as the result of a tendency to add a plural *s* to an adjective ending in /ət/.

Summary: Reject the plural reading *desolates,* the reading in 𝒪, for Helaman 3:5–6 and 3 Nephi 4:1; although there is some evidence that the plural *desolates* could be correct in some cases, the safest solution is to adopt the expected form *desolate,* the reading in 𝒫 and all the printed editions.

■ **Helaman 3:5–6**

yea and even they did spread forth into all parts of the land
in whatsoever parts it had not been rendered desolate and without timber
because of the many inhabitants which had before **inherited** *the land*
and now no part of the land was desolate save it were for timber etc.
but because of the greatness of the destruction of the people
which had before **inhabited** *the land*
it was called desolate

One wonders here if *inherited* in verse 5 might not be an error for *inhabited,* perhaps the result of an attempt to avoid the redundancy of "because of the many **inhabitants** which had before **inhabited** the land". In verse 6 we get the word *inhabited* but without any redundancy: "because of the greatness of the destruction of the **people** which had before **inhabited** the land". Both *inhabited* and *inherited* are visually similar, but since 𝒪 is extant for both words (*inherited* in verse 5 and *inhabited* in verse 6), one might conclude that Joseph Smith misread the text as he dictated it to Oliver Cowdery. Or perhaps *inherited* in verse 5 was prompted by the occurrence earlier in verse 3 of the word *inherit:*

> Helaman 3:3
> > there were an exceeding great many
> > which departed out of the land of Zarahemla
> > and went forth unto the land northward to **inherit** the land

On the other hand, the text in verses 5–6 is referring to the Jaredites as the ones who had earlier inherited the land—that is, received the land as an inheritance:

> Ether 1:38
> > and who knoweth but the Lord will carry us forth into a land
> > which is choice above all the earth
> > and if it so be / let us be faithful unto the Lord
> > that we may receive it for our inheritance

> Ether 2:15
> > and this is my thoughts upon the land
> > which I shall give you for your inheritance

However, there is at least one other place in the text where the verb *inherit* is used more in the sense of 'inhabit':

> Mosiah 10:3
> > and it came to pass that we did **inherit** the land of our fathers
> > for many years / yea for the space of twenty and two years

Stan Thayne (personal communication, 11 February 2005) notes that the Oxford English Dictionary, under definition 3 for the verb *inherit,* lists a transferred meaning "chiefly in biblical and derived uses", namely, 'to receive, obtain, have, or hold as one's portion' (or, in other words, 'to possess'). Besides biblical citations, the OED gives the following example (accidentals regularized) from John Milton's *Samson Agonistes* (1671): "It is not virtue, wisdom, valor, wit, strength, comeliness

of shape, or amplest merit that woman's love can win or long **inherit**". In Exodus 32:13, the King James Bible provides a good example where the verb *inherit* means 'to possess by inheritance' rather than 'to receive by inheritance': "and all this land that I have spoken of will I give unto your seed and they shall **inherit** *it* forever". (The Hebrew verb in this passage means 'to possess'.) Thus the occasional use of *inherit* in the Book of Mormon with the meaning 'to possess' is quite appropriate and should not be emended to *inhabit*.

Summary: Retain the occurrence of the verb *inherit* in Helaman 3:5 (as well as in Mosiah 10:3); there is evidence in earlier English, especially biblical English, that the word *inherit* meant 'possess', especially with respect to land.

■ **Helaman 3:6**

and now no part of the land was desolate save it were for timber
[*&.C* 0 | *.&c.* 1 | *&c.* ABCDEFGHIKLMNOQ | *etc.* JPS | RT]

Here we have an example of an original *etc.* that was removed from the 1920 LDS edition. In this instance, the *etc.* seems to be an attempt to avoid repeating the text in the preceding verse that referred to the reason the desolate land lost its timber, namely, "because of the many inhabitants which had before inherited the land":

> Helaman 3:5
>> yea and even they did spread forth into all parts of the land
>> in whatsoever parts it had not been rendered desolate and without timber
>> because of the many inhabitants which had before inherited the land

In other words, Mormon did not want to explicitly repeat the *because*-phrase. Thus the *etc.* here in verse 6 serves as a kind of ellipsis. The critical text will restore the *etc.* here since it is clearly intended, irrespective of how it is being used. For further discussion, see under ETC. in volume 3.

Summary: Restore the *etc.* in Helaman 3:6, the reading of both manuscripts and all the early editions.

■ **Helaman 3:9**

and they did suffer whatsoever tree should spring up
[*upon* 01ABCDEFGHIJKLMOPQRST | *on* N] *the face of the land*
that it should grow up

The original text here reads *up upon*. The 1906 LDS edition replaced this with *up on*, but since that edition never served as a copytext for any subsequent LDS edition, the shorter reading has never been transmitted. As explained under Alma 2:15, there are quite a few examples of *up upon* in the original text, so there is no reason to emend *up upon* here in Helaman 3:9. In particular, we have two other references in the text to a tree "springing up" (used metaphorically in these two cases):

> Alma 32:41   it shall be a tree **springing up** unto everlasting life
> Alma 33:23   it will become a tree **springing up** in you unto everlasting life

In addition, *upon* is much more frequent than *on* for the phrase "(up)on the face of the land", with 30 other instances with *upon* but only one with *on,* in 1 Nephi 12:4: "I saw a mist of darkness **on** the face of the land of promise". (Similarly, when *all* is included, there are 15 instances in the original text of "**upon** all the face of the land" but only one of "**on** all the face of the land", in Alma 16:16). See under 1 Nephi 12:4 for further discussion regarding the choice between *upon* and *on* for this phrase.

Summary: Maintain in Helaman 3:9 the original occurrence of *up upon,* which is independently supported by usage elsewhere in the text.

■ **Helaman 3:11**

and thus they did enable the people in the land northward
that they [*might* 01ABCEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST | *may* D] *build many cities*
both of wood and of cement

The original modal here, *might,* allows for the correct past-tense interpretation, whereas the *may* introduced in the 1841 British edition forces a present-tense interpretation, an obvious error. The subsequent LDS edition (1849) restored the correct *might*. For a list of other cases where *might* and *may* have been switched in the history of the text, see under Jacob 5:13.

Summary: Maintain in Helaman 3:11 the original *might,* the appropriate modal for allowing the past-tense interpretation in this passage.

■ **Helaman 3:12**

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*

Here in the original manuscript, Oliver Cowdery initially wrote "into **the** land". Virtually immediately he corrected the *the* to *this* by overwriting the *e* with an *i* and inserting inline an *s*. In a number of cases in the text, Oliver accidentally replaced *this land* with *the land;* for a list, see under Alma 27:10–12. As also explained under that passage, there are cases of *the land* in the original text where modern readers expect *this land*. For each case of *this land* versus *the land,* the critical text will follow the earliest reading, here the corrected reading in Ꝺ ("into **this** land").

Summary: Accept in Helaman 3:12 Oliver Cowdery's virtually immediate correction in Ꝺ of *the land* to *this land*.

■ **Helaman 3:14**

> *but behold a hundredth part of the proceedings of this people*
> *yea the account of the Lamanites and of the Nephites*
> *and their wars and contentions and dissensions*
> *and their preaching and their prophesies*
> *and their shipping and their building of ships*
> *and their building of temples and of synagogues and* **their** *sanctuaries*
> *and their righteousness and their wickedness*
> *and their murders and their robbings and their plunderings*
> *and all manner of abominations and whoredoms*
> *cannot be contained in this work*

Ross Geddes has suggested (personal communication, 12 September 2004) that *their sanctuaries* could be an error for *of sanctuaries*. Note that in the larger context, every conjunct in the list has to do with what the people did (actions or states that can be considered "proceedings of this people") but not with any of the objects of those proceedings—except for this odd case of *their sanctuaries*. Geddes proposes that the original text read "and their building of temples and of synagogues and **of** sanctuaries" (or perhaps without the last repeated *of:* "and their building of temples and of synagogues and sanctuaries").

An intrusive *their* before *sanctuaries* could have occurred in anticipation of the repeated *their* that occurs in the following text: "and **their** righteousness and **their** wickedness and **their** murders and **their** robbings and **their** plunderings" (note also the many instances of *their* in the preceding text). There is also some evidence in the history of the text for errors resulting from anticipation of a following *their;* for discussion and examples, see under 1 Nephi 10:3.

Here in Helaman 3:14, 𝓞 is extant for that part of the conjunctive phrase that refers to the building of temples and synagogues, but not for "& their sanctuaries"; however, the length of the lacuna suggests that "& of sanctuaries" would be too short. The other emendation, "& sanctuaries", would be even shorter. Of course, some other scribal mishap could account for the difference in the length of the lacuna.

One could interpret these sanctuaries as sacred places out in nature—that is, sanctuaries were not built. Given such an interpretation, the reader could exclude "and their sanctuaries" from "and their building of temples and of synagogues". Yet all other relevant passages in the text indicate that sanctuaries were built:

> Alma 21:6
> > behold we have **built sanctuaries**
> > and we do assemble ourselves together to worship God

> Alma 22:7
> > and I have granted unto them that they should **build sanctuaries**
> > that they might assemble themselves together to worship him

> Helaman 3:9
> > 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

A fourth possible example (depending on the antecedent for the relative pronoun *which*) is in 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".

Although there is no support for a direct switch of *their* and *of* in the transmission of the text, there is separate evidence for adding *their* and for omitting *of*. For an example where an extra *their* was added to a conjunctive phrase, see under Mosiah 23:28 (where "their wives and children" was changed to "their wives and **their** children"). For an example where a repeated *of* was lost in a conjunctive phrase, see under Enos 1:23 (where "reminding them of death and **of** the duration of eternity" was changed to "reminding them of death and the duration of eternity").

When we consider all other conjunctive phrases involving temples, synagogues, sanctuaries, and other places of worship, we find that determiners and prepositions are typically repeated, although not always; but most importantly for these phrases, no determiner or preposition occurs in a later conjunct unless it occurs earlier in the first conjunct. In the following list, I mark with an asterisk every instance where all three words appear, *temples, synagogues,* and *sanctuaries:*

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

> * Alma 16:13 (repetition of *in* and *their*)
>
>> and Alma and Amulek went forth preaching repentance unto the people
>> **in their** temples and **in their** sanctuaries and also **in their** synagogues

> Alma 21:16 (repetition of *in*)
>
>> and they went forth whithersoever they were led by the Spirit of the Lord
>> preaching the word of God **in** every synagogue of the Amlicites
>> or **in** every assembly of the Lamanites

> Alma 23:2 (repetition of *their* but not *to*)
>
>> but that they should have free access
>> **to their** houses and also **their** temples and **their** sanctuaries

> Alma 26:29 (repetition of *their* but not *into*)
>
>> and we have also entered **into their** temples and **their** synagogues

> Alma 32:1 (repetition of *into* and *their*)
>
>> they did go forth and began to preach the word of God unto the people
>> entering **into their** synagogues and **into their** houses

> * Helaman 3:9 (repetition of *their*)
>
>> 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

> 3 Nephi 13:2 (repetition of *in* and *the*)
>
>> do not sound a trumpet before you as will hypocrites do
>> **in the** synagogues and **in the** streets

3 Nephi 13:5 (repetition of *in* and *the*)
  for they love to pray
  standing **in the** synagogues and **in the** corners of the streets

3 Nephi 18:32 (repetition of *your* but not *out of*)
  nevertheless ye shall not cast him
  out of your synagogues or **your** places of worship

The two examples in 3 Nephi 13 are found in the King James Bible, Matthew 6:2, 5.

Thus the occurrence of *their sanctuaries* in Helaman 3:14 is anomalous in its sudden use of *their* as well as its identification of sanctuaries as a proceeding or doing of the people. Instead, it is "and their building of temples and of synagogues and of sanctuaries" that represents what the people were doing. In the two other examples where *temples, synagogues,* and *sanctuaries* are all conjoined, repetition is consistent for all three conjuncts (with repetition of *in their* for Alma 16:13 and repetition of *their* for Helaman 3:9). The systematic repetition of the preposition after its first repetition provides some support for repeating here in Helaman 3:14 the *of* for *sanctuaries* (the last conjunction) since the first two have the *of* (thus "and their building **of** temples and **of** synagogues and **of** sanctuaries"). We can be quite sure that the *their* is intrusive, but less sure about whether the *of* was repeated before *sanctuaries*. Most likely, the extra *their* arose as Joseph Smith dictated the text to Oliver Cowdery, not when Oliver later copied the text from 𝓞 into 𝓟 (given that the spacing between extant fragments in 𝓞 agrees with the anomalous reading in 𝓟).

It should be pointed out that the 1920 LDS edition emended the 1830 punctuation to show that *their sanctuaries* was conjoined with the preceding *of synagogues*. The 1830 punctuation (determined by John Gilbert, the typesetter) was "and their building of temples, and of synagogues, and their sanctuaries, and their righteousness, and their wickedness". The editors for the 1920 edition removed the comma after *synagogues,* giving "and their building of temples, and of synagogues and their sanctuaries, and their righteousness, and their wickedness". Thus the 1920 edition recognized the difficulty with the phraseology "and their building of temples and of synagogues and their sanctuaries". In the emended phrase, "and their building of temples and of synagogues and of sanctuaries", it would be best to avoid any commas, thus allowing the whole phrase to be set off from the other proceedings and doings listed in this passage.

Summary: Emend Helaman 3:14 to read "and their building of temples and of synagogues and **of** sanctuaries", thus replacing *their* before *sanctuaries* with *of;* usage elsewhere in the text indicates that the *their* in the earliest extant reading is intrusive; conjunctive repetition of prepositions for other conjuncts involving *temples, synagogues,* and *sanctuaries* supports repeating the *of* before *sanctuaries*.

■ **Helaman 3:14**

and their murders and their robbings
and their [plunderings 01 | *plundering* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
and all manner of abominations and whoredoms

Here the 1830 typesetter accidentally replaced the plural *plunderings* with the singular *plundering,* even though the conjoined nouns are in the plural. Elsewhere the text is consistent in using the

singular *plundering* when immediately conjoined nouns are singular, but the plural *plunderings* when those nouns are plural:

◻ conjoined with singular nouns

Mosiah 29:14　　　no stealing nor **plundering** nor murdering

Mosiah 29:36　　　and the stealing and the **plundering** and the committing
　　　　　　　　　　　of whoredoms

Alma 16:18　　　　and stealing robbing **plundering** murdering

Alma 17:14　　　　yet they sought to obtain these things by murdering and **plundering**

◻ conjoined with plural nouns

Alma 37:21　　　　yea all their murders and robbings and their **plunderings**

Alma 50:21　　　　yea their murderings and their **plunderings**

Helaman 6:21　　　for their murders and their **plunderings** and their stealings

Helaman 10:3　　　and their murderings and their **plunderings**

In the last example, Oliver Cowdery initially wrote *plundering* in 𝒫, but this was the last word on the page and he simply ran out of space at the end of the line. Oliver never actually finished writing the word since the *i* was not dotted. He simply crossed out *plundering* and then wrote the full plural form as the first word at the beginning of the next page of 𝒫.

Thus the original text in Helaman 3:14 is consistent with other usage, especially in the second half of the Book of Mormon (where only the plural *plunderings* is found). Here in Helaman 3:14, the critical text will restore the plural for this noun.

Summary: In accord with the reading of the manuscripts, restore the plural *plunderings* in Helaman 3:14 (which is consistent with other usage in the text).

■ **Helaman 3:16**

until they are no more called the Nephites
becoming wicked [*& wild* 01 | *and wild* ABCEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST | D] *and ferocious*

The 1841 British edition accidentally omitted *and wild*. After setting *wicked*, the compositor's eye skipped from *wicked* to the visually similar *wild*, with the result that he continued by setting *and ferocious*, thus skipping *and wild*. The subsequent LDS edition (1849) restored the original reading here.

Summary: Maintain the occurrence of *and wild* in Helaman 3:16: "becoming wicked and wild and ferocious".

■ **Helaman 3:19**

there **was** *still great* [*contentions* 01ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQS | *contention* RT] *in the land*

The 1920 LDS edition resolved the disagreement between the singular *was* and the plural *contentions* by making the noun singular. But in the original text, there were numerous instances of

"there was <plural noun>" (see the discussion under 1 Nephi 4:4). For such examples, the overriding tendency has been to emend the *was* to *were,* not change the plural noun to a singular one, as in the change to *were* for two other instances of the plural *contentions* (made by Joseph Smith in his editing for the 1837 edition):

> Alma 4:1
> there [*was* >js *were* 1 | *was* A | *were* BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
> no contentions nor wars in the land of Zarahemla

> 4 Nephi 1:2
> and there [*was* >js *were* 1 | *was* A | *were* BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
> no contentions and disputations among them

It should be noted that these two examples involve negation, unlike the case here in Helaman 3:19.

As we might expect, there are examples of "there was (a) contention" in the text. In fact, here in Helaman 3:19 it appears that the editors for the 1920 LDS edition were influenced by several references in their copytext to "there was no contention" and "there was much contention" at the beginning of this chapter:

> Helaman 3:1–3 (the 1920 copytext, but with *yea* emended to *year* in verse 3)
> and now it came to pass in the forty and third year of the reign of the judges
> **there was no contention** among the people of Nephi . . .
> and **there was no contention** among the people in the forty and fourth year
> neither **was there much contention** in the forty and fifth year
> and it came to pass in the forty and sixth year
> **there was much contention** and many dissensions

The 1911 LDS edition, the copytext for the 1920 edition, had four instances of the singular *contention* in Helaman 3:1–3, although in the earliest text the last one read in the plural: "there were much contentions and many dissensions" (see the nearby discussion under Helaman 3:3). For each case of "there was/were contention(s)", the critical text will maintain the earliest reading, even if it violates the standard rules of subject-verb agreement.

The use of the adverb *still* here in Helaman 3:19 should also be noted: "there was **still** great contentions in the land". Earlier in this passage, we have a specific reference to the great contentions that occurred in the previous year:

> Helaman 3:17
> and now I return again to mine account
> therefore what I have spoken had passed
> after there had been **great contentions** and disturbances
> and wars and dissensions among the people of Nephi

Thus the use in verse 19 of the plural *great contentions* in "there was **still** great contentions in the land" is precisely correct.

Summary: Restore in Helaman 3:19 the plural *contentions* while retaining the singular *was:* "there **was** still great **contentions** in the land".

■ **Helaman 3:19**

and also in the forty and [*eight* 0N | *eighth* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMOPQRST] *year*

Here in the original manuscript, the word *eighth* was written as *eight*. One wonders if this *eight* might actually be correct. Under Alma 52:15, I discussed two examples, "the twentieth and seventh year" and "the thirtieth and seventh year" (that is, where all the conjoined numbers are ordinals) and showed that this kind of compound ordinal number may actually represent the original text. Under Alma 56:7, 9, on the other hand, I argued that examples like "the twenty and six year" are probably errors for "the twenty and sixth year"; in cases like that, the final /θ/ sound in *sixth* was apparently omitted as Joseph Smith read off the text to Oliver Cowdery.

In contrast to these two types, the word *eighth* was orthographically difficult—that is, scribes and typesetters had difficulty with the complex sequence *ghth* and tended to omit one of the *h*'s, either the *h* before the *t* (thus *eigth*) or the *h* after the *t* (thus *eight*). Even though *eighth* appears as *eight* here in 𝓞 for Helaman 3:19, this is most likely Oliver's scribal error for the ordinal number, not the cardinal number itself. We can see this orthographic difficulty when we list all the variant forms in the manuscripts and the printed editions for the ordinal number *eighth:*

Alma 4:9	this *eighth* year	eight	1841
Alma 53:23	the twenty and *eighth* year	eight	𝓟*
		eigth	1830
Alma 57:5	the twenty and *eighth* year	eigth	𝓞
Alma 63:7	the thirty and *eighth* year	eigth	𝓟
		eight	1888
Alma 63:9	the thirty and *eighth* year	eigth	𝓞, 𝓟
Helaman 3:19	the forty and *eighth* year	eight	𝓞, 1906
Helaman 3:22	the forty and *eighth* year	eight	1906
Helaman 4:8	the fifty and *eighth* and ninth years	eigth	𝓟*
		eight	𝓟ᶜ, 1841, 1849, 1852
Helaman 6:41	the sixty and *eighth* year	eight	1841, 1852
Helaman 11:22	the seventy and *eighth* year	eighty	1837, 1840
3 Nephi 2:4	the ninety and *eighth* year	eight	1841

Also note the typo *eighty* for two of the editions in Helaman 11:22. Overall, *eighth* appears 19 times in the text, yet 11 of these show at least one textual source, seldom the same one, where *eighth* was not correctly written or set in type.

I tally here the number of times each manuscript or edition had these various errors for *eighth:*

	eight	*eigth*	*eighty*
𝓞	1	2	
𝓟	2	3	
1830		1	
1837			1
1840			1
1841	4		
1849	1		
1852	2		
1888	1		
1906	2		

In various editions from 1841 through 1906, the tendency was to accidentally set *eight* for *eighth*, not *eigth*. In the manuscripts, the tendency was to miswrite either *eigth* or *eight* for *eighth* (with *eigth* more frequent than *eight*). There is only one case where the earliest manuscript evidence supports *eight* instead of the expected *eighth,* namely, here in 𝓞 for Helaman 3:19. The critical text will consider this *eight* as a scribal error for *eighth*. In Helaman 4:8 (where 𝓞 is not extant but probably read *eighth*), Oliver Cowdery initially wrote *eigth* in 𝓟, which he then supralinearly corrected to *eight* rather than the intended *eighth*. For this example, see either the list of errors for *eighth* under Alma 52:15 or the transcript of 𝓟 in volume 2 of the critical text (lines 5–6 on page 337 of 𝓟).

Summary: Interpret the case of *eight* in 𝓞 for Helaman 3:19 as a scribal error for *eighth;* evidence elsewhere in the manuscripts shows that Oliver Cowdery tended to miswrite *eighth* by omitting one of the two *h*'s, giving either *eigth* or *eight*.

■ **Helaman 3:22–23**

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]
[*&* > NULL 1 | ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *in the latter end of the forty and eighth year*
of the reign of the judges over **the people of Nephi**
[*&* 1 | *And* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *it came to pass*
in the forty and ninth year of the reign of the judges
there was continual peace established in the land . . .

The original manuscript is not extant for the manuscript pages from Helaman 3:21 to Helaman 13:36, so for this part of the text we are unable to make any conjectures regarding the reading in 𝓞 based on spacing between extant fragments. Here in the printer's manuscript for Helaman 3:22, Oliver Cowdery initially wrote "among the people of Nephi &". Virtually immediately, he crossed out the ampersand and inserted supralinearly the word *the* as well as *tes* to the end of *Nephi* (there is no change in the level of ink flow for the correction). Thus 𝓟 ends up reading "among the people of the Nephites". As explained under Alma 45:13, the corrected reading here in Helaman 3:22 is the unexpected reading and is undoubtedly the original reading. One could explain the initial reading here in 𝓟 as Oliver's tendency to write the more frequent "the people of Nephi". But in this case what seems to have happened is that Oliver's eye skipped down one line since what he wrote also includes the ampersand that occurs at the juncture of verses 22 and 23 ("the people of Nephi &"). We can see this in the transcript for 𝓟 or in the following reconstructed reading for 𝓞 (with bolding added to show where Oliver's eye would have skipped down):

> Helaman 3:22–23 (reconstructed 𝓞)
> **the people of the Nephites** in the latter end of the forty & eighth year of the reign of the
> Judges over **the people of Nephi &** it came to pass in the forty & ninth year of the reign of

In any event, the correct reading in the middle of verse 22 is "the people of the Nephites"—and without any *and* before "in the latter end of the forty and eighth year".

Summary: Maintain in Helaman 3:22 the corrected reading in 𝓟, "among the people of the Nephites".

■ **Helaman 3:23**

there was continual peace established in the land
all save it were the secret combinations
which Gaddianton the [rober > robber 1 | nobler A | robber BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
   had established

Oliver Cowdery frequently wrote his *n*'s and *r*'s alike, with the consequence that for some words in the text there have been mix-ups; for the following examples, see the discussion under the listed passage:

  ▫ *clear* versus *clean*   Mosiah 2:15–16
  ▫ *repair* versus *retain*   Alma 39:13
  ▫ *desent* versus *desert*   Alma 46:27
  ▫ *ever* versus *even*   Alma 56:46

(Oliver's *desent* is his spelling for *dissent*.)

   Here in Helaman 3:23 we have a rather amusing example where the 1830 compositor misread the word *robber* in 𝒫 and set *nobler*, thus "Gaddianton the nobler" (*Gaddianton* is spelled with one *d*). As expected, this reading was replaced with the correct "Gaddianton the robber" in the second edition (1837). Everywhere else the text refers to Gaddianton and his band as robbers, with eight instances of "Gaddianton robbers" and five of "robbers of Gaddianton". Here in Helaman 3:23, the critical text will follow the original reading, "Gaddianton the robber".

Summary: Maintain in Helaman 3:23 the reference to "Gaddianton the **robber**" rather than the 1830 reading, "Gaddianton the **nobler**"; Gaddianton and his band are always referred to as robbers.

■ **Helaman 3:23**

there was continual peace established in the land all save it were the secret combinations
which Gaddianton the robber had established in the more settled parts of the land
which at that time were not known unto those
which were at the head of [1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRT | the S] government

In modern English we expect "at the head of **the** government". Elsewhere in the text we find two other occurrences of "head of . . . government", and in one of these cases there is no determiner:

   Alma 60:24   yea even the great head of **our** government
   Helaman 7:5   to be held in office at the head of government

In fact, this second example is precisely the same prepositional expression as here in Helaman 3:23 ("at the head of government"). Even though the original manuscript does not exist for either Helaman 3:23 or Helaman 7:5, their agreement strongly suggests that nothing is wrong with not having *the* before *government* in this Book of Mormon expression. The 1953 RLDS edition added the expected *the* here in Helaman 3:23, but not in Helaman 7:5 (which suggests that the addition was unintended). This error probably occurred because in English the word *government* usually

takes the definite article *the* (for instance, there are 13 occurrences of *the government* in the original Book of Mormon text).

Summary: Accept in Helaman 3:23 and Helaman 7:5 the phraseology "at the head of government"; that is, without the expected *the* before *government.*

■ **Helaman 3:26**

and it came to pass that the work of the Lord did prosper
[*to* > *unto* 1 | *unto* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *the baptizing*
and uniting to the church of God many souls

Oliver Cowdery initially wrote in the printer's manuscript "to the baptizing", but then he virtually immediately corrected the preposition *to* to *unto* by inserting *un* inline (but raised a little off the line); there is no change in the level of ink flow for the *un.*

Elsewhere in the text, gerundives are usually preceded by *unto* rather than *to,* but *to* is also possible. There are 44 other gerundives with *unto* in the original text, but there are 25 with *to.* For one other case of *unto,* Oliver initially wrote *to* in 𝓟; in this instance, 𝓞 is extant and it reads *unto:*

> Alma 53:17
> yea to protect the land
> [*unto* 0ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST | *to* > *unto* 1] the laying down of their lives

We can see the contrast in usage between *unto* and *to* for the gerundive phrase "(un)to the fulfilling of something": there are 14 instances with *unto* and 4 with *to.* In general, either preposition is possible, so in each case we follow the earliest textual sources. Here in Helaman 3:26, we accept Oliver Cowdery's correction in 𝓟 as the reading in 𝓞. For a general list of cases where Oliver wrote *to* instead of the correct *unto,* see under Jacob 2:17.

Summary: Maintain *unto* for the gerundive in Helaman 3:26, the corrected reading in 𝓟 ("**unto** the baptizing and uniting to the church of God many souls").

■ **Helaman 3:26**

and it came to pass that the work of the Lord did prosper
unto the baptizing and [*the* > NULL 1 | ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *uniting*
to the church of God many souls

Here in the printer's manuscript, Oliver Cowdery initially wrote "and the uniting", which parallels the preceding conjoined gerund ("the baptizing"). But virtually immediately Oliver crossed out the repeated *the;* there is no apparent change in level of ink flow for the crossout. Most likely, this correction was based on the reading of the original manuscript (no longer extant here).

Elsewhere in the text there are two other examples of this kind of conjoined gerunds, and in both cases the definite article *the* is not repeated:

1 Nephi 22:8
>   wherefore it is likened unto **the being nursed** by the Gentiles
>   and **being carried** in their arms and upon their shoulders

2 Nephi 3:12
>   and also that which shall be written by the fruit of the loins of Judah
>   shall grow together
>   unto **the confounding** of false doctrines
>   and **laying down** of contentions
>   and **establishing** peace among the fruit of thy loins
>   and **bringing them** to the knowledge of their fathers in the latter days

So actually the nonrepeated *the* in Helaman 3:26 (based on the corrected text in 𝒫) is consistent with these other examples.

Summary: Maintain the lack of the repeated *the* in the conjoined gerunds in Helaman 3:26: "unto the baptizing and uniting to the church of God many souls".

■ **Helaman 3:26**

and it came to pass that the work of the Lord did prosper **unto** *the baptizing and uniting*
[*unto > to* 1 | *to* ABCEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST | *unto* D] *the church of God many souls*

Oliver Cowdery initially wrote "**unto** the church of God", but then virtually immediately he crossed out the *un* of *unto* (there is no apparent difference in ink flow for the crossout). This correction probably follows the reading of the original manuscript since either *to* or *unto* is possible here. The 1841 British edition accidentally made this same change of *to* to *unto,* but the subsequent LDS edition (1849) restored the correct *to*. The *unto* here may have been prompted by the *unto* earlier in the clause ("**unto** the baptizing and uniting").

Elsewhere in the text there are six other examples of "uniting (un)to \<an organization\>":

2 Nephi 6:12	if it so be that they . . . do not unite themselves **to** that great and abominable church
Alma 4:5	there was about three thousand five hundred souls that united themselves **to** the church of God
Helaman 7:25	and ye have united yourselves **unto** it / yea **to** that secret band which was established by Gaddianton
3 Nephi 28:18	uniting as many **to** the church as would believe in their preaching
3 Nephi 28:23	and they were converted unto the Lord and were united **unto** the church of Christ

Thus there are four other cases with *to,* but also two with *unto;* so either preposition is acceptable. And in one passage (Helaman 7:25), we first get *unto* but then *to* in the following *yea*-phrase.

Summary: Accept Oliver Cowdery's virtually immediate correction of *unto* to *to* in Helaman 3:26 ("and uniting **to** the church of God many souls").

■ **Helaman 3:29**

and lead the man of Christ
in a [*strait* 1ST | *straight* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQR] *and narrow course*
across that everlasting gulf of misery which is prepared to engulf the wicked

> As discussed under 1 Nephi 8:20, the critical text will restore the four instances of the phrase "straight and narrow". Here in Helaman 3:29, both the current LDS and RLDS texts read "strait and narrow".

■ **Helaman 3:29–30**

yea we see that whosoever will
[1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQS | *may* RT] *lay hold upon the word of God*
which is quick and powerful
which shall divide asunder all the cunning and the snares and the wiles of the devil
and lead the man of Christ in a straight and narrow course
across that everlasting gulf of misery which is prepared to engulf the wicked
and land their souls—yea their immortal souls—
at the right hand of God in the kingdom of heaven
to sit down with Abraham and Isaac and with Jacob and with all our holy fathers
to go no more out

> It is obvious that this passage is very complex. Originally, it was a run-on sentence. Here in Helaman 3:29, the editors for the 1920 LDS edition emended the text by inserting the auxiliary verb *may* before *lay hold*. In the original text, the immediately preceding *will* acted as the auxiliary verb for *lay hold*, but the 1920 emendation makes *will* into a main verb with the meaning 'wishes' or 'wants to'. One problem with this emendation is that it makes a minor change in the meaning of the passage. The original text expresses the idea that the word of God will lead the man of Christ to the kingdom of heaven. The use of *may* weakens the original meaning in this passage by introducing a sense of optionality.
>
> In the original text there is actually one example of *will may*; in that case, ᴏ is entirely extant and the reading is appropriate:

> > Alma 41:8
> > therefore the way is prepared
> > that whosoever **will may** walk therein and be saved

> There are some other cases of "whosoever will" where *will* acts as an auxiliary verb and is immediately followed by the main verb:

> > | Alma 12:35 | and whosoever **will harden** his heart and **will do** iniquity . . . |
> > | Alma 42:27 | whosoever **will come** may come and partake of the waters of life |
> > | Alma 46:20 | whosoever **will maintain** this title upon the land . . . |
> > | Helaman 14:29 | that whosoever **will believe** might be saved |
> > | 3 Nephi 9:14 | and whosoever **will come** him will I receive |
> > | 3 Nephi 23:5 | and whosoever **will hearken** unto my words . . . |

The question is whether the sentence fragment in the original text for Helaman 3:29–30 actually needs to be edited. The structure is so long that it doesn't seem to pose any real problem in understanding. In addition, there are other such run-on sentences in the text, some of which have been discussed previously. See, for instance, the case of Enos 1:1–2 (discussed under Enos 1:3).

Summary: Remove the intrusive *may* from Helaman 3:29 since this extra auxiliary verb makes a change in the meaning (although minor); the original sentence fragment is readily understandable and is consistent with other incomplete sentences found in the original text (some of which are still found in the current text).

■ **Helaman 3:30**

and land their [1ABCEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST | *immortal* D] *souls*
—yea their **immortal** *souls—*
at the right hand of God in the kingdom of heaven

Here the 1841 British edition, in anticipation of the following "their immortal souls" inserted the word *immortal* before the preceding *souls*. The resulting dittography is a clear redundancy and makes the following *yea*-phrase purely repetitive ("and land their immortal souls—yea their immortal souls—at the right hand of God"). The subsequent LDS edition (1849) removed the intrusive *immortal*. The critical text will maintain the original (and current) reading.

Summary: Maintain in Helaman 3:30 the lack of *immortal* before *souls* in the phrase prior to the *yea*-phrase; otherwise, the *yea*-phrase serves no purpose.

■ **Helaman 3:31**

and in this year there [*were* 1ABDEP | *was* CGHIJKLMNOQRST | *were > was* F]
continual [*rejoiceings >% rejoiceing* 1 | *rejoicing* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
in the land of Zarahemla

Here Oliver Cowdery initially wrote *rejoicings* (spelled as *rejoiceings*) in the printer's manuscript; then he immediately erased the plural *s,* which means that the original manuscript probably had the singular *rejoicing* (spelled as *rejoiceing*). However, the occurrence of the plural *were* suggests that such a singular *rejoicing* in 𝓞 could have been an error for *rejoicings,* that the plural *s* had been accidentally dropped while taking down Joseph Smith's dictation. And we have one instance in the manuscripts where Oliver initially wrote *rejoicing* instead of the correct *rejoicings:*

> Alma 30:22
> why do ye teach this people that there shall be no Christ
> to interrupt their [*rejoiceing > rejoiceings* 1 | *rejoicings* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]

As discussed under that passage, either the singular or the plural is theoretically possible.

Another possibility here in Helaman 3:31 is that the verb in the earliest extant reading, *were,* is an error for *was.* The grammatical change of *were* to *was* was first made in the 1840 edition (perhaps by Joseph Smith in his editing for that edition) and then later in the second printing for

the 1852 LDS edition (apparently by reference to the 1840 edition). Another possible emendation would have been to change *rejoicing* to the plural, giving "there were continual rejoicings", much like the grammatically emended reading that Joseph, in his editing for the 1837 edition, introduced into the following passage:

> Mosiah 23:24
>
> and great [*was* >js *were* 1 | *was* A | *were* BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] their rejoicings

Despite these suggestions for removing this case of subject-verb disagreement in Helaman 3:31, there is evidence in the original text for expressions of the form "there **were** <singular noun>", although all of these examples have been edited to "there **was** <singular noun>" at some time in the history of the text:

> Helaman 16:12 (by Joseph Smith in his editing for the 1837 edition)
>
> and there [*were* >js *was* 1 | *were* A | *was* BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
> but **little alteration** in the affairs of the people

> 3 Nephi 1:23 (in the third printing of the 1905 LDS edition, in 1907)
>
> Nephi went forth among the people and also many others baptizing unto repentance
> in the which there [*were* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLNPS | *were* > *was* M | *was* OQRT]
> **a great remission** of sins

> 3 Nephi 4:4 (by Joseph Smith in his editing for the 1837 edition)
>
> therefore there [*were* >js *was* 1 | *were* A | *was* BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
> **no chance** for the robbers to plunder and to obtain food

> 3 Nephi 11:3 (in the 1849 LDS edition and in the 1858 Wright edition)
>
> it did pierce them that did hear to the center
> insomuch that there [*were* 1ABCD | *was* EFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
> **no part** of their frame that it did not cause to quake

> 4 Nephi 1:35 (by Joseph Smith in his editing for the 1837 edition)
>
> yea in the two hundred and thirty and first year
> there [*were* >js *was* 1 | *were* A | *was* BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
> **a great division** among the people

These instances of "there were <singular noun>" argue that "there were continual rejoicing" is actually possible. For this reason, the critical text will accept the corrected reading in 𝓟 for Helaman 3:31 (the earliest extant reading) as the original reading.

Summary: Restore in Helaman 3:31 the immediately corrected reading in 𝓟, "there were continual rejoicing in the land of Zarahemla"; despite the subject-verb disagreement, there is evidence in the original text for the construction "there were <singular noun>".

■ **Helaman 3:32**

and it came to pass that
there [was 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRT | were S] peace and exceeding great joy
in the remainder of the forty and ninth year
yea and also there [was 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRT | were S] continual peace and great joy
in the fiftieth year of the reign of the judges

Here the 1953 RLDS edition twice changed the singular *was* to *were,* probably because in each case the delayed subject conjoins *peace* and *joy.* The editors for that edition apparently felt that these two instances of "peace and great joy" should be considered plurals. As explained under 1 Nephi 4:4, the original text allows for singular *was* to occur with a subject of plural conjuncts, as in Alma 4:9: "yea there **was** envyings and strifes and malice and persecutions and pride". And, one could also argue, the conjuncts in a subject noun phrase can be viewed as a singular unit when there is a semantic connection between the conjuncts, as in the following examples involving *peace* and *joy:*

> 1 Nephi 13:37 (original text)
>> yea whoso shall publish **peace**
>> that shall publish **tidings of great joy**
>> how beautiful upon the mountains shall they be

> Helaman 6:14
>> and in the sixty and fifth year
>> they did also have **great joy** and **peace**
>> yea much preaching and many prophecies concerning that which was to come

Summary: Maintain in Helaman 3:32 the use of the singular *was* for the two subjects that conjoin *peace* and *joy;* even if these two nouns form a semantic plural, the original text allows for cases of subject-verb disagreement.

■ **Helaman 3:34**

now this was a great evil
which did cause the more humble part of the people to suffer great persecutions
and to wade through much [affliction 1ABDEFIJLMNOPQRST | afflictions CGHK]

Here the 1840 edition changed the singular *much affliction* to the plural *much afflictions.* The singular form was restored to the RLDS text in the 1908 RLDS edition. As explained under 1 Nephi 16:35, either reading is possible, so we follow here the reading of the earliest textual sources, namely, the singular *much affliction* (the reading in 𝓟). The 1840 change was probably not the result of editing on the part of Joseph Smith since three other instances of *much affliction* were otherwise left unchanged in the 1840 edition (see the list under 1 Nephi 16:35). Moreover, the form *much afflictions* would be considered the more difficult reading, although the original text allowed for the occurrence of "much <plural count noun>" (as discussed under Enos 1:21).

Summary: Maintain in Helaman 3:34 the singular *much affliction,* the reading of the earliest textual source (𝓟).

Helaman 4

■ **Helaman 4:3**

but behold the Lamanites were exceeding [*fraid* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQS | *afraid* RT]

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.

■ **Helaman 4:6**

and the Nephites and the armies of Moronihah were driven
even [*into* 1ABCDEFGHIJLMNOPQRST | *unto* K] *the land of Bountiful*

Here the 1892 RLDS edition accidentally replaced *into* with *unto,* probably because the preposition *unto* appears in a similar phrase at the end of the preceding verse: "even **unto** the land which was near the land Bountiful" (Helaman 4:5). The 1908 RLDS edition restored the original *into* in verse 6. As explained under Helaman 3:3, either preposition is theoretically possible with verbs of motion, although *into* is preferred in the Book of Mormon. With the verb *drive,* there are three other instances, and once more *into* is more frequent:

Alma 18:7	that thereby they might drive away many that were scattered **unto** their own land
Alma 50:7	yea and they went forth and drave all the Lamanites which were in the east wilderness **into** their own lands
Helaman 11:29	they were driven back even **into** their own lands

Summary: Maintain in Helaman 4:6 the original preposition *into* in the phrase "even **into** the land of Bountiful".

■ **Helaman 4:7**

it being a day's journey
for a [*Nephites >% Nephi* 1 | *Nephite* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]

Here Oliver Cowdery initially wrote *a Nephites* in 𝓟. He caught his error immediately; but in erasing the final *s,* he ended up erasing the *te* as well, giving "it being a day's journey for a **Nephi**". The 1830 typesetter corrected this impossible reading to the correct "it being a day's journey for a **Nephite**". As explained under Alma 23:17, virtually every Book of Mormon name that refers to

a people and is derived from a personal name takes the ending *-ite* (such as *Nephite* from *Nephi*); the only exception appears to be *Nehor*.

Summary: Maintain in Helaman 4:7 the name *Nephite* in "it being a day's journey for a **Nephite**"; Oliver Cowdery's correction in 𝒫 of *Nephites* to *Nephi* was a scribal error.

■ **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*

One wonders here whether the singular *all the possession* might be an error for *all the possessions*. There is evidence in the manuscripts that Oliver Cowdery occasionally mixed up the grammatical number for *possession(s);* for examples, see under Alma 22:33–34. Here in Helaman 4:8, the occurrence of the singular *was* in the following relative clause ("which **was** in the land southward") is not evidence against the plural *possessions* since such cases of subject-verb disagreement were prevalent in the original text (see the general discussion under 1 Nephi 4:4).

When we consider other instances of *possession(s)* in the text, we find that either singular or plural can occur. Consider, for instance, the phrase "the land(s) of one's possession(s)", which is discussed under 2 Nephi 29:14: although in the earliest text there are six instances of "the land(s) of one's **possessions**", there are also two instances of "the land(s) of one's **possession**" (in Helaman 5:52 and Helaman 7:22). Similarly, we get a choice in number for the phrase "no more possession(s)", with one instance in the singular and two in the plural (see the discussion under Alma 22:33–34). Moreover, there are other instances of plural *possessions* involving lands that support emending *possession* to the plural in Helaman 4:8:

Mosiah 7:21	having yielded up into his hands the **possessions** of a part of the land
Alma 50:13	it was on the south by the line of the **possessions** of the Lamanites
Alma 58:3	to the maintaining those parts of the land of the which we had retained of our **possessions**
Helaman 4:10	they succeeded in retaining even the half of all their **possessions**

Despite these examples, the singular *possession* is not impossible here in Helaman 4:8; in fact, there has never been any tendency in the textual history to change this instance of *possession* to the plural, which argues that the singular is not all that difficult. The critical text will therefore continue with the singular *possession* here, even though it could be an error for *possessions*.

Summary: Retain in Helaman 4:8 the singular *possession* despite its unusualness in the expression "all the possession of the Nephites which was in the land southward"; usage elsewhere in the text generally allows for either singular or plural for the word *possession(s)*.

■ **Helaman 4:9**

yea they retained many cities which had fallen
into the [*hand > hands* 1 | *hands* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *of the Lamanites*

> Here Oliver Cowdery initially wrote the singular *hand* in 𝓟; but then virtually immediately he
> inserted the plural *s* inline (there is no change in the level of ink flow). Although 𝓞 is not extant
> here, it undoubtedly read in the plural. As discussed under Alma 52:10, the Book of Mormon text
> always uses the plural *hands* in the expression "fall into the hand(s) of X".

Summary: Accept Oliver Cowdery's virtually immediate correction from *hand* to *hands* in Helaman
4:9; the text consistently uses the plural *hands* in the expression "fall into the hand(s) of X".

■ **Helaman 4:9–10**

and it came to pass in the sixtieth year of the reign of the judges
Moronihah did succeed with his armies in obtaining many parts of the land
yea they [*retained* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQS | *regained* RT] *many cities*
which had fallen into the hands of the Lamanites
and it came to pass in the sixty and first year of the reign of the judges
they succeeded in [*retaining* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMPS | *regaining* NOQRT]
even the half of all their possessions

> Here we have two instances in the original text where the verb *retain* has the meaning 'take back'.
> Early 20th-century LDS editions made the change to *regain,* the 1920 edition for the one in verse 9
> and the 1906 large-print edition for the one in verse 10. As explained under Alma 58:3, the critical
> text will restore the original verb *retain* whenever it is supported by the earliest textual sources.

■ **Helaman 4:10**

they succeeded in retaining even the half
of all their [*possessions* 1ABCEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST | *posses~sion* D]

> Here the 1841 British edition replaced the plural *possessions* with the singular *possession* (the last *s*
> in the word was set upside down, thus the symbol *~s*). The subsequent LDS edition (in 1849)
> restored the original plural. As explained nearby under Helaman 4:8, the Book of Mormon text
> allows for some variation in the grammatical number for the noun *possession(s)*. For discussion
> of variation in the related phrase "the land(s) of one's possession(s)", see under 2 Nephi 29:14.
> For each case of *possession(s),* the critical text will follow the earliest extant reading, thus "the half
> of all their **possessions**" here in Helaman 4:10.

Summary: Maintain in Helaman 4:10 the plural *possessions* in the phrase "the half of all their posses-
sions", the reading in 𝓟 (here the earliest textual source).

■ **Helaman 4:11**

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

> Here in the printer's manuscript, Oliver Cowdery initially wrote "for **the** wickedness and their abomination". Virtually immediately he corrected the *the* to *their* by inserting the *ir* inline (there is no change in the level of ink flow for the correction). Oliver frequently wrote *the* instead of the correct *their;* for a list of examples, see under Alma 27:23. The immediacy of the correction, plus the difficulty in this case of the phrase "for the wickedness", argues that the original text read *their wickedness,* not *the wickedness.*

Summary: Maintain in Helaman 4:11 the corrected reading in 𝓟, "for **their** wickedness".

■ **Helaman 4:12**

and smiting their humble brethren
upon the [cheek > cheeks 1 | cheek ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]

> Here Oliver Cowdery initially wrote the singular *cheek* in 𝓟; but then virtually immediately he added the plural *s* by inserting it inline (there is no change in the level of ink flow). 𝓞 is not extant here but most likely read in the plural. Despite the correction in 𝓟, the 1830 compositor set the singular *cheek.* And all the subsequent editions have followed the 1830 reading.
>
> As discussed under Mosiah 12:2, the Book of Mormon text favors the plural *cheeks,* as in Alma 14:15: "and the judge smote them again upon their cheeks". Here in Helaman 4:12, the 1830 compositor may have been influenced by the King James language, which permits only the singular *cheek* in references to smiting someone. And most of these biblical examples are of the form "the cheek" while the Book of Mormon examples are mostly of the form "<possessive pronoun> cheeks". For each case of *cheek(s),* the critical text will follow the earliest extant reading, thus here in Helaman 4:12 the virtually immediate correction in 𝓟, *cheeks.* In addition, the determiner *the* will be maintained in this instance even though *their cheek(s)* is more common than *the cheek(s)* in the Book of Mormon text. See under Mosiah 12:2 for a listing of all examples from both the Book of Mormon and the King James Bible that refer to smiting someone on the cheek(s).

Summary: Restore in Helaman 4:12 the corrected reading *cheeks* in 𝓟: "and smiting their humble brethren upon the **cheeks**".

■ **Helaman 4:12**

making a mock of that which was sacred
denying the spirit of prophecy and of revelation
murdering plundering lying stealing
committing adultery
[raiseing 1 | raising A | rising BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] up in great contentions

> Here in the earliest textual sources, we have an intransitive use of the verb *raise.* Such usage occurred fairly often in the original text, as explained under 2 Nephi 3:24. Although there is no

other example exactly like this one in the text, there are four examples of "to **raise** up in rebellion" (as well as four of "to **rise** up in rebellion"); for discussion, see under Alma 57:32. In each case we follow the earliest textual sources, thus *raising* here in Helaman 4:12. In this instance, the 1837 edition introduced the standard *rising*.

Summary: Restore *raising* in Helaman 4:12, the reading in 𝓟 and the 1830 edition; intransitive uses of the verb *raise* occurred fairly often in the original Book of Mormon text.

■ **Helaman 4:12**

and [*desenting* 1|*deserting* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *away into the land of Nephi among the Lamanites*

As explained under Alma 46:27, the original text here read *dissenting* rather than *deserting*. The word was spelled as *desenting* in 𝓟 (𝓞 is not extant), which led the 1830 compositor to mistakenly set the word as *deserting*.

■ **Helaman 4:16**

for when Moronihah saw that they did repent
he did venture to lead them forth from place to place and from city to city
even until they had [*retained* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNPS|*regained* OQRT]
the one half of their property and the one half of all their lands

As explained under Alma 58:3, the critical text will restore the original uses of the verb *retain* with the meaning 'take back'. For two nearby instances of the same restoration, see under Helaman 4:9–10.

■ **Helaman 4:16**

even until they had retained the one half of their property
and the one half of [NULL > *all* 1|*all* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *their lands*

In the printer's manuscript, Oliver Cowdery initially wrote "the one half of their lands", probably because the preceding phrase reads "the one half of their property". Oliver supralinearly inserted the universal quantifier *all* in 𝓟 and without any change in the level of ink flow, so the correction is virtually immediate and undoubtedly represents the reading of the original manuscript.

This usage involving *all* with the fraction *one half* (or *the half*) is prevalent elsewhere in the text, including a nearby example in Helaman 4:10:

Mosiah 7:22	and even one half of **all** we have or possess
Mosiah 19:15	even one half of **all** they possessed
Mosiah 19:15	one half of . . . **all** their precious things
Mosiah 19:22	a tribute . . . of one half of **all** they possessed
Mosiah 19:26	even one half of **all** they possessed
Helaman 4:10	even the half of **all** their possessions

In four of these cases, the *all* is followed by a reduced relative clause (where the direct object relative pronoun *that* is lacking), and as a result the *all* cannot be deleted in those four examples. But in the two other examples, the *all* is followed by a noun phrase (as here in Helaman 4:16). In those cases, the *all* is not required. For instance, for the second case in Mosiah 19:15, we can see the choice in the use of *all;* the *all* appears before *their precious things,* but not before *their gold* or *their silver:*

> Mosiah 19:15
> one half of their gold and their silver and **all** their precious things

Since in Helaman 4:16 the text will work either with or without the *all,* there would have been no motivation for Oliver Cowdery to edit the text here. Undoubtedly, 𝓞 had the *all*.

Summary: Accept Oliver Cowdery's virtually immediate insertion of *all* in 𝓟 for Helaman 4:16 ("and the one half of **all** their lands"); 𝓞 undoubtedly had the *all*.

■ **Helaman 4:21–22**

and they saw that they had been a stiff-necked people
and that they had set at naught the commandments of God
and that they had altered and trampled under their feet the laws of Mosiah
or that which the Lord commanded him to give unto the people
and [*thus* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQS| RT]
[*seeing* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQS|*they saw* RT]
that their laws had become corrupted
and that they had become a wicked people
insomuch that they were wicked even like unto the Lamanites

As discussed under Mosiah 23:13–14, the original text sometimes allowed a sentence-final present-participial clause to be connected by means of an *and* to a preceding main clause; see under that passage for other examples of this original usage. Here in Helaman 4:21–22, the editors for the 1920 LDS edition omitted the *thus* and changed the nonfinite *seeing* to the finite *they saw,* thereby making the sentence end with a finite clause. Although the original usage is awkward, it is fully intended, and thus the original *thus seeing* will be restored in the critical text.

It should be noted that the deletion of the narrative connector *thus* was unnecessary. The change was marked in the 1920 committee copy, so the deletion of the *thus* was not a typo. Perhaps the 1920 editors felt that the ideas in verse 22 repeated the ideas in the previous verse rather than deriving logically from them; in other words, the *thus* was not consequential or resultive and therefore seemed unnecessary. Yet *thus* frequently has a summarizing purpose in the Book of Mormon text, as in the following example:

> Mosiah 23:21–22
> nevertheless the Lord seeth fit to chasten his people
> yea he trieth their patience and their faith
> nevertheless whosoever putteth his trust in him
> the same shall be lifted up at the last day
> yea and **thus** it was with this people

Summary: Restore the original nonfinite *seeing* in Helaman 4:22 ("and thus seeing that their laws had become corrupted"); this kind of present-participial construction can be found elsewhere in the original text; the *thus* in this passage acts as a summarizing narrative connector and will also be restored.

■ **Helaman 4:22**

and thus seeing that their laws had become
[*corrupt* >+ *corrupted* 1 | *corrupted* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
and that they had become a wicked people
insomuch that they were wicked
even [NULL >+ *like* 1 | *like* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *unto the Lamanites*

Here in the printer's manuscript, Oliver Cowdery initially made two errors as he copied from 𝓞 into 𝓟. He initially wrote *corrupt* but later corrected it to *corrupted* by supralinearly inserting the *-ed* ending. And he initially skipped the word *like*, which he also later supralinearly inserted in 𝓟. For both corrections, the level of ink flow is somewhat heavier, which argues that both these corrections were made at the same time, apparently when Oliver proofed 𝓟 against 𝓞.

The *like* is necessary here. The text really makes no sense without the *like*, and 𝓞 undoubtedly had the word. For further discussion regarding the phrase "like (un)to X", which occurred 89 times in the original text, see under Jacob 2:17.

Most likely, 𝓞 read *corrupted*. Note first of all that the use of *corrupted* here in Helaman 4:22 can be supported by the parallel language in nearby Helaman 5:2: "for the laws had become **corrupted**". More generally, the text allows for either *corrupt* or *corrupted* as a predicate adjective, although most instances read *corrupted* (below I mark each case of *corrupt* with an asterisk):

	2 Nephi 28:11	they have become **corrupted**
	2 Nephi 28:12	their churches have become **corrupted**
*	Jacob 5:39	the fruit of the natural branches had become **corrupt** also
*	Jacob 5:39	and they had all become **corrupt**
	Jacob 5:42	all the fruit of the vineyard save it were these had become **corrupted**
	Jacob 5:42	and now these . . . have also become **corrupted**
	Jacob 5:46	the trees thereof hath become **corrupted**
	Jacob 5:48	the trees of thy vineyard hath become **corrupted**
*	Jacob 5:75	and that his vineyard was no more **corrupt**
	Jacob 5:75	that my vineyard is no more **corrupted**
	Omni 1:17	and their language had become **corrupted**
	Helaman 4:22	that their laws had become **corrupted**
	Helaman 5:2	for the laws had become **corrupted**

Note that all three instances of *corrupt* occur in the allegory of the olive tree (in Jacob 5). Moreover, some passages show that basically the same phraseology can read with either *corrupt* or *corrupted* (compare, for instance, the two examples in Jacob 5:75). So in each case of predicate adjective *corrupt(ed)*, the critical text will follow the earliest textual sources. It appears that here in Helaman 4:22 Oliver Cowdery would not have made the change to *corrupted* in 𝓟 unless 𝓞 read that way.

Summary: Accept Oliver Cowdery's *corrupted* in Helaman 4:22, his corrected reading in 𝓟, as the reading of the original text; also accept the inserted *like* in 𝓟 ("like unto the Lamanites"), a correction also made at the same time that *corrupt* was corrected to *corrupted*.

■ **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*

Here the printer's manuscript, the earliest extant source, has no *that* immediately following the verb *saw*. The 1830 typesetter supplied it, perhaps because the following conjoined clause has the *that* ("and **that** the Spirit of the Lord did no more preserve them"). As discussed under Alma 27:2, there is definite evidence that the subordinate conjunction *that* does not need to follow the verb *see*. But since the *that* does occur at the beginning of the conjoined *that*-clause, one suspects that the original text could have had a *that* immediately following *saw,* as in the following nearby examples:

> Helaman 1:22
>
> > and now when Coriantumr **saw that** he was in possession of the city of Zarahemla
> > and **saw that** the Nephites had fled before them and were slain
> > > and were taken and were cast into prison
> > and **that** he had obtained the possession of the strongest hold in all the land
> > his heart took courage

> Helaman 4:21−22
>
> > and they **saw that** they had been a stiff-necked people
> > and **that** they had set at naught the commandments of God
> > and **that** they had altered and trampled under their feet the laws of Mosiah
> > > or that which the Lord commanded him to give unto the people
> > and thus **seeing that** their laws had become corrupted
> > and **that** they had become a wicked people
> > insomuch that they were wicked even like unto the Lamanites

> Helaman 5:24
>
> > and when they **saw that** they were encircled about with a pillar of fire
> > and **that** it burned them not
> > their hearts did take courage

And there is also manuscript evidence that Oliver Cowdery sometimes omitted the *that* after the verb *see;* in both of the following cases, he initially skipped the *that* in 𝓟 and started to write the following *the:*

> Helaman 12:1
>
> > yea we can see
> > [*the > that* 1|*that* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] the Lord
> > in his great infinite goodness
> > doth bless and prosper those who put their trust in him

Ether 3:7
and the Lord saw
[*the > that* 1| *that* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] the brother of Jared
had fallen to the earth

So there is some evidence that Oliver could have accidentally omitted the *that* after *saw* in Helaman 4:24.

Nonetheless, there is internal evidence that even though the complement for a verb can have a conjoined noun clause that begins with *that*, the first noun clause may lack the *that*, as in this example from Alma 30:39: "I know there is a God and also **that** Christ shall come". This example argues that the earliest extant reading for Helaman 4:24 may very well be the correct reading. The critical text will therefore remove the *that* added by the 1830 typesetter in this passage.

Summary: Restore in Helaman 4:24 the earliest reading without the *that* after the verb *saw*, even though an original *that* could have been lost here during the early transmission of the text; the fact that the conjoined noun clause begins with *that* does not mean that the first noun clause must have the *that*, especially in light of examples like Alma 30:39.

■ **Helaman 4:24**

and they saw they had become [*wicked > weak* 1| *weak* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]

Oliver Cowdery initially wrote *wicked* in the printer's manuscript, but almost immediately he corrected the word to *weak* by crossing out *wicked* and supralinearly writing *weak* (there is no change in the level of ink flow). Oliver's initial *wicked* was probably influenced by the preceding occurrences of *wicked* in verse 22:

Helaman 4:22
and thus seeing that their laws had become corrupted
and that they had become a **wicked** people
insomuch that they were **wicked** even like unto the Lamanites

One could argue that in verse 24 the original manuscript (which is not extant here) read *weak* but that this was an error for *wicked*. Both words are phonetically and orthographically similar. Joseph Smith could have misread an original *wicked* as *weak*, or Oliver Cowdery could have misheard *wicked* /wɪkəd/ as *weak* /wik/.

Despite these arguments, *weak* is undoubtedly correct here in verse 24. Later, in verse 26, the text returns to this theme of strength and explains that the Nephites had become physically weak because of their spiritual wickedness:

Helaman 4:26
for behold they saw that the strength of the Lamanites
was as great as their strength / even man for man
and thus had they fallen into this great transgression
yea thus had they become **weak** because of their transgression
in the space of not many years

The critical text will therefore maintain the use of *weak* in verse 24.

Summary: Maintain in Helaman 4:24 the corrected reading in 𝒫, "they had become **weak**"; the use of *weak* is supported by the language in verse 26.

■ **Helaman 4:25**

and they saw that the Lamanites were
[*more exceeding* 1 | *more exceeding* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQS | *exceedingly more* RT]
numerous than they

Here the editors for the 1920 LDS edition changed "more exceeding numerous" to "exceedingly more numerous". The change from *exceeding* to *exceedingly* was common in the 1920 edition. For discussion of that change, see under 1 Nephi 2:16 (or more generally under EXCEEDING in volume 3). The more crucial change here in Helaman 4:25 is the shift in word order, where *more* was moved from before *exceeding* to after it. Basically, the earliest reading states that both the Nephites and the Lamanites were "exceeding numerous", but the Lamanites more so.

Elsewhere the original text has only the other word order, "exceeding more <adjective>"; it turns out that the adjective in this phrase is always the word *numerous:*

> Jarom 1:6
>> and they were scattered upon much of the face of the land and the Lamanites also
>> and they were **exceeding more numerous** than were they of the Nephites

> Alma 58:2
>> and they were so **exceeding more numerous** than was our army
>> that we durst not go forth and attackt them in their strong holds

> 4 Nephi 1:40
>> and the more wicked part of the people did wax strong
>> and became **exceeding more numerous** than were the people of God

The first of these, in Jarom 1:6, is particularly relevant in interpreting Helaman 4:25 since the comparison there is between the population of the Nephites and the Lamanites—and the Lamanites are "exceeding more numerous" than the Nephites. Thus one could consider the word order "more exceeding numerous" in Helaman 4:25 as an error that occurred during the early transmission of the text, although there is not much evidence in the history of the text for changes in word order of this nature. There is one example, in 1 Nephi 17:41, where two adjectival modifiers were switched in order; in that instance, the original order "flying fiery serpents" was changed to "fiery flying serpents" when Oliver Cowdery copied the text from 𝒪 into 𝒫. But it should be noted that these two words, *flying* and *fiery,* are visually similar, unlike *exceeding* and *more* in Helaman 4:25.

The word order "more exceeding(ly)" actually does occur in the Book of Mormon text, but only once, and that is in an adverbial phrase:

> Alma 12:7
>> now when Alma had spoken these words
>> Zeezrom began to tremble **more exceedingly**
>> for he was convinced more and more of the power of God

The usage here implies that Zeezrom had already been trembling exceedingly, but now even more so. And at the beginning of Alma 12, we can find support for Zeezrom's trembling:

Alma 12:1

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

Presumably, Zeezrom's trembling in verse 1 was already exceeding, so by verse 7 he "began to tremble **more** exceedingly". Although not used in Alma 12:1, there are passages that specifically refer to someone as "trembling exceedingly":

1 Nephi 1:6	he did quake and tremble exceedingly
1 Nephi 16:27	he did fear and tremble exceedingly
2 Nephi 1:25	and I exceedingly fear and tremble because of you
Mosiah 2:30	my whole frame doth tremble exceedingly

It should also be pointed out that there are examples of "more exceeding(ly)" in the King James Bible:

Mark 15:14

> and they cried out the **more exceedingly**
> crucify him

2 Corinthians 4:17

> for our light affliction—which is but for a moment—
> worketh for us a far **more exceeding** *and* eternal weight of glory

Galatians 1:14

> being **more exceedingly** zealous of the traditions of my fathers

In the last one, as pointed out by Don Brugger (personal communication), the phrase "more exceedingly" modifies an adjective, *zealous*.

So ultimately the question here in Helaman 4:25 is whether the population of the Nephites can be considered "exceeding numerous". And we can find evidence elsewhere in the text that the Nephites are indeed numerous (one of which refers to them as being "very numerous"):

Jacob 3:13

> and a hundredth part of the proceedings of this people
> which now began to be **numerous**
> cannot be written upon these plates
>
>> [Although in this part of the text Joseph Smith did not grammatically
>> emend the relative pronoun *which* to *who,* the *which* does refer to the
>> people, not to the proceedings. Elsewhere in the Book of Mormon,
>> the word *numerous* always refers to the number of people (44 times),
>> never to the number of anything else.]

Mosiah 27:6

> and there began to be much peace again in the land
> and the people began to be **very numerous**
> and began to scatter abroad upon the face of the earth
> yea on the north and on the south
> on the east and on the west
> building large cities and villages in all quarters of the land

The Nephites are numerous, yet in the book of Mosiah the Lamanites are referred to as being more than twice as numerous (even with the people of Zarahemla having now joined with the people of Nephi):

> Mosiah 25:3
>> and there were not so many of the people of Nephi
>>> and of the people of Zarahemla
>> as there was of the Lamanites
>> yea they were not half so numerous

Thus one can refer to the Lamanites as being "more exceeding numerous" than the Nephites. The critical text will therefore maintain the earliest extant reading in Helaman 4:25, the reading in 𝒫.

Summary: Restore in Helaman 4:25 the original word order, "more exceeding numerous", as well as the form *exceeding* in place of the innovative modern adverbial form *exceedingly;* usage elsewhere in the text allows for *exceeding* to be compared; moreover, the Nephites are considered "very numerous", so the more numerous Lamanites can be considered "more exceeding numerous" than the Nephites.

Helaman 5

■ **Helaman 5:1**

and it came to pass that in [*this* 1ABCEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST | *the* D] *same year . . .*

Here the 1841 British edition changed "in **this** same year" to "in **the** same year"; the subsequent LDS edition (1849) restored the original *this*. Either reading is theoretically possible. Overall, we get the following statistics for the entire text:

> "in **that** same year"   8 times
> "in **this** same year"   6 times
> "in **the** same year"   1 time

The only example in the earliest text of "in **the** same year" is in Helaman 6:15. For discussion of "in **that** same year", see under Alma 50:37. In each instance, we follow the earliest textual sources, thus "in **this** same year" here in Helaman 5:1.

Summary: Maintain "in **this** same year" in Helaman 5:1, the reading of 𝒫 (here the earliest extant source).

■ **Helaman 5:2**

for as their laws and their
[*goverment > goverments* 1 | *governments* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *were established by the voice of the people . . .*

Oliver Cowdery typically wrote the word *government* according to pronunciation, as *goverment*. In most instances, the text reads in the singular for this word, but in two cases the earliest textual sources read in the plural, here in Helaman 5:2 and also originally in Alma 43:17. As explained under that passage, this plural usage appears to be intended and will be maintained in the critical text. Here in Helaman 5:2, Oliver inserted inline the plural *s* virtually immediately (there is no difference in the level of ink flow for the inserted *s*); the plural reading was very likely the reading in 𝒪.

Summary: Maintain the plural *governments* in Helaman 5:2, the reading in 𝒫 (and most probably the reading in 𝒪).

■ **Helaman 5:2**

and they which [*chose* 1ABCEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST | *choose* D] *evil were more numerous than they which* **chose** *good*

> Here we have one more typo in the 1841 British edition; in this case, the compositor accidentally set the present-tense *choose* rather than the correct past-tense *chose*. Note that he did not make that error for the second *chose* in the sentence. The 1849 LDS edition restored the correct *chose*. The larger passage, verses 1–3, is all in the past tense. (For discussion regarding Oliver Cowdery's tendency to misspell *choose* as *chose,* see under the Words of Mormon 1:4–6.)

Summary: Maintain the two instances of past-tense *chose* in Helaman 5:2; the larger passage is all in the past tense.

■ **Helaman 5:6**

and this [*I have* 1ABCDEFGIJLMNOPQRST | *have I* HK] *done that when you remember your names that ye may remember them*

> Here the 1874 RLDS edition switched the order of the perfective *have* and the subject *I* in the environment of the fronted direct object *this* (in accord with the biblical style). In the 1908 RLDS edition, the original word order ("this I have done") was restored to the RLDS text, probably by reference to 𝓟.
>
> Elsewhere in the text, we get three examples of the inverted order with fronted *this* and the perfective auxiliary *have:*

1 Nephi 13:27	and **all this have they** done that they might pervert the right ways of the Lord
1 Nephi 19:4	and now **this have I** done and commanded my people . . .
Jacob 5:25	behold **this have I** planted in a good spot of ground

> However, there are also three other examples with the noninverted order:

1 Nephi 3:16	and **all this he hath** done because of the commandment
Alma 10:10	and **this he hath** done while this Alma hath dwelt at my house
Alma 60:9	yea and **this they have** done

> Either order is possible, so we follow the earliest textual sources in Helaman 5:6 and maintain the noninverted order.

Summary: Retain in Helaman 5:6 the noninverted order "this I have done", the reading of the earliest textual sources.

■ **Helaman 5:6**

and this I have done
that when [*you* 1ABCDEFGIJLMNOQRT | *ye* HKPS] *remember your names*
that **ye** *may remember them*
and when **ye** *remember them*
ye *may remember their works*
and when **ye** *remember their works*
ye *may know how that it is said and also written*
that they were good

Here the earliest textual source, the printer's manuscript, reads *you* for the first instance of the second person plural subject pronoun, whereas elsewhere in this logically arranged sequence of complex clauses, we get only *ye*. The 1874 RLDS edition changed this one instance of *you* to *ye*, and it has been maintained in all subsequent RLDS editions, probably because of the strong parallelism with the following sequence of clauses. Although this instance of *you* may be an error for *ye* (Ⓞ is not extant here), the critical text will maintain the *you* since in the Book of Mormon text *you* is possible as the subject pronoun form, even when there is a *ye* elsewhere in the same sentence (see the discussion under Mosiah 4:14 and, more generally, under YE in volume 3).

Summary: In accord with the earliest extant text (the printer's manuscript), maintain in Helaman 5:6 the subject pronoun form *you* in the first *when*-clause, "when **you** remember your names"; although *ye* is supported by the usage in the remainder of this passage, *you* is still possible.

■ **Helaman 5:6**

and this I have done
that when you remember your names
that ye **may** *remember them*
and when ye [1ABDEFIJLMNOQRT | *may* CGHKPS] *remember them*
ye **may** *remember their works*
and when ye remember their works
ye **may** *know how that it is said and also written*
that they were good

Here in the 1840 edition, an extra *may* was inserted into the text. This intrusive modal has been retained throughout the RLDS textual tradition. The addition of this word to the text was probably accidental and not the result of Joseph Smith's editing for the 1840 edition. It was most likely added because of the use of the modal *may* throughout this passage. Yet *may* is actually restricted to the main clauses in this passage, while its subordinate *when*-clauses never have the *may*:

Helaman 5:6 (earliest extant text)

　　and this I have done
(1)　that when you remember your names
(1′)　that ye **may** remember them
(2)　and when ye remember them
(2′)　ye **may** remember their works
(3)　and when ye remember their works
(3′)　ye **may** know how that it is said and also written that they were good

The critical text will therefore maintain the earliest reading without the intrusive *may* in clause number 2.

Summary: Reject the intrusive *may* in the second *when*-clause of Helaman 5:6, first introduced in the 1840 edition (most likely as a typo by the 1840 typesetter).

■ **Helaman 5:8**

and now [*behold* > NULL 1 | ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *my sons behold I have somewhat more to desire of you*

Here in the printer's manuscript, Oliver Cowdery initially wrote "& now behold my Sons". Shortly afterwards he crossed out this *behold* because after "my sons" there is another *behold*. The deletion of the first *behold* appears to have been virtually immediate since there is no difference in the level of ink flow for the crossout.

One possibility here is that Oliver Cowdery wrote two *behold*'s in 𝓟 because there were two *behold*'s in 𝓞. One needs to consider the possibility that the repetition of the two *behold*'s is actually correct (that is, the original text read "and now **behold** my sons **behold** I have somewhat more to desire of you"). Yet it turns out there are no examples in the original Book of Mormon text where *behold* occurs twice within the same sentence unless the *behold*'s occur in different clauses or there is some intervening parenthetical text or a subordinate clause between the *behold*'s, as in the following two examples:

> 2 Nephi 27:1
> but **behold** in the last days—or in the days of the Gentiles—
> yea **behold** all the nations of the Gentiles and also the Jews
> —both they which shall come upon this land
> and they which shall be upon other lands
> yea even upon all the lands of the earth—
> **behold** they will be drunken with iniquity and all manner of abominations

> Helaman 13:13
> but **behold** if it were not for the righteous which are in this great city
> **behold** I would cause that fire should come down out of heaven and destroy it

For similar examples of multiple *behold* within the same sentence, see the discussion under Jacob 6:1. We therefore seem to have some kind of scribal error initially in 𝓟 for Helaman 5:8. The most likely reason for the repetition is that Oliver Cowdery accidentally anticipated the following *behold* and wrote it too soon, especially since the phrase "and now behold" is very frequent in the text (occurring 113 times in the original text). There is one example of dittography involving *behold* in 𝓟, namely, in Alma 12:27. In that case, scribe 2 of 𝓟 wrote *behold behold;* the 1830 typesetter, John Gilbert, interpreted the repeated *behold* as a simple scribal error, which it probably was (see the discussion under that passage). There Gilbert crossed out the second *behold* in 𝓟 with pencil.

Thus the odds are that the repeated *behold* in Helaman 5:8 is a simple scribal error that Oliver Cowdery virtually immediately corrected by crossing out the first *behold*.

Summary: Accept in Helaman 5:8 Oliver Cowdery's crossout of the first *behold* that he originally wrote in 𝓟; here Oliver seems to have anticipated the *behold* that comes after "my sons".

■ **Helaman 5:8**

*yea that **ye** may have that precious gift of eternal life*
which [*ye > we* 1 | *we* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *have reason to suppose*
hath been given to our fathers

Here we have an initial error in 𝒫 where Oliver Cowdery accidentally wrote *ye* instead of the correct *we*. He was undoubtedly prompted by the occurrence of *ye* in the preceding clause ("that **ye** may have that precious gift of eternal life"). Virtually immediately Oliver caught his error, crossing out the second *ye* and supralinearly inserting *we* (there is no change in the level of ink flow for the correction). The inclusive first-person plural pronoun *we* works much better here than *ye*.

Summary: Maintain the *we* in Helaman 5:8 ("which **we** have reason to suppose hath been given to our fathers"), the corrected reading in 𝒫 (the earliest extant source).

■ **Helaman 5:9**

O remember remember my sons
the words which king Benjamin spake unto his people
yea remember that there is no other way nor means
whereby [*man* 1ABCDEFIJLMNOPQRST | *men* GHK] *can be saved*

Here the 1858 Wright edition accidentally replaced the singular *man* with the plural *men*. The 1908 RLDS edition restored the original singular to the RLDS text. Elsewhere in the text, there are four occurrences of "whereby man can be saved" but none of "whereby men can be saved". And one of these other occurrences with *man* is in king Benjamin's actual speech, which is referred to here in Helaman 5:9:

> Mosiah 4:8
> and there is none other salvation save this which hath been spoken of
> neither is there any conditions whereby **man** can be saved
> except the conditions which I have told you

So the use of the singular here in Helaman 5:9 is consistent with king Benjamin's actual words in Mosiah 4:8.

Summary: Maintain in Helaman 5:9 the use of the singular *man* in the phrase "whereby man can be saved", which is consistent with Benjamin's own words in Mosiah 4:8.

■ **Helaman 5:11**

and he hath power given unto him from the Father
to redeem them from their sins because of repentance
therefore he hath sent his angels
to declare the tidings of the conditions of repentance
*which bringeth **unto** the power of the Redeemer*
unto the salvation of their souls

The final part of this passage is hard to understand. Something could be wrong here in the relative clause that ends the verse: "which bringeth unto the power of the Redeemer unto the salvation of

their souls". 𝒫 reads this way, as does every printed edition. 𝒪 is not extant here, so perhaps there was some error that occurred when Oliver Cowdery copied the text from 𝒪 into 𝒫. Or perhaps some error occurred when Joseph Smith dictated the text to Oliver.

A number of correspondents have suggested a couple of emendations to the text here, involving either the addition or deletion of a single word:

(1) Karl Franson (personal communication, 2 October 2003) suggests that the first occurrence of *unto* is extra; in other words, the original text read "which bringeth the power of the Redeemer unto the salvation of their souls". An extra *unto* could have been inserted during the early transmission of the text, prompted by the following *unto* in "unto the salvation of their souls".

(2) Joseph Reed (personal communication, 22 November 2003) suggests that something has been left out here. More specifically, Ross Geddes (personal communication, 12 September 2004) suggests that the subject pronoun *them* is missing; in other words, the original text read "which bringeth **them** unto the power of the Redeemer unto the salvation of their souls". If *them* had been pronounced /əm/, then it might have been hard for Oliver Cowdery to hear this syllable after the verb *bringeth* since that word already ends in an unstressed syllable, /əθ/, that has the same reduced vowel /ə/. In addition, there is the following syllable, the *un* of *unto* (pronounced as /ən/), and it is almost identical to /əm/. Thus it could have been quite difficult to hear *them* (pronounced as /əm/) between *bringeth* and *unto*.

On the other hand, Lyle Fletcher points out (personal communication, 19 October 2004) that although the verb *bring* almost always takes a direct object, there are a few cases of ellipsis, as in the following examples:

> three-witness statement ("he brought and laid *the plates* before our eyes")
>> and he **brought** and laid before our eyes
>> that we beheld and saw the plates and the engravings thereon

> Alma 32:31 ("every seed bringeth forth *fruit* unto its own likeness")
>> and now behold are ye sure that this is a good seed
>> I say unto you : yea
>> for every seed **bringeth** forth unto its own likeness

> Alma 55:8 ("we have took of their wine and brought *it* with us")
>> and behold we have took of their wine
>> and **brought** with us

> Ether 12:28 ("faith hope and charity bringeth *the humble* unto me")
>> and I will shew unto them that
>> faith hope and charity **bringeth** unto me / the fountain of all righteousness

In the last case, "the fountain of all righteousness" is not the direct object but instead an appositive modifying *me* (on this point, see the discussion regarding the phrase "the Sun/Son of righteousness" under 2 Nephi 26:9). More importantly, this last example refers to bringing the humble to Christ, similar to bringing the repentant to salvation in Helaman 5:11. Thus we can provide a reasonable interpretation for Helaman 5:11 without resorting to emendation. The critical text will

therefore maintain the invariant reading in this passage without specifying any explicit direct object for the verb *bring,* thus "which bringeth unto the power of the Redeemer unto the salvation of their souls".

Summary: Maintain the current reading in Helaman 5:11 (the reading of all the extant textual sources): "which bringeth unto the power of the Redeemer unto the salvation of their souls"; in this case, the direct object for the verb *bring* is ellipted.

■ **Helaman 5:12**

> *when the devil shall send forth his mighty winds*
> *yea his* **shafts** *in the whirlwind*
> *yea when all his hail and his mighty storm shall beat upon you*
> *it shall have no power over you*

David Calabro (personal communication) wonders if the word *shafts* here (the reading in 𝓟 and all the printed editions) might be a mishearing for *chaff* (or, less likely, the plural form *chaffs*). Calabro notes that the following biblical imagery could be applicable in interpreting Helaman 5:12:

> Hosea 13:3 (King James Bible)
>> therefore they shall be as the morning cloud
>> and as the early dew that passeth away
>> as the **chaff** *that* is driven with the **whirlwind** out of the floor
>> and as the smoke out of the chimney

𝓞 is not extant for Helaman 5:12, but if such an error entered the text, it probably would have occurred as the scribe for 𝓞 (most likely Oliver Cowdery) took down Joseph Smith's dictation here, although there is the possibility that *chaff(s)* could have been misread as *shafts.*

The problem with this proposal is that this Hosea passage does not really apply. In Helaman 5:12, Helaman is talking to his sons about the storm elements that Satan unleashes against mankind. Hosea 13:3, on the other hand, refers to how molten images will be scattered as chaff by the Lord. In Helaman 5:12, the shafts could figuratively refer to the spears, lances, and arrows that Satan throws at mankind (see definitions 1 and 2 under the noun *shaft* in the Oxford English Dictionary). A more likely possibility is that *shafts* refers to bolts of lightning that come with the whirlwind. The OED lists under definition 2g for the noun *shaft* the definition 'a streak of lightning', used poetically. Here in Helaman 5:12, "his shafts in the whirlwind" collocates with other specific storm elements that metaphorically come from Satan, namely, "his mighty winds" and "all his hail". In fact, in a letter dated 27 November 1832 Joseph Smith used the word *shaft* with this meaning: "like as a tree that is smitten by the vivid shaft of lightning" (Doctrine and Covenants 85:8). Thus it seems very likely that *shafts* in Helaman 5:12 refers to lightning.

Interestingly, there is one Book of Mormon passage that actually uses the Hosea 13:3 vocabulary *chaff* and *whirlwind:*

> Mosiah 7:30
>> if my people shall sow filthiness
>> they shall reap the **chaff** thereof in the **whirlwind**

In this case, the printer's manuscript (the earliest extant source) reads *chaff,* not *shaft(s).* Once more, the context is different: in Mosiah 7:30, the text is referring to reaping the results of transgression. In Helaman 5:12, on the other hand, the reference is to the storm that the devil sends against us. Since the reading in Helaman 5:12 can be reasonably interpreted as referring to lightning, the critical text will maintain that reading (namely, "his **shafts** in the whirlwind").

Summary: Retain the word *shafts* in Helaman 5:12 since the word here can be reasonably interpreted as referring to shafts of lightning in the storm.

■ **Helaman 5:15**

and from the city **of** *Gid*
to the city [NULL >+ *of* ₁ | *of* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *Mulek*

Here in 𝑃, Oliver Cowdery initially omitted the *of* in the phrase "the city of Mulek". He later supplied the *of,* perhaps when he proofed 𝑃 against 𝒪 (the level of ink flow for the supralinear correction is somewhat heavier). Here 𝒪 is not extant but probably read with the *of.* Another instance of "the city of Mulek" with the same initial error in 𝑃 is found earlier in the text; in that case, 𝒪 is extant and has the *of:*

> Alma 53:2
> and Moroni went
> to the city [*of* 0ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST | NULL >+ *of* ₁] Mulek with Lehi

In that case, the supralinear *of* was written in 𝑃 with heavier ink flow; again the correction probably occurred when Oliver proofed 𝑃 against 𝒪. As explained under Alma 53:6, either reading, with or without the *of,* for "city (of) Mulek" is possible. In each case, the critical text will follow the earliest extant reading, thus the corrected reading in 𝑃 for Helaman 5:15 and the reading in 𝒪 for Alma 53:2.

Summary: Maintain the occurrence of *of* for "the city **of** Mulek" in Helaman 5:15; the corrected *of* is very likely the reading in 𝒪 (which is not extant here); also maintain the *of* in Alma 53:2, which is extant in 𝒪.

■ **Helaman 5:17**

and immediately returned [*to* 1ABCDEFGIJLMNOPQRST | *unto* HK] *the Nephites*
to endeavor to repair unto them the wrongs which they had done

Here the 1874 RLDS edition accidentally replaced the preposition *to* with *unto.* The 1908 RLDS edition restored the original *to* to the RLDS text. The verb *return,* when referring to returning to a person or to a group of people, can take either *to* or *unto* as the preposition. In the original text, there are 13 instances with *unto* and 11 with *to* (including the case here in Helaman 5:17). Since either reading is theoretically possible in Helaman 5:17, we follow the earliest textual sources, thus "returned **to** the Nephites".

Summary: Maintain the preposition *to* in Helaman 5:17: "and immediately returned **to** the Nephites" (the reading in 𝑃, the earliest extant source); either *unto* or *to* can be used with the verb *return.*

■ **Helaman 5:21–22**

and it came to pass that they were taken by an army of the Lamanites
and cast **into** *prison / yea even* **in** *that same prison*
in *which Ammon and his brethren were cast by the servants of Limhi*
and after they had been cast **into** *prison many days without food*
behold they went forth into the prison to take them that they might slay them

One wonders here at the beginning of the relative clause ("**in** which Ammon and his brethren were cast by the servants of Limhi") whether the preposition *in* might be an error for *into,* perhaps the result of the preceding *in* ("yea even **in** that same prison"). But then one might ask why the preceding *in* couldn't also be a mistake for *into.* In other words, perhaps the original text here read "yea even **into** that same prison **into** which Ammon and his brethren were cast by the servants of Limhi".

Except for this one place where *in* is twice used instead of the expected *into,* the text has only the preposition *into* for the phrase "cast in(to) prison(s)" (35 times); in fact, both earlier and later in this passage we have the preposition *into:* "and cast **into** prison . . . and after they had been cast **into** prison". More generally, the verb *cast* prefers the preposition *into* (with 43 cases besides the 35 that refer to being cast into prison). Even so, there are four other cases where *in* occurs with the verb *cast,* although in these instances we have the phrasal verb *cast in,* where the *in* acts as an adverb rather than as a preposition. The first two cases use the expression "to cast in their voices" to refer to a vote on a political issue (in Mosiah 29:39 and Alma 2:6). But the two other cases are semantically closer to the cases of "cast into X" that we have been discussing:

> Alma 14:14
>
>> now it came to pass that when the bodies of those
>> which had been cast into the fire were consumed
>> and also the records which were **cast in** with them

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

These two instances of the phrasal verb *cast in* suggest that the preposition *in* can also be used with the verb *cast.* For each case of the phrase "cast in(to) X", the critical text will follow the earliest text, thus retaining the two instances of *in* here in Helaman 5:21. The fact that the *in* is repeated argues for retaining it. Also note that in Alma 14:14 we have examples of both *cast into* and *cast in* ("which had been cast **into** the fire . . . which were cast **in** with them"), just like here in Helaman 5:21–22.

Summary: Maintain in Helaman 5:21 the two instances of the preposition *in* for the phrase "cast in(to) prison", even though elsewhere the text consistently uses the preposition *into* for this phrase; the repetition of the *in* in this passage ("yea even **in** that same prison **in** which Ammon and his brethren were cast by the servants of Limhi") as well as the existence of the semantically related phrasal verb *cast in* argues that the preposition *in* is possible for "cast in(to) prison".

■ **Helaman 5:23**

and it came to pass that
Nephi and Lehi were encircled about **as if** *by fire*
even insomuch that they durst not lay their hands upon them
for fear lest they should be burned
nevertheless Nephi and Lehi were not burned
and they were **as** *standing in the midst of fire*

One wonders here if the text at the end of this passage didn't originally read with an *if,* as "and they were **as if** standing in the midst of fire". Elsewhere the narrative in this chapter has 12 instances of *as if:*

Helaman 5:23	Nephi and Lehi were encircled about **as if** by fire
Helaman 5:25	but stood **as if** they were struck dumb with amazement
Helaman 5:27	and the walls of the prison did shake **as if** they were about to tumble to the earth
Helaman 5:29	there came a voice **as if** it were above the cloud of darkness
Helaman 5:30	it was a still voice of perfect mildness **as if** it had been a whisper
Helaman 5:31	and the walls of the prison trembled again **as if** it were about to tumble to the earth
Helaman 5:33	and the earth shook **as if** it were about to divide asunder
Helaman 5:36	**as if** talking or lifting their voices to some being which they beheld
Helaman 5:44	yea they were **as if** in the midst of a flaming fire
Helaman 5:45	and they were filled **as if** with fire
Helaman 5:46	there came a voice unto them / yea a pleasant voice **as if** it were a whisper
Helaman 5:48	they cast up their eyes **as if** to behold from whence the voice came

The case later in verse 23 of "**as** standing in the midst of fire" is the only instance in the earliest text for this chapter where we have *as* instead of the expected *as if.* Note especially the example in Helaman 5:36 where *as if* is followed by a present-participial clause: "and they were in the attitude **as if** talking or lifting their voices to some being which they beheld". Earlier in the text, there is one more example of *as if* followed by a present-participial clause:

Alma 52:6	but he kept his men round about **as if** making preparations for war

All these examples support emending Helaman 5:23 to read "**as if** standing in the midst of fire".

We can find evidence in the printed editions for the loss of *if* from *as if,* including one case in this same chapter of Helaman:

Helaman 5:44 (loss of *if* in the 1840 edition)
   yea they were as [*if* 1ABDEFIJLMNOPQRST | CGHK] in the midst of a flaming fire

3 Nephi 19:14 (loss of *if* in the 1858 Wright edition)
   and behold they were encircled about
   as [*if* 1ABCDEFHIJKLMNOPQRST | G] it were fire

In the original manuscript, there is one example where Oliver Cowdery initially omitted the conjunction *if.* In Alma 46:21, after writing the phrase "or in other words", Oliver first skipped the *if*

and started to write the subject pronoun *they.* After writing the *th* of *they,* he caught his error and overwrote the *th* with the correct *if.* But since that correction was unclear, he then crossed it out and wrote inline *if they.* (For this scribal error, see line 10 on page 317′ of 𝒪.) Of course, this initial error in 𝒪 did not involve any *as.*

Nonetheless, there are a number of cases elsewhere in the text where we have *as* instead of the expected *as if.* In fact, for the phrase "as (if) it were", there are 15 instances without the *if* and 9 with it. Note, in particular, the following contrastive pair that involve fire (just like in Helaman 5:23):

> 3 Nephi 17:24   and they saw angels descending out of heaven **as it were**
>   in the midst of fire
> 3 Nephi 19:14   and behold they were encircled about **as if it were** fire

For further discussion of other textual difficulties with the phrase "as it were", see under Alma 36:7.

Besides the *as if,* we also expect in Helaman 5:23 for the *as if* to come after *standing:* "and they were standing **as if** in the midst of fire", as with other examples in Helaman 5 referring to the fire; in these other cases, the *as if* follows the verb:

> Helaman 5:23   Nephi and Lehi were encircled about **as if** by fire
> Helaman 5:44   yea they were **as if** in the midst of a flaming fire
> Helaman 5:45   and they were filled **as if** with fire

But since *as* is a possible substitute for *as if,* we could also have *as* without the *if* after *standing:* "and they were standing **as** in the midst of fire"; this reading is strongly supported by the one in 3 Nephi 17:24, where *as* follows *descending:* "and they saw angels descending out of heaven **as it were** in the midst of fire".

Yet the *as* can precede *standing* in Helaman 5:23. For modern readers, the *as* before *standing* makes it seem like the text is questioning whether Nephi and Lehi were actually standing. Yet the use of *as if* elsewhere in Helaman 5 shows that in verse 23 Nephi and Lehi were really standing. The *as if* in this chapter is used to show that we have an eyewitness account, not that everything taking place was hypothetical. For instance, in verse 25 the *as if* in "as if they were struck dumb with amazement" is used to make clear that the narrative is carefully reporting what Nephi and Lehi were observing, yet there is nothing hypothetical here: the Lamanites were indeed struck dumb with amazement. Similarly, the prisons walls were about to tumble down (verses 27 and 31), the voice came from above (verses 29 and 46), the voice was a whisper (verses 30 and 46), the earth was about to divide asunder (verse 33), Nephi and Lehi were talking to some being (verse 36), and the fire was real (verses 23, 44, 45), only it didn't burn any of them. Thus here at the end of verse 23, the phrase *as standing* is not saying that Nephi and Lehi were not standing, only that they were observed to be standing. Given this interpretation of *as if* and *as* in Helaman 5, the earliest reading in verse 23, *as standing,* is fully acceptable.

David Calabro (personal communication) suggests another possible emendation here: the *as* could be an error for the prepositional *a;* that is, the text originally read "and they were **a** standing in the midst of fire". We can definitely find support in the earliest text for use of the prepositional *a* after plural *were:*

> 1 Nephi 8:28   because of those that were **a** scoffing at them
> Ether 13:31   all the people upon all the face of the land were **a** shedding blood

Calabro also points out the difficulty of hearing the difference between *as* and *a* when the following word begins with an *s* (namely, *standing* here in Helaman 5:23). Later in the printer's manuscript, there is an example where the indefinite article *a* was either misheard as *as* when 𝓞 was written down or miswritten as *as* when copied from 𝓞 into 𝓟:

> Mormon 7:7
> in [*as* 1 | *a* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] state of happiness
> which hath no end

Once more, the following word, *state,* begins with an *s*. Here in Helaman 5:23, the substitution of *as* for *a* could have been further facilitated by the numerous uses of *as if* in the chapter, especially the earlier one in this verse ("Nephi and Lehi were encircled about **as if** by fire").

Although this emendation of *as* to *a* is possible, the critical text will maintain the *as,* the reading of all the (extant) textual sources. First of all, there is some evidence that the *if* is not necessary in Helaman 5:23. Moreover, the *as* can come before *standing* since the equivalent *as if* is used throughout Helaman 5 to report on what was actually observed rather than to claim that those events only appeared to happen.

Summary: Maintain in Helaman 5:23 the occurrence of *as* without the expected *if:* "and they were **as** standing in the midst of fire" (the reading of all the extant textual sources); there is some evidence in the text that *as* is an alternative to *as if,* chiefly in the phrase "as (if) it were"; it is possible that the *as* may be an error for *a,* but since the oldest extant reading will work, the critical text will maintain the *as.*

■ **Helaman 5:26**

ye cannot lay your hands [*upon* > *on* 1 | *on* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *us to slay us*

Here Oliver Cowdery initially wrote the preposition *on* as *upon* in 𝓟. Virtually immediately he corrected the *upon* to *on* by crossing out the *up* (there is no change in the level of ink flow for the crossout). Oliver was probably prompted to write *upon* here in verse 26 because of its two occurrences in the phrase "lay hands (up)on X" earlier in this passage:

> Helaman 5:23   even insomuch that they durst not lay their hands **upon** them
> Helaman 5:25   for they saw that the Lamanites durst not lay their hands **upon** them

Overall the Book of Mormon text is fairly equally divided between "lay hands **upon** X" and "lay hands **on** X" (13 to 12). There is a passage in Mosiah 13 where there is variation in the use of *upon* and *on* for this phrase:

> Mosiah 13:2   and they stood forth and attempted to lay their hands **on** him
> Mosiah 13:3   for God shall smite you if ye lay your hands **upon** me
> Mosiah 13:5   the people of king Noah durst not lay their hands **on** him

So either reading is possible, and we follow the earliest textual sources in each case. For a general list of mix-ups of *upon* and *on* in the textual history, see under Alma 2:38.

Summary: Accept in Helaman 5:26 Oliver Cowdery's correction in 𝓟 of *upon* to *on* ("ye cannot lay your hands **on** us to slay us").

■ **Helaman 5:30**

when they heard this voice
and beheld that it was not a voice of thunder
neither was it a voice of [*a* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMOPQRST | N] *great tumultuous noise*
but behold it was a [*small > still* 1 | *still* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *voice of perfect mildness*

In this passage we have a couple cases of minor variation in the textual history. First of all, in the 1906 LDS edition, the indefinite article *a* in the phrase "a great tumultuous noise" was accidentally dropped. This edition never served as a copytext; thus the *a* has remained in the subsequent LDS text. The 1906 loss of the *a* after "a voice of" may have been influenced by the lack of *a* after "a voice of" both before and after this clause:

> Helaman 5:30 (the earliest text)
>
> | | it was not | **a** | **voice of** | thunder |
> | neither | was it | **a** | **voice of** | a great tumultuous noise |
> | but behold it was | | **a** still | **voice of** | perfect mildness |

Taking the opposite tack, one could argue that the *a* before "great tumultuous noise" in 𝓟 was an error of perseverance coming from the *a* in the immediately preceding "**a** voice of". Here the critical text will follow the earliest reading, "neither was it a voice of **a** great tumultuous noise".

The other minor textual variant in 𝓟 for this passage occurred when Oliver Cowdery initially wrote *small* instead of *still* in "it was a **still** voice of perfect mildness". The correction, a supralinear insertion of *still,* appears to be a later correction since it was written with a slightly sharper quill; perhaps Oliver made this correction when he proofed 𝓟 against 𝓞.

One may wonder here if the original text read "still small voice". This longer expression that includes both adjectives is found once in the Book of Mormon text:

> 1 Nephi 17:45
>
> and he hath spoken unto you in **a still small voice**
> but ye were past feeling / that ye could not feel his words

This longer version of the phrase is also found once in the King James Bible:

> 1 Kings 19:12
>
> and after the earthquake a fire
> *but* the LORD *was* not in the fire
> and after the fire **a still small voice**

The Book of Mormon also has an occurrence of "small voice" (that is, without the *still*), so the other shorter expression is also possible:

> 3 Nephi 11:3
>
> and it was not a harsh voice neither was it a loud voice
> nevertheless—and notwithstanding it being **a small voice**—
> it did pierce them that did hear to the center

Thus the Book of Mormon, based on its earliest textual sources, has a single occurrence each of "small voice", "still voice", and "still small voice" (but none of "small still voice").

Summary: Accept in Helaman 5:30 Oliver Cowdery's correction in 𝓟 of "small voice" to "still voice"; Oliver was very likely correcting to the reading in 𝓞, no longer extant here.

■ **Helaman 5:36**

and he beheld that they **did lift** [1ABDEFIJLMNOPQRST | *up* CGHK] *their eyes to heaven*
and they were in the attitude as if talking or **lifting** *their voices to some being which they beheld*

The 1840 edition added the adverbial *up* after *did lift* but not to *lifting* later on in the passage, thus creating variation in the usage here ("did lift **up** their eyes" versus "lifting their voices"). This addition of *up* is probably unintended and not due to editing. The 1908 RLDS edition restored the original reading lacking the *up*.

There are only two other occurrences in the text of "lift (up) eyes", and these examples, both quotes from Isaiah in the King James Bible, have the adverbial *up:*

> 1 Nephi 21:18   lift **up** thine eyes round about and behold
>
> 2 Nephi 8:6   lift **up** your eyes to the heavens

And this result for biblical quotations is not surprising when we note that the King James Bible has instances of only "lift **up** eyes" (59 times); there are no examples at all of "lift eyes" in the King James text.

But this result does not mean that the Book of Mormon text cannot have any instances of "lift eyes". We can see this when we consider the corresponding phrase "lift (up) voice(s)". The King James Bible has instances of only "lift **up** voice(s)" (36 times); there are no examples of "lift voice(s)". In King James quotes in the Book of Mormon, not surprisingly, we get only "lift **up** voice(s)" (five times), but in the nonbiblical parts of the text we get variation, three cases with the *up* and two without (including the one here in Helaman 5:36):

> 2 Nephi 4:35   therefore I will lift **up** my voice unto thee
>
> Mosiah 17:12   but the priests lifted **up** their voices against him
>
> Mosiah 24:22   yea all their men and all their women and all their children . . .
>   lifted their voices in the praises of their God
>
> Alma 31:26   and he lifted **up** his voice to heaven and cried saying . . .
>
> Helaman 5:36   as if talking or lifting their voices to some being which they beheld

(The 1874 RLDS edition omitted the *up* in 2 Nephi 4:35; for discussion, see under that passage.) The two nonbiblical instances of "lift voice(s)" therefore support the one case of "lift eyes". In addition, there is a similar instance of the verb *lift* (in 3 Nephi 4:8) with *their cries* instead of *their voices;* here the *up* is also lacking: "the armies of the Nephites . . . did lift their cries to the Lord". On the other hand, as before, the King James Bible has only the *up,* with two instances of "lift **up** (a) cry" (in Jeremiah 7:16 and Jeremiah 11:14).

Taken all together, the nonbiblical Book of Mormon examples indicate that in each case we should follow the earliest textual sources in determining whether the adverbial *up* occurs in phrases involving *lift*. The critical text will therefore retain the two cases of *lift* without the *up* here in Helaman 5:36.

Summary: In accord with the earliest text, maintain in Helaman 5:36 the two instances of the verb *lift* without the adverbial *up:* "and he beheld that they **did lift** their eyes to heaven . . . as if talking or **lifting** their voices to some being".

■ **Helaman 5:36–37**

and behold he saw through the cloud of darkness the **faces** *of Nephi and Lehi*
and behold they did shine exceedingly
even as the [*face* 1A | *faces* BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *of angels . . .*
and they did behold the **faces** *of Nephi and Lehi*

There is no original manuscript for this part of the text. Here in verse 36, the printer's manuscript has the singular *face* in "the face of angels", even though in this passage the text twice reads "the **faces** of Nephi and Lehi" (earlier in verse 36 and later in verse 37). Here in Helaman 5:36, the 1830 compositor set "the face of angels", the reading of his copytext (𝒫). But in the 1837 edition, the singular *face* was replaced with the plural *faces*. All subsequent editions have followed the plural reading.

As explained under 2 Nephi 26:20, there is some evidence in the earliest text for "the face of X" (where the referent for the X is semantically plural):

> 1 Nephi 21:23   they shall bow down to thee with **their face** towards the earth
> 2 Nephi 26:20   that they may get gain and grind upon **the face of the poor**

Both of these are based on passages in Isaiah that read in the plural when they are cited elsewhere in the Book of Mormon:

> 2 Nephi 6:7   they shall bow down to thee with **their faces** towards the earth
> 2 Nephi 13:15   ye beat my people to pieces and grind **the faces of the poor**

The grammatical number is mixed in Isaiah itself, with plural "the **faces** of the poor" in Isaiah 3:15 but singular "with *their* **face** toward the earth" in Isaiah 49:23.

There is one case in the editions where a correct plural was replaced by the singular *face,* also in a biblical quotation:

> Mosiah 14:3
> and we hid as it were our [*faces* 1AT | *face* BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRS] from him

Here Isaiah 53:3 has the plural, "*our* faces". We could take this change to the singular as evidence that the *face* in the earliest text for Helaman 5:36 is an error for an original plural. Unfortunately, there is no direct support for mix-ups between *face* and *faces* in the manuscripts, although some of the Book of Mormon quotations from Isaiah may involve such errors (see the discussion under 2 Nephi 26:20).

This passage in Helaman 5:36–37 can be compared to the description of Stephen in the book of Acts when he spoke before the Jewish council:

> Acts 6:15
> and all that sat in the council
> looking steadfastly on him
> saw his **face** as it had been the **face** of an angel

Of course, here the text is referring to only one person, not to a plurality of persons, so Stephen's face is compared to the face of a single angel. There is one other scriptural reference to the faces of angels; and in that passage there is a plural *faces:*

Revelation 7:11
> and all the angels stood round about the throne
> and *about* the elders and the four beasts
> and fell before the throne on their **faces** and worshipped God

The use in the earliest text of "the face of angels" for Helaman 5:36 may actually be acceptable. First of all, there are passages in the King James Bible where the singular *face* is used to refer to a plurality of individuals:

Matthew 17:6
> and when the disciples heard *it*
> they fell on their **face** and were sore afraid

1 Thessalonians 2:17
> but we brethren . . . endeavored the more abundantly
> to see your **face** with great desire

1 Thessalonians 3:10
> night and day praying exceedingly that we might see your **face**

In each of these cases, we could interpret the singular *face* as referring to the face of each person individually.

But a more compelling argument is that the phrase "the face of angels" is actually quite common in English, with examples dating from the late 1500s up to the present time. The following examples (with original accidentals here retained) are found on *Literature Online* <lion.chadwyck.com>:

John Eliot (1593)
> eies like glistering starres, what face of Angels hew?

Josuah Sylvester (1611)
> Yet, this were little, if thy spight audacious
> Spar'd (at the least) the face of Angels gracious,

James Astry (1700)
> They have the Face of Angels, but end in Serpents;

Henry Fielding (1743)
> They lead us into Ruin with the Face of Angels,
> and when the Door is shut on us, exert the Devil.

The traditional translation of the Venerable Bede's Latin *nam et angelicam habent faciem* was "for they have the face of angels", although *faciem angelicam* would be literally translated as "an angelic face" (or "the angelic face"). The phrase "the face of angels" is found in English translations of Bede's *Ecclesiastical History of the English People* and occurs repeatedly in various histories of Britain published in England during the late 1800s (see the examples listed on <www.google.com> under the phrase "the face of angels"). There is also this example of "the face of angels" from a current website:

Jayne Stars (2006)
> Our favorite celebrities are glamorous and beautiful in adulthood.
> When they were babies, did they have the face of angels?
> Or were they just average looking kids?

These examples show that "the face of angels", the earliest reading for Helaman 5:36, could well be correct. The critical text will therefore restore the original singular *face* in the phrase "the face of angels" (but leave, of course, the original plural *faces* in "the faces of Nephi and Lehi").

Summary: Restore in Helaman 5:36 the original singular *face* in the phrase "the face of angels" even though the larger passage has two instances of "the faces of Nephi and Lehi"; there are numerous examples of the phrase "the face of angels" from Early Modern English up to present-day English.

■ **Helaman 5:38**

behold what [*doth* 1ABDEPS | *do* CGHIJKLMNOQRT | *doth > do* F] *all these things mean*

As explained under Mosiah 12:20, original instances of *meaneth* and *doth mean* with plural subjects will be maintained or restored, as the case may be, in the critical text. The original text had many instances where plural subjects took verbs ending in the historical third person singular ending *-(e)th*. In the Book of Mormon, this ending was apparently used as an indicator of the biblical style. For a complete discussion, see under INFLECTIONAL ENDINGS in volume 3. Here in Helaman 5:38, the 1840 edition made the grammatical correction to the plural *do;* this reading entered the LDS text in the second printing of the 1852 LDS edition, apparently by reference to the 1840 edition. On the other hand, the 1908 RLDS edition restored the original *doth* to the RLDS text (apparently by reference to 𝒫).

Summary: Restore the original *doth* in Helaman 5:38 even though its subject is the plural noun phrase "all these things".

■ **Helaman 5:41**

you must repent and cry unto the voice
even until ye shall have faith in Christ
[*which* 1A | *who* BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *was taught unto you*
by Alma and Amulek and by Zeezrom

Here the 1837 edition changed the *which* to *who*, which means that the original *which* was interpreted as referring to Christ; the change was probably made by Joseph Smith in his editing for that edition, although the change was not marked in 𝒫. However, it is possible that the relative pronoun *which* actually refers to "faith in Christ"—that is, Alma, Amulek, and Zeezrom taught faith in Christ. Elsewhere, the text refers to Alma and Amulek's faith in Christ when they were freed from the prison in the city of Ammonihah (Alma 14:26, 28). And Alma, when healing Zeezrom, refers to Zeezrom's faith in Christ (Alma 15:10). Alma was accompanied by Amulek and Zeezrom on his mission to the Zoramites (Alma 31:6), and Alma's chief discourse there was on faith (Alma 32–33). Finally, Alma admonished his son Helaman to "preach unto them repentance and faith on the Lord Jesus Christ" (Alma 37:33).

The Book of Mormon text has no other phrases that could be interpreted as equivalent to the phraseology "to teach Christ" or "to preach Christ"—that is, with *Christ* as the direct object of the verb *teach* or *preach*. The closest is in 2 Nephi 25:26 ("we preach **of** Christ"). There are five

references to "preaching faith", including Alma 37:33 mentioned above (the others are in Mosiah 18:7, 20 and Mosiah 25:15, 22). Interestingly, there are no instances of "teaching faith" in the Book of Mormon text (except possibly here in Helaman 5:41).

The King James New Testament has numerous references to "preaching Christ", including two that are syntactically similar to the expression in Helaman 5:41 (especially the first one):

> Acts 3:20
>   and he shall send Jesus Christ
> → which before was preached unto you

> 2 Corinthians 1:19
>   for the Son of God / Jesus Christ
> → who was preached among you by us
>   *even* by me and Silvanus and Timotheus
>   was not yea and nay
>   but in him was yea

The New Testament, on the other hand, has no instances of "teaching Christ".

Of course, the critical text of the Book of Mormon will restore the original *which* here in Helaman 5:41 no matter whether this relative pronoun refers to Christ or to faith in Christ. In Early Modern English, *which* was used to refer to persons, as in "our Father **which** art in heaven" (in Matthew 6:9 and originally in 3 Nephi 13:9). The original Book of Mormon text had many instances of *which* with the meaning 'who(m)', just like the King James Bible. For a complete discussion, see under WHICH in volume 3.

Summary: Restore *which* in Helaman 5:41; in this instance, *which* probably refers to faith in Christ since Alma and his missionary companions consistently taught faith in Christ; the specific expression "to preach Christ" or "to teach Christ" is foreign to the Book of Mormon text.

■ **Helaman 5:41**

even until ye shall have faith in Christ which was taught unto you
by Alma and Amulek and [NULL > *by* 1 | *by* A | BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *Zeezrom*

Oliver Cowdery originally wrote "by Alma and Amulek and Zeezrom" in the printer's manuscript; shortly afterwards he supralinearly inserted (with no change in the level of ink flow) the preposition *by* before *Zeezrom*—but not before *Amulek,* thus creating a mixed conjunctive structure ("**by** Alma and Amulek and **by** Zeezrom"). In the 1837 edition, the extra *by* was deleted, probably because of the perceived awkwardness of the mixed structure.

Nonetheless, the corrected text in 𝔓 is appropriate. We first note that Alma and Amulek worked together as a missionary pair (as exemplified by their successive discourses in Alma 9–13 and in Alma 32–34). Of course, when they taught in the city of Ammonihah, Zeezrom was not yet converted, so his discourses would have been later (such as during the missionary work among the Zoramites). Zeezrom is definitely not as closely associated with Alma and Amulek as they are with each other. Of course, Zeezrom is still associated with Alma since he is listed as one of the missionaries that accompanied Alma on the Zoramite mission (Alma 31:6, 32). Elsewhere the Book

of Mormon text reflects an extra closeness between Alma and Amulek; whenever their names are conjoined in a prepositional phrase, the preposition is never repeated:

Alma 11:20	therefore they did stir up the people **against** Alma and Amulek
Alma 14:3	and they were also angry **with** Alma and Amulek
Alma 14:5	and many such things did the people testify **against** Alma and Amulek
Alma 14:7	the words which had been spoken **by** Alma and Amulek
Alma 14:14	the chief judge of the land came and stood **before** Alma and Amulek
Alma 14:25	the power of God was **upon** Alma and Amulek
Alma 14:27	which smote **upon** Alma and Amulek
Alma 14:29	and fled from the presence **of** Alma and Amulek
Alma 14:29	and thus they did flee from the presence **of** Alma and Amulek
Alma 15:15	ascribing all the power **of** Alma and Amulek to the devil
Ether 12:13	behold it was the faith **of** Alma and Amulek that . . .

Thus this extra-close relationship between Alma and Amulek is shown in Helaman 5:41 by the lack of the preposition *by* before *Amulek* but not before *Zeezrom*. (For a general discussion concerning whether the preposition *by* should be repeated in conjunctive structures, see under Alma 2:38.)

Summary: Restore in Helaman 5:41 the preposition *by* in front of *Zeezrom* ("by Alma and Amulek and **by** Zeezrom"); the lack of the *by* in front of *Amulek* reinforces the special closeness between Alma and Amulek.

■ **Helaman 5:41**

 ▫ *and when ye* **shall** *do this*
  the cloud of darkness **shall**
  be removed from overshadowing you   1A

 ▫ *and when ye* **shall**
  be removed from overshadowing you   BC

 ▫ *and* **then it** *shall*
  be removed from overshadowing you   DEFIJLMNOQ | G

 ▫ *and then* **shall it**
  be removed from overshadowing you   HK

 ▫ *and when ye shall do this*
  the cloud of darkness shall
  be removed from overshadowing you   PS | RT

Here in Helaman 5:41, the extant Book of Mormon sources show five stages:

(1) This stage, the earliest extant one, is the reading in 𝒫 and presumably the reading in 𝒪, no longer extant here; this stage was correctly copied into the 1830 edition.

(2) When the text was set for the 1837 edition, the compositor's eye skipped from the first *shall* to the second one; the shortened text, a fragment, makes no sense but nonetheless was copied into the subsequent 1840 edition.

(3) The compositor for the 1841 British edition minimally emended the text here so that we get a complete sentence that answers Aminadab's question proposed in the previous verse: "what shall we do that this cloud of darkness may be removed from overshadowing us" (Helaman 5:40). The 1841 compositor replaced the *when* with *then* and the *ye* with *it*, under the assumption that the *when* and *ye* were accidental errors that had earlier entered the text; subsequent LDS editions followed this reading until the 1920 edition. The same two changes were made in the 1858 Wright edition, set in New York City. Once more the language of the preceding verse appears to be the source for the minimal emendation in the 1858 edition, not any of the earlier editions (1841, 1849, or 1852) that had the *then* and *it*.

(4) Here the 1874 RLDS edition followed the reading of the 1858 Wright edition except that there was a switch in the word order (probably unintentional) from *it shall* to *shall it*; the subsequent 1892 RLDS edition followed this revised reading.

(5) Finally, the standard LDS and RLDS editions restored the original reading, as represented in the first stage. The RLDS text restored the correct reading in 1908 (probably by reference to 𝓟), the LDS text in 1920 (probably by reference to the 1830 edition).

The critical text will, of course, maintain the current reading since it is the reading in 𝓟 (the earliest extant source) and is undoubtedly the reading of the original text.

Summary: Maintain in Helaman 5:41 the reading in 𝓟, "and when ye shall do this / the cloud of darkness shall be removed from overshadowing you"; this sentence has undergone various changes in the history of the text but was restored in both the LDS and RLDS texts in early 20th-century editions.

■ **Helaman 5:42**

and it came to pass that they [*all did* 1ABCDEFGIJLMNOPQRST | *did all* HK] *begin to cry unto the voice of him which had shook the earth*

The 1874 RLDS edition changed the order of "they **all did** begin" to "they **did all** begin". The placement of the *all* between the helping verb *did* and the main verb is characteristic of the Book of Mormon text:

1 Nephi 8:6	we **did all** go down into the ship
Mosiah 13:32	they **did** not **all** understand the law
Alma 1:26	and they **did all** labor
Alma 19:33	and they **did all** declare unto the people the selfsame thing
3 Nephi 6:1	the people of the Nephites **did all** return to their own lands
3 Nephi 17:10	and they **did all** . . . bow down at his feet

There are no other examples like Helaman 5:42 where the *all* comes before the helping verb form *did* and its main verb. But for other helping verbs, we can occasionally find examples where the *all* precedes the entire verb phrase, the helping verb(s) as well as the main verb:

Helaman 1:12	they **all could** not be found
3 Nephi 18:24	and ye **all have** witnessed

The critical text will therefore follow the less frequent word order in Helaman 5:42, with the *all* before *did begin.*

Summary: Accept in Helaman 5:42 the original placement of *all* before the helping verb *did:* "they **all did** begin to cry unto the voice of him which had shook the earth".

■ **Helaman 5:42**

and it came to pass that they all did begin to cry unto the voice of him
which had [shook 1ABCDEFGHIJKLPS | shook > shaken m | shaken NOQRT] the earth

The standard past-participial form for the verb *shake* is *shaken.* Normally the original Book of Mormon text has *shaken* (five times), but there are two instances of *shook* (where the past-participial form is the same as the simple past-tense form). The first instance is here in Helaman 5:42, where the standard *shaken* was introduced into the LDS text in the 1906 LDS large-print edition. The other instance of past-participial *shook* was changed to *shaken* in the 1920 LDS edition:

> 3 Nephi 8:14
> and many were [*shook* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQS | *shaken* RT]
> till the buildings thereof had fallen to the earth

For both these cases of original *shook,* the RLDS text has retained the nonstandard *shook.* As explained under 1 Nephi 5:1, 4 for the past-participial *came,* the critical text will restore instances where the simple past-tense form is used as the past participle. For a general discussion, see under PAST PARTICIPLE in volume 3.

Summary: Restore the two instances of past-participial *shook,* in Helaman 5:42 and in 3 Nephi 8:14.

■ **Helaman 5:43**

and it came to pass that
when they cast their eyes about
and saw that the cloud of darkness was dispersed from overshadowing them
[& 1 | and ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQS | RT] behold they saw that
they were encircled about—yea every soul—by a pillar of fire

Here in the original text we have another instance of the Hebraistic *and* separating an initial subordinate clause from its following main clause ("when they cast their eyes about . . . **and** behold they saw that . . ."). The 1920 LDS edition removed the unexpected occurrence of the *and* here. The critical text will, as explained under 1 Nephi 4:8–9, restore or maintain (depending on the case) each original instance of *and* that separates a preceding *when*-clause from its following main clause. For a complete discussion of this Hebraistic construction, see under HEBRAISMS in volume 3.

Summary: Restore in Helaman 5:43 the original Hebraistic use of *and* that separates the preceding *when*-clause from its following main clause; the original text has numerous examples of this kind of subordinate construction.

■ **Helaman 5:44**

and Nephi and Lehi [*were > was >*js *were* 1 | *was* A | *were* BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
   in the midst of them
yea they **were** *encircled about*
yea they **were** *as if in the midst of a flaming fire*

> Here in the printer's manuscript, Oliver Cowdery initially wrote "& Nephi & Lehi **were** in the midst of them". Virtually immediately Oliver corrected the *were* to *was* by crossing out the *were* and supralinearly inserting the *was* (there is no change in the level of ink flow for this correction). It appears that the original manuscript, which is not extant here, read *was*. Here Oliver rejected the expected *were* and copied the text of 𝓞 as it was; in other words, his correction in 𝓟 was definitely not due to editing. Note, in particular, the following two instances of *were,* which were left unchanged: "yea they **were** encircled about / yea they **were** as if in the midst of a flaming fire". Thus we have one more case showing Oliver correcting his scribal errors but not emending cases of actual subject-verb disagreement (for a summarizing discussion of this issue, see under Mosiah 10:14). But as we would expect, here in Helaman 5:44 Joseph Smith did make the change to *were* in his editing for the 1837 edition of the Book of Mormon.

Summary: Restore the original nonstandard use of *was* at the beginning of Helaman 5:44: "and Nephi and Lehi **was** in the midst of them".

■ **Helaman 5:44**

yea they were as [*if* 1ABDEFIJLMNOPQRST | CGHK] *in the midst of a flaming fire*

> As discussed nearby under Helaman 5:23, the original text had quite a few instances of *as if.* Here in Helaman 5:44, an original *if* was accidentally omitted when the 1840 edition was typeset. The RLDS textual tradition maintained this secondary reading ("they were **as** in the midst of a flaming fire") until the 1908 RLDS edition. As discussed under Helaman 5:23, instances of *as* without the *if* can be found in the original text as well. For each case, we let the earliest textual sources determine the correct reading, *as if* or *as.*

Summary: Maintain the original occurrence of *as if* in Helaman 5:44: "they were **as if** in the midst of a flaming fire".

■ **Helaman 5:47**

peace peace be unto you because of your faith
in my [*beloved >+ well beloved* 1ABCDEFGHKPS | *well Beloved* IJLMNOQ | *Well Beloved* RT]
which was from the foundation of the world

> Here the Father refers to his Son as "my Well Beloved". Originally Oliver Cowdery wrote simply "my beloved" in 𝓟; later he supralinearly inserted the word *well* (with heavier ink flow). This correction, probably made when Oliver proofed 𝓟 against 𝓞, undoubtedly restored the reading of 𝓞 (no longer extant here) since "my Beloved" is perfectly acceptable.
>
> Normally, the Book of Mormon uses *beloved* without any preceding *well,* with the following examples and accompanying statistics for the original text:

"my beloved brethren"	59 times
"my beloved son"	8 times
"my beloved brother"	6 times
"my beloved"	4 times
"my beloved people"	1 time
"my best beloved brethren"	1 time
"my dearly beloved brother"	1 time

The only other occurrences of the phrase "well beloved" (two of them) are found in an Isaiah quotation from the King James Bible, in 2 Nephi 15:1. Of particular interest here is that Oliver Cowdery initially omitted the *well* from the first instance of "well beloved" in that passage (for discussion, see under 2 Nephi 15:1).

Summary: Maintain Oliver Cowdery's inserted *well* in Helaman 5:47 ("because of your faith in my Well Beloved"), a correction undoubtedly based on the reading in 𝒪, no longer extant here.

■ **Helaman 5:49**

and there were about three hundred souls
which saw and heard [*those > these* 1 | *these* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *things*

As discussed under Alma 3:25, there have been numerous mix-ups in the history of the text between *those* and *these*. In each case, we follow the earliest textual sources. Here in Helaman 5:49, Oliver Cowdery initially wrote *those*. He first tried to correct *those* to *these* by overwriting the *o* with an *e*. But then, in order to make the correct reading clear, he crossed out the entire *those* rewritten as *these* and supralinearly wrote *these*. All the printed editions have followed the corrected reading in 𝒫, as will the critical text. Either reading will work here. Since there would have been no motivation to edit *those* to *these,* we can assume that 𝒪 read *these*.

Summary: Accept in Helaman 5:49 Oliver Cowdery's correction to *these* ("about three hundred souls which saw and heard **these** things"), which very likely represents the reading of 𝒪, no longer extant here.

■ **Helaman 5:49**

and they were [*bid* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQS | *bidden* RT] *to go forth*

Here the past participle for the verb *bid* is *bid* rather than the standard *bidden*. The 1920 LDS edition made the change to *bidden*. The only other past-participial form for this verb is the standard *bidden* (in 2 Nephi 4:25). The past-participial form *bid* is presumably based on a simple past-tense form *bid,* which does not occur at all in the text. Instead, the text has five instances of the standard (although archaic) simple past-tense form *bade*. The Oxford English Dictionary lists *bid* as an acceptable simple past-tense form for the verb *bid;* in fact, the OED also lists *bid* as an acceptable past-participial form. The critical text will, of course, restore the original past-participial *bid* here in Helaman 5:49.

Summary: Restore in Helaman 5:49 the original *bid,* a past-participial form for the verb *bid*.

■ **Helaman 5:51**

and as many as were convinced did lay down their weapons of war and also their hatred
and the tradition of their [*father > fathers* 1 | *fathers* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]

> Here in the printer's manuscript, Oliver Cowdery originally wrote *fathers* as *father;* but virtually immediately Oliver inserted inline the plural *s* (and without any change in the level of ink flow). Here we are talking about the tradition of the Lamanites, and clearly they had more than one founding father: one would count Laman, Lemuel, and the sons of Ishmael as their fathers. But the same plurality also holds for the tradition(s) of the Nephite fathers, where not only Nephi but also Jacob and Joseph (and probably Zoram) count as founding fathers. (See the listing of the Nephite and Lamanite tribes under Jacob 1:13.) Overall the text has instances of only the plural *fathers* in the expression "the tradition(s) of one's father(s)". In all, there are 28 instances, of which 18 refer to the Lamanite fathers and 10 to the Nephite fathers.

Summary: Maintain the plural *fathers* in Helaman 5:51 ("the tradition of their **fathers**"); the plural *fathers* always occurs in this expression.

■ **Helaman 5:52**

and it came to pass that they did yield up unto the Nephites
the lands of their [*possession* 1ABCDEFGIJLMOPQRST | *possessions* HKN]

> Here the 1874 RLDS edition and the 1906 LDS large-print edition independently replaced the singular *possession* with the plural *possessions.* Such changes show that editors or typesetters expect the full plural expression "the lands of X's (own) possessions", as in six places elsewhere in the text (see the list under 2 Nephi 29:14). On the other hand, there is evidence of a tendency to replace the plural *possessions* with the singular in this expression:

> > 2 Nephi 9:14 (initial error in 𝔓)
> > > my people which are of the house of Israel shall be gathered home unto the lands
> > > of their [*possession > possessions* 1 | *possessions* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]

> > Alma 50:12 (change in the 1830 edition)
> > > that they should have no power upon the lands
> > > of their [*possessions* 1PS | *possession* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOQRT]

> So one could argue that the singular *possession* here in Helaman 5:52 is an early error for the correct *possessions.*

> One example that opposes this change is the nearby example in Helaman 7:22, which reads without variation as "the land of our possession" (but which is not extant in 𝕆). In addition, as discussed under Helaman 4:8, there are instances in the original text of *possession* where English speakers expect *possessions.* For this reason, the critical text will accept the singular *possession* here in Helaman 5:52, the reading of the earliest extant textual sources (𝔓 and all the early editions).

Summary: Retain in Helaman 5:52 the singular *possession* in the phrase "the lands of their possession"; although speakers may expect the plural here, the singular can be found elsewhere in the text.

Helaman 6

■ **Helaman 6:2**

insomuch that they did reject the word of God
and all the preaching and [*the* 1| ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *prophesying*
which did come among them

> The 1830 typesetter accidentally omitted the repeated definite article *the* in the conjunctive noun phrase "and all the preaching and **the** prophesying". The use of the repeated determiner is characteristic of the Book of Mormon text. In accord with the earliest extant source (the printer's manuscript), the critical text will restore the original repeated *the* here in Helaman 6:2.

Summary: Restore in Helaman 6:2 the original repeated *the* in "all the preaching and **the** prophesying", the reading in 𝓟 (here the earliest extant source).

■ **Helaman 6:3**

nevertheless the people of the church did have great joy
because of the conversion of the Lamanites
yea because of the church of God
[1EF|, ABCDGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
which had been established among them

> Here the 1830 typesetter placed a comma after "the church of God". However, this appears to be a mistake since the following relative clause "which had been established among them" is restrictive—that is, the people of the church were rejoicing because of the Lamanite conversion and because the church had been established among these Lamanites. They were not rejoicing because of the church per se. The use of *yea* is inappropriate unless the following *because*-clause restates the idea of the preceding *because*-clause ("because of the conversion of the Lamanites"). Thus the text in this passage should read without the comma after "the church of God":

> > Helaman 6:3 (with revised punctuation; otherwise the 1981 LDS text)
> > Nevertheless, the people of the church did have great joy
> > because of the conversion of the Lamanites,
> > yea, because of the church of God which had been established among them.

> Interestingly, the 1849 LDS edition omitted the comma before the relative clause, and this change in punctuation was followed in the 1852 LDS edition. But the 1879 LDS edition restored the comma to the LDS text.

The word *church* frequently has the meaning 'congregation' in the Book of Mormon text. In fact, there are 11 instances in the text where the plural *churches* is used to refer to different congregations of the one church of God rather than to distinct churches (these plural cases are listed in the discussion under Alma 8:23). Moreover, there are a number of passages that use the singular *church* to refer to the congregation established in a particular place; in fact, in three other cases there is a following restrictive relative clause of the form "which was established in some place X" (each of these is marked below with an asterisk):

*	Alma 5:2	and these are the words which he spake to the people in the church which was established in the city of Zarahemla
	Alma 5:3	he began to establish a church in the land which was in the borders of Nephi
*	Alma 6:1	after Alma had made an end of speaking unto the people of the church which was established in the city of Zarahemla
	Alma 6:7	he departed from them / yea from the church which was in the city of Zarahemla
*	Alma 6:8	and Alma went and began to declare the word of God unto the church which was established in the valley of Gideon
	Alma 15:13	and Alma established a church in the land of Sidom
	Alma 15:17	after Alma having established the church at Sidom
	Alma 19:35	and they did establish a church among them
	Alma 20:1	when they had established a church in that land
	Alma 28:1	after the people of Ammon were established in the land of Jershon and a church also established in the land
	Alma 31:6	and Himni he did leave in the church in Zarahemla
	3 Nephi 5:12	yea the first church which was established among them after their transgression

Interestingly, in Alma 5:2 and Alma 6:8 there is no comma before the *which* in any of the printed editions; but in Alma 6:1 the comma is there, beginning with the 1830 edition. In that instance, the comma should be removed from the standard text, just as it should be removed here in Helaman 6:3.

Summary: Remove the comma after "the church of God" in Helaman 6:3 since the following relative clause is restrictive; similarly, the comma should be removed before the restrictive relative clause in Alma 6:1 ("the church which was established in the city of Zarahemla").

■ **Helaman 6:5**

unto the bringing down many of them into the depths of humility
to be the humble followers of God and [*of* > NULL 1| ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *the Lamb*

Oliver Cowdery initially repeated the preposition *of* before the conjunct *the Lamb,* but then he deleted the *of* (with no apparent change in the level of ink flow for the crossout). The lack of repeated *of* does not necessarily mean that God is indistinguishable from the Lamb. The humble follower of one is a follower of the other, which means that the repeated *of* can be avoided because of the close association between God and his Son. A similar lack of repeated *of* in referring to God and the Lamb occurs elsewhere in the text:

1 Nephi 12:18
> and a great and a terrible gulf divideth them
> yea even the sword of the justice
> **of** the eternal God and Jesus Christ which is the Lamb of God

In other words, the text does not read "the sword of the justice **of** the eternal God and **of** Jesus Christ which is the Lamb of God". The unity of the Father and the Son is thus supported by the lack of the repeated *of* in both these passages. Most likely, Oliver's correction here in Helaman 6:5 was in accord with the reading of the original manuscript (not extant here), especially since otherwise there would have been no strong motivation for removing the repeated *of*.

Summary: Accept in Helaman 6:5 Oliver Cowdery's corrected text in the printer's manuscript without the repeated *of* before *the Lamb* ("to be the humble followers of God and the Lamb").

■ **Helaman 6:7−8**

and behold there was peace in all the land
insomuch that the Nephites did go into whatsoever part of the land they would
whether *among the Nephites or the Lamanites*
and it came to pass that the Lamanites did also go
[*whethersoever* 1 | *whithersoever* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *they would*
whether *it were among the Lamanites or among the Nephites*

As explained under 1 Nephi 22:4, Oliver Cowdery frequently mixed up *whether* and *whither* in the manuscripts. Here in Helaman 6:8, he wrote the impossible *whethersoever* in the printer's manuscript, probably because he was influenced by the two instances of *whether* elsewhere in this passage. The 1830 compositor correctly set the word as *whithersoever* since the clause refers to motion ("the Lamanites did also go **whithersoever** they would"). In fact, the word *whithersoever* corresponds to the phrase "into whatsoever part of the land", found in the preceding verse:

Helaman 6:7−8
> the Nephites   did   go **into whatsoever part of the land** they would
> the Lamanites did also go **whithersoever**   they would

Summary: Maintain in Helaman 6:8 the form *whithersoever,* not the impossible *whethersoever* that Oliver Cowdery wrote in 𝒫.

■ **Helaman 6:8**

and it came to pass that the Lamanites did also go whithersoever they would
whether it were among the Lamanites
or [NULL > *among* 1 | *among* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *the Nephites*

Here in the printer's manuscript, Oliver Cowdery initially wrote "among the Lamanites or the Nephites"; then he supralinearly inserted the repeated *among* (with no change in the level of ink flow). His correction undoubtedly reflects the reading of the original manuscript, especially since in English we expect the preposition to not be repeated. His error was probably prompted by the lack of repetition in the parallel sentence in the preceding verse:

Helaman 6:7
> insomuch that the Nephites did go into whatsoever part of the land they would
> whether **among** the Nephites or the Lamanites

The repeated *among* is characteristic of the Book of Mormon text and occurs with other instances of conjuncts conjoined by *or:*

Alma 4:19
> that he himself might go forth **among** his people
> or **among** the people of Nephi

Alma 17:22
> if it were his desires to dwell in the land **among** the Lamanites
> or **among** his people

Alma 19:14
> which had been the cause of so much mourning **among** the Nephites
> or **among** all the people of God

But there are other cases without the repeated *among:*

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 land

Alma 54:3
> and there was not a woman nor a child **among** all the prisoners of Moroni
> or the prisoners which Moroni had taken

(Note that all five of these other cases involve the corrective *or,* not the regular disjunctive *or* used twice in Helaman 6:7–8.)

So either reading, with or without the *among,* is theoretically possible. In each case, we follow the earliest reading; thus the repeated *among* will be maintained in Helaman 6:8. (We can also find evidence for the repeated *among* when the conjunction is *and* rather than *or;* see under Alma 51:7 for three examples.)

Summary: Accept Oliver Cowdery's inserted *among* in Helaman 6:8, the corrected reading in 𝓟, as the reading of the original text (and presumably the reading in 𝓞).

■ **Helaman 6:9**

and they did have an exceeding plenty **of** *gold*
and [*of* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLNOPRST | MQ] *silver*
and **of** *all manner of precious metals*

The 1905 LDS edition accidentally omitted the repeated *of* in this conjunctive structure. The 1911 LDS edition continued this error, but the editors for the 1920 LDS edition restored the repeated *of* to the LDS text. This correction is consistent with virtually all other conjunctive phrases of the

form "of gold and (of) silver". There are ten other instances with the repeated *of* in the text; in fact, one of the other instances occurs nearby:

> Helaman 6:11
>> and behold there was all manner **of** gold in both these lands
>> and **of** silver and **of** precious ore of every kind

But there is one example in the text without the repeated *of* for the expression "of gold and (of) silver":

> Mosiah 19:15
>> one half **of** their gold and their silver and all their precious things

Note that in this example the *of* is not repeated, neither before "their silver" nor before "all their precious things". For each case of the expression "of gold and (of) silver", we follow the earliest textual sources with regard to the repetition of the preposition *of.* We should also note that there is an example without the repeated *of* in 2 Nephi 12:7, but there the order of *gold* and *silver* is reversed: "their land also is full **of** silver and gold". This example is identical to the corresponding reading in the King James Bible (in Isaiah 2:7).

Summary: Maintain in Helaman 6:9 the repetition of the *of* in "**of** gold and **of** silver and **of** all manner of precious metals", the normal Book of Mormon form.

■ **Helaman 6:14**

they did also have great joy
[NULL > *& peace* 1 | *and peace* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
[*yea* > NULL > *yea* 1 | *yea* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *much preaching*
and many prophecies concerning that which was to come

Oliver Cowdery initially wrote in 𝓟 "they did also have great joy / yea much preaching & many prophecies". Virtually immediately Oliver crossed out the *yea,* then supralinearly reinserted it. Finally, he inserted "& peace" right before the supralinear *yea* (there is no change in the level of ink flow for these two supralinear corrections). 𝓞 undoubtedly read with the conjoined "& peace" since either reading, with or without "and peace", is theoretically possible. Normally, "great joy" occurs in the text without any conjoined reference to peace (27 times). Oliver's omission of "and peace" in 𝓟 may be because earlier in this chapter there are two instances of "great joy" without any reference to peace:

> Helaman 6:3
>> nevertheless the people of the church did have **great joy**
>> because of the conversion of the Lamanites
>> yea because of the church of God which had been established among them
>> and they did fellowship one with another
>> and did rejoice one with another and did have **great joy**

Even so, there are two earlier references to "peace and great joy" in the book of Helaman, both in the same passage:

Helaman 3:32

> and it came to pass that there was **peace** and exceeding **great joy**
> in the remainder of the forty and ninth year
> yea and also there was continual **peace** and **great joy**
> in the fiftieth year of the reign of the judges

The critical text will maintain the corrected reading in 𝒫 for Helaman 6:14.

Summary: Maintain in Helaman 6:14 the conjoined "and peace", the corrected reading in 𝒫; such usage is supported by two similar occurrences of conjoined "peace and great joy" in Helaman 3:32.

■ **Helaman 6:15**

in the sixty and sixth year of the reign of [*the* 1ABCDEFGIJKLMNOPQRST | H] *judges*

Here we have an obvious typo in the 1874 RLDS edition, the accidental omission of the second *the* in the phrase "the reign of **the** judges". In this case, the 1892 RLDS restored the *the* to the RLDS text; the phrase with the *the* is so common in the text that the 1892 typesetter would have had no problem in deciding to add the expected *the* before *judges*. Theoretically, the *the* is not necessary, but elsewhere in the text there are at least 99 instances of "the reign of **the** judges" but none of "the reign of judges". (Also see the discussion under Alma 10:6 for the phrase "the reign of **our** judges".)

Summary: Maintain the *the* before *judges* in the phrase "the reign of **the** judges", including here in Helaman 6:15.

■ **Helaman 6:15**

behold [*Cezoram* 1ABCDEFGIJLMNOPQRST | *Cezorum* HK] *was murdered*
by an unknown hand as he sat upon the judgment seat

The 1874 RLDS edition twice misspelled the name *Cezoram* as *Cezorum,* here in Helaman 6:15 and later in verse 19:

Helaman 6:19

> and it was they which did murder
> the chief judge [*Cezoram* 1ABCDEFGIJLMNOPQRST | *Cezorum* HK] and his son
> while in the judgment seat

The subsequent RLDS edition (1892) maintained this error, but the 1908 RLDS edition restored the correct *Cezoram.* Earlier in the text, when this name is first mentioned, the name was spelled correctly in those first two RLDS editions:

Helaman 5:1

> behold Nephi delivered up the judgment seat
> to a man whose name was **Cezoram**

The original manuscript is not extant for any of the three occurrences of this name, but the printer's manuscript consistently reads *Cezoram.* The critical text will maintain this spelling.

This name appears to be a compound containing the name *Zoram.* Notice that the text has the name *Seezoram,* who was also a chief judge (Helaman 9:23, 26−27). The names *Cezoram* and *Seezoram* seem to parallel each other. The text has three different individuals named *Zoram* and two different peoples referred to as *Zoramites.* As with the name *Cezoram,* there was some minor tendency in the manuscripts to replace the correct spelling *Zoram* with *Zorum;* see the discussion under 1 Nephi 4:35.

Summary: The spelling *Cezoram,* with *a* as the final vowel, is the reading of the earliest extant textual sources and will be maintained in the critical text; this spelling is supported by the spelling of the names *Seezoram* and *Zoram.*

■ **Helaman 6:15**

and it came to pass that in the same year that his son
[NULL > *which* >js *who* 1 | *which* A | *who* BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *had been appointed*
    by the people in his stead
was also murdered

Here in 𝓟, Oliver Cowdery initially wrote "his Son had been appointed by the people in his stead". Virtually immediately Oliver supplied the relative pronoun *which* (the supralinearly inserted *which* was written with no change in the level of ink flow). The relative pronoun seems necessary since otherwise we get a finite clause immediately followed by an unattached predicate. This kind of construction occurs nowhere else in the Book of Mormon text. Oliver's inserted *which* does not seem to represent editing, but rather his attempt to get the reading of 𝓞 down correctly in 𝓟. For a list of other cases where the scribes omitted the relative pronoun *which* (usually momentarily), see under Alma 5:3. For the later editing of *which* to *who* in Helaman 6:15, see under WHICH in volume 3.

Summary: Maintain the relative pronoun in Helaman 6:15: "his son **which** had been appointed by the people in his stead was also murdered"; Oliver Cowdery's addition of the *which* here in 𝓟 was apparently the result of his making sure the reading in 𝓞 was correctly copied into 𝓟.

■ **Helaman 6:17**

for behold the Lord had blessed them so long with the riches of the world
that they had not been stirred up to anger
to wars [& >+ *nor* 1 | *nor* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *to bloodsheds*

Oliver Cowdery initially wrote "to wars & to bloodsheds" here in the printer's manuscript; then with slightly heavier ink flow, he crossed out the ampersand and supralinearly inserted the negative conjunction *nor.* It's quite possible that Oliver's correction followed the reading of the original manuscript. He could have made this correction when he proofed 𝓟 against 𝓞. It's also possible that Oliver caught his error virtually immediately after writing down the ampersand, with him redipping his quill and then correcting the ampersand to *nor.*

On the other hand, there is some evidence that Oliver Cowdery's correction of *and* to *nor* could have been the result of editing. In 4 Nephi 1:2, scribe 2 of the printer's manuscript copied the text there as "there was no contentions & disputations among them". The 1830 edition also reads *and*, so most likely there was an *and* (written as an ampersand) in the original manuscript for 4 Nephi 1:2. (For that part of the text, both the 1830 edition and 𝓟 are firsthand copies of 𝓞.) When Oliver was proofreading 4 Nephi 1:2, he initially crossed out the & and wrote *nor* supralinearly. But he then restored the original *and* by crossing out the supralinear *nor* and writing an ampersand before the now crossed-out *nor*. Thus Oliver seems to have had a tendency in negative sentences to emend *and* to *nor* in conjuncts. Yet he was also able to resist this tendency, at least in 4 Nephi 1:2, where he ended up restoring the actual reading of his copytext, the original manuscript.

Here in Helaman 6:17, one could argue that Oliver Cowdery expected the *and* in the clause "they had not been stirred up to anger / to wars **and** to bloodsheds". Elsewhere in the text, there are seven instances of "war(s) **and** bloodshed(s)" but no instances of "war(s) **or** bloodshed(s)" or of "war(s) **nor** bloodshed(s)". In fact, if one were to emend this passage in Helaman 6:17, perhaps some kind of conjunctive element between *to anger* and *to wars* should be supplied, such as *neither* or *nor*. And for each of these possible emendations, we can find an example elsewhere in the text that supports that kind of conjunctive negation:

□ *not . . . neither . . . nor*

Helaman 6:17 (possible emendation)
they had **not** been stirred up to anger
neither to wars **nor** to bloodsheds

3 Nephi 8:22 (the reading in 𝓟 and the 1830 edition; not extant in 𝓞)
and there was **not** any light seen
neither fire **nor** glimmer
neither the sun **nor** the moon **nor** the stars

□ *not . . . nor . . . nor*

Helaman 6:17 (possible emendation)
they had **not** been stirred up to anger
nor to wars **nor** to bloodsheds

Alma 23:3 (the reading in 𝓟 and the 1830 edition; partially extant in 𝓞)
and that they had **not** ought to murder
nor to plunder **nor** to steal **nor** to commit adultery
nor to commit any manner of wickedness

These possible emendations for Helaman 6:17 presuppose the loss of either *neither* or *nor* in the early transmission of the text. Yet elsewhere in the textual history, there are no examples of the loss of *neither* or *nor* as single words, even momentarily, which suggests that the original text here in Helaman 6:17 actually read as corrected in 𝓟, "they had not been stirred up to anger / to wars nor to bloodsheds".

There is some minimal evidence in the Book of Mormon text that *nor* can be lacking in a negative sequence of conjuncts, but the only example is in a biblical citation where the negative conjunction is lacking before *thy manservant* (marked below with an arrow):

> Mosiah 13:18 (citing Exodus 20:10)
>> but the seventh day / the sabbath of the Lord thy God
>> thou shalt not do any work
>> thou **nor** thy son **nor** thy daughter
> → thy manservant **nor** thy maidservant
>> **nor** thy cattle **nor** thy stranger that is within thy gates

The King James text also lacks the *nor* in that one place, and that is because the original Hebrew lacks a connecting *waw* 'and' before *thy manservant* (but only there for any of the nouns that are conjoined with *thou*). We note that the phrase "thy manservant nor thy maidservant" works as a unit, which may justify the omission of the *waw*. Similarly, "to wars nor to bloodsheds" works as a unit, thus justifying the missing preceding negative conjunction before *to wars*.

This independent evidence, although minor, supports the current reading in Helaman 6:17. For that reason, the critical text will maintain the corrected reading in 𝒫. This difficult reading in 𝒫 was probably the reading in 𝒪 since Oliver made sure that it was copied correctly into 𝒫. There still remains the possibility that the original text had a negative conjunction between *to anger* and *to wars,* perhaps *neither* or *nor,* that was lost during the dictation of the text.

Nonetheless, it should be pointed out that *nor* does occur before *his manservant* later on in Mosiah 13 as Abinadi continues to quote from the Ten Commandments:

> Mosiah 13:24 (citing Exodus 20:17)
>> thou shalt not covet thy neighbor's house
>> thou shalt not covet thy neighbor's wife
> → **nor** his manservant **nor** his maidservant
>> **nor** his ox **nor** his ass
>> **nor** any thing that is thy neighbor's

And in this second case, the *nor* also appears before *his manservant* in the corresponding passage in the King James Bible as well as in the Hebrew original. Thus the evidence for omitting the *nor* before a semantically related pair of conjuncts is fairly weak.

Summary: Accept in Helaman 6:17 Oliver Cowdery's correction in 𝒫 of *and* to *nor* (giving "they had not been stirred up to anger / to wars **nor** to bloodsheds"); Oliver's correction in 𝒫 probably followed the reading in 𝒪; there is some minor evidence for this difficult reading from Mosiah 13:18, a biblical quote, but there is also some possibility that the original text had *neither* or *nor* immediately preceding *to wars*.

■ **Helaman 6:17**

they had not been stirred up to anger
to wars nor to [*bloodsheds* 1ABCDEFGHIJKNOPS | *bloodshed* LMQRT]

Here the 1902 and 1905 LDS missionary editions replaced the plural *bloodsheds* with the singular *bloodshed;* the 1905 change may have occurred independently of the 1902 change. The LDS text has continued with the singular *bloodshed.* In modern English, speakers expect the singular; but as explained under 2 Nephi 10:6, the original Book of Mormon text had a number of instances of the

plural *bloodsheds* when conjoined with other plural nouns (such as here in Helaman 6:17 where *bloodsheds* is conjoined with *wars*). The critical text will restore the original plural in this passage.

Summary: Restore in Helaman 6:17 the original plural *bloodsheds*, the earliest extant reading.

■ **Helaman 6:20**

and they did use every means
[*whatsoever was* 1A | BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *in their power*
to destroy them off the face of the earth

The 1837 edition omitted the pronoun *whatsoever* and the finite verb *was*. This change is probably due to editing on the part of Joseph Smith, although he did not mark the deletion in the printer's manuscript. The original reading does seem a little awkward, although there is nothing overtly difficult with that expression. Here the word *whatsoever* acts like the restrictive relative pronoun *that*, so that "every means **whatsoever** was in their power" is equivalent to "every means **that** was in their power". The antecedent for *whatsoever* is *every means*, a semantic plural that agrees with the plurality inherent in the word *whatsoever*.

A similar use of *whatsoever* as a relative pronoun occurs for the overtly plural noun phrase *all things*, as in these examples elsewhere in the text:

Mosiah 6:6	and did keep his commandments in all things whatsoever he commanded him
Alma 1:29	having abundance of all things whatsoever they stood in need
Alma 37:16	for you must appeal unto the Lord for all things whatsoever ye must do with them
3 Nephi 6:1	and all things whatsoever did belong unto them

There are also three examples of this phraseology in the Book of Mormon that follow the language of the King James Bible:

1 Nephi 22:20 and 3 Nephi 14:12 (compare with Acts 3:22)
    him shall ye hear in all things whatsoever he shall say unto you

3 Nephi 14:12 (compare with Matthew 7:12)
    therefore all things whatsoever ye would that men should do to you
    do ye even so to them

The King James Bible has three more instances of this construction, all in the New Testament. But note that all these examples, both in the Book of Mormon and the King James Bible, involve the universal quantifier *all* rather than the semantically equivalent *every*. In other words, there are no examples like "every thing whatsoever did belong to them" (the equivalent to 3 Nephi 6:1). Thus the language of "every means whatsoever was in their power" is unique to the Book of Mormon text. In Early Modern English, however, we can find examples of *every thing* postmodified by a *whatsoever*-clause; here are some examples from *Literature Online* <lion.chadwyck.com>, with accidentals regularized:

Thomas Taylor (died 1632)
    in **every thing whatsoever** we speak or do

Robert Saunderson (1635)
> for **every thing whatsoever** we do

Peter Heylyn (1654)
> for therefore God the Father is said to be almighty or omnipotent
> not that he can do **every thing whatsoever** it be and will do all things that he can
> but because he can do all things that he pleaseth—all that can be done—
> because he can do **all things whatsoever** he pleaseth

The last citation is interesting since at the end it also has an instance of "all things whatsoever", the semantic equivalent to "every thing whatsoever". The critical text will therefore restore the earliest reading in Helaman 6:20 ("every means **whatsoever was** in their power") since that expression is clearly intended and we can find evidence for it in Early Modern English.

Summary: Restore the original *whatsoever was* in Helaman 6:20, thus "and they did use every means **whatsoever was** in their power to destroy them off the face of the earth"; this expression is supported by seven instances in the Book of Mormon of *all things* followed by a *whatsoever*-clause (plus five instances of the same construction in the King James Bible); the singular "every means whatsoever" is also supported by examples in Early Modern English of the parallel expression "every thing whatsoever".

■ **Helaman 6:20**

and they did use every means whatsoever was in their power
to destroy them **off** *the face of the earth*

One wonders if the infinitive phrase here isn't missing the preposition *from;* that is, perhaps the original text read "to destroy them **from off** the face of the earth". The original manuscript isn't extant here, but it is quite possible that it had the *from* and Oliver Cowdery accidentally omitted it as he copied the text from 𝒪 into 𝒫. There are three instances in 𝒫 where Oliver momentarily omitted *from,* although not from this particular expression:

Alma 59:6
> yea even those which had been compelled to flee from the land of Manti
> and [*from* 0ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST | NULL > *from* 1] the land round about

3 Nephi 4:12
> behold the Nephites did beat them
> insomuch that they did fall back
> [NULL > *from* 1 | *from* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] before them

Moroni 10:28
> and his word shall hiss forth
> [NULL >+ *from* 1 | *from* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] generation to generation

The second instance is similar to the case here in Helaman 6:20 in that we have an isolated, optional occurrence of *from*. To be sure, there are quite a few instances of *from before* in the text (21 of them, of which nine involve the verb *flee,* as in Mormon 4:20: "and they fled again **from before** them"). Even so, the *from* is not required for that expression; for instance, there are 27

instances in the text of the expression "to flee before someone", that is, without the *from,* as in Mosiah 19:21: "and they fled **before** them".

Elsewhere the text definitely supports the preposition *from* in the expression "to destroy **from off** the face of the earth/land":

Jarom 1:10	they should be destroyed **from off** the face of the land
Mosiah 12:8	I will utterly destroy them **from off** the face of the earth
Alma 9:12	or he will utterly destroy you **from off** the face of the earth
Alma 9:24	that ye shall utterly be destroyed **from off** the face of the earth
Alma 37:22	they should be destroyed **from off** the face of the earth
Alma 37:25	I will destroy them **from off** the face of the earth
Alma 54:12	even until you are destroyed **from off** the face of the earth
Helaman 7:28	and ye shall be destroyed **from off** the face of the earth
3 Nephi 4:4	they did hope to destroy the robbers **from off** the face of the land
Ether 11:12	that the Lord would utterly destroy them **from off** the face of the earth

The King James Bible also supports the use of *from* with *off* in this expression:

Genesis 7:4	and every living substance that I have made will I destroy **from off** the face of the earth
Deuteronomy 6:15	and destroy thee **from off** the face of the earth
1 Kings 13:34	and to destroy *it* **from off** the face of the earth
Amos 9:8	and I will destroy it **from off** the face of the earth

Additional biblical support for the use of *from off* can be found in Joshua 23:15: "until he have destroyed you **from off** this good land". The expression with *from* also occurs in a revelation given to Joseph Smith during the general time period that the Book of Mormon was translated (in this case, in March 1829):

> Book of Commandments 4:11 (Doctrine and Covenants 5:33)
> and there are many that lie in wait
> to destroy thee **from off** the face of the earth

These many examples provide considerable evidence for emending Helaman 6:20 to read "to destroy them **from off** the face of the earth".

Nonetheless, it should be pointed out that originally the word *off* meant 'from'; in fact, the preposition *of* derives from *off.* Thus from a historical point of view, the sense of 'from' is already present in *off* and the *from* is not necessary. Or one could equivalently argue that we could have *from* without the *off* in this expression. In fact, there is one instance of that form in the King James Bible, in Genesis 6:7: "I will destroy man whom I have created **from** the face of the earth".

Since the earliest reading without the *from* will work, the critical text will maintain that reading here in Helaman 6:20, although it is quite possible that an original *from* was lost during the early transmission of the text. Examples in earlier English follow the biblically styled expression "destroyed **from off** the face of the earth/land", but by the 1800s there are examples without the *from,* as in Thomas D'Arcy McGee (1861): "they ought to be destroyed **off** the face of the earth" (listed on *Literature Online* <lion.chadwyck.com>). It is also worth noting that the modern

expression "to be wiped **off** the face of the earth/land" typically lacks the *from*. So at least the modernizing tendency has been to remove the *from* in the expression "to be destroyed **from off** the face of the earth/land".

Summary: Maintain in Helaman 6:20 the earliest reading without the *from* in "to destroy them **off** the face of the earth"; there is indirect support in Genesis 6:7 for a shorter reading without both *from* and *off;* elsewhere the scriptures prefer *from off* in this expression (five times in the King James Bible, ten times in the Book of Mormon, and once in the Doctrine and Covenants), which suggests that *from* may have been lost during the early transmission of the text for this one exception.

■ **Helaman 6:21**

but behold Satan did stir up the hearts
of the more [*parts* 1ABDEFIJLMNOQ | *part* CGHKPRST] *of the Nephites*

Here in the 1840 edition the plural *parts* was changed to the singular *part,* perhaps by Joseph Smith in his editing for that edition. The singular reading has been maintained in the RLDS textual tradition. The 1920 LDS edition introduced the singular *part* into the LDS text, perhaps by reference to the 1840 edition or simply because the 1920 editors found that "the more **parts** of the Nephites" sounded odd. The original manuscript is not extant here. If the original text read in the singular as *part,* the change to *parts* could have been prompted by the preceding rhyming plural, *hearts,* thus replacing "the hearts of the more **part** of the Nephites" with "the hearts of the more **parts** of the Nephites". Such a change could have happened during the dictation of the text or when Oliver Cowdery copied the text from 𝓞 into 𝓟.

The singular form, *more part,* is considerably more frequent in the Book of Mormon text than the plural, *more parts.* There are 24 instances of the singular; in all cases but one the determiner is *the* (the one exception, marked below with an asterisk, takes *a* as the determiner):

1 Nephi 9:4	the more part of the ministry
1 Nephi 9:4	the more part of the reigns of the kings
1 Nephi 19:2	the more part of all our proceedings
1 Nephi 22:4	the more part of all the tribes
Alma 14:2	the more part of them
Alma 47:2	the more part of them
Alma 53:2	the more part of all his battles
Helaman 5:50	the more part of the Lamanites
Helaman 6:1	the more part of them
Helaman 6:31	the more part of them
* Helaman 6:32	a more part of it
Helaman 6:38	the more part of the righteous
Helaman 11:21	the more part of the people
Helaman 13:12	the more part of this great city
Helaman 14:21	the more part of it
Helaman 15:5	the more part of them
Helaman 15:6	the more part of them

Helaman 16:6	the more part of them
Helaman 16:10	the more part of the people
3 Nephi 1:22	the more part of the people
3 Nephi 7:8	the more part of the people
3 Nephi 7:26	the more part of the year
3 Nephi 26:7	the more part of the things
Ether 9:11	the more part of the people

In addition, there are 14 instances where there is an adjective occurring between *more* and *part;* once more, the determiner is *the* except for one case of *a* (marked below with an asterisk):

* 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 22:28	the more idle part of the Lamanites
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

In contrast to these 14 instances of the singular "more <adjective> part", the text has a number of instances of the plural "more <adjective> parts", including one verse where the phrase is repeated in a corrective *or*-clause (Alma 43:38):

1 Nephi 16:16	the more fertile parts of the wilderness
1 Nephi 19:3	the prophecies / the more plain and precious parts of them
Alma 43:38	the more vital parts of the body
Alma 43:38	the more vital parts of the body
Helaman 3:23	the more settled parts of the land
Helaman 11:6	the more wicked parts of the land

For the nouns *wilderness, body,* and *land,* there is independent evidence in the text that these nouns actually have parts:

1 Nephi 16:14	keeping in the most fertile **parts** of the **wilderness**
Alma 41:2	and that **every part** of the **body** should be restored to itself
Helaman 3:5	and even they did spread forth into **all parts** of the **land**

Although there is no independent evidence in the text for "parts of prophecies" (as implied by 1 Nephi 19:3), the statement that Nephi should write down "the more plain and precious parts" of their prophecies seems fully appropriate.

There is one instance of *more parts* elsewhere in the text, and this one occurs without an intervening adjective, just like the earliest extant reading for Helaman 6:21:

> 4 Nephi 1:27
>> and yet they did deny
>> the more [*part* 1PS | *parts* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOQRT] of his gospel

Interestingly, the printer's manuscript for this passage reads in the singular ("the more **part** of his gospel"). For that part of the text, both the 1830 edition and 𝓟 are firsthand copies of the original manuscript, so either the 1830 edition or 𝓟 may represent the reading in 𝓞, no longer extant in 4 Nephi. If 𝓞 read in the singular, then the 1830 typesetter added the plural *s*. If 𝓞 read in the plural, then scribe 2 of 𝓟 omitted the plural *s*. Since the plural *parts* is the unexpected reading for modern English speakers, the most likely scenario in 4 Nephi 1:27 is that 𝓞 read in the plural and scribe 2 of 𝓟 dropped the unexpected plural *s*. We can find evidence for one case where the scribe replaced the plural *parts* with the singular *part* (in that case, the scribe was Oliver Cowdery). For discussion of that possibility, see under Jacob 5:13–14.

As with all but one of the six plural cases of "more <adjective> parts", we can find specific evidence for "parts of the gospel" elsewhere in the text:

> 1 Nephi 13:26
>> for behold they have taken away from the **gospel** of the Lamb
>> **many parts** which are plain and most precious

> 1 Nephi 13:32
>> because of the plain and most precious **parts** of the **gospel** of the Lamb
>> which hath been kept back by that abominable church

> 1 Nephi 13:34
>> because of the most plain and precious **parts** of the **gospel** of the Lamb
>> which hath been kept back by that abominable church

Since the Book of Mormon text does refer to different parts of the gospel, the use of "the more parts of his gospel" in 4 Nephi 1:27 is acceptable and will be maintained in the critical text.

Most of the examples of "more part" and "more <adjective> part" involve people (28 out of the 38 instances, including all 9 instances where *part* is postmodified by *of them*). Given this regularity, one could argue that the one case of "the more **parts** of the Nephites", here in Helaman 6:21, is most likely an error for "the more **part** of the Nephites". The ultimate question, however, is whether one can refer to parts of a people. When we look at the entire text, we find that the text virtually always refers to "**part** of a people" rather than to "**parts** of a people". But there is one clear exception:

> Alma 47:5
>> and now he had gat the command of **those parts** of the Lamanites
>> which were in favor of the king

Here there is no question that the original text reads *parts* since its determiner is the plural *those*. In other words, this example definitely shows that "the more **parts** of the Nephites" in Helaman 6:21

is possible. The critical text will therefore restore the plural *parts* in Helaman 6:21, the earliest extant reading, even though it could be an error for *part*.

Summary: Accept the two original instances in the text of *more parts,* here in Helaman 6:21 ("the more parts of the Nephites") and in 4 Nephi 1:27 ("the more parts of his gospel"); this usage is supported by six instances in the text of "more <adjective> parts of X"; in addition, there is clear evidence that the text can refer to "parts of a people" as well as to "parts of the gospel".

■ **Helaman 6:21**

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

> Here in Helaman 6:21, the original text had the preposition *in* at both the beginning and the end of the *whatsoever*-clause: "**in** whatsoever difficult circumstances they should be placed **in**". Such repetition is considered unacceptable in standard English; thus the clause-final *in* was removed in the 1837 edition, and it has never been restored in any subsequent edition. As explained under Alma 23:1, the original Book of Mormon text had a number of *whatsoever*-clauses for which an initial preposition *in* was repeated at the end of the clause; some of these have been maintained in the current text. In two cases, the text will be emended by adding a repeated *in* to the end of such a *whatsoever*-clause.

Summary: Restore in Helaman 6:21 the original *in* that ended the *whatsoever*-clause, thus providing an *in* at both the beginning and the end of the clause: "**in** whatsoever difficult circumstances they should be placed **in**".

■ **Helaman 6:22**

that whatsoever wickedness his brother should do
he should not be injured by his brother
nor [NULL > *by* 1 | *by* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *those*
who did belong to his band who had taken this covenant

> Here Oliver Cowdery inserted the repeated preposition *by* in the printer's manuscript. The level of ink flow is unchanged for the supralinear *by,* so the correction appears to be virtually immediate. The corrected reading in 𝒫 was most likely the reading in 𝒪, no longer extant here.
>
> In this case, the expression does seem more natural when the *by* is repeated after the negative conjunction *nor.* In any event, such parallelism is characteristic of the Book of Mormon text, although it is not required. See the discussion under Alma 2:38 and, more generally, under CONJUNCTIVE REPETITION in volume 3.

Summary: Accept in Helaman 6:22 Oliver Cowdery's inserted *by* in 𝒫 ("he should not be injured by his brother nor **by** those who did belong to his band"); repetition of the preposition in conjunctive structures is common in the Book of Mormon text.

■ **Helaman 6:25**

now behold it is
[*those > these* 1 | *these* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *secret oaths and covenants*
which Alma commanded his son should not go forth unto the world

As explained under Alma 3:25, in the early transmission of the text there are quite a few places where Oliver Cowdery mixed up *these* and *those*. In each case, the critical text will follow the reading of the earliest extant source. Here in Helaman 6:25, Oliver appears to have initially written *those,* but then virtually immediately he overwrote the *o* with an *e* (there is no change in the level of ink flow). The critical text will maintain the *these.*

The earlier reference to the oaths of the Gaddianton robbers is found in verse 21 ("insomuch that they did unite with those bands of robbers and did enter into their covenants and their oaths"). So the use of "these secret oaths" is quite possible here in verse 25. It should be noted, however, that the printer's manuscript has "those secret oaths" later on in the next verse:

> Helaman 6:26
>> now behold **those** secret oaths and covenants did not come forth unto Gaddianton from the records which were delivered unto Helaman

Variation is, of course, possible, so we will follow the earliest extant reading here in Helaman 6:25.

Summary: Accept "**these** secret oaths and covenants" in Helaman 6:25, the corrected reading of the printer's manuscript (the earliest extant source); either *these* or *those* is possible here, so we follow the earliest textual sources.

■ **Helaman 6:28**

and it was that same being
*which led **on** the people which came from that tower into this land*
[1 |; ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
which spread the works of darkness and abominations over all the face of the land
until he dragged the people down to an entire destruction and to an everlasting hell

Lester Dickey, in an unpublished article "Engraving the Book of Mormon" (dated 22 April 2001, received by me in October 2003), suggests that the *on* here in this verse is intrusive and should be removed from the text. 𝒪 is not extant here; 𝒫 and all the printed editions have *on*—and without any textual variation. More significantly, the phrase "to lead someone on" occurs elsewhere in the Book of Mormon:

Jacob 4:15	and now I Jacob am led **on** by the Spirit unto prophesying
Alma 4:11	the example of the church began to lead those who were unbelievers **on** from one piece of iniquity to another
Alma 58:24	lest there was a plan laid to lead them **on** to destruction

This phrase often implies deception (as in the two Alma citations). But the phrase "to lead someone on" can also simply mean 'to lead someone', as in the Jacob 4:15 example. We get the same semantically neutral usage in the King James Bible: "and he led them **on** safely" (Psalm 78:53).

Here in Helaman 6:28, the verb phrase "to lead on" actually has the sense of deception, but the punctuation makes it difficult for the reader to recognize that. The 1830 typesetter placed a semicolon after the first relative clause that postmodifies the noun phrase *the people;* this forces a more neutral sense for the verb phrase: "and it was that same being which led on the people which came from that tower into this land". The problem here is that Satan did not lead the Jaredites to the promised land at all. Instead, the book of Ether expressly states in various passages that it was the Lord who led the Jaredites to the promised land, as in Ether 7:27: "and he remembered the great things that the Lord had done for his fathers in bringing them across the great deep into the promised land". What we actually have here in Helaman 6:28 is a statement that Satan led on the Jaredites to spread the works of darkness and abomination, thus dragging them down to destruction:

> Helaman 6:28
>> and it was that same being
>> which led on the people which came from that tower into this land
>> which spread the works of darkness and abominations over all the face of the land
>> until he dragged the people down to an entire destruction and to an everlasting hell

The relative clause "which came from that tower into this land" is restrictive and definitional; its only purpose is to identify these people as the Jaredites ("the people which came from that tower into this land"). On the other hand, the subsequent relative clause ("which spread the works of darkness and abominations over all the face of the land") directly relates to the preceding *led on;* that is, the last relative pronoun, *which,* refers either to Satan ("it was that same being . . . which spread the works of darkness and abominations over all the face of the land") or to the Jaredites themselves ("it was that same being which led on the people . . . which spread the works of darkness and abominations over all the face of the land"). But clearly it is not Satan who led the people from the tower of Babel to the promised land.

Summary: Remove the semicolon from Helaman 6:28 so that the expression "it was that same being which led on the people", with its sense of deception, correctly refers to Satan's influence on the Jaredites in leading them on to works of darkness and ultimately causing their destruction; the relative clause "which came from that tower into this land" is restrictive and simply defines these people as the Jaredites.

■ **Helaman 6:29**

yea it is that same being who put it into the heart of Gaddianton
to still carry on **the work of darkness** *and of secret murder*

Under 2 Nephi 30:17, I argued that the earliest reading in that passage, namely, "there is no **works** of darkness", is an error for "there is no **work** of darkness". Here in Helaman 6:29, the earliest reading reads in the singular, as "the **work** of darkness", yet general usage in the text argues for the plural, "the **works** of darkness". Nearby are two other instances of the plural:

Helaman 6:28	which spread the **works** of darkness and abominations
Helaman 6:30	he doth carry on his **works** of darkness and secret murder

The last instance closely parallels the language here in verse 29. As noted under 2 Nephi 30:17, there are quite a few instances in the manuscripts where *works* was replaced by *work,* sometimes momentarily. Thus it is quite possible here in Helaman 6:29 that we have an early scribal error, *work* instead of the correct *works.* 𝕆 is not extant here and could have read in the plural. Or the *s* could have been lost during the dictation of the text.

Despite these arguments, the singular will work here in Helaman 6:29, which means that the motivation for conjectural emendation is not strong. Also note that there is another reference to Gaddianton that refers to his "secret **work** of murder" rather than his "secret **works** of murder":

> Helaman 2:4
>> for there was one Gaddianton who was exceeding expert in many words
>> and also in his craft to carry on the secret **work** of murder and of robbery

In this earlier passage, the singular *work* agrees with the reading here in Helaman 6:29: "the **work** of . . . secret murder". Note, in contrast, that Helaman 6:30 refers to Satan carrying on "his works of . . . secret murder". Since either "secret **work** of murder" or "secret **works** of murder" is possible, we should allow variation between "**work** of darkness" and "**works** of darkness". The critical text will therefore maintain the singular *work* in Helaman 6:29 ("the **work** of darkness"), even though this could be an error for "the **works** of darkness".

Summary: Maintain in Helaman 6:29 the singular *work* in "the **work** of darkness and of secret murder", the reading of 𝔓 and all the printed editions (𝕆 is not extant here); there is support for the singular in the earlier reference to Gaddianton in Helaman 2:4 ("to carry on the secret **work** of murder"); generally, the text has "the **works** of darkness", so the possibility remains that the singular *work* in Helaman 6:29 is an error for the plural *works.*

■ **Helaman 6:31**

and did build up unto themselves idols
of [NULL > *their* 1|*their* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *gold*
and [*of* > *their* 1|*their* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *silver*

Oliver Cowdery initially wrote the expected Book of Mormon phrase "of gold and of silver" here in 𝔓. This phrase, in fact, was used earlier in this chapter: "and they did have an exceeding plenty **of gold and of silver** and of all manner of precious metals" (Helaman 6:9). Here in verse 31, Oliver corrected his initial reading to "of their gold and their silver". The correction seems to have been virtually immediate since there is no change in the level of ink flow for the crossout of the repeated *of* nor for the two instances of *their* that were supralinearly inserted. The original manuscript, not extant here, very likely read "of their gold and their silver".

When *gold* and *silver* are conjoined in a prepositional phrase headed by *of,* if a possessive pronoun modifies both *gold* and *silver,* then sometimes the *of* is repeated, sometimes not. Besides the case here in Helaman 6:31 without the repeated *of,* there are three cases with the repeated *of,* but there is one without (marked below with an asterisk):

	Mosiah 11:3	a fifth part **of** their gold and **of** their silver
*	Mosiah 19:15	one half **of** their gold and their silver and all their precious things
	Alma 11:4	the names of the different pieces **of** their gold and **of** their silver
	Helaman 13:28	ye will give unto him **of** your gold and **of** your silver

So the *of* does not have to be repeated, and the corrected reading in 𝓟 for Helaman 6:31 will be maintained.

Summary: Accept in Helaman 6:31 Oliver Cowdery's correction in 𝓟 to "idols of their gold and their silver", where the possessive pronoun *their* is repeated but the *of* is not.

■ **Helaman 6:32**

and it came to pass that **all these iniquities** *did come unto them in the space of not many years insomuch that* [*the > a* 1 | *a* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *more part of* **it** *had come unto them in the sixty and seventh year of the reign of the judges over the people of Nephi*

Here Oliver Cowdery initially wrote "**the** more part of it" in the printer's manuscript, but then he crossed out the definite article *the* and supralinearly inserted the indefinite article *a*. The level of ink flow is unchanged, so the correction appears immediate and based on the reading of the original manuscript (no longer extant for this part of the text). The use of the indefinite article in this context is rare in the Book of Mormon text (thus explaining Oliver Cowdery's natural tendency to write "**the** more part"). But there is one more example in the text with the *a:* "for **a** more history part are written upon mine other plates" (2 Nephi 4:14). For a list of all instances of "more part(s)" in the text, see nearby under Helaman 6:21.

This passage in Helaman 6:32 does have a problem with the referent to the singular pronoun *it*. Its referent seems to be the preceding "all these iniquities", which is plural. Of course, the *it* could be considered as referring to the Nephites' general state of iniquity, as if the text read "all this iniquity" (even though it is very doubtful the original text actually read "all this iniquity" instead of "all these iniquities"). Emending the pronoun *it* here in this passage to *them* is not a viable option since the reader would then tend to interpret "a more part of them", at least initially, as referring to "a more part of the Nephites" since the preceding text reads "all these iniquities did come unto **them** in the space of not many years". If any emendation is to be done, probably the plural "all these iniquities" should be changed to the singular "all this iniquity". But as already observed in other passages, there is considerable switching in grammatical number in statements where either the singular or the plural will work semantically. See, for instance, the discussion regarding *it* and *them* under 1 Nephi 19:24, where in the original text the singular pronoun *it* refers to an earlier plural, "the words of the prophet". The critical text will maintain the singular *it* here in Helaman 6:32 even though it refers to a plural, "all these iniquities".

Summary: Accept in Helaman 6:32 the indefinite article *a* in "a more part of it" (the corrected reading in 𝓟); also retain the singular pronoun *it* even though its antecedent is the plural "all these iniquities".

■ **Helaman 6:36**

and thus we see that the Lord began to pour out his Spirit upon the Lamanites
because of their easiness and willingness to believe
in his [*word* 1ABCDEGHKPS | *words* FIJLMNOQRT]

Here the 1852 LDS edition changed the singular *word* to *words*, probably unintentionally. This reading has been followed by all subsequent LDS editions. We have already discussed quite a few cases where there has been some variation in the grammatical number for *word(s)*. For some discussion regarding "the word(s) of the Lord", see under Mosiah 20:21; for the phrase "the word(s) of God", see under Alma 5:11. Either number for *word* is possible when referring to the Lord, although the singular dominates in the Book of Mormon text. In each case, the critical text will follow the earliest extant reading, thus the singular *word* here in Helaman 6:36. See under Helaman 16:1 for specific discussion of the expression "to believe in the word(s) of the Lord".

Summary: Restore the singular *word* in Helaman 6:36, the reading of the earliest text; either singular or plural is possible, but the singular form is the more frequent one in referring to the word(s) of the Lord.

■ **Helaman 6:37**

and it came to pass that the Lamanites did hunt the band of robbers of Gaddianton
and they did preach the word of God among **the more wicked part of them**
insomuch that this band of robbers was utterly destroyed from among the Lamanites

One wonders if there isn't some mistake in this passage. The expression "the more wicked part of them", referring it would seem to the Gaddianton robbers, doesn't make much sense. A more reasonable interpretation is that the Lamanites hunted down these robbers, killing the more wicked part of them but preaching to the less wicked part, thus eliminating them. Earlier in my work on the text, I proposed that Mormon himself accidentally wrote "the **more** wicked part of them" instead of the intended "the **less** wicked part of them". Perhaps he conflated the two ideas of "preaching to the less wicked" and "killing the more wicked", ending up with "preaching to the more wicked". For this proposed emendation, see page 65 of *Uncovering the Original Text of the Book of Mormon: History and Findings of the Critical Text Project,* edited by Gerald Bradford and Alison Coutts (Provo, Utah: FARMS, 2002). Another possibility is that "the more **wicked** part of them" was introduced here into verse 37 because of its correct occurrence in the following verse:

> 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

Also note that such an error in verse 37 (of *more* for an original *less*) could have entered the text as Joseph Smith dictated this passage or when Oliver Cowdery copied it from 𝓞 into 𝓟.

But there is a much better and obviously correct solution to the difficult reading here in verse 37, one proposed by Paul and Rachel Jenkins (personal communication, 18 November 2005)—namely, there is no need to make any change here, just a recognition that the pronoun *them* in

"the more wicked part of them" in Helaman 6:37 does not refer to the Gaddianton robbers but to the Lamanites. This interpretation is supported by the explanation earlier in this chapter:

> Helaman 6:18
>> and now behold those murderers and plunderers were a band
>> which had been formed by Kishcumen and Gaddianton
>> and now it had came to pass that
>> there were many even among the Nephites of Gaddianton's band
>> but behold they were more numerous
>> among **the more wicked part of the Lamanites**

Thus in verse 37, by converting the more wicked Lamanites and by hunting down the Gaddianton robbers, the Lamanites totally eliminated the Gaddianton robbers and their influence from among their own people. In fact, the same kind of interpretation applies to the *them* in the phrase "the more wicked part of them" in verse 38: "the Nephites did build them up and support them beginning at **the more wicked part of them**"; that is, the more wicked part of the Nephites supported the Gaddianton robbers, allowing them to thrive among the Nephites until those robbers spread throughout the Nephites. The critical text will therefore accept the earliest text in Helaman 6:37 with the understanding that the pronoun *them* in "the more wicked part of them" refers to the Lamanites, not to the Gaddianton robbers.

Summary: Maintain in Helaman 6:37 the original text, "the more wicked part of them"; here the text explains that the Lamanites preached unto the more wicked Lamanites, converting them, and thus undermining the support the Gaddianton robbers received among the Lamanites.

■ **Helaman 6:37**

insomuch that this band of robbers
[*was* 1ABCDEFHIJKLMNOPQRST | *were* G] *utterly destroyed from among the Lamanites*

Here the 1858 Wright edition substituted the plural *were* for the singular *was,* perhaps because of the immediately preceding *robbers* or because semantically one can refer to a band of robbers as a plurality. In this particular case, the 1874 RLDS edition did not follow the 1858 Wright edition but maintained the 1840 reading, "this band of robbers **was** utterly destroyed". The critical text will retain the original *was*.

Summary: Maintain in Helaman 6:37 the singular *was* in "this band of robbers was utterly destroyed", the reading of the earliest text.

■ **Helaman 6:38**

and it came to pass [1ABDEFIJLMNOPQRST | *that* CGHK]
on the other hand
that *the Nephites did build them up and support them*

Here in Helaman 6:38, the printer's manuscript had only a single *that,* namely, after the transitional phrase "on the other hand" (the original manuscript is not extant here). The 1840 edition

supplied an additional *that* before "on the other hand", probably because of the high expectancy of *that* immediately after "it came to pass". The insertion was probably unintended.

There is only one other example of "it came to pass" co-occurring with "on the other hand". In that instance, *that* precedes "on the other hand":

> Alma 49:28 (𝒪 is extant)
>> and it came to pass **that** on the other hand
>> the people of Nephi did thank the Lord their God

In neither case, we should note, is the *that* repeated; it occurs either before or after "on the other hand". But it is worth noting that in theory the *that* could have been repeated here in Helaman 6:38, as in the following example involving the prepositional phrase "on the morrow":

> Jacob 7:17
>> and it came to pass **that** on the morrow
>> [*that* 0A | *that* >js NULL 1 | BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
>> the multitude were gathered together

For the use of the repeated *that* in the original text, see the discussion under THAT in volume 3.

Summary: Maintain in Helaman 6:38 the placement of the subordinate conjunction *that* after "on the other hand"; in the earliest text for this passage, there was no *that* before that phrase.

■ **Helaman 6:39**

insomuch that they did trample under their feet
and smite and rend and turn their backs
upon [*the* 1ABCDEGHIJKLMNOPQRST | *their* > *the* F] *poor*
and the meek and [1A | *the* BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *humble followers of God*

Here in the textual history for Helaman 6:39, there are two errors that entered the text. The first was the replacement of "upon **the** poor" with "upon **their** poor" in the first printing of the 1852 LDS edition. This error was undoubtedly prompted by the occurrence of *their* earlier in the sentence ("they did trample under **their** feet and smite and rend and turn **their** backs"). In the second printing of the 1852 edition, the original *the* was restored, most likely by reference to the 1840 edition. The definite article *the* is supported by the occurrence of *the* in the following conjunct, "and **the** meek and humble followers of God".

The second error has to do with the definite article in that following noun phrase, which in the earliest text read as "the meek and humble followers of God". The 1837 edition inserted the definite article *the* before *humble followers,* thus creating three separate conjuncts in the larger prepositional phrase: "upon **the** poor and **the** meek and **the** humble followers of God". The earlier text implies that there are two conjuncts, (1) the poor and (2) the followers of God who are meek and humble. In other words, in the earlier text *meek* is treated as an adjective modifying *followers,* but in the altered text *the meek* acts as a distinct noun phrase.

Elsewhere in the text, every occurrence of *the meek* acts as a noun phrase (eight times):

2 Nephi 9:30	and they persecute **the meek**
2 Nephi 21:4	and reprove with equity for **the meek** of the earth
2 Nephi 27:30	and **the meek** also shall increase
2 Nephi 28:13	and they persecute **the meek** and the poor in heart
2 Nephi 30:9	and reprove with equity for **the meek** of the earth
3 Nephi 12:5	and blessed are **the meek** / for they shall inherit the earth
Ether 12:26	and my grace is sufficient for **the meek**
Moroni 7:44	for none is acceptable before God save **the meek** and lowly of heart

In two of these examples, *the meek* is conjoined with another noun phrase; one conjoined noun phrase repeats the definite article ("**the** meek and **the** poor in heart", in 2 Nephi 28:13), but the other does not ("save **the** meek and lowly of heart", in Moroni 7:44). In the last example, the phrase *of heart* modifies only *lowly,* not both *meek* and *lowly;* the phrase "the meek of heart" sounds quite implausible.

Elsewhere in the text, there are six examples of *meek* as an adjective, each of which occurs as a conjunct:

Mosiah 3:19	and becometh as a child
	submissive **meek** humble patient full of love
Alma 13:28	becoming humble **meek** submissive patient
	full of love and all long-suffering
Alma 37:33	and to be **meek** and lowly in heart
Alma 37:34	but to be **meek** and lowly in heart
Moroni 7:43	save he shall be **meek** and lowly of heart
Moroni 7:44	and if a man be **meek** and lowly in heart

The conjoined adjective phrase "meek and lowly in heart" (which occurs three times in the Book of Mormon text) also occurs once in the King James Bible: "for I am meek and lowly in heart" (Matthew 11:29). Literally the Greek there reads "meek I am and lowly in heart", which argues that the adjective *meek* is distinct from the adjective phrase *lowly in heart.* Similarly, for the two cases of "meek and lowly of heart" (here in Helaman 6:39 and also in Moroni 7:44), the adjective *meek* should be interpreted as distinct from the adjective phrase *lowly of heart.*

These other examples, in conjuncts of both noun and adjective phrases, argue that the original expression in Helaman 6:39, "the meek and humble followers of God", is perfectly acceptable. There is no need to repeat the definite article *the* before *humble.* The critical text will therefore restore the earliest reading in Helaman 6:39.

Originally in Helaman 6:39, the typesetter for the 1830 edition placed commas after both *poor* and *meek,* which implies that he treated all three conjuncts as nouns (even though there was no *the* before the third conjunct, "humble followers of God"):

> Helaman 6:39 (the 1830 text)
> upon the poor, and the meek, and humble followers of God

The comma after *meek* may have therefore prompted the addition of the repeated *the* before *humble followers* in the 1837 edition:

> Helaman 6:39 (the 1837 text)
>
> upon the poor, and the meek, and the humble followers of God

The 1920 LDS edition removed the comma after *poor* but left the one after *meek:*

> Helaman 6:39 (the 1920 LDS text)
>
> upon the poor and the meek, and the humble followers of God

The critical text will remove the intrusive *the* before *humble followers*. The original reading implies that there should be no commas at all since there are only two noun-phrase conjuncts, "the poor" and "the meek and humble followers of God":

> Helaman 6:39 (the critical text)
>
> upon the poor and the meek and humble followers of God

Summary: Remove from Helaman 6:39 the intrusive *the* that the 1837 edition inserted before *humble;* in the original text the word *meek* serves as an adjective modifying *followers* ("the meek and humble followers of God"), which explains the lack of a repeated *the* before *humble followers.*

Helaman 7

■ **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 [NULL >+ *the* 1 | *the* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
[*Neph* >+ *Nepites* 1 | *Nephites* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] . . .

As explained under Alma 45:13, the expected phrase in the Book of Mormon is "the people of Nephi", yet "the people of the Nephites" also occurs (although much less frequently). Here in Helaman 7:1, Oliver Cowdery started to write "the people of Nephi" in 𝓟, but he ran out of ink as he was writing *Nephi*. Having completed only *Neph*, he redipped his quill and overwrote the *ph* with *pit*, and then he continued inline with the final *es* (thus accidentally omitting the *h* in his correction). Finally, Oliver inserted the necessary *the*. Although the original manuscript is not extant for this part of the text, it probably read as "the people of the Nephites" (especially since it is unlikely that Oliver would have emended the text to the less common phraseology). See under Helaman 3:22 – 23 for another example of this same kind of error by Oliver Cowdery as he copied from 𝓞 into 𝓟.

Summary: Accept in Helaman 7:1 Oliver Cowdery's corrected reading in 𝓟, "the people of the Nephites", not the more common "the people of Nephi" (which is what Oliver started to write in 𝓟).

■ **Helaman 7:4**

having usurped the power and authority of the land
laying aside the [*commands* > *commandments* 1 | *commandments* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
  of God . . .

As noted under Alma 30:7, the Book of Mormon scribes sometimes wrote *commands* instead of the correct *commandments*. Here in Helaman 7:4, the correction was immediate since Oliver Cowdery, after initially writing *commands*, overwrote the plural *s* with an *m* and then continued inline with the rest of the word, *ents*. For a general list of cases where the scribes miswrote *commandments* as *commands*, sometimes only initially, see under Alma 30:7. Here in Helaman 7:4 the corrected text in 𝓟 undoubtedly agreed with the reading in 𝓞, no longer extant for this part of the text.

Summary: Accept in Helaman 7:4 Oliver Cowdery's immediate correction in 𝓟 of *commands* to *commandments*.

■ **Helaman 7:5**

and moreover to be held in office at the head of government
to rule and [*to* 1 | ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *do according to their wills*

Here the 1830 typesetter accidentally dropped the repeated *to* in the infinitival conjunctive phrase "to rule and **to** do". For a list of other passages where the infinitival *to* has been omitted in the history of the text, see under Alma 16:2. For a more general discussion, see under CONJUNCTIVE REPETITION in volume 3.

Elsewhere the text has cases of conjunctive infinitive clauses where the infinitival *to* is repeated before a conjoined *do:*

3 Nephi 1:14	to fulfill all things . . . **and to do** the will both of the Father and of the Son
3 Nephi 6:17	to be carried about by the temptations of the devil . . . **and to do** whatsoever iniquity he desired they should
4 Nephi 1:34	to build up many churches **and to do** all manner of iniquity
Moroni 7:12	and inviteth and enticeth to sin **and to do** that which is evil continually
Moroni 7:31	and to fulfill **and to do** the work of the covenants of the Father

For the first of these, the 1837 edition omitted the repeated *to,* but both the LDS and RLDS texts have restored the original *to:*

3 Nephi 1:14
    behold I come unto my own
    to fulfill all things which I have made known unto the children of men
      from the foundation of the world
    and [*to* 1APRST | BCDEFGHIJKLMNOQ] do the will
      both of the Father and of the Son

And as we might expect, there are also cases where the infinitival *to* is not repeated before *do:*

2 Nephi 3:24	to work mighty wonders **and do** that thing which is great in the sight of God
Mosiah 11:2	to commit sin **and do** that which was abominable in the sight of the Lord
Helaman 12:5	to boast **and do** all manner of that which is iniquity
Helaman 16:12	to be more hardened in iniquity **and do** more and more of that which was contrary to the commandments of God

For each of these examples without the *to,* the complement for the *do* verb has the pronoun *that* modified by a relative clause beginning with *which.* Nonetheless, Moroni 7:12 also has this structure, yet the *to* is repeated there ("and **to** do that which is evil continually"). So in each case where the infinitival *to* could be repeated, the critical text will follow the earliest reading; thus the repeated *to* will be restored here in Helaman 7:5.

Summary: Restore in Helaman 7:5 the repeated *to* in "to rule and **to** do according to their wills".

■ **Helaman 7:5**

that they might [NULL >+ *the* 1 | *the* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *more*
[*easy* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLPS | *easy* > *easily* M | *easily* NOQRT] *commit adultery and steal and kill
and do according to their own wills*

Here in the printer's manuscript, Oliver Cowdery initially wrote "that they might **more easy** commit adultery". Somewhat later, perhaps when he proofed 𝒫 against 𝒪, Oliver supralinearly inserted the definite article *the* (the level of ink flow is somewhat heavier for the *the*). In modern English, speakers do not expect the definite article *the* before "more <adverb>"; thus it seems very unlikely that Oliver inserted the *the* as a result of conscious editing. Most likely, 𝒪 had the *the*, and Oliver made sure that he copied it into 𝒫. Although there are no other examples of this usage with *the* in the Book of Mormon text, we can find quite a few examples of "the more <adverb>" in the King James Bible:

Mark 14:31	but he spake **the more vehemently**
Mark 15:14	and they cried out **the more exceedingly**
Acts 24:10	I do **the more cheerfully** answer for myself
Romans 15:15	I have written **the more boldly** unto you
2 Corinthians 12:15	though **the more abundantly** I love you / the less I be loved
Philippians 2:28	I sent him therefore **the more carefully** that . . .
1 Thessalonians 2:17	but we . . . endeavored **the more abundantly** to see your face

(Note that in all these examples the adverb ends in *-ly,* unlike the case of "the more easy" originally here in Helaman 7:5.) There are also four examples of "the more <adjective>" in the King James text:

1 Samuel 18:29	and Saul was yet **the more afraid** of David
Luke 23:5	and they were **the more fierce**
John 19:8	when Pilate therefore heard that saying / he was **the more afraid**
Hebrews 2:1	we ought to give **the more earnest** heed to the things which we have heard

Elsewhere in the Book of Mormon text there are 25 instances of "more <adverb>", and in each case there is no preceding *the* (this also holds for the many cases of "more <adjective>" in the Book of Mormon). The following sampling lists at least one example for each particular adverb:

1 Nephi 19:23	that I might **more fully** persuade them to believe in the Lord
2 Nephi 19:1	and afterwards did **more grievously** afflict by the way of the Red Sea beyond Jordan in Galilee of the nations
Jacob 2:13	some of you have obtained **more abundantly** than that of your brethren
Alma 12:7	Zeezrom began to tremble **more exceedingly**
Alma 13:19	therefore of him they have **more particularly** made mention
Alma 44:16	to contend **more powerfully** against the Nephites
Alma 55:13	therefore they took of it **more freely**
Alma 60:10	yea and ye had ought to have stirred yourselves **more diligently**

Helaman 4:25	the Lamanites were **more exceeding** numerous than they
Helaman 16:10	and the lesser part walking **more circumspectly** before God
Ether 9:19	all of which were useful unto man and **more especially** the elephants and cureloms and cumoms

In only one of these cases (Helaman 4:25) does the original text have a bare adverb, *exceeding*, which modifies the adjective *numerous*. In all other cases, the adverb ends in *-ly*.

Thus the phrase "the more easy" is a difficult reading. The definite article *the* has been maintained in the text, perhaps because such archaic usage is recognizable as biblical in style. On the other hand, the use of the bare adverb *easy* is quite unacceptable to modern readers and has therefore been edited in the LDS text to *easily,* beginning with the 1906 large-print edition and later adopted in the third printing (in 1907) of the 1905 missionary edition and in the 1907 vest-pocket edition. Here in Helaman 7:5, all subsequent LDS editions have maintained the expected adverbial form ending in *-ly.* Elsewhere, the original text has instances of only *easily* (six times) as the adverbial form for *easy.* Nonetheless, the use of the bare adverb sometimes occurs for other adverbs in the original Book of Mormon text. See, for instance, under 2 Nephi 25:20 for cases where the original text had the bare adverb *plain* instead of the standard *plainly.* For a complete discussion on the use of the bare adverb in the original text, see under ADVERBS in volume 3. The critical text will restore the adverbial form *easy* here in Helaman 7:5 despite its uniqueness in the text.

Summary: Restore the original phrase "the more easy" in Helaman 7:5, the reading of the earliest extant source (the printer's manuscript); although there are no other examples of "the more <adverb>" in the Book of Mormon, such usage is common enough in the King James Bible; the use of the bare adverb *easy* is also acceptable, especially since similar usage for other adverbs occurs elsewhere in the original Book of Mormon text.

◼ **Helaman 7:8**

yea if **my** *days could have been*
in [*my* > *them* 1 | *them* ABCDEFGHIJKLMP | *those* NOQRST] *days* . . .

Here in the printer's manuscript, Oliver Cowdery initially wrote *my days* twice: "if my days could have been in my days". Virtually immediately he caught his error, crossed out the second *my* and supralinearly inserted *them,* giving the nonstandard "in them days". Although 𝓞 is not extant here in Helaman 7:8, it probably read "in them days". There are other examples in the earliest text of *them* acting as a demonstrative modifying a noun, including one more example of "in **them** days"; each of these has been grammatically emended to either *these* or *those:*

Alma 37:30 (changed to *these* in the 1830 edition, to *those* in the 1840 edition)
and thus the judgments of God did come upon
[*them* 01 | *these* ABDEFIJLMNOPQRST | *those* CGHK] workers of darkness

Helaman 13:37 (changed in 𝓟 to *these* by Joseph Smith but set as *those* in the 1837 edition)
and this shall be your language
in [*them* 0A | *them* >js *these* 1 | *those* BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] days

3 Nephi 19:8 (changed to *those* in the 1830 edition)
>   and when they had ministered
>   [*them* 1| *those* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] same words
>   which Jesus had spoken . . .

The critical text will therefore accept the corrected reading in 𝓟 for Helaman 7:8, "in **them** days". For further discussion of this usage, see under PRONOMINAL DETERMINERS in volume 3.

Summary: Restore the original *them* in Helaman 7:8: "if my days could have been in **them** days" (the corrected reading in 𝓟).

■ **Helaman 7:9**

but behold I am **consigned** *that these are my days*
and that my soul shall be filled with sorrow
because of this the wickedness of my brethren

One wonders here in Helaman 7:9 if the word *consigned* is an error for *resigned.* The context in Helaman 7:9 implies that the word *consigned* means that Nephi reluctantly accepted those days as his own. There is no other use of the word *consign* with this meaning in the Book of Mormon. Elsewhere in the earliest text, there are nine instances of *consign* (plus two of *consignation*), and they all have the meaning 'to deliver or to commit' (especially with respect to judgment). This meaning for *consign* is listed in the Oxford English Dictionary under definition 7.

On the other hand, definition 5 in the OED has the meaning 'to agree to something' (or 'to submit to the same terms with someone', Samuel Johnson's definition), with quotes all from William Shakespeare (here cited with accidentals regularized):

> *Henry IV, Part 2* (1597)
>   —heaven consigning to my good intents—

> *Henry V* (1599)
>   It were, my lord, a hard condition for a maid to consign to.

> *Cymbeline* (1611)
>   All lovers young, all lovers must consign to thee and come to dust.

Basically, in these instances *consign* means 'to assent', with the last two suggesting reluctance. This usage is clearly obsolete.

It is worth noting that substitute words such as *resign* and *consent* (or words based on them) do not occur at all in the Book of Mormon text. One other possible substitute, the adjective *content,* occurs once in the text—and expresses a similar idea:

> Alma 29:3
>   for I had ought to be **content** with the things
>   which the Lord hath allotted unto me

Nonetheless, it seems unlikely in Helaman 7:9 that "I am consigned", the difficult reading, is a mistake, either aural or visual, for "I am content" (or "I am contented"), especially since the word

consigned is so unexpected. The critical text will accept the use of *consigned* here in Helaman 7:9 with its unexpected archaic meaning.

Summary: Accept in Helaman 7:9 the use of *consigned* with its apparent meaning of 'resigned' or 'reluctantly agreed'; *consigned* appears to be the intended word rather than an error for *resigned* or *content(ed)*.

■ **Helaman 7:9**

but behold I am consigned that these are my days
and that my soul [should > shall 1 | shall ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] be filled with sorrow

Here Oliver Cowdery initially wrote "should be filled" in 𝓟; then virtually immediately he corrected the *should* to *shall* (there is no change in the level of ink flow for the supralinear *shall*). Either reading works, although the *should* seems more expected. There are a couple of cases in 3 Nephi 9 where Oliver initially wrote *should* in 𝓟 rather than the correct *shall*; for discussion of these cases, see under 3 Nephi 9:5, 7. Most likely, Helaman 7:9 read *shall* in 𝓞 (which is not extant here), especially since there is nothing wrong with *should* and thus there would have been no motivation for Oliver Cowdery to consciously emend *should* to *shall*.

Summary: Accept in Helaman 7:9 the corrected reading in 𝓟 with the modal *shall:* "that my soul **shall** be filled with sorrow".

■ **Helaman 7:10–11**

therefore [as 1| ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] Nephi had bowed himself upon the tower
*   which was in his garden*
which tower was also near unto the garden gate which was by the highway
and *it came to pass that there was certain men passing by . . .*

There are instances in the earliest test where a sentence begins with a subordinate *as*-clause that is never completed. For a list, see under 1 Nephi 8:7; there I argue that most of these instances of *as* were in the original text. In some of these cases, the 1830 typesetter removed the extra *as,* as here in Helaman 7:10. In this particular case, the 1830 typesetter removed the *as* during proofing since in all the printed 1830 copies there is extra spacing in this line between the words for "therefore, Nephi had"; the extra word spacing in this line of type accounts precisely for an original *as* that was removed only after the initial typesetting.

David Calabro points out (personal communication) that here in Helaman 7:10–11 we may also have an original example of the Hebraistic *and* separating an initial *as*-clause from its following main clause. For discussion of this possibility, see under 1 Nephi 8:13 or, more generally, under HEBRAISMS in volume 3. Under either interpretation, the critical text will restore the original *as* here in Helaman 7:10.

Summary: Restore in Helaman 7:10 the earliest extant reading (in 𝓟) with its initial *as*-clause; such usage can be found elsewhere in the earliest text.

■ **Helaman 7:10–11**

therefore as Nephi had bowed himself upon the tower which was in his garden
which tower was also near unto the garden gate
[*which led by* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQS | *by which led* RT] *the highway*
and it came to pass that there was certain men passing by . . .

The question here is whether a garden gate can lead "by a highway". The editors for the 1920 LDS edition altered the text to read "by which led the highway" since highways can lead somewhere. There definitely appears to be some difficulty with the earliest reading here in Helaman 7:10.

Elsewhere in the Book of Mormon text, we have numerous cases (including metaphorical ones) of paths, ways, highways, and roads leading somewhere:

1 Nephi 8:20	and I also beheld a straight and narrow **path** . . . and it also led by the head of a fountain unto a large and spacious field
1 Nephi 8:21	that they might obtain the **path** which led unto the tree by which I stood
1 Nephi 8:22	they did come forth and commenced in the **path** which led to the tree
2 Nephi 31:18	and then are ye in this straight and narrow **path** which leads to eternal life
2 Nephi 33:9	and walk in the strait **path** which leads to life
Mosiah 23:36	if they would shew them the **way** which led to the land of Nephi
Mosiah 23:37	after Alma had shewn them the **way** that led to the land of Nephi
Alma 7:19	ye are in the **path** which leads to the kingdom of God
Helaman 7:10	which was in the garden of Nephi which was by the **highway** which led to the chief market
3 Nephi 6:8	and there were . . . many **roads** made which led from city to city and from land to land and from place to place

There are also references to the narrow pass that led from the land southward to the land northward:

Alma 50:34	and there they did head them by the **narrow pass** which led by the sea into the land northward
Alma 52:9	and secure the **narrow pass** which led into the land northward
Alma 63:5	and launched it forth into the west sea by the **narrow neck** which led into the land northward
Mormon 2:29	yea even to the **narrow passage** which led into the land southward
Mormon 3:5	to a city which was in the borders by the **narrow pass** which led into the land southward

The rod of iron, referred to in Lehi's dream, leads to the tree of life:

1 Nephi 8:19	and I beheld a **rod of iron** and it . . . led to the tree by which I stood
1 Nephi 11:25	the **rod of iron** . . . was the word of God which led to the fountain of living waters or to the tree of life
1 Nephi 15:23	what meaneth the **rod of iron** . . . that led to the tree

There are four cases that conjoin *gate* and *way,* followed by a relative clause referring to the way leading somewhere. All four of these follow the language of the Sermon on the Mount (in the King James text):

3 Nephi 14:13	for wide is the **gate** and broad is the **way** that leadeth to destruction
3 Nephi 14:14	because strait is the **gate** and narrow is the **way** which leadeth unto life
3 Nephi 27:33	for strait is the **gate** and narrow is the **way** that leads to life
3 Nephi 27:33	but wide is the **gate** and broad the **way** which leads to death

One could interpret the relative clauses "that leadeth to destruction" and "which leadeth unto life" as modifying both the preceding *gate* and *way*—that is, both the strait gate and the narrow way can lead to life (or both the wide gate and the broad way can lead to destruction or death). Nonetheless, the use of the third person ending *-eth* is restricted to singulars in the King James Bible, which reflects the Greek original with its singular verb form in the relative clause. On the other hand, in the original text of the Book of Mormon, the *-eth* ending also frequently occurs with plural subjects, so more generally these Book of Mormon relative clauses could, at least in theory, be interpreted as referring to both *gate* and *way*. Even so, there is no independent evidence in the text for gates leading anywhere.

One possibility is that the word *gate* may refer more to the opening itself rather than to what closes it. Numerous passages in the Bible refer to the door(s) of a gate, where the word *gate* refers to the opening and the frame that supports the door(s) rather than to the door(s) proper, as in these examples:

Judges 16:3	and took the doors of the gate of the city and the two posts
1 Samuel 21:13	and scrabbled on the doors of the gate
Nehemiah 3:1	and they builded the sheep gate . . . and set up the doors of it
Ezekiel 8:3	to the door of the inner gate that looketh toward the north
Acts 12:13	and as Peter knocked at the door of the gate . . .

When describing the gate of a city or a house, the word *gate* could therefore refer to a passageway of some minor length through the wall surrounding the city or the house. Thus the use of *gate* in Helaman 7:10 could refer to the passageway opening out onto the highway. Still, one wonders why the preposition is *by*. We expect the gate to lead "(in)to the highway", not "by the highway".

In two of the above cases we get a *by*-phrase along with the specification of a destination, with the idea that one goes by something on the way to the destination:

1 Nephi 8:20
    and I also beheld a straight and narrow path
    which came along by the rod of iron even to the tree by which I stood
    and it also led **by the head of the fountain** unto a large and spacious field

Alma 50:34
    and there they did head them by the narrow pass
    which led **by the sea** into the land northward

In the first case, the path goes by the head of the fountain; and in the second, the pass goes by the sea. Note, however, that in both cases a destination is still stated. In fact, in all other cases of

something leading somewhere, the destination is explicitly stated; only in Helaman 7:10 is the destination lacking: "the garden gate which led by the highway" (the earliest reading) or "the garden gate by which led the highway" (the emended reading). One could assume, at least for the emended reading, that there is an ellipsis of the destination, based on what is stated earlier in this passage:

> Helaman 7:10 (the 1920 LDS text, with the ellipsis at the end in italics)
> and behold now it came to pass that it was upon a tower
> which was in the garden of Nephi
> which was by the highway which led **to the chief market**
> **which was in the city of Zarahemla**
> therefore Nephi had bowed himself upon the tower
> which was in his garden
> which tower was also near unto the garden gate
> by which led the highway *to the chief market*
> *which was in the city of Zarahemla*

In other words, the highway led by the garden gate to the chief market in the city of Zarahemla. Thus the two actual instances with the *by*-phrase provide some support for the 1920 LDS emendation and its assumed ellipsis of the destination.

On the other hand, the syntax of the 1920 emended reading, "by which led the highway", is unique for the text. There are 17 instances of relative clauses headed by *by which* in the original text; and in all 17 cases, the subject rather than the verb immediately follows *by which,* as in these examples:

> 1 Nephi 8:19   and led to the tree by which **I** stood
>
> 2 Nephi 31:9   it sheweth . . . the narrowness of the gate by which **they** should enter
>
> Alma 8:4   according to the holy order of God by which **he** had been called
>
> Moroni 7:18   seeing that ye know the light by which **ye** may judge

The same basic syntax holds for the King James Bible, with 14 occurrences of *by which* heading the relative clause and followed directly by its subject rather than having the subject postponed. Of course, "by which led the highway" is English, but its uniqueness in the Book of Mormon text (as well as its difference from usage in the King James Bible) casts some doubt that this reading could have been the original one in Helaman 7:10. Of course, one could argue that such a difficult original reading was accidentally changed to the order *which led by* (the earliest extant reading) because *which led* occurs quite often in the text—not only in 11 examples listed earlier in this discussion but also in these additional cases:

> 1 Nephi 16:16   and we did follow the directions of the ball **which led** us
>   in the more fertile parts of the wilderness
>
> Mosiah 1:16   and the ball or director **which led** our fathers through the wilderness
>
> Helaman 6:28   and it was that same being **which led** on the people
>   which came from that tower into this land

A more reasonable emendation for Helaman 7:10 is that the verb *led* is an error for *was*. Note the language earlier in this verse has an occurrence of *led* that does work, but it is surrounded by four occurrences of *was:*

Helaman 7:10

  and behold now it came to pass that it **was** upon a tower
  which **was** in the garden of Nephi which **was** by the highway
  which **led** to the chief market which **was** in the city of Zarahemla

This preceding sentence, with *led* following "which was by the highway", could have prompted Oliver Cowdery, early on in the transmission of the text, to accidentally write *led* in the following part of the verse rather than the correct *was:*

Helaman 7:10 (proposed emendation)

  therefore as Nephi had bowed himself upon the tower which was in his garden
  which tower was also near unto the garden gate which **was** by the highway

Such an emendation would directly explain how those passing by could see Nephi praying from his tower, and at the same time it would avoid the need to accept an emendation (the 1920 one) that is so unlike usage elsewhere in the text.

David Calabro (personal communication) points out another possible emendation here, one that is phonetically and visually closer to the *led* (the earliest extant reading), namely, some past-tense form (perhaps dialectal) of the verb *lie* or *lay,* as in these possibilities:

  □ *earliest extant reading*   which **led** by the highway

  □ *alternative readings*   which **lay** by the highway
                                    which **laid** by the highway

The form *lay,* the simple past-tense form for *lie,* is the standard form, but in colloquial English the historically intransitive past-tense *lay* is frequently mixed up with the historically transitive past-tense *laid* (see, for instance, the discussion under *lay, lie* in Merriam-Webster's Dictionary of English Usage). For some discussion of the variation between these two verbs in the text of the Book of Mormon, see under 2 Nephi 9:7.

The colloquial *laid* /leid/ is phonetically closest to the *led* /lɛd/ of the earliest extant text (the reading in 𝒫). The preceding use of *led* earlier in the verse ("which **led** to the chief market") could have prompted Oliver Cowdery to write *led* later in the verse rather than the *laid* (or perhaps *lay*) of the original text, either when he took down Joseph Smith's dictation or when he copied the text from 𝒪 into 𝒫.

The Book of Mormon text, when referring to location, almost always uses the verb *be;* but there are a couple cases where the verb is *lie,* and in both cases the form is the standard past-tense *lay,* not *laid:*

Alma 31:3

  now the Zoramites had gathered themselves together in a land
  which they called Antionum which was east of the land of Zarahemla
  which **lay** nearly bordering upon the seashore

Mormon 4:3

  now the city Teancum **lay** in the borders by the seashore

These two examples argue that Helaman 7:10 could have originally read "the garden gate which **lay** by the highway". Note, however, that one of these refers to a land lying somewhere, the other

to a city. Although the change of an original *lay* (or *laid*) to *led* is quite reasonable, the reference to a gate lying by the highway seems rather implausible. We expect the gate to be by the highway. And since the *led* could have come from the language earlier in the verse, the critical text will accept *was* as the most plausible reading for the original text.

One other possibility, suggested by Don Brugger (personal communication), is that the earliest extant reading, "the garden gate which led **by** the highway", is an error for "the garden gate which led **to** the highway", a possibility hinted at earlier in this discussion. The *by* could have come from the *by* that precedes *the highway* earlier in the verse ("**by** the highway which led to the chief market") or perhaps from the *by* that occurs in the next verse ("there was certain men passing **by**"). Brugger points out that the preposition *to* occurs earlier in this verse: "by the highway which led **to** the chief market". (There is also the possibility that the preposition was *unto:* "the garden gate which led **unto** the highway".) Of course, the emendation of the preposition still has the gate leading somewhere, a problematic reading.

Summary: Emend the earliest reading in Helaman 7:10 by replacing *led* with *was:* "the garden gate which **was** by the highway"; it seems highly unlikely that the garden gate led "**by** the highway" or even "**to** the highway"; the 1920 LDS emendation, "the garden gate by which led the highway", is quite foreign to the text and probably does not represent the original reading; another possible emendation would be to replace *led* with *lay* (or *laid*), although to refer to a gate as lying by the highway seems rather unlikely.

■ **Helaman 7:11**

> *and it came to pass that* **there was** *certain men passing by*
> **and saw** *Nephi as he was a pouring out his soul unto God upon the tower*

One wonders here if a subject pronoun *they* might be missing; perhaps the original text read "there was certain men passing by and **they** saw Nephi as he was a pouring out his soul unto God upon the tower". As discussed under 2 Nephi 18:22, there is evidence in the manuscripts for the occasional loss of *they,* if only momentarily, so a missing *they* is a distinct possibility here in Helaman 7:11. One might also consider the possibility that the *and* could be an error for a relative pronoun such as *which* (or *who*): "there was certain men passing by / **which** saw Nephi as he was a pouring out his soul unto God upon the tower". But there is no evidence for mix-ups between *which* (or *who*) and *and* in the manuscripts, so an error of that kind seems unlikely.

There are no other examples in the Book of Mormon text of a conjoined predicate in an existential *there*-clause. But we can find a couple examples of this syntax in the King James Bible:

> 2 Chronicles 13:7
> and **there are** gathered unto him vain men / the children of Belial
> **and have strengthened** themselves against Rehoboam the son of Solomon

> Luke 4:33
> and in the synagogue **there was** a man which had a spirit of an unclean devil
> **and cried out** with a loud voice . . .

The second one is interesting in that the original Greek more literally reads "and in the syna-
gogue there was a man **having** the spirit of a unclean demon and cried out with a loud voice". In
other words, *a man* is postmodified by a present participial phrase rather than by a relative clause,
just like in Helaman 7:11 ("there was certain men **passing** by and saw Nephi"). Given that such
constructions are possible, the critical text will maintain in Helaman 7:11 the earliest (and current)
reading without the *they* in the conjoined predicate. Since the construction is unique in the Book
of Mormon text, the possibility remains that the original text had a *they* here.

Summary: Maintain in Helaman 7:11 the earliest reading without a subject *they* at the beginning of
the conjoined predicate: "there was certain men passing by **and saw** Nephi as he was a pouring out
his soul unto God upon the tower".

■ **Helaman 7:12**

and now when Nephi arose
[& > he 1 | he ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *beheld the multitudes of people*
which had gathered together

Oliver Cowdery initially wrote an ampersand in the printer's manuscript; then soon after (with
no change in the level of ink flow) he crossed out the ampersand and supralinearly inserted the
pronoun *he* above the line. His correction was probably in agreement with the reading of the
original manuscript (no longer extant here). Without the correction, he would have ended up
with a sentence fragment. Although there is evidence in the original text for such fragments (see
the discussion under Enos 1:3 regarding Enos 1:1–2), most instances of sentence-initial *when*-
clauses are completed by a main clause.

Summary: Accept in Helaman 7:12 Oliver Cowdery's correction in the printer's manuscript as the
probable reading of the original manuscript: "and now when Nephi arose / he beheld the multitudes
of people".

■ **Helaman 7:15**

and because of my mourning and lamentation
ye have gathered yourselves together and [do 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMOPQRST | to N] *marvel*
yea and ye have great need **to** *marvel*
yea ye had ought **to** *marvel*

The 1906 LDS large-print edition replaced *do* with *to,* giving "ye have gathered yourselves together
and to marvel". The source for this typo was undoubtedly the two occurrences of *to marvel* in the
immediately following text: "yea and ye have great need to marvel / yea ye had ought to marvel".
No subsequent LDS edition followed this reading, "and **to** marvel", since the 1906 edition was
never used as a copytext.

    This minor variant makes one wonder if the original text might have read "ye have gathered
yourselves together **to** marvel" (that is, without the *and*). Yet the semantics here suggests that
"and do marvel" is correct since in this case the people wouldn't have gathered together for the
purpose of marveling. Instead, these people had seen Nephi praying with great sorrow and had

therefore gathered together "that they might know the cause of so great mourning for the wicked-ness of the people". It was his prayer that made them marvel. There are numerous examples in the text of people gathering together to do something (for example, to hear someone, to fight or go to battle, or to sing and dance). But these are specific acts where the individuals are acting as agents. Marveling, on the other hand, is a result.

The use of *and* with the auxiliary verb *do* is, of course, characteristic of the Book of Mormon text, as in the following examples involving people gathering together:

> Alma 2:9   they gathered themselves together **and did** consecrate Amlici
>   to be their king
>
> 3 Nephi 7:9   the people did gather themselves together **and did** place at their head
>   a man whom they did call Jacob
>
> Ether 14:28   Coriantumr did gather his armies together upon the hill Comron
>   **and did sound** a trumpet unto the armies of Shiz

Thus the earliest reading here in Helaman 7:15 is perfectly acceptable and should not be emended.

Summary: Maintain in Helaman 7:15 the earliest reading, "and do marvel"; the context as well as usage elsewhere in the text supports this reading.

■ **Helaman 7:15–16**

yea ye had ought to marvel because ye are given **away**
that the devil hath got so great hold upon your hearts
yea how could ye have given [*away* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLNPS | *way* MOQRT]
to the enticing of him who art seeking to hurl away your souls
down to everlasting misery and endless woe

Here in verse 16 for the 1905 LDS edition, *given away* was set as *given way*. This change may have been a typo since the occurrence of *given away* earlier in verse 15 was not changed to *given way*. Yet it is possible that the first instance of *given away* was left because there was no following infinitive clause that would have highlighted the strangeness of *given away*. The second instance of *given away* is followed by an infinitive clause, "to the enticing of him who art seeking to hurl away your souls down to everlasting misery and endless woe".

The Oxford English Dictionary indicates that *give away* is a mistake for *give way* when the meaning is 'to yield', which is the case here in Helaman 7:16. Nonetheless, the expression does exist, despite its secondary development. The more recent citations in the OED (see under defini-tion 54f for the verb *give*) are American, but the first two quotes are from British authors (here the spelling is regularized and other accidentals are ignored):

> John Speed (1611)
>   the whole power of the French gave **away** and sought to save itself by flight

> Sarah Fielding (1747)
>   I have continually languished for impossibilities and given **away** to desires

> U. Brown (1816)
>   James gave **away** although full six feet high and well-made

H. Barnard (1833)
    he spoke about an hour and a half and gave **away**
    on account of a sudden dizziness in his head and failure of voice

Boston Weekly Transcript (1893)
    his death is as though one of the sheet anchors of society had suddenly given **away**

Richard Ely (1903)
    the cattle-raising frontier has given **away** to continually higher stages

There is an example of "give away" in the Book of Mormon that takes the normally expected meaning in English:

Alma 22:18   and I will give **away** all my sins to know thee

Elsewhere the Book of Mormon text has a number of instances of *give way* with the expected meaning 'to yield':

2 Nephi 4:27   yea why should I **give way** to temptations
Alma 47:36   drinking in with the traditions of the Lamanites
                        giving way to indolence and all manner of lasciviousness
Alma 52:34   they did not **give way** before the Lamanites
Alma 56:51   the men of Antipus . . . began to **give way** before the Lamanites
Alma 57:20   and as the remainder of our army were about to **give way**
                        before the Lamanites . . .
3 Nephi 17:12   and the multitude **gave way** till they had all been brought unto him

This last example, by the way, shows a tendency for Oliver Cowdery to accidentally write *gave away* instead of *gave way.* In 3 Nephi 17:12, Oliver started to write the initial *a* of *away,* but he immediately caught his error, erased the half-formed *a* and overwrote it with a *w,* and then finished by writing inline the rest of the word *way.*

Another possibility is that the *are* in Helaman 7:15 could be a mistake for *have.* All other instances of "give (a)way" in the Book of Mormon occur in the active voice. Nor is the passive voice found in any of the historical instances cited above. Thus verse 15 may have originally read "ye **have** given away":

Helaman 7:15 (possible emendation)
    yea ye had ought to marvel because ye **have given** away
    that the devil hath got so great hold upon your hearts

This emendation is supported by the usage in the next verse:

Helaman 7:16
    yea how could ye **have given** away to the enticing of him
    who art seeking to hurl away your souls
    down to everlasting misery and endless woe

The use of the *be* verb as the perfect helping verb is restricted to verbs of motion or change of state in Early Modern English (as in "Christ **is** come" rather than "Christ **has** come"). The use of "are given" is probably not the semantic equivalent of the proposed "have given" since the verb *give* is not a verb of motion or change of state.

Probably the best solution as far as verse 15 is concerned is to leave the earliest reading, especially since "are given away" can be interpreted as meaning 'being in the state of having given way'. The critical text will restore the original "have given away" in verse 16, thus accepting in both verses the original adverbial *away* rather than *way,* especially since there is evidence from Early Modern English up into 20th-century English for "give away" as a substitute for the historically earlier "give way".

Summary: Restore in Helaman 7:16 the original reading with its use of nonstandard *away* rather than standard *way:* "how could ye have given **away** to the enticing of him"; similarly, the occurrence of *away* in the previous verse should be maintained: "ye had ought to marvel because ye are given **away**"; the use in verse 15 of *are given* instead of *have given* should also be maintained.

■ **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 the original text, there are a few instances in relative clauses where the nonstandard use of the second person singular *art* appears to be intended. Here in Helaman 7:16 is one example: "of him who **art** seeking to hurl away your souls". See the discussion under Alma 10:7 for the evidence that *art* was the original reading here in Helaman 7:16 and in three other passages. In this particular case, Joseph Smith made the grammatical emendation to *is* in his editing for the 1837 edition.

Summary: Restore in Helaman 7:16 the original *art* in the relative clause "who **art** seeking to hurl away your souls".

■ **Helaman 7:16**

yea how could ye have given away to the enticing of him
who art seeking to **hurl away your souls down** *to everlasting misery and endless woe*

Ross Geddes (personal communication, 12 September 2004) suggests that the verb *hurl* in an expression like "to hurl away a soul down to hell" could be an error. He considers the possibility that the original text here in Helaman 7:16 read *lead* instead of *hurl* and that Oliver Cowdery misread the verb *lead* as *hurl* when he copied from 𝓞 into 𝓟 (𝓞 is not extant here). On the other hand, one wonders how the more exceptional and vivid *hurl* could have replaced the more common and general verb *lead*.

There are no other occurrences of the verb *hurl* in the Book of Mormon, but there are definitely other passages that refer to Satan leading away the souls of people down to hell:

> 1 Nephi 14:3
> and that great pit which hath been digged for them
> by that great and abominable church
> which was founded by the devil and his children
> that he might **lead away the souls of men down** to hell

2 Nephi 28:21
>> and thus the devil cheateth **their souls**
>> and **leadeth them away** carefully **down** to hell

The larger passage for the last example also suggests the possibility of *lull* as an emendation for *hurl:*

2 Nephi 28:21
>> and others will he pacify and **lull** them **away** into carnal security

In other words, perhaps Helaman 7:16 originally read "who art seeking to **lull away** your souls **down** to everlasting misery and endless woe".

It turns out that *hurl* is very likely correct but that its meaning may be somewhat different here in the Book of Mormon than what we as modern readers expect. The Oxford English Dictionary lists under definition 6 for *hurl* the meaning 'to drag or pull with violence', with citations dating from Middle English through Early Modern English; here are the two citations from Early Modern English (with accidentals regularized) that the OED gives as having this meaning (determined apparently from the larger context):

William Dunbar (between 1500 and 1520)
>> In ire they **hurled** him here and there.

Robert Blair (1663)
>> The new creature was assaulted, **hurled**, and holed as a captive.

Thus the reading with *hurl* in Helaman 7:16 may mean that the devil is the one 'who is seeking to **drag** away your souls down to everlasting misery and endless woe'.

In the Book of Mormon passage, the verb *hurl* implies the use of force rather than the enticement implied by the verbs *lead* and *lull*. And there are corresponding passages where the text refers to the devil dragging the wicked down to hell—that is, where the verb is *drag,* implying that the verb *hurl* in Helaman 7:16 may mean 'drag':

Alma 30:60
>> the devil will not support his children at the last day
>> but doth speedily **drag** them down to hell

Helaman 5:12
>> yea when all his hail and his mighty storm shall beat upon you
>> it shall have no power over you to **drag** you down
>> to the gulf of misery and endless woe

Helaman 6:28
>> until he **dragged** the people down
>> to an entire destruction and to an everlasting hell

Note in particular that Helaman 5:12 refers to "the gulf of misery and endless woe", similar to here in Helaman 7:16 with its reference to "everlasting misery and endless woe". This similarity supports the interpretation of *hurl* as having the meaning 'drag'.

Nonetheless, the verb *hurl* in Helaman 7:16 can be interpreted as taking the standard meaning, 'to throw or cast with violence' (definition 3 in the OED), as in the famous passage from

Paradise Lost (lines 44–49 of book 1, here given with original accidentals) which uses *hurl* in reference to Satan being cast down to hell:

> John Milton (1667)
> . . . Him the Almighty Power
> **Hurld** headlong flaming from th' Ethereal Skie
> With hideous ruin and combustion down
> To bottomless perdition, there to dwell
> In Adamantine Chains and penal Fire,
> Who durst defie th' Omnipotent to Arms.

In any event, the critical text will retain *hurl* in Helaman 7:16 despite its unique occurrence in the Book of Mormon text.

Summary: Retain the verb *hurl* in Helaman 7:16; it is not a mistake for *lead* or *lull,* but instead appears to have the archaic meaning 'drag', although the traditional meaning 'cast' or 'throw' is also possible.

■ **Helaman 7:21**

but behold it is to get gain
to be praised of men
yea [& 1|*and* ABCDEFGIJLMNOPQRST| HK] *that ye might get gold and silver*

Here the *and* was omitted in the 1874 RLDS edition; its loss was probably accidental. The 1908 RLDS edition restored the *and* to the RLDS text. There are four other instances in the text of "yea and that S", where S is a finite clause. For a list, see the discussion regarding "yea and that S" under Alma 36:13–14. In these other cases, there is a preceding *that*-clause that the *yea*-clause refers to. Here in Helaman 7:21, on the other hand, the preceding clause is infinitival rather than being a *that*-clause ("to get gain / to be praised of men").

As we might expect, there are examples in the text of "yea that S"—that is, without an intervening *and.* Of the seven instances of "yea that S", five of them refer to a preceding *that*-clause. But in two cases the preceding conjoined text is not a subordinate *that*-clause:

> Alma 30:46 (a preceding *because-of* prepositional phrase)
> behold I am grieved because of the hardness of your heart
> **yea that** ye will still resist the spirit of the truth

> Alma 57:26 (a preceding main clause)
> and now their preservation was astonishing to our whole army
> **yea that** they should be spared
> while there was a thousand of our brethren which were slain

Thus there is nothing wrong in Helaman 7:21 with having "yea and that S" refer to a preceding infinitival clause ("to get gain / to be praised of men") rather than to a more expected *that*-clause.

Summary: Accept in Helaman 7:21 the use of the *and* in the *yea*-clause, the reading of the earliest extant source, the printer's manuscript.

■ **Helaman 7:22**

behold this great city
and also all those great cities which are round about
which are in the **land** *of our* **possession**
shall be taken away
that ye shall have no place in them

Normally the text refers to "the lands of our possessions". Nonetheless, the singular *land* is possible; see for instance the discussion under 2 Nephi 9:2 regarding the related phrase "the land(s) of one's inheritance". Similarly, the singular *possession* is generally possible, as discussed under Alma 22:33–34. For specific discussion of the phrase "the land(s) of one's possession(s)", see under 2 Nephi 29:14 and Helaman 5:52. Here in Helaman 7:22, the critical text will maintain the reading of the earliest extant text, "the land of our possession" (the reading in 𝔓).

Summary: Maintain in Helaman 7:22 the earliest extant reading, "the land of our possession"; usage elsewhere in the text allows for the singular *land* and the singular *possession* in this phrase.

■ **Helaman 7:24**

even when thou [*shalt* 1ABDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST | *shall* C] *be utterly destroyed*
except thou **shalt** *repent*

The first instance of *shalt* in this passage was changed to *shall* in the 1840 edition. Since the second *shalt* was left unaltered, we can assume that the change to *shall* was accidental. The subsequent 1858 Wright edition restored the correct *shalt*. As discussed under Mosiah 12:11, the earliest text has a few instances of *thou shall* rather than *thou shalt.*

Summary: Maintain in Helaman 7:24 the two instances of *thou shalt,* the reading of the earliest extant text for this passage.

■ **Helaman 7:29**

behold [NULL >+ *now* 1 | *now* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *I do not say*
[NULL >+ *that* 1 | *that* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *these things shall be*
of myself

Here in the printer's manuscript, Oliver Cowdery initially wrote "behold I do not say these things shall be of myself"; then later (with somewhat heavier ink flow) he supralinearly inserted *now* after *behold* and *that* after *say.* For both corrections, either the initial reading or the corrected reading is possible. Thus we can safely assume that the corrected text in 𝔓 represents the reading of the original manuscript, no longer extant here. Oliver probably made these corrections when he proofed 𝔓 against 𝒪.

The phrase "behold now" is fairly common in the Book of Mormon, with 11 other sentence-initial occurrences in the earliest text. Of course, there are many more instances where the sentence begins with simply *behold.* For discussion of another case where the scribe (in this case, scribe 2 of 𝔓) accidentally omitted the *now* after a sentence-initial *behold,* see under 3 Nephi 20:10.

As far as the second correction goes, given the verb *say* and a following sentential complement, we normally find the subordinate conjunction *that,* but in some cases the *that* is missing; see, for instance, the discussion under 2 Nephi 30:2 or, more generally, under THAT in volume 3.

Summary: Accept Oliver Cowdery's two supralinear insertions in 𝓟 for Helaman 7:29 ("behold **now** I do not say **that** these things shall be of myself"); since these two inserted words *now* and *that* are not required, the original manuscript probably had them.

■ **Helaman 7:29**

behold now I do not **say** *that these things shall be*
[1|, ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *of myself*
[NULL >jg , 1|, ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
because it is not of myself that I know these things

In this passage the first instance of the prepositional phrase *of myself* belongs to the preceding verb *say;* that is, the text would read more naturally in English if the phrase *of myself* were shifted forward in the sentence: "behold now I do not say **of myself** that these things shall be". But we frequently find in the Book of Mormon text instances where a prepositional phrase is displaced or delayed. For some examples, see under Mosiah 26:23; for an extensive list, see volume 3 under DISPLACED PREPOSITIONAL PHRASES. Here in Helaman 7:29, the 1830 typesetter attempted to deal with this difficulty by placing commas around the phrase *of myself.* The critical text will, of course, maintain the original delayed placement of the prepositional phrase.

There are several examples in the text where *of myself* is delayed after a short phrase (such as a direct object, prepositional phrase, or adverbial) but not after a *that*-clause (except here in Helaman 7:29):

Alma 5:46
behold I have fasted and prayed many days
that I might know **these things** of myself

Alma 34:8
and now behold I will testify **unto you** of myself
that these things are true

Alma 38:6
now my son I would not that ye should think
that I know **these things** of myself

3 Nephi 21:2
when these things which I declare unto you
and which I shall declare **unto you hereafter** of myself . . .

In an equal number of cases, *of myself* occurs right after the verb. In three cases, we have *of myself* followed by a *that*-clause:

Alma 5:46
and now I do know of myself
that they are true

> Alma 5:48
>
>> I say unto you that I know of myself
>> **that** whatsoever I shall say unto you concerning that which is to come is true
>
> Helaman 7:29
>
>> because it is not of myself
>> **that** I know these things

In one case, *of myself* occurs before a long series of conjuncts involving the *of* preposition:

> Alma 36:4
>
>> and I would not that ye think that I know of myself
>> not **of** the temporal but **of** the spiritual
>> not **of** the carnal mind but **of** God

Here the *of* prepositional phrases following *of myself* act as the complement of the verb *know:* 'I know of the spiritual . . . I know of God'. In all these other cases of longer complements, *of myself* precedes the complement. The only exception is here in Helaman 7:29.

Summary: Maintain in Helaman 7:29 the delayed placement of the prepositional phrase *of myself* after the *that*-clause ("behold now I do not say that these things shall be of myself"); in the standard text, commas around *of myself* are used to show that this prepositional phrase does not belong to the *that*-clause but to the preceding verb *say.*

Helaman 8

■ **Helaman 8:2**

why seest [*thou* 1APRST | BCDEFGHIJKLMNOQ] *this man*
and hearest him revile against this people and against our law

> Here the subject *thou* was accidentally omitted in the 1837 edition. The resulting defective text was maintained in all subsequent editions until the 1908 edition for the RLDS text and the 1920 edition for the LDS text. Perhaps the lack of familiarity with the use of *thou* from Early Modern English made it difficult for 19th-century editors and typesetters to recognize an error here. The 1908 RLDS edition probably relied on 𝒫 to make the change, the 1920 LDS edition on the 1830 edition.
>
> We should also note here the use of *thou* for the plural. There are a number of instances in the Book of Mormon where an original second person singular pronoun (*thou, thee, thy,* or *thine*) has been emended to the corresponding second person plural pronoun (*ye, you, your,* or *yours*). For some discussion of this editing, see under 1 Nephi 3:29 (or more generally under THOU in volume 3). But not every instance of this original usage has been edited out of the text. We have this example here in Helaman 8:2. And Jacob 5:75 has a couple examples where the singular second person pronoun has never been emended to the plural: "he calleth up his servants and saith unto them . . . and **thou beholdest** that I have done according to my will . . . and blessed **art thou**".

Summary: Maintain in Helaman 8:2 the second person singular pronoun *thou,* even though it refers to more than one person; such usage can be found elsewhere in the original text.

■ **Helaman 8:3**

and nothing did he speak
which [*were* 1A | *was* BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *contrary to the commandments of God*

> Here the earliest text has the plural form *were* rather than the expected *was* ("nothing did he speak which **were** contrary to the commandments of God"). The 1837 edition, presumably as a result of Joseph Smith's editing for that edition, made the change to the singular *was.* One could argue that the *were* occurs because of the implied plural in this negative construction (in other words, "all things he spoke **were** in accord with the commandments of God"). As discussed under Helaman 3:31, the original text sometimes uses *were* where *was* is expected after an existential *there.* In each case, the critical text will follow the earliest textual sources in choosing between *was* and *were.*

Summary: Restore the plural *were* in Helaman 8:3: "and nothing did he speak which **were** contrary to the commandments of God".

■ **Helaman 8:4**

and those judges were angry with him
because he spake [plane 1 | plain ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQS | *plainly* RT] *unto them*

> As noted under 2 Nephi 25:20, the original text had a number of instances of the bare adverb *plain* instead of the standard *plainly.* The critical text will restore all these instances of original *plain,* including here in Helaman 8:4.

■ **Helaman 8:7**

[now >+ & 1 | And ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *it came to pass that*
thus they did stir up the people to anger against Nephi

> Oliver Cowdery initially wrote "now it came to pass" in the printer's manuscript; then somewhat later he crossed out the *now* and supralinearly wrote an ampersand. The ink flow for the ampersand is considerably broader, which implies that Oliver made the correction later with a duller quill, probably when he proofed 𝒫 against 𝒪. This change undoubtedly represents the reading of the original manuscript, especially since there are numerous examples of both "**now** it came to pass" and "**and** it came to pass" (as well as "**and now** it came to pass") in the Book of Mormon text; there would have been no grammatical motivation for Oliver Cowdery to edit "now it came to pass" to "and it came to pass". For each case of "it came to pass", the critical text will follow the earliest extant reading for the initial connector, thus "**and** it came to pass" here in Helaman 8:7.

> *Summary:* Accept in Helaman 8:7 the corrected reading in 𝒫 with the sentence-initial *and* as the reading of the original text ("and it came to pass").

■ **Helaman 8:8**

and he knoweth as well all things which shall befall us
as he knoweth [of 1ABDEFIJLMNOPQRST | CGHK] *our iniquities*

> As discussed under Alma 17:16, the original text allows for expressions of the form "to know **of** something" (in addition, of course, to the more frequent "to know something"). In each case, we follow the earliest textual sources. Here in Helaman 8:8, the 1840 edition omitted the *of,* probably accidentally. Perhaps the typesetter was influenced by the fact that earlier in the verse the verb *know* lacks the *of:* "and he knoweth as well all things which shall befall us". The 1908 RLDS edition restored the *of* to the RLDS text.

> There are other passages where a mixture of *know* and *know of* occurs within the same sentence, yet there has been no editorial tendency to eliminate such variation:

> > Alma 12:7
> > for he was convinced that they **knew** the thoughts and intents of his heart
> > for power was given unto them that they might **know of** these things
> > according to the spirit of prophecy

Summary: Maintain the occurrence of *of* after the second *knoweth* in Helaman 8:8 ("as he knoweth **of** our iniquities") even though earlier in the verse there is no *of* after the first *knoweth* ("and he knoweth as well all things which shall befall us").

■ **Helaman 8:11**

behold my brethren have ye not read
that God gave power unto one man even Moses to smite upon the waters of the Red Sea
and they [departed 1| parted ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] hither and thither
insomuch that the Israelites which were our fathers came through upon dry ground
and the waters closed upon the armies of the Egyptians and swallowed them up

Referring to the waters of the Red Sea, the printer's manuscript reads "and they **departed** hither and thither". The 1830 typesetter thought that *departed* was in error and substituted the visually similar verb form *parted* ("and they **parted** hither and thither"). We do not have the original manuscript here, but it is possible that it read *parted* and that Oliver Cowdery miscopied it into 𝓟 as *departed*. It is also possible that Oliver wrote down *departed* accidentally in 𝓞. Even so, there is no independent evidence in the manuscripts for adding or omitting an initial unstressed *de* for words. Potentially there could be mix-ups between the following pairs of verbs (or their forms):

delay	lay
delight	light
denote	note
depress	press

But there are no examples of any mix-ups, not even scribal slips, involving these *de*-initial verbs.

Another possibility is that the reading in 𝓟, *departed,* is an error for some other *de*-initial verb. One obvious candidate is the visually similar *divided*; the word in 𝓞 could have been *divided,* but Oliver Cowdery misread it as *departed* when he copied from 𝓞 into 𝓟. In fact, when referring to the parting of waters, the King James Bible uses either verb, *part* or *divide:*

2 Kings 2:8
and Elijah took his mantle and wrapped *it* together and smote the waters
and they were **divided** hither and thither
so that they two went over on dry ground

2 Kings 2:14
and when he also had smitten the waters
they **parted** hither and thither and Elisha went over

The Book of Mormon itself prefers the verb *divide* in the context of the phrase "hither and thither":

1 Nephi 4:2
let us be strong like unto Moses
for he truly spake unto the waters of the Red Sea
and they **divided** hither and thither
and our fathers came through out of captivity on dry ground
and the armies of Pharaoh did follow and were drownded in the waters of the Red Sea

1 Nephi 17:26–27
    now ye know that Moses was commanded of the Lord to do that great work
    and ye know that by his word the waters of the Red Sea was **divided** hither and thither
    and they passed through on dry ground
    but ye know that the Egyptians were drowned in the Red Sea
        which were the armies of Pharaoh

Helaman 10:1
    and it came to pass that there arose a division among the people
    insomuch that they **divided** hither and thither and went their ways

Helaman 12:8
    for behold the dust of the earth moveth hither and thither
    to the **dividing** asunder at the command of our great and everlasting God

And the first two examples specifically refer to Moses's dividing of the Red Sea; thus *divided* is a possible emendation for *departed* in Helaman 8:11. Even so, there is no evidence in the history of the Book of Mormon text for mix-ups between the verbs *divide* and *depart*.

Another possibility, one consistent with the archaic lexical usage elsewhere in the original Book of Mormon text, is that the reading *departed* in Helaman 8:11 is actually correct and that it means 'parted' or 'divided'. The Oxford English Dictionary gives 'to divide or part' as one of the earliest meanings in English for the verb *depart;* the first four definitions (listed under section I) provide citations of this obsolete usage, including several that refer to religious subjects (original spellings here retained):

John Wycliffe's 1388 translation of Isaiah 59:2
    ȝoure wickednesses han **departid** bitwixe ȝou and ȝoure God

        "but your iniquities have **separated** between you and your God"
          (King James Bible)

John Maundeville (about 1400)
    þe ȝerde of Moyses with þe whilk he **departid** þe Reed See

        "the rod [yard] of Moses with the which he **parted** the Red Sea"

William Tyndale's 1526 translation of Romans 8:39
    to **departe** us from Goddes love

        "to **separate** us from the love of God" (King James Bible)

The Book of Common Prayer (1548–1549)
    till death vs **departe**

        changed in 1662 to "till death us **do part**"

The Geneva Bible's 1557 translation of John 19:24
    they **departed** my rayment among them

        "they **parted** my raiment among them" (King James Bible)

Note how the King James Bible studiously avoids using the verb *depart* in places where earlier translations of the Bible used that verb with the meaning 'to divide or part'.

As discussed under Mosiah 19:24 (with respect to the possibility that *ceremony* is an error for the archaic word *sermon,* meaning 'talk, discourse'), the English-language vocabulary of the Book of Mormon appears to date from the 16th and 17th centuries. From that perspective, there is nothing wrong with the use of *departed* originally in Helaman 8:11. Of course, the 1830 typesetter had no idea that *departed* could be correct.

The critical text will therefore restore *departed* in Helaman 8:11, the reading of the earliest extant source (the printer's manuscript). For the two possible emendations, *parted* and *divided,* there is no independent evidence in the history of the Book of Mormon text to support the hypothesis that either of these two verb forms could have been accidentally replaced by *departed* during the early transmission of the text.

Summary: Restore in Helaman 8:11 the original verb form *departed* ("and they departed hither and thither"), with the understanding that here *departed* means 'parted' or 'divided'; such archaic meanings for Book of Mormon words (dating from the 1500s and 1600s) can be found elsewhere in the original text.

■ **Helaman 8:13**

yea the words which he hath spoken concerning the coming
[*of Messiah* 1 | *of the Messiah* ABCDEFGIJLMNOPQRST | *Messiah* HK]

The printer's manuscript reads "of Messiah", as if *Messiah* is a personal name. The 1830 typesetter emended the text by inserting the definite article *the* before *Messiah,* thus interpreting *Messiah* as a title. The 1874 RLDS edition removed *of the,* thus changing *coming* from a gerund to a participle ("the coming Messiah").

Elsewhere in the Book of Mormon text, *Messiah* is always treated as a title rather than as a personal name. In fact, in all other cases, *Messiah* is preceded by a determiner:

"the Messiah"	17 times
"the true Messiah"	3 times
"a Messiah"	3 times
"the holy Messiah"	2 times
"a false Messiah"	1 time
"another Messiah"	1 time
"one Messiah"	1 time
"this Messiah"	1 time
"that Messiah"	1 time

Included in this list are two more occurrences of the phrase "the coming of **the** Messiah" and one of "the coming of **a** Messiah":

1 Nephi 1:19
and also the things which he read in the book manifested plainly
of **the coming of a Messiah**

2 Nephi 6:13
>   for they still wait for **the coming of the Messiah**

Mosiah 13:33
>   for behold did not Moses prophesy unto them
>   concerning **the coming of the Messiah**

On the other hand, there are no occurrences of *Messiah* preceded by a present participle (such as
coming). The 1874 RLDS change from "the coming of the Messiah" to "the coming Messiah" was
undoubtedly a typo. The 1908 RLDS edition restored the 1830 reading, not the reading in 𝓟.

Given the otherwise systematic use of *Messiah* as a title rather than as a name in the Book of
Mormon, the 1830 typesetter's emendation seems quite reasonable. One other possibility, also
quite reasonable, is that the original text read "the coming of **a** Messiah" (as in 1 Nephi 1:19).
There are two other uses of "a Messiah" in the Book of Mormon text:

1 Nephi 10:4
>   a prophet would the Lord God raise up among the Jews
>   yea even **a Messiah** or in other words a Savior of the world

2 Nephi 25:18
>   that they need not look forward any more for **a Messiah** to come

Given the usage elsewhere in the text, either the definite article *the* or the indefinite article *a*
could have been accidentally omitted here in Helaman 8:13. And we have examples of scribal diffi-
culty with both these articles, as in the following cases where there is a preceding *of* and Oliver
Cowdery was the scribe:

□ *of the > of*

1 Nephi 13:40 (initial loss in 𝓟)
>   the twelve apostles of [NULL > *the* 1 | *the* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] Lamb

Mosiah 8:20 (initial loss in 𝓟)
>   the works of [NULL >+ *the* 1 | *the* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] Lord

Alma 23:14 (permanent loss in 𝓟)
>   any of [1 | *the* 0ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] Amulonites

Alma 32:2 (initial loss in 𝓞; permanent loss in 𝓟)
>   the [*poorer* 0 | *poor* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] class
>   of [NULL > *the* 0 | 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] people

Alma 34:16 (initial loss in 𝓟)
>   the whole law of [*the* 0ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST | NULL > *the* 1] demands
>   of justice

Alma 47:14 (initial loss in 𝓟)
>   at the dawn of [*the* 0ABCDEFGHKPS | NULL > *the* 1 | IJLMNOQRT] day

3 Nephi 6:23 (initial loss in 𝓟)
>   of [NULL >+ *the* 1 | *the* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] things pertaining to Christ

□ *of a > of*

Alma 20:13 (initial loss in 𝓟)

sons of [NULL >+ *a* 1 | *a* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] liar

3 Nephi 3:2 (initial loss in 𝓟)

by the hand of [NULL >+ *a* 1 | *a* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] god

Statistically, Oliver Cowdery's deletion of *the* after *of* is more frequent than his deletion of *a* after *of*. Nonetheless, the loss of *a* is possible in this context.

David Calabro points out (personal communication) that these arguments depend on the use of *Messiah* as a title within the text of the Book of Mormon. In contrast, the King James Bible uses *Messiah* (and its New Testament variant *Messias*) as a name, with the result that in most of the biblical cases there is no article at all, especially in the original Hebrew and Greek:

Daniel 9:25

| *King James text:* | **the** Messiah **the** Prince |
| *equivalent Hebrew:* | Messiah   Prince |

Daniel 9:26

| *King James text:* | shall Messiah be cut off |
| *equivalent Hebrew:* | will be cut off Messiah |

John 1:41

| *King James text:* | **the** Messias which is . . . **the** Christ |
| *equivalent Greek:* | **the** Messias which is . . .   Christ |

John 4:25

| *King James text:* | Messias cometh which is called Christ |
| *equivalent Greek:* | Messias cometh which is called Christ |

These biblical examples argue that *Messiah* can lack a determiner and thus provide support here in Helaman 8:13 for the reading in 𝓟, "the coming of Messiah".

Calabro also points out that we can find evidence for no determiner in the words that John the Baptist spoke on 15 May 1829 when he ordained Joseph Smith and Oliver Cowdery to the Aaronic Priesthood. Although the textual sources for this language date from the mid to late 1830s, they consistently avoid the definite article *the* before *Messiah*:

Oliver Cowdery, letter to William Phelps (1834)

upon you my fellow servants
in the name of Messiah
I confer this priesthood and this authority

Joseph Smith, History of the Church (1839)

upon you my fellow servants
in the name of Messiah
I confer the priesthood of Aaron

There is also an example in his editing for the 1837 edition of the Book of Mormon where Joseph Smith apparently used *Messiah* as a name, at least initially, when he decided to replace the first instance of the name *Jesus Christ* in the small plates of Nephi with *Messiah*:

1 Nephi 12:18
yea even the sword of the justice of the eternal God
and [*Jesus Christ* 0A | *Jesus Christ* >js *Mosiah* 1 |
the Messiah BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]

Joseph spelled the name *Messiah* as *Mosiah* in 𝔓, probably because he pronounced both names identically. But the 1837 edition ended up supplying the definite article, thus "and **the** Messiah", which has been the reading in all subsequent editions of the Book of Mormon. (For a complete discussion of this emendation of the text, see under 1 Nephi 12:18.)

In both these examples, one from church history and the other from Joseph Smith's later editing of the printer's manuscript of the Book of Mormon, *Messiah* is treated as a name. In fact, in John the Baptist's phrase "in the name of Messiah", the word *name* is explicitly provided. Similarly, the Bible uses *Messiah* and *Messias* as the name for the Anointed One. So if we exclude the case of *Messiah* here in Helaman 8:13, there is a systematic difference: the Book of Mormon uses *Messiah* as a title (thus supplying a determiner) while the Bible and other scriptural sources use it as a name (thus generally avoiding the determiner).

Given the occurrence of *the Messiah* in Mosiah 13:33 (which, like Helaman 8:13, refers to Moses's prophesy of "the coming of **the** Messiah"), I would favor the definite article *the* in Helaman 8:13. Moreover, only in the small plates do we have prophets referring to "a Messiah" (Lehi in 1 Nephi 1:19 and 1 Nephi 10:4, and Nephi in 2 Nephi 25:18). Thus the 1830 typesetter's emendation to *the Messiah* in Helaman 8:13 is consistent with usage elsewhere in the text and most likely represents the original reading.

Summary: Accept in Helaman 8:13 the 1830 typesetter's insertion of *the* before *Messiah* ("the coming of **the** Messiah"); *Messiah* is otherwise used as a title in the Book of Mormon, and Moses is cited as referring to "the coming of **the** Messiah" in Mosiah 13:33; only in the small plates of Nephi do Lehi and Nephi refer to "**a** Messiah"; *Messiah* is used as a name in other scriptures, but not (it would appear) in the original text of the Book of Mormon.

◼ **Helaman 8:14**

yea did he not bear [1ABCEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST | *the* D] *record that the Son of God should come*

The 1841 British edition accidentally added the definite article *the* before *record,* an obvious typo since the text refers only to "bearing record" (37 times, including here in Helaman 8:14), never to "bearing **the** record". The subsequent LDS edition (1849) removed the intrusive *the*.

Summary: Maintain in Helaman 8:14 and elsewhere the consistent use of "to bear record" without any determiner for *record*.

■ **Helaman 8:14**

yea did he not bear record that the Son of God **should** *come*
and as he lifted up the brazen serpent in the wilderness
even so [*should* 1 | *shall* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *he be lifted up which* **should** *come*

This passage refers to the future coming of the Savior. Originally the passage consistently used the modal verb *should* ("the Son of God **should** come . . . even so **should** he be lifted up which **should** come"). The 1830 typesetter accidentally replaced the second *should* with *shall.* For consistency, the original *should* should be restored.

This use of future *should* (rather than conditional *should*) is found elsewhere in the text, as in the following examples that refer to being lifted up, either to the future crucifixion of Christ or to the coming resurrection of mankind:

> 1 Nephi 16:2
>> and the righteous have I justified and testified
>> that they **should** be lifted up at the last day

> 3 Nephi 27:14
>> that as I have been lifted up by men
>> even so **should** men be lifted up by the Father
>> to stand before me to be judged of their works

> Ether 4:1
>> and they were forbidden to come unto the children of men
>> until after that he **should** be lifted up upon the cross

For additional discussion of the competition between *should* and *shall,* see under 2 Nephi 25:19.

Summary: Restore the original *should* in Helaman 8:14 ("even so **should** he be lifted up"), especially since the surrounding text also uses *should.*

■ **Helaman 8:16**

and now behold Moses did not only testify of these things
but also all the holy prophets
from his [*day* 1A | *days* BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
even to the **days** *of Abraham*

Here the 1837 edition changed the singular *day* ("from his day") to the plural *days* ("from his days"). The following plural *days* in "even to the days of Abraham" may have led to this 1837 change, whether intended or not (the change of *day* to *days* was not marked by Joseph Smith in 𝒫). There is definitely internal evidence to support the plural *days* in phrases of the form "the day(s) of X", where X is a personal name; for discussion of the phrase "since the day(s) of Nephi", see under Alma 50:23. But here in Helaman 8:16, there is no postmodification by an *of*-phrase; instead, the word *day(s)* is premodified by the determiner *his.* Elsewhere, the text has quite a few examples of *his days* (17 of them), but there are also three examples of *his day;* the first two clearly refer to Christ, and it appears that the third one does too:

2 Nephi 25:13

wherefore my soul delighteth to prophesy concerning him
for I have seen **his day** and my heart doth magnify his holy name

Helaman 8:22

yea they have testified of the coming of Christ
and have looked forward and have rejoiced in **his day** which is to come

Ether 9:22

yea and he even saw the Sun of Righteousness
and did rejoice and glory in **his day**

So one could claim that the text uses only *his day* when referring to the day of Christ.

However, when we consider the parallel case of *my day(s),* we find two instances of *my day* (and for neither of these does the *my* refer to the Lord):

Alma 13:25

and now we only wait to hear the joyful news
declared unto us by the mouth of angels of his coming
for the time cometh—we know not how soon—
would to God that it might be in **my day**
but let it be sooner or later / in it I will rejoice

3 Nephi 5:16

therefore I do make my record from the accounts
which hath been given by those which were before me
until the commencement of **my day**

Elsewhere there are 11 occurrences of *my days*. So probably what we have is a predominance of *his days* and *my days*, but the singular *day* is still possible for both *his day* and *my day*. Similarly, *his days* and *my days* dominate in the King James Bible, but there are also a few instances of *his day* and *my day,* as in Job 3:1 ("after this opened Job his mouth and cursed **his day**") and in John 8:56 ("your father Abraham rejoiced to see **my day**"), the latter referring once more to Christ. The critical text will restore the singular *his day* here in Helaman 8:16.

The possibility remains, of course, that *his day* here in Helaman 8:16 is an error for *his days*. There are quite a few examples in the manuscripts where the scribes accidentally wrote *day* instead of the correct *days* (and sometimes without correcting the error in the manuscript):

1 Nephi 15:13 (initial error by Oliver Cowdery in 𝔓)

in the latter [*days* 0ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST | *day* > *days* 1]
when our seed shall have dwindled in unbelief

Jacob 1:7 (initial error by Oliver Cowdery in 𝔓)

as in the provocation
in the [*day* > *days* 1 | *days* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] of temptation
while the children of Israel were in the wilderness

Mosiah 18:7 (Oliver Cowdery's uncorrected error in 𝔓)

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

Alma 13:18 (initial error by scribe 2 of 𝒫)

and Melchizedek did establish peace in the land
in his [*day > days* 1 | *days* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]

Alma 36:16 (Oliver Cowdery's uncorrected error in 𝒪)

for three [*day* 0 | *days* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
and for three nights was I racked even with the pains of a damned soul

Helaman 13:2 (Oliver Cowdery's uncorrected error in 𝒫)

he did preach [*many day* 1 | *many-day* A | *many days* BCEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST |
manv days D] repentance unto the people

3 Nephi 2:5 (initial error by Oliver Cowdery in 𝒫)

and also an hundred years had passed away
since the [*day > days* 1 | *days* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] of Mosiah

Note that the example in Alma 13:18 deals with the phrase "in his days" while the one in 3 Nephi 2:5 deals with "since the days of Mosiah". Thus the case of "in his day" here in Helaman 8:16 could be an error.

Summary: Restore in Helaman 8:16 the singular *day* in the phrase "in his day"; the singular is possible, although the text prefers the plural phrase "in his days".

■ **Helaman 8:19**

and now I would that ye should know
that **even** *since the days of Abraham*
there hath been many prophets that hath testified these things

As mentioned under Mosiah 4:7, this is the only example in the text of *even since;* elsewhere there are examples of only *ever since* (seven of them). Moreover, there are quite a few examples in the manuscripts where Oliver Cowdery momentarily mixed up *even* and *ever;* for a list, see under Alma 56:46. In fact, one of these involves a case of *ever since:*

Mosiah 13:33

yea and even all the prophets which have prophesied
[*even >+ ever* 1 | *ever* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] since the world began

Thus it is quite possible that *even* in Helaman 8:19 is an early error for *ever.*

The text here in Helaman 8:19 emphasizes that prophets after Abraham testified of Christ's coming. In fact, the immediately following text refers to some of these prophets by name:

Helaman 8:19 – 20

yea behold the prophet Zenos did testify boldly
for the which he was slain
and behold also Zenoch and also Ezaias
and also Isaiah and Jeremiah

And the immediately preceding text (in verses 16 – 18) refers not only to prophets that came between Abraham and Moses (listed under 1 below) but also to prophets that came before Abraham himself (listed under 2 below), yet all of them testifying of Christ:

Helaman 8:16–18
    and now behold Moses did not only testify of these things
(1) but also all the holy prophets from his day even to the days of Abraham
    yea and behold Abraham saw of his coming
    and was filled with gladness and did rejoice
    yea and behold I say unto you
    that Abraham not only knew of these things
(2) but there were many before the days of Abraham
    which were called by the order of God
    yea even after the order of his Son
    and this that it should be shewn unto the people
    a great many thousand years before his coming
    that even redemption should come unto them

Thus it seems wholly unnecessary for verse 19 to use *even* in referring to the prophets that came after Abraham ("**even** since the days of Abraham there hath been many prophets that hath testified these things") given that these prophets (or at least the ones between Abraham and Moses) have already been mentioned in verse 16: "but also all the holy prophets from his day even to the days of Abraham" (for discussion of the lack of the word *back* in this phrase, see under Mosiah 28:17).

The word *even* might have worked here in verse 19 if the text had referred to "the days of Moses" rather than to "the days of Abraham" since those later prophets have not yet been specifically referred to here in the larger passage:

Helaman 8:19–20 (revised so *even* will work)
    and now I would that ye should know
    that **even** since the days of **Moses**
    there hath been many prophets that hath testified these things
    yea behold the prophet Zenos did testify boldly
    for the which he was slain
    and behold also Zenoch and also Ezaias
    and also Isaiah and Jeremiah

Of course, the prophets Isaiah and Jeremiah came after Moses. The prophets Zenos, Zenoch, and Ezaias are not identified in the Bible, so we cannot positively claim that they came after Moses, although the prophecies of Zenos and Zenoch are addressed to the house of Israel and refer to them being scattered and then eventually restored (1 Nephi 19:10–17, Jacob 5–6, and Alma 33:12–17). The specific prophecies of Zenos and Zenoch suggest that these two prophets were contemporary with prophets in Israel that lived prior to the destruction of Jerusalem by the Babylonians but after the Israelites had conquered the land of Canaan. (For discussion of when Ezaias might have lived, see nearby under Helaman 8:19–20.)

Although "the days of Abraham" in Helaman 8:19 could be an error for "the days of Moses", it seems much more likely that *even* is a mistake for *ever*. Besides the many cases where these two words were mixed up in the manuscripts, there are several occurrences of *even,* all correct, in verses 16 and 18 that could have prompted Oliver Cowdery to accidentally write *even* in verse 19 instead of the correct *ever:*

Helaman 8:16	from his day **even** to the days of Abraham
Helaman 8:18	yea **even** after the order of his Son
Helaman 8:18	that **even** redemption should come unto them

In fact, in the case of Mosiah 13:33, cited above, the incorrect *even since* was probably prompted by the preceding (but correct) occurrence of *even* in the same sentence: "yea and **even** all the prophets which have prophesied **even since** the world began" (the initial reading in 𝒫).

The critical text will assume that here in Helaman 8:19 the earliest extant text, the printer's manuscript, incorrectly reads "**even** since the days of Abraham"; the word *even* is very likely an error for *ever,* one that probably occurred as Oliver Cowdery took down Joseph Smith's dictation or as he copied the text from 𝒪 into 𝒫.

Summary: Emend Helaman 8:19 to read "**ever** since the days of Abraham" since the emphasis here is on the prophets' continual testifying of the coming of Christ, including prophets after Abraham; this emendation is supported by considerable manuscript evidence that Oliver Cowdery occasionally mixed up *even* and *ever.*

■ **Helaman 8:19**

and now I would that ye should know
that *ever since the days of Abraham*
[*that* > NULL 1 | ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *there hath been many prophets*
that hath testified these things

Here in the printer's manuscript, Oliver Cowdery initially repeated the subordinate conjunction *that;* he wrote "**that** even since the days of Abraham **that** there hath been many prophets". (For the occurrence of *even* in 𝒫 rather than *ever,* see the preceding discussion.) As discussed under 1 Nephi 10:2–3, there are examples in the original text of the repeated conjunction *that;* but of course there are also examples without the repeated *that.* In each case, the critical text will follow the earliest textual sources. Here in Helaman 8:19, Oliver's crossout of the repeated *that* appears to be virtually immediate (there appears to be no change in the level of ink flow for the crossout). The original manuscript, not extant here, probably lacked the repeated *that.*

Summary: Maintain the lack of the repeated subordinate conjunction *that* in Helaman 8:19 (the corrected reading in 𝒫, the earliest extant source for this part of the text).

■ **Helaman 8:19**

there hath been many prophets that hath **testified these things**

One wonders here if there isn't an *of* missing in the phrase "testified these things". We note that the Book of Mormon text has 16 instances of "to testify **of** things", including three in this same chapter of Helaman:

Helaman 8:16	Moses did not only testify **of** these things
Helaman 8:22	because he testified **of** these things
Helaman 8:22	Nephi also testified **of** these things

Nonetheless, there is some evidence for "to testify things". In the Book of Mormon text, we have one more example without the *of:*

> Alma 5:44
>> yea I am commanded to stand and testify unto this people
>> the things which have been spoken by our fathers

One could argue, of course, that this example is not quite the same since there is an intervening prepositional phrase, "unto this people", between the verb *testify* and the direct object ("the things which have been spoken by our fathers").

Turning to the King James Bible, we can find examples of all these types, with and without the *of,* including one case where there is an intervening prepositional phrase:

> John 21:24
>> this is the disciple which testifieth **of** these things
>> and wrote these things

> Revelation 22:16
>> I Jesus have sent mine angel
>> to testify unto you these things
>> in the churches

> Revelation 22:20
>> he which testifieth these things saith :
>> surely I come quickly

The example in Revelation 22:16 parallels Alma 5:44 while the one in Revelation 22:20 parallels Helaman 8:19. The critical text will therefore maintain the two Book of Mormon occurrences of "to testify things" without the preposition *of.*

Summary: Maintain the occurrence in the text of "to testify things" (that is, without the expected preposition *of*), with one example in Alma 5:44 and another here in Helaman 8:19; usage in the King James Bible supports this occasional lack of *of* in the Book of Mormon text.

■ **Helaman 8:19 – 20**

yea behold the prophet [*Zenos* 1BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST | *Zenas* A] *did testify boldly*
    for the which he was slain
and behold also [*Zenock* / *Zenoch* 1 | *Zenoch* ABDE | *Zenock* CGHIJKLMNOPQRST |
    Zenoch > *Zenock* F]
and also [*Ezaias* 1PS | *Ezias* ABCDEFGHIJKLMOQRT | *Esias* N]
and also Isaiah and Jeremiah

In this passage there have been a number of difficulties with the spelling of the names. First, *Zenos* is misspelled as *Zenas* in the 1830 edition. This misspelling is clearly a typo since elsewhere in the earliest textual sources (in both manuscripts and in the 1830 edition), *Zenos* is the spelling. In fact, eight out of the 12 occurrences of this name are extant in the original manuscript.

The spelling *Zenock* is a mistake for the correct *Zenoch;* for discussion of this case, see under 1 Nephi 19:10. Here in Helaman 8:20, Oliver Cowdery intended to write the name in 𝓟 as *Zenock,*

which was a mistake. But his final *k* looked almost like an *h,* with the result that the 1830 compositor set *Zenoch,* which just happens to be the correct spelling. Ultimately, however, the incorrect *Zenock* (the spelling elsewhere in the text) was returned to this passage (in the 1840 edition and in the second printing of the 1852 LDS edition, with reference to the 1840 edition).

The third case of spelling variation in this passage involves *Ezaias* versus *Ezias.* The printer's manuscript reads *Ezaias,* but the 1830 edition, set from the printer's manuscript, dropped out the first *a,* giving *Ezias.* It does not look like this change is due to conscious editing.

Orson Pratt, in his editing for the 1879 LDS edition, added a footnote for the name *Ezias* in which he proposed that this name is the same as *Esaias:* "Ezias may have been identical with Esaias who lived contemporary with Abraham". Pratt then refers the reader to a passage in the Doctrine and Covenants that gives the priesthood lineage from Moses back to Esaias:

> Doctrine and Covenants 84:11–13
>> and Gad under the hand of **Esaias**
>> and **Esaias** received it under the hand of God
>> **Esaias** also lived in the days of Abraham and was blessed of him

The 1906 LDS edition of the Book of Mormon made the name *Ezias* closer to *Esaias* by changing the *z* to *s,* substituting *Esias* for *Ezias* and making the corresponding change in the footnote: "Esias may have been identical with Esaias who lived contemporary with Abraham". Yet the 1906 edition did not change the Book of Mormon name to *Esaias.* Obviously, the original *Ezaias* here in Helaman 8:20 is closer to *Esaias,* but is still not identical.

All three of the variant names, *Ezaias, Ezias,* and *Esias,* are unique to the Book of Mormon text. And none of these occur in the King James Bible. The closest name in the King James Bible is *Esaias,* the New Testament form of the name *Isaiah.* To be sure, we would not want to say that *Ezaias,* the earliest reading for the name in Helaman 8:20, is an error for the name *Isaiah* since the text includes both prophets in its list and thus distinguishes between the two ("and also Ezaias and also Isaiah and Jeremiah"). Moreover, since Helaman 8:19–20 lists Ezaias as one of the prophets "since the days of Abraham", we should probably not identify him as the Esaias mentioned as the contemporary of Abraham in section 84 of the Doctrine and Covenants.

One could argue that the spelling *Ezaias* in 𝓟 was accidentally influenced by the immediately following *Isaiah.* Of course, there is no manuscript evidence for the 1830 spelling, *Ezias* (or for the 1906 spelling, *Esias*). Moreover, the name *Ezaias* has a *z,* not an *s.* The best solution here in Helaman 8:20 is to follow the spelling of the earliest textual source, namely the reading in 𝓟, *Ezaias.* This spelling is the one found in the current RLDS text (since 1908).

Summary: Restore the spelling *Ezaias* in Helaman 8:20, the reading of the earliest textual source (here the printer's manuscript); as already discussed, the spelling *Zenoch* will be restored; in addition, the spelling *Zenos* will be maintained.

■ **Helaman 8:21**

and now will ye dispute
that Jerusalem was [not 1| ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] destroyed
will ye say that the sons of Zedekiah were **not** *slain*
all except it were Muloch
yea and do ye not behold that the seed of Zedekiah are with us
and they were driven out of the land of Jerusalem

> The printer's manuscript had the negative *not* in the *that*-clause following the verb *dispute*. The 1830 typesetter accidentally, it would appear, dropped the *not*. The point of this passage is that Nephi's audience knew that Jerusalem had been destroyed and that all the sons of Zedekiah had been slain except for Muloch. Until the Nephites discovered the people of Zarahemla, they had no confirmation of Lehi's original prophecy hundreds of years earlier that Jerusalem would be destroyed (see 1 Nephi 1:13). Here in Helaman 8, Nephi is giving his listeners an example of a fulfilled prophecy and rhetorically asking if they really believe it was not fulfilled. Note especially how the parallel yes-no question that follows also uses the negative *not* within its *that*-clause: "will ye say that the sons of Zedekiah were **not** slain / all except it were Muloch". (For discussion of the name *Muloch* rather than *Mulek*, see under Mosiah 25:2.)
>
> Part of the difficulty with this passage may have resulted from the unique way in which the verb *dispute* is used here in Helaman 8:21: there are no other examples in the Book of Mormon text where *dispute* is followed by a *that*-clause. Yet there is nothing wrong with the original text ("will ye dispute that Jerusalem was **not** destroyed"), the reading of the earliest extant text (the printer's manuscript). The critical text will restore the *not* here.

Summary: Restore the original *not* in the *that*-clause following *dispute,* thus making the larger passage consistent in its use of *not*.

■ **Helaman 8:22**

yea they have testified of the coming of Christ
and have looked forward
and have rejoiced in [his 1ABCEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST| this D] day which is to come

> The 1841 British edition replaced *his* with *this,* undoubtedly a typo rather than the result of editing. The subsequent LDS edition (1849) restored the correct "in his day". The 1841 typesetter was prone to mix up *his* and *this;* we have three other examples of this kind of typo in that edition (all three of the others incorrectly replace *this* with *his*):

> Mosiah 1:10
>> for on the morrow I shall proclaim unto this my people out of mine own mouth
>> that thou art a king and a ruler over [this 1ABCEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST| his D] people

> Alma 30:10
>> yea for all [these > this O| this 1ABCEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST| his D] wickedness
>> they were punished

Mormon 3:15
> and because [*this* 1ABCEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST | *his* D] people repented not
> after that I had delivered them
> behold they shall be cut off from the face of the earth

The phrase "in his day" is definitely correct here in Helaman 8:22. For further discussion of this phrase, especially the use of the singular *day* instead of the plural *days,* see nearby under Helaman 8:16. Interestingly, the original text has no instances of the phrase "in this day".

Summary: Maintain the determiner *his* in Helaman 8:22: "and have rejoiced in **his** day which is to come".

■ **Helaman 8:24**

yea even ye have received all things
—both things in heaven
and all things which are in [1 | *the* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *earth—*
as a witness that they are true

Here the 1830 typesetter added the definite article *the* before *earth,* although the preceding *heaven* also lacks the definite article ("things in heaven"). As explained under Mosiah 12:36, when the preposition is *in,* the most common conjoining of *heaven* and *earth* in the Book of Mormon (as well as in the King James Bible) is without *the* for both of the two nouns (that is, the most common phraseology is "in heaven . . . in earth"). Here in Helaman 8:24, the critical text will restore the earliest text, which lacks the *the* before *earth.*

Summary: Remove in Helaman 8:24 the intrusive *the* before *earth;* the earliest extant text (the printer's manuscript) reads without *the* before *earth,* which is the most common way in the text of expressing conjuncts of *heaven* and *earth* in prepositional phrases headed by *in.*

■ **Helaman 8:25**

and even at this time
instead of laying up for yourselves treasures in heaven
where nothing doth corrupt and where nothing can come which is unclean
[NULL >+ *ye are* 1 | *ye are* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *heaping up for yourselves*
    wrath against the day of judgment

Here in the printer's manuscript, Oliver Cowdery initially omitted *ye are.* He later supplied the two words, perhaps when he proofed 𝒫 against 𝒪 (the supralinear *ye are* was written with slightly heavier ink flow). In any event, the sentence here definitely needs a subject and finite verb. Although 𝒪 is not extant, it probably read "ye are heaping up for yourselves wrath".

Summary: Maintain the corrected reading in 𝒫 for Helaman 8:25: "**ye are** heaping up for yourselves wrath against the day of judgment"; the initial text in 𝒫 without *ye are* seems to be the result of a simple scribal error.

■ **Helaman 8:27**

yea go ye [*in* 1ABCGHIJKLMNOPQRST | DE | NULL > *in* F] *unto the judgment seat*

Here the 1841 British edition omitted the adverb *in,* probably unintentionally, although the use of *in* in "go ye **in** unto the judgment seat" is unexpected in English. Yet here the term *judgment seat* refers more to the room where the judgment seat was. In the next chapter, we find evidence for this interpretation. The first instance there uses the same phraseology as here in Helaman 8:27; the two subsequent ones specifically refer to "the **place** of the judgment seat":

> Helaman 9:3
>
> they ran in their might and came **in unto** the judgment seat

> Helaman 9:7
>
> and behold the people did gather themselves together
> unto **the place of** the judgment seat

> Helaman 9:14
>
> we ran and came to **the place of** the judgment seat

In Helaman 8:27, the 1849 LDS edition followed the shorter reading without the *in,* as did the first printing of the 1852 LDS edition. The second 1852 printing restored the *in* to the LDS text, apparently by reference to the 1840 edition.

Elsewhere there are other instances in the text where *in* is used with *unto* in this way, "to go or to come **in unto** <an enclosed place>":

> 1 Nephi 3:11
>
> and we cast lots which of us should go **in unto** the house of Laban
> and it came to pass that the lot fell upon Laman
> and Laman went **in unto** the house of Laban

> Alma 14:18
>
> and they came **in unto** the prison to see them

> Alma 14:23
>
> the chief judge over the land of Ammonihah
> and many of their teachers and their lawyers
> went **in unto** the prison where Alma and Amulek was bound with cords

> Alma 15:5
>
> and they went **in unto** the house unto Zeezrom

The King James Bible also has examples of this usage in reference to entering the tabernacle in the wilderness:

> Exodus 28:29
>
> and Aaron shall bear the names of the children of Israel
> in the breastplate of judgment upon his heart
> when he goeth **in unto** the holy *place*
> for a memorial before the LORD continually

Exodus 28:35

> and it shall be upon Aaron to minister
> and his sound shall be heard
> when he goeth **in unto** the holy *place* before the LORD

Exodus 28:43

> and they shall be upon Aaron and upon his sons
> when they come **in unto** the tabernacle of the congregation
> or when they come near unto the altar to minister in the holy *place*
> that they bear not iniquity and die

There is also a more general reference to "coming in unto a house":

Exodus 12:23

> the LORD will pass over the door and will not suffer
> the destroyer to come **in unto** your houses to smite *you*

Summary: Maintain in Helaman 8:27 the adverb *in* in "go ye in unto the judgment seat"; usage elsewhere in the Book of Mormon as well as the King James Bible supports the phraseology "to go **in unto** <an enclosed place>".

■ **Helaman 8:28**

and [NULL > *behold* 1|*behold* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *they both belong to your secret band whose author is Gaddianton*

In the printer's manuscript, Oliver Cowdery initially wrote "& they both belong", but then he corrected the text by supralinearly inserting *behold*. The correction was probably virtually immediate (its level of ink flow is unchanged). There would be no need to edit here since either reading—with or without the *behold*—is possible.

Summary: Accept in Helaman 8:28 Oliver Cowdery's insertion of *behold* in 𝒫 as the reading of 𝒪, no longer extant here.

Helaman 9

■ **Helaman 9:6**

he being stabbed by his brother **by** *a garb of secrecy*

The second occurrence of the preposition *by* seems strange here. One wonders if some other preposition (such as *with* or *in*) might be the original one. In other words, perhaps the second *by* is an accidental repetition of the first one.

On the other hand, the second *by* can be interpreted as meaning 'by means of'. There are a few examples of this meaning for *by* elsewhere in the text:

> Alma 27:24
>> and we will guard them from their enemies **by** our armies

> Alma 51:6
>> for the freemen had sworn or covenanted
>> to maintain their rights and the privileges of their religion
>> **by** a free government

> Helaman 2:11
>> and they took their flight out of the land
>> **by** a secret way into the wilderness

For the first example, the 1830 edition replaced the *by* with the preposition *with* (see the discussion under Alma 27:24). On the other hand, in Alma 58:8 there is example where 𝒪 read *with,* but that preposition was replaced with *by* (with the meaning 'by means of') when Oliver Cowdery copied the text from 𝒪 into 𝒫 (for discussion, see under that passage). The occasional occurrence in the text of *by* with the appropriate meaning 'by means of' argues that no emendation should be made here in Helaman 9:6.

Summary: Accept the phrase "by a garb of secrecy" in Helaman 9:6 since the use of *by* with the meaning 'by means of' occurs elsewhere in the text.

■ **Helaman 9:8**

and now behold the people knew nothing concerning the multitude
[which 1APS | *who* BCDEFGHIJKLMNOQRT] *had gathered together at the garden of Nephi*

Here the 1908 RLDS edition restored the original *which* in this passage. The 1837 edition made the change from *which* to *who,* but Joseph Smith did not mark it in 𝒫. There are six other cases in the text where *multitude(s)* is postmodified by a relative clause headed by *which,* and in those

cases not only was the *which* changed to *who* in the editing for the 1837 edition but Joseph also marked the change in 𝒫. Not surprisingly, the 1908 RLDS edition did not restore the original *which* in those six cases since the change to *who* was marked in 𝒫, as in the example found in the next chapter of the book of Helaman:

> Helaman 10:12
>> he did stop and did not go unto his own house but did return unto the multitudes [*which* >js *who* 1 | *which* A | *who* BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] were scattered about upon the face of the land

Here in Helaman 9:8 we see a precise reliance in the 1908 RLDS edition on whether 𝒫 itself was explicitly edited. The critical text will, of course, restore all the original instances of *which,* providing they are supported by the earliest textual sources. For further discussion of the editing of *which* when it refers to persons, see under WHICH in volume 3.

Summary: Restore the original *which* after *multitude* in Helaman 9:8 as well as in six other cases of "multitude(s) which" in the original text.

■ **Helaman 9:10**

and it came to pass that on the morrow
the people did assemble themselves together
to mourn and to fast at the burial
of the great [*&* 1 | *and* A | BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *chief judge which had been slain*

Here the earliest text reads "the great **and** chief judge". In the 1837 edition, the *and* was omitted, perhaps intentionally. This change suggests the possibility that here the original text read without the *and* as "the great chief judge". There are, as one might expect, numerous examples in the text where we have "great and <modifier> <noun>", as in Helaman 13:18: "our great and true God". In the case of "great chief judge", on the other hand, one could consider *chief judge* as a compound noun modified by the adjective *great*.

In the Book of Mormon, the adjective *great,* whenever it modifies a noun representing a political position, can be thought of as meaning 'supreme'. We have several instances of such usage in the earliest text:

> Alma 58:4 (original manuscript only)
>> and it came to pass that I thus did send an embassy
>> to **the great governor** of our land

> Alma 60:24
>> behold it will be expedient that we contend no more with the Lamanites
>> until we have first cleansed our inward vessel
>> yea even **the great head** of our government

> 3 Nephi 3:18
>> now the chiefest among all the chief captains
>> and **the great commander** of all the armies of the Nephites
>> was appointed and his name was Gidgiddoni

But there are no other examples of *great* modifying *chief judge* as a unit or *judge* alone. Note that in these three other examples the form is always "the great X of Y", which is different in that respect from the form here in Helaman 9:10 ("the great and chief judge which had been slain").

A parallel example to the earliest reading in Helaman 9:10 can be found in 2 Nephi; in that instance, the original *and* has been retained:

> 2 Nephi 9:22
> > and he suffereth this that the resurrection might pass upon all men
> > that all might stand before him at **the great and judgment day**

Here we have one more instance of "great and <modifier> <noun>"; not only does the noun *judgment* modify *day,* but *great* does too. And we can find support for the phrase *great day* referring to the day of judgment; note, in particular, that the first of the following examples has an instance of conjoined *great* modifying *day* (marked below with an arrow):

> 2 Nephi 33:12–13
> > and I pray the Father in the name of Christ
> > that many of us—if not all—may be saved in his kingdom
> → > at **that great and last day**
> > and now my beloved brethren
> > all they which are of the house of Israel
> > and all ye ends of the earth
> > I speak unto you as the voice of one crying from the dust
> > farewell until **that great day** shall come

> Mormon 9:2
> > behold will ye believe in the day of your visitation
> > behold when the Lord shall come
> > yea even **that great day** when the earth shall be rolled together as a scroll
> > and the elements shall melt with fervent heat
> > yea in **that great day** when ye shall be brought to stand before the Lamb of God
> > then will ye say that there is no God

There are five other instances in the text of "great and last day", plus two of "great and dreadful day" and one of "great and coming day", all in reference to the "great day" of judgment. These other examples of "great and <modifier> day" further support the expression "great and judgment day". And the latter supports the expression "the great and chief judge" here in Helaman 9:10. Thus the critical text will restore the original *and* between *great* and *chief* in "the great and chief judge".

Summary: In accord with the earliest textual source (the printer's manuscript), restore the *and* in Helaman 9:10 ("the great **and** chief judge"); such usage is found elsewhere in the text, as in 2 Nephi 9:22 ("the great **and** judgment day").

■ **Helaman 9:11**

and thus [*were also* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNPS | O | *also* QRT] *those judges*
which were at the garden of Nephi and heard his words
were also *gathered together at the burial*

Here the 1907 LDS vest-pocket edition deleted the first *were also* in this passage (changing "and thus **were also** those judges" to "and thus those judges"). This emendation eliminated the redundancy of the original text (where there is a repeated instance of *were also* at the end of the sentence: "and thus **were also** those judges . . . **were also** gathered together at the burial"). Like the 1907 edition, the 1911 LDS edition removed the *were* (probably independently of the 1907 edition) but neglected to remove the equally redundant *also*. The LDS text has continued with the 1911 reading, "and thus **also** those judges . . . were **also** gathered together at the burial".

Here in Helaman 9:11 the repetition of *were also* helps process the sentence since there is a rather long intervening relative clause ("which were at the garden of Nephi and heard his words"). There is evidence elsewhere in the text for this kind of verbal redundancy, especially when there is some kind of intervening phrase or clause; in the following example, we have a rather long adverbial *by*-phrase:

> Mosiah 10:18 (the earliest extant reading)
> for this very cause **hath** king Laman
> by his cunning and lying craftiness and his fair promises
> **hath** deceived me

Joseph Smith, in his editing for the 1837 edition, removed the repeated *hath* from this particular passage; the critical text will restore it (see the discussion under Mosiah 10:18). A similar example of this kind of redundancy in the original text involves the repetition of the subordinate conjunction *that* and the restatement of the subject as a pronoun:

> 2 Nephi 10:3 (the earliest extant reading)
> it must needs be expedient **that Christ**
> —for in the last night the angel spake unto me
> that this should be his name—
> **that he** should come among the Jews

In that passage, the 1830 compositor (John Gilbert) deleted the redundant *that he* when he reviewed the printer's manuscript prior to setting the type. On the other hand, there are no other examples in the text where *also* is unnecessarily repeated within the same clause (as it is here in Helaman 9:11).

Summary: Restore in Helaman 9:11 the original text, with its redundant *were;* also maintain the redundant *also* in this sentence; similar redundancies can be found elsewhere in the original text.

■ **Helaman 9:12**

where *are the five which was sent to inquire concerning the chief judge*
[*whither* >jg *whether* 1 | *whether* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *he was dead*

As discussed under 1 Nephi 22:4, there are quite a few cases in the manuscripts where Oliver Cowdery mixed up the two words *whether* and *whither*. Here in 𝔓 (𝔒 is not extant), Oliver wrote

whither, perhaps under the influence of the semantically related *where* at the beginning of the sentence. John Gilbert, the 1830 typesetter, emended 𝒫 by overwriting the *i* of *whither* with an *e,* thus giving the obviously correct *whether* (which is also the reading of all the printed editions).

Summary: Maintain the use of *whether* in Helaman 9:12; in the printer's manuscript, Oliver Cowdery wrote *whither* (meaning 'where to'), an impossible reading in this context.

■ **Helaman 9:12**

they inquired among the people saying :
where are **the** *five which was sent*
to inquire concerning the chief judge
whether he was dead
and they answered and said :
concerning [*this* 1ABDEFIJLMNOPQST | *the* CGHKR] *five*
which ye say ye have sent
we know not

Here the 1840 edition replaced the demonstrative adjective *this* with the definite article *the.* This change could well be a typo rather than the result of conscious editing. The previous use in this verse of *the* before *five* ("**the** five which was sent to inquire concerning the chief judge") may have prompted the change from *this five* to *the five* in the 1840 edition. In 1908 the original *this* was restored to the RLDS text.

Grammatically, one could object to the use of the singular *this* in "concerning **this** five" rather than the plural *these* ("concerning these five"). Such a factor may have led the editors for the 1920 LDS edition to adopt the 1840 reading with the *the.* This change was marked in the 1920 committee copy, which means that the change was a conscious one. In any event, the 1981 LDS edition restored the original *this* to the LDS text. The use of *this* in this context is actually appropriate since the people are trying to identify which five were sent and which five were alleged to have killed the chief judge. In such a discourse, one can refer to "this five" or "that five" as well as to "these five" or "those five".

Summary: Maintain in Helaman 9:12 the original reading "**this** five which ye say ye have sent" (also the current reading in both the LDS and RLDS editions).

■ **Helaman 9:13**

and they told them all
[*they* > *that* 1 | *that* ABCDEGHIJKLMOPQRST | NULL > *that* F | N] *they had done*

There is a clear tendency here in the text to accidentally drop the subordinate conjunction *that.* It first happened when Oliver Cowdery was copying the text into the printer's manuscript. He started to write "and they told them all they had done"; but after writing *all they,* he crossed out the *y* of *they* and wrote an *a* over the *e* and the crossed-out *y,* and then he continued by writing inline the final *t* of the *that.* The correction was therefore immediate. Since either reading works, the original manuscript undoubtedly had the *that.*

This difficulty in retaining the *that* also shows up in the first printing of the 1852 LDS edition and in the 1906 LDS large-print edition. The plates for the 1852 edition were later corrected by restoring the *that* (most likely by reference to the 1840 edition), with the result that the second printing of the 1852 edition and subsequent LDS editions (except for the 1906) have continued with the *that*. The 1906 edition was never used as a copytext, so its reading without the *that* was not transmitted into any later LDS edition.

Elsewhere in the text we find that in relative clauses involving "they had done", the original text always has the relative pronoun, either *that* or *which*:

1 Nephi 7:20	that I would forgive them of the thing **that** they had done against me
1 Nephi 7:21	I did frankly forgive them all **that** they had done
1 Nephi 18:20	they repented of the thing **which** they had done
Mosiah 27:35	to repair all the injuries **which** they had done to the church
Alma 17:39	for a testimony of the things **which** they had done
Alma 24:24	for they repented of the thing **which** they had done
Helaman 5:17	to repair unto them the wrongs **which** they had done
3 Nephi 6:26	to be judged of their crime **which** they had done
Mormon 4:10	and yet the Nephites repented not of the evil **which** they had done

In the last example only, Joseph Smith removed the relative pronoun in his editing for the 1837 edition. All these other examples argue that the relative pronoun *which* should be restored in Mormon 4:10.

Summary: Maintain the relative pronoun *that* in Helaman 9:13 ("all **that** they had done"); also restore the *which* in Mormon 4:10 ("the evil **which** they had done"); in the original text, relative clauses referring to what "they had done" consistently maintain the direct object relative pronoun, either *that* or *which*.

■ **Helaman 9:14**

we ran and came to the place of the [*Judgmentseat* 1 | *judgement* A | *judgment* BCDEFGHIJKLMNOQR | *judgment seat* PS | *judgment-seat* T]

The printer's manuscript reads *judgment seat* here in Helaman 9:14 (although spelled as *Judgmentseat*). The 1830 compositor accidentally dropped the word *seat* when he set the type for this passage. Perhaps he was expecting something like "the place of judgment", as in Ecclesiastes 3:16: "and moreover I saw under the sun the place of judgment". The 1908 RLDS edition and the 1981 LDS text restored the missing *seat* (by reference to 𝔓). The use of the compound noun *judgment seat* with the noun *place* is consistent with an earlier occurrence in this chapter:

> Helaman 9:7
> and behold the people did gather themselves together
> unto **the place of the judgment seat**

And earlier references to the murder of this chief judge refer to the place of the judgment seat but without using the word *place:*

Helaman 8:27	go ye in unto the judgment seat
Helaman 9:1	certain men which were among them ran to the judgment seat
Helaman 9:3	they ran in their might and came in unto the judgment seat

Thus the expression "the place of the judgment seat" is more appropriate in the Book of Mormon text than "the place of the judgment", the 1830 reading. The current LDS and RLDS texts read correctly in Helaman 9:14 as well as in Helaman 9:7.

Summary: Retain "the place of the judgment seat" in Helaman 9:14 as well as in Helaman 9:7, the reading in both instances of the earliest extant text (the printer's manuscript).

■ **Helaman 9:14–15**

and when we saw all things even as Nephi had testified
we were **astonished** *insomuch that we fell to the earth*
and when we were recovered from our **astonishment**

    □ *that we fell to the earth*   1*

    □ *behold they cast us into prison*   1ᶜABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST

now as for the murder of this man . . .

Here in the printer's manuscript, as Oliver Cowdery copied from the original manuscript (no longer extant for this part of the text), his eye skipped from the word *astonishment* back to the similar *astonished,* with the result that initially in 𝒫 he repeated after *astonishment* the earlier *that*-clause, "that we fell to the earth". Oliver immediately caught his error, crossed out the dittography, and wrote the correct text by inserting "behold they cast us into" above the crossed-out text and finishing up by writing inline the last word in the sentence, *prison*. The immediacy of the correction shows that the corrected reading in 𝒫 was undoubtedly the reading in 𝒪. Moreover, the dittography does not make any sense.

Summary: Maintain in Helaman 9:14 the corrected reading in 𝒫, where the verse ends with the main clause, "behold they cast us into prison", rather than with the nonsensical initial repetition in 𝒫 of the subordinate *that*-clause ("that we fell to the earth").

■ **Helaman 9:15**

and behold he was dead according to
the [*word > words* 1 | *words* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *of Nephi*

Oliver Cowdery initially wrote "the word of Nephi" in 𝒫; then he inserted inline the plural *s* at the end of *word*. The level of ink flow is unchanged, so probably the correction was virtually immediate and in accord with the reading of 𝒪, no longer extant here. Typically, the text prefers "the words of X" over "the word of X", where X refers to a person other than deity. For instance, there are four instances of "the words of Nephi" elsewhere in the text but none of "the word of Nephi". For another example of this plural usage, see the discussion under Alma 25:9 regarding the phrase "the word(s) of Abinadi".

Summary: Accept in Helaman 9:15 Oliver Cowdery's corrected reading in 𝓟, namely, the plural *words;* the virtual immediacy of the correction in 𝓟 as well as usage elsewhere in the text supports the plural *words* in the phrase "the words of Nephi".

■ **Helaman 9:16**

behold we know that this Nephi must have agreed with some one to slay the judge
and then he might declare [it 1ABCDEGHKPRST | FIJLMNOQ] *unto us*
that he might convert us unto his faith
that he might raise himself to be a great man chosen of God and a prophet

The 1852 LDS edition omitted the direct object pronoun *it* from this passage. It was restored in the 1920 LDS edition. (For another example of the omission of a direct object *it,* see under Alma 13:22.) Here in Helaman 9:16, the *it* is nonexpletive—that is, *it* does not refer to one of the following *that*-clauses (which are actually resultive clauses, not complements for the verb *declare*). In this particular instance, the *it* refers to the slaying of the judge. Of course, it is possible to have an expletive use of *it* referring to a following direct object *that*-clause:

Helaman 10:6
behold I declare **it** unto thee in the presence of mine angels
that ye shall have power over this people
and shall smite the earth with famine and with pestilence and destruction
according to the wickedness of this people

Summary: Retain the original *it* in Helaman 9:16: "and then he might declare **it** unto us" (the reading of the earliest extant text, the printer's manuscript).

■ **Helaman 9:19**

and they began to question him in [divers 1ADEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST | *diverse* BC] *ways*

In earlier English, *divers* and *diverse* were used interchangeably. In modern English, the general tendency has been to distinguish the two semantically, with *divers* meaning 'various, sundry, several' and *diverse* meaning 'different in character or quality' (see the various definitions under both *divers* and *diverse* in the Oxford English Dictionary). There are six instances of *divers(e)* in the Book of Mormon, and in each case the context suggests the meaning 'various', which implies that the modern spelling in the Book of Mormon text should be *divers*. In four of the six instances, some of the early editions replaced the manuscript spelling *divers* with *diverse,* but both the current LDS and RLDS editions have only *divers:*

Mosiah 4:29 (𝓞 is not extant)
for there are **divers** ways and means
even so many that I cannot number them

Mosiah 26:11 (𝓞 is not extant)
yea and they have been taken in **divers** iniquities

Helaman 9:19

> and they began to question him
> in [*divers* 1ADEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST | *diverse* BC] ways

Mormon 8:30 (*diver* in the 1852 LDS edition is a typo for *divers*)

> and there shall also be heard of wars and rumors of war
> and earthquakes in [*divers* 1CDEGHIJKLMNOPQRST | *diverse* AB | *diver* F] places

Moroni 7:24

> and behold there were [*divers* 1EFGHIJKLMNOPQRST | *diverse* ABCD] ways
> that he did manifest things unto the children of men

Moroni 10:16

> and again to another the interpretation of languages
> and of [*divers* 1BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST | *diverse* A] kinds of tongues

The printer's manuscript consistently reads *divers*. The original manuscript is not extant in any instance but probably also read *divers*. The spelling *diverse* shows up only occasionally in the early editions (three times in the 1830 edition, three times in the 1837 edition, two times in the 1840 edition, and once in the 1841 British edition). The critical text will follow the spelling distinction found in standard modern-day English, thus *divers* throughout the text since the meaning in the Book of Mormon is consistently 'various' rather than 'different'.

Summary: Maintain the spelling *divers* in the Book of Mormon text since the consistent meaning in all six passages where it occurs is 'various' rather than 'different'.

■ **Helaman 9:20**

thou art confederate
[*with > who is* 1 | *who is* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *this man*
that hath done this murder

Oliver Cowdery was expecting "confederate with X", the normal usage in English, so he accidentally wrote in the printer's manuscript "with this man" after *confederate*. Virtually immediately Oliver realized that he had misread the original manuscript (not extant here), which very likely read "who is this man" after *confederate*. Oliver crossed out the *with* and then supralinearly wrote *who is;* the correction is without any change in the level of ink flow.

The Oxford English Dictionary lists some citations of the predicate adjective *confederate* where there is no explicit reference to being confederate "with someone"; in the following examples (all plural), the understanding is that these individuals are confederate with each other:

Robert Henryson (about 1460)

> quhilk wer confederate straitlie in ane band
> 'which were confederate straitly in one band'

John Gay (1714)

> these sirens stand . . . confederate in the cheat

A. R. Pennington (1884)
> victories over the foes confederate against them

In all these citations (original spellings maintained), the meaning is 'united in a league, alliance, or confederacy' (the OED definition). Thus the expression "thou art confederate" without any following *with*-phrase is quite possible.

Another possibility here in Helaman 9:20 is that in the original text there was an indefinite article *a* before *confederate* ("thou art **a** confederate"). Under this reading, the word *confederate* would be a predicate noun, and the need to follow *confederate* with a *with*-phrase would be lessened. But since the earliest extant reading, "thou art confederate", will work, the critical text will maintain it.

Summary: Accept in Helaman 9:20 the unusual (but not especially difficult) use of *confederate* as a predicate adjective without any following *with*-phrase: "thou art confederate" (the corrected reading in ⅋, here the earliest extant source).

■ **Helaman 9:20**

who is this man that [*hath* 1afijlmnoqrt | *has* bcdeghkps] *done this murder*

Here the 1837 edition changed *hath* to *has*. The 1852 LDS edition restored the original *hath* but did so unintentionally, it would seem, since nearly all instances of Joseph Smith's grammatical emendation of the archaic *-(e)th* ending to *-(e)s* for the 1837 edition have been maintained in the text. For a few other examples like this one here in Helaman 9:20 (that is, where the original *hath* was restored in some later edition), see under Alma 34:8. The critical text will, of course, restore or maintain, as the case may be, each original instance of the archaic inflectional ending *-(e)th*. For a complete discussion of this editing, see under INFLECTIONAL ENDINGS in volume 3.

Summary: Maintain the original *hath* in Helaman 9:20 since this is how the earliest text reads: "who is this man that **hath** done this murder".

■ **Helaman 9:20**

and also we will grant unto thee thy life
if thou [*wilt* 1ahijklmnopqrst | *will* bcdefg] *tell us*
and acknowledge the agreement which thou hast made with him

The earliest text here reads in the indicative as "if thou **wilt**". In the 1837 edition, the *wilt* was replaced by *will,* giving the subjunctive "if thou **will**". This secondary form was maintained until the 1874 RLDS edition and the 1879 LDS edition. The critical text will maintain the earliest reading, *wilt,* although both *wilt* and *will* are theoretically possible here. For further discussion of this choice, see under Alma 8:20.

Summary: Maintain in Helaman 9:20 the indicative form *wilt* in "if thou wilt", the reading in ⅋ (the earliest extant source).

■ **Helaman 9:21**

do ye know how long the Lord your God will suffer you
that ye shall go on in this your [*ways* 1A | *way* BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *of sin*

The earliest text reads "in this your **ways** of sin". The use of the singular *this* with the plural *ways* is probably the reason why *ways* was replaced with *way* in the 1837 edition. As explained under Mosiah 7:23, the use of *this* with plural nouns occasionally occurs in the earliest text. Moreover, there is more than one way of sinning, so the plural "your ways of sin" will work. In fact, there is one other instance in the text of "way(s) of sin", and that too reads in the plural:

> Mosiah 16:5
> > he that persists in his own carnal nature
> > and goes on in the **ways** of sin and rebellion against God . . .

The critical text will therefore restore the original plural *ways* in Helaman 9:21.

Summary: Restore in Helaman 9:21 the plural *ways* in the phrase "in this your **ways** of sin", the reading of the earliest text, which is also supported by the plural phraseology "the ways of sin" in Mosiah 16:5.

■ **Helaman 9:22**

O ye had ought to begin to howl and mourn
because of the great destruction
    □ *at this time* **that** *doth await you*   1*
    □ *at this time* **which** *doth await you*   1ᶜABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQS
    □ **which** *at this time doth await you*   RT
except ye shall repent

Originally the text had the prepositional phrase "at this time" preceding the relative clause that it refers to. The earliest textual source, the printer's manuscript, reads "at this time which doth await you". (Initially in 𝓟, Oliver Cowdery wrote *that* rather than *which,* but virtually immediately he corrected the *that* to *which;* there is no change in the level of ink flow for the supralinear *which*. Since either relative pronoun will work here, 𝓞 probably read *which*.)

One can readily misread the original reading as saying that the great destruction was occurring "at this time", which is obviously not the case since the Lord is still giving this people time to repent. The editors for the 1920 LDS edition dealt with this problem by moving the relative pronoun *which* forward so that the phrase "at this time" would be within the relative clause itself: "because of the great destruction **which** at this time doth await you". Another possible emendation would be to move the prepositional phrase to the end of the relative clause: "because of the great destruction which doth await you **at this time**". One could argue that either of these readings could have been the original; if so, there must have been some mix-up in the word order during the early transmission of the text.

On the other hand, there are a good many examples in the text where a prepositional phrase is displaced from its normal position, including a few cases where the prepositional phrase is delayed until after an intervening relative clause:

Mosiah 26:23 (the original preposition is *in,* not the *unto* of the current LDS text)
and it is I that **granteth** unto him that believeth
in the end a place at my right hand

[that is, "and it is I that granteth **in the end** unto him that believeth
a place at my right hand"]

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

[that is, "and a part of those men **of Antipus** which were not slain"]

3 Nephi 11:41
therefore go forth unto this people
and **declare** the words which I have spoken
unto the ends of the earth

[that is, "and declare **unto the ends of the earth** the words
which I have spoken"]

In Helaman 9:22, we seem to have the opposite problem in word order: namely, a prepositional phrase ("at this time") belongs at the end of the relative clause (that is, "which doth await you at this time"), yet it actually precedes the relative clause ("at this time which doth await you"). It is possible that the earliest text here in Helaman 9:22 is an error. Even so, there are a few instances in the text where a prepositional phrase seems to have been moved forward from its clause, as in the following example where the prepositional phrase precedes its infinitive clause:

Alma 50:26
and they were determined **by the sword** to slay them

In Helaman 9:22, the critical text will restore the awkward placement of the prepositional phrase "at this time" before the relative clause that it belongs to ("which doth await you"); such a construction, although awkward, appears to be intended. For further discussion, see under DISPLACED PREPOSITIONAL PHRASES in volume 3.

Summary: Restore in Helaman 9:22 the word order of the earliest extant text, with the prepositional phrase preceding the relative clause that it belongs to (thus "because of the great destruction **at this time** which doth await you"); although this word order is awkward and could be an error, there is evidence elsewhere in the text that prepositional phrases may sometimes precede the clauses they belong to.

■ **Helaman 9:22**

except ye [NULL > *shall* 1|*shall* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *repent*

Here Oliver Cowdery initially wrote "except ye repent" in the printer's manuscript; then virtually immediately he inserted the modal verb *shall* before *repent* (the level of ink flow is unchanged). Undoubtedly, "except ye shall repent" was the reading of the original manuscript. For a list of other cases where Oliver omitted the modal *shall,* sometimes only momentarily, see under 1 Nephi 17:46.

Elsewhere in the original text, there are 18 occurrences of "except ye repent" and 5 more of "except ye shall repent". It is not surprising here in Helaman 9:22 that Oliver Cowdery initially wrote the more common expression ("except ye repent"). But the other is also possible, so there definitely would not have been any grammatical motivation for Oliver to have edited the text towards the less common expression. For another case where the *shall* has been omitted from the phrase "except ye shall repent", see under Jacob 3:3.

Summary: Accept in Helaman 9:22 Oliver Cowdery's correction in 𝓟 from "except ye repent" to the less common "except ye **shall** repent", undoubtedly the reading in 𝓞 (which is not extant here).

■ **Helaman 9:24**

and because I have done this
ye say that I have agreed with a man that he should do this thing
[NULL > *yea* 1 | *yea* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
because I shewed unto you this sign
ye are angry with me and seek to destroy my life

Here in the printer's manuscript, Oliver Cowdery initially wrote *because* without the preceding *yea;* then almost immediately he inserted the *yea* supralinearly (and without any change in the level of ink flow). The construction *yea because* occurs five other times in the text, as in this nearby passage:

> Helaman 7:13–14
>> behold why have ye gathered yourselves together
>> that I may tell you of your iniquities
>> **yea because** I have got upon my tower
>> that I might pour out my soul unto my God
>> because of the exceeding sorrow of my heart
>> which is because of your iniquities

There is nothing unusual about Oliver Cowdery's correction to *yea because* in Helaman 9:24. Either reading, with or without the *yea,* is possible. Thus the original manuscript, which is not extant here, probably had the *yea.*

Summary: Maintain in Helaman 9:24 the instance of *yea because,* the corrected reading in 𝓟 (the earliest extant source).

■ **Helaman 9:31**

but behold ye shall examine him
and ye shall find blood [*in* >+ *upon* 1 | *upon* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *the skirts of his cloak*

Here in the printer's manuscript, Oliver Cowdery initially wrote "**in** the skirts of his cloak". Later, with slightly heavier ink flow, Oliver crossed out the *in* and supralinearly inserted *upon.* This change could be due to editing, especially since the use of *in* here seems so strange. Of course, the correction could have been made when Oliver later proofed 𝓟 against 𝓞. This is the only example of the prepositions *in* and *upon* being mixed up in the history of the text, although there are a few examples of mix-ups between *in* and *on* (see the discussion under Alma 50:15).

Elsewhere in the text, blood always "comes **upon**" someone or their clothing, although the reference in these other cases is to responsibility rather than to actual blood:

Jacob 1:19	their blood might not come **upon** our garments
Jacob 1:19	otherwise their blood would come **upon** our garments
Mosiah 2:27	that your blood should not come **upon** me
Alma 1:13	his blood would come **upon** us for vengeance
Alma 60:10	insomuch that the blood of thousands shall come **upon** your heads for vengeance

In any case, the text consistently supports the use of the preposition *upon* when referring to blood. This evidence supports the occurrence of *upon* as the preposition in the original manuscript for Helaman 9:31.

Summary: Accept Oliver Cowdery's correction in 𝔓 of *in* to *upon* in Helaman 9:31; this correction probably occurred when Oliver proofed 𝔓 against 𝕆 (no longer extant here).

■ **Helaman 9:32**

and when ye have seen this
ye shall say : from whence cometh **this** *blood*
do we not know that [*it* 1ABCDEGHKPRST | *this* FIJLMNOQ] *is the blood of your brother*

The 1852 LDS edition accidentally replaced the pronoun *it* with *this,* probably under the influence of the preceding *this* in "from whence cometh **this** blood". The 1920 LDS edition restored the correct pronoun *it* to the LDS text. Either reading is, of course, possible. In the text, there are 33 examples of "that it is" (including this one in Helaman 9:32) and 21 of "that this is", where *that* is the subordinate conjunction.

Summary: Maintain in Helaman 9:32 the original reading with the pronoun *it* rather than *this* in "do we not know that **it** is the blood of your brother"; either reading is possible, but the earliest textual sources support the *it.*

■ **Helaman 9:33**

and then shall he tremble and [*shall* 1ABCDEFGIJLMNOPQRST | HK] *look pale*
even as if death had come upon him

The 1874 RLDS edition accidentally omitted the repeated *shall* in this conjoining of predicates. The 1908 RLDS edition restored the original *shall* to the RLDS text. Otherwise, the larger narrative here in Helaman 9 does not have the repeated *shall* in predicate conjuncts:

Helaman 9:17	and he shall confess his fault **and make known** unto us the true murderer of this judge
Helaman 9:30	and he shall stand with fear **and wist** not what to say
Helaman 9:35	and then shall he confess unto you **and deny** no more

This lack of the repeated *shall* may have led to the loss of the *shall* in verse 33.

Elsewhere in the text, there is an occasional case of a repeated *shall* in predicate conjuncts, as in these cases with inverted subject-verb order:

Mosiah 26:25   then shall they that never knew me come forth
            and shall stand before me

3 Nephi 18:30   then shall ye receive him **and shall minister** unto him
            of my flesh and blood

But there are also more examples of nonrepeated *shall* (and again with inverted subject-verb order):

1 Nephi 15:14   and then shall they know **and come** to the knowledge
            of their forefathers

Helaman 13:32   and then shall ye weep **and howl** in that day

Helaman 13:32   and then shall ye lament **and say** . . .

3 Nephi 11:26   and then shall ye immerse them in the water **and come forth** again
            out of the water

3 Nephi 24:18   then shall ye return **and discern** between the righteous
            and the wicked

Thus variation seems to be normal in this case, and we therefore let the earliest textual sources determine whether the *shall* should be repeated in conjoined predicates.

Summary: Accept the original repeated *shall* in Helaman 9:33: "and then shall he tremble and **shall** look pale".

■ **Helaman 9:36**

and then shall he say unto you
that I Nephi [knew 1PS | know ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOQRT] nothing concerning the matter
save it were given unto me by the power of God

Here in the printer's manuscript, Oliver Cowdery definitely wrote an *e* vowel for the past-tense form *knew.* The *knew,* however, was at the end of the line in 𝔓, and Oliver accidentally smeared the *e,* which makes the letter look somewhat like an *o.* This lack of clarity led the 1830 compositor to set *know* rather than the correct *knew.* In accord with the reading in 𝔓, the 1908 RLDS edition restored the original *knew.*

The verb *know* occurs in the present tense in other parts of this narrative: "do we not know" (verse 32), "behold we know" (verse 34), and "and then shall ye know" (later on in verse 36). This surrounding present-tense usage may have played a role in causing the 1830 compositor to misread the *knew* as *know* here in the first part of verse 36. The preceding instances of *know* use the plural pronouns *we* and *ye* and refer to those who will be sent to interrogate Seantum; for such sentences, the present tense is correct. But in this passage in verse 36, we have the words that Seantum will speak concerning Nephi's own foreknowledge, which Seantum will refer to in the past tense (that is, Seantum will say "Nephi **knew** nothing concerning the matter"). Thus the use of the past-tense *knew* is fully appropriate in the first part of verse 36.

Summary: In accord with the reading of the printer's manuscript, restore the past-tense *knew* in Helaman 9:36: "and then shall he say unto you that I Nephi **knew** nothing concerning the matter".

■ **Helaman 9:39**

and there were some of the Nephites
which [did believe >+ believed 1| believed ᴀʙᴄᴅᴇꜰɢʜɪᴊᴋʟᴍɴᴏᴘǫʀꜱᴛ] on the words of Nephi
and there were some also which believed because of the testimony of the five

Oliver Cowdery sometimes added the auxiliary verb *do* in the manuscripts, if only momentarily. Here in the printer's manuscript, he initially wrote "which did believe". Later he crossed out the *did* and inserted inline a *d* at the end of *believe*. These corrections are with slightly heavier ink flow and were probably made when Oliver proofed 𝓟 against 𝓞 (no longer extant here). There are a few other cases in the text where Oliver added the *do* auxiliary, usually in the context of other instances of the *do* auxiliary. In two cases, the *do* auxiliary was permanently added to the text when Oliver copied from 𝓞 into 𝓟:

> 1 Nephi 2:16
>> wherefore I [*cried* 0| *did cry* 1ᴀʙᴄᴅᴇꜰɢʜɪᴊᴋʟᴍɴᴏᴘǫʀꜱᴛ] unto the Lord
>> and behold he **did visit** me and **did soften** my heart
>> that I **did believe** all the words which had been spoken by my father

> 1 Nephi 18:11
>> Laman and Lemuel **did take** me and **bind** me with cords
>> and they **did treat** me with much harshness
>> nevertheless the Lord [*suffered* 0| *did suffer* 1ᴀʙᴄᴅᴇꜰɢʜɪᴊᴋʟᴍɴᴏᴘǫʀꜱᴛ] it

(See under those two passages for discussion.) In a couple of other cases, Oliver initially wrote the *do* auxiliary in 𝓟, perhaps in the second case because of a nearby use of the *do* auxiliary (marked below with an arrow):

> Alma 53:13
>> but it came to pass that when they saw the danger
>> and the many afflictions and tribulations
>> which the Nephites [*did > bore* 1| *bore* ᴀʙᴄᴅᴇꜰɢʜɪᴊᴋʟᴍɴᴏᴘǫʀꜱᴛ] for them
>> they were moved with compassion

> 3 Nephi 11:15
>> and it came to pass that the multitude went forth
>> and [*did > thrust* 1| *thrust* ᴀʙᴄᴅᴇꜰɢʜɪᴊᴋʟᴍɴᴏᴘǫʀꜱᴛ] their hands into his side
> → and **did feel** the prints of the nails in his hands and in his feet

In the first case, Oliver apparently started to write *did bear* in 𝓟 (for discussion, see under Alma 53:13). In the second case, he started to write *did thrust* in 𝓟. Here in Helaman 9:39, Oliver's initial *did believe* was probably influenced by the use of the auxiliary form *did* earlier in verse 37: "for according to the words he **did deny** and also according to the words he **did confess**". On the other hand, the intervening verse 38 has only instances of the *be* verb ("and he **was** brought to prove that he himself **was** the very murderer insomuch that the five **were** set at liberty and also **was** Nephi"); nevertheless, these verb forms would not have interfered much with the influence of the preceding instances of *did* in verse 37.

There are 12 other occurrences in the earliest text of "<relative pronoun> believed", including one more in Helaman 9:39: "and there were some also which **believed** because of the testimony of the five". But there are also two examples in the earliest text of "<relative pronoun> did believe":

Alma 19:35 there was many that **did believe** in their words

Helaman 16:3 there were many more which **did believe** on his words

These two passages parallel the first one in Helaman 9:39 (all three refer to believing in or on someone's words). Thus either reading is theoretically possible in Helaman 9:39, and we can assume that Oliver Cowdery's replacement of *did believe* with *believed* in 𝓟 was not influenced by grammatical considerations, only by his attempt to correctly copy the text from 𝓞 into 𝓟.

Summary: Accept in Helaman 9:39 the corrected reading in 𝓟 of *believed* instead of *did believe;* although not extant here, 𝓞 probably read *believed* since either *believed* or *did believe* is possible.

■ **Helaman 9:41**

behold he is a god for except he was a god
he [would > could 1 | could ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *not know of all things*

Oliver Cowdery initially wrote *would* here in 𝓟; then virtually immediately he crossed out the *would* and wrote *could* supralinearly (there is no difference in the level of ink flow for the correction). Elsewhere in the text, there are four instances of "would know" and one of "could know" (marked below with an asterisk):

2 Nephi 32:8 ye **would know** that ye must pray

Alma 10:6 yet I **would** not **know**

* Alma 10:17 now they knew not that Amulek **could know** of their design

Alma 43:22 that the armies of Moroni **would know** whither they had gone

3 Nephi 28:33 ye **would** . . . **know** that these things must surely come

So either reading is theoretically possible here in Helaman 9:41; the critical text will follow the corrected reading in 𝓟, "he **could** not know of all things".

Summary: Accept in Helaman 9:41 Oliver Cowdery's correction in 𝓟 of "would not know" to "could not know"; this correction undoubtedly represents the reading in 𝓞, no longer extant here.

■ **Helaman 9:41**

for except he was a god
*he could not know [*NULL *>- of 1 | of* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *all things*

Here in 𝓟, Oliver Cowdery initially wrote "he could not know all things". Somewhat later, with weaker ink flow, he supralinearly inserted *of* after *know*. Oliver's correction may have occurred when he proofed 𝓟 against 𝓞. As explained under Alma 17:16, there has been a tendency in the history of the text to omit the *of* from instances of "to know **of** X" (but not to insert the *of* in instances of "to know X"). In either case, we follow the earliest textual sources in determining whether the original text read "to know X" or "to know **of** X".

Elsewhere in the text, there are ten instances of "to know all things", but no others of "to know **of** all things". The predominance of the form without the *of* may have led Oliver Cowdery to initially omit the *of* here in Helaman 9:41.

Summary: Maintain in Helaman 9:41 the use of *of* in "he could not know **of** all things", the corrected reading in 𝒫 (the earliest extant reading).

■ **Helaman 9:41**

for except he was a god
he could not know of **all things**
for behold he hath told us the thoughts of our hearts
and also hath told us **things**
and even he hath brought unto our knowledge the true murderer of our chief judge

Ross Geddes (personal communication, 22 September 2004) suggests that here in Helaman 9:41 the original text twice read *all things* but that in the second case the *all* was lost during the early transmission of the text, giving "and also hath told us **things**" instead of the correct "and also hath told us **all things**". Nonetheless, it is possible "to tell things", as in Alma 19:34: "and thus they had told them **things of God**". In this earlier example, an expected *the* before *things* is lacking, just like here in "and also hath told us things". Moreover, the people here in Helaman 9:41 can say that Nephi told them not only their thoughts but also actual events and deeds (in particular, who had murdered the chief judge). As suggested by David Calabro (personal communication), such a distinction between thoughts and things would explain the use of *also* in this sentence: "he hath told us the thoughts of our hearts and **also** hath told us things".

In addition, one could propose that this conjoined predicate is missing an *of*. In other words, the original text could have read "and also hath told us **of** things"—or even "and also hath told us **of all** things", which parallels the earlier clause "he could not know **of all** things". Note, for instance, the parallel usage in another passage where there is an instance of "know of" followed by an instance of "tell of":

   Jacob 7:7
      for no man knoweth **of** such things
      for he cannot tell **of** things to come

Ultimately, here in Helaman 9:41 the critical text will reject these proposed emendations (an *of* or an *all* before *things*) since the earliest extant reading, "and also hath told us things", will work.

Don Brugger points out (personal communication) that the verb *tell* here can be interpreted as meaning 'foretell'. Brugger does not propose that there is necessarily an error here in the text, but instead that in older English *tell* had the now obsolete meaning 'to reveal (something future); to foretell, predict' (see definition 5b under the verb *tell* in the Oxford English Dictionary). And this is precisely what Nephi has done with his telling of things, as in his earlier use in verse 25 of the word *thing* to refer to his predictions: "and see if ye will in **this thing** seek to destroy me". Thus the earliest text here in verse 41 appears to be equivalent to "and also hath **foretold** us things". The OED gives an interesting citation from a sermon of Wycliffe's dating from late Middle English that supports this interpretation:

   John Wycliffe (about 1380)
      þis Gospel of Mark bigynneþ how Crist was **teld** in þe olde lawe
      'this gospel of Mark begins with how Christ was foretold in the old law'

The verb *foretell* occurs only once in the Book of Mormon text, but interestingly it is followed by a use of the verb *tell* that also has the meaning 'foretell':

> 2 Nephi 25:9–10
>> and never hath any of them been destroyed
>> save it were **foretold** them by the prophets of the Lord
>> wherefore it hath been **told** them concerning the destruction
>> which should come upon them immediately after my father left Jerusalem

Thus the archaic meaning 'foretell' for the verb *tell* supports maintaining the phraseology "and also hath **told** us things" in Helaman 9:41.

Summary: Maintain in Helaman 9:41 the earliest extant reading, "and also hath told us things" (the reading in 𝓟); this reading is acceptable, so emendations like *all things* and *of things* (or even *of all things*) are unnecessary; in this instance, the verb *tell* appears to mean 'foretell'.

Helaman 10

■ **Helaman 10:4**

blessed art thou Nephi
for those things which thou hast done
for I [have 1ABCDEGHIJKLMNOPQRST | NULL > *have* F] *beheld*
how thou hast with unwearyingness declared the word

In the first printing of the 1852 LDS edition, the perfect *have* in "I have beheld" was accidentally omitted. In the second printing, the *have* was supplied, probably by reference to the 1840 edition. Although the simple past-tense *beheld* will work, the surrounding text is in the perfect ("which thou **hast** done" and "how thou **hast** . . . declared the word"). The original "I have beheld" will be maintained in the critical text.

Summary: Maintain the perfect "I have beheld" in Helaman 10:4, the reading of the earliest extant source (the printer's manuscript).

■ **Helaman 10:4**

and thou **hast** *not feared them and* **hast** *not sought thine own life*
but [hath 1A | *have* BCDEFGHIJKLMNPQS | *hast* ORT] *sought my will*

Here at the beginning of the sentence, we have *thou hast* and a conjoined *hast* in the earliest text ("and thou **hast** not feared them and **hast** not sought thine own life"). But this is then conjoined with the biblically styled *hath* ("but **hath** sought my will") rather than with *hast.* In the 1837 edition, the *hath* was emended to the plural *have,* which was still not correct for the subject pronoun *thou.* Finally, the 1907 LDS vest-pocket edition (and later the 1920 LDS edition, probably independently) supplied the standard *hast* in the LDS text. Elsewhere in the earliest text, there is one other example of a conjoined predicate of this nature:

> Ether 3:3
>> behold O Lord thou **hast** smitten us because of our iniquity
>> and [*hath* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNPQS | *hast* ORT] driven us forth

And once more the 1907 and 1920 LDS editions made the change to the correct *hast.* The critical text will restore these two instances of *and hath* conjoined with *thou hast.* Note that the biblically styled *hath* was acceptable in this construction because the *thou* and the *hath* do not occur adjacent to each other, neither as *thou hath* nor as *hath thou.* There are no instances in the original text of that kind of usage.

Summary: Restore the two instances (in Helaman 10:4 and Ether 3:3) of *and hath* conjoined with a preceding *thou hast,* the reading of the earliest extant text (the printer's manuscript in both cases).

■ **Helaman 10:5**

for thou [*shalt* 1ACGHIJKLMNOPQRST | *shall* BDEF] *not ask*
that which is contrary to my will

> As discussed under Mosiah 12:11, there are a number of cases in the history of the text where an original *shalt* was replaced by *shall.* Here in Helaman 10:5, the 1837 edition accidentally changed *thou shalt* to *thou shall.* This nonstandard usage was retained in the first three British editions, but the correct *thou shalt* was restored in the 1840 edition and in the 1879 LDS edition. The critical text will maintain *thou shalt.* There were a few instances in the earliest text of *thou shall,* as explained under Mosiah 12:11.

Summary: Maintain the original instance of *thou shalt* in Helaman 10:5, the reading of the earliest textual sources.

■ **Helaman 10:8–9**

and thus if ye shall say unto this temple :
    it shall be rent in twain
[*&* 1 | *and* A | BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *it shall be done*

and if ye shall say unto this mountain :
    be thou cast down and become smooth
[*&* 1 | *and* A | BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *it shall be done*

> Here in the original text, we have two instances of the Hebraistic *if-and* construction. These unexpected *and*'s were removed in the editing for the 1837 edition, but as explained under 1 Nephi 17:50 and Helaman 12:13–21, the critical text will restore these *and*'s since they were definitely intended in the original text. For a complete listing of all instances of this literal Hebraism in the original text, see under HEBRAISMS in volume 3.
>
> It is worth noting here that not every sentence-initial *if*-clause has an *and* before its following main clause. For instance, in the subsequent verse in Helaman 10 we have a normal *if*-clause without any extra *and* before its following main clause:

> Helaman 10:10 (earliest extant reading)
>   and behold if ye shall say that
>   God shall smite this people
>   it shall come to pass

> For each possible case of the Hebraistic *and,* we follow the reading of the earliest textual sources, thus restoring the original *and*'s in verses 8 and 9 but leaving verse 10 without any extra *and.*

Summary: Restore the two cases of the Hebraistic *and* in Helaman 10:8–9, where *and* separates a preceding *if*-clause from its following main clause.

■ **Helaman 10:10**

and behold if ye shall say
[*that* 1BCDEFGHIJKMNOPQRT | *That* AL | S]
God shall smite this people
it shall come to pass

Elsewhere in the text, if an *if*-clause has a quotation introduced by the verb *say,* the subordinate conjunction *that* never precedes the quotation. We see this, for instance, in the two preceding verses here in Helaman 10:

> Helaman 10:8–9
>> and thus if ye shall say unto this temple :
>>> it shall be rent in twain
>> and it shall be done
>
>> and if ye shall say unto this mountain :
>>> be thou cast down and become smooth
>> and it shall be done

We find the same for all other series of *if*-clauses with direct quotes:

> 2 Nephi 2:13
>> and if ye shall say
>>> there is no law
>> ye shall also say
>>> there is no sin
>
>> and if ye shall say
>>> there is no sin
>> ye shall also say
>>> there is no righteousness

> Alma 27:7–8,10
>> and if he saith unto us :
>>> go down unto our brethren
>> will ye go
>
>> yea if the Lord saith unto us :
>>> go
>> we will go down unto our brethren
>
>> and if he saith unto us :
>>> go
>> we will go

> Helaman 12:13–14
>> yea and if he saith unto the earth :
>>> move
>> and it is moved
>
>> yea if he say unto the earth :
>>> thou shalt go back that it lengthen out the day for many hours
>> and it is done

Helaman 12:16–21

   and behold also if he saith unto the waters of the great deep :
      be thou dried up
   and it is done

   behold if he saith unto this mountain :
      be thou raised up and come over and fall upon that city that it be buried up
   and behold it is done

   and behold if a man hideth up a treasure in the earth and the Lord shall say :
      let it be accursed because of the iniquity of him that hath hid it up
   behold it shall be accursed

   and if the Lord shall say :
      be thou accursed that no man shall find thee from this time
         henceforth and forever
   and behold no man getteth it henceforth and forever

   and behold if the Lord shall say unto a man :
      because of thine iniquities thou shalt be accursed forever
   and it shall be done

   and if the Lord shall say :
      because of thine iniquities thou shalt be cut off from my presence
   and he will cause that it shall be so

And the same holds for various isolated instances of *if*-clauses where *say* introduces a quotation:

   1 Nephi 17:50
   if he should command me that I should say unto this water :
      be thou earth
   and it shall be earth

   2 Nephi 28:6
   if they shall say
      there is a miracle wrought by the hand of the Lord
   believe it not

   Alma 22:7
   and if now thou sayest
      there is a God
   behold I will believe

   Alma 37:12
   and it may suffice if I only say
      they are preserved for a wise purpose

   Helaman 13:27
   but behold if a man shall come among you and shall say :
      do this and there is no iniquity
      do that and ye shall not suffer . . .

Thus it is not surprising that in Helaman 10:10 the *that* was omitted in the 1953 RLDS edition, even if unintentionally.

In standard English we expect the *that* when the quote is indirect, but not when the quote is direct:

- □ *indirect quote*

   he said **that** he was coming

- □ *direct quote*

   he said: "I am coming"

Here in Helaman 10:10, the quote can be interpreted as either indirect or direct, so *that* is clearly acceptable in standard English. Even so, it is worth noting that the Book of Mormon text allows *that* even when the quote is direct, as in the following example:

   1 Nephi 3:15 (𝒪 is extant here and has the *that*)
   but behold I said unto them **that**
   as the Lord liveth and as we live
   we will not go down unto our father in the wilderness
   until we have accomplished the thing which the Lord hath commanded us

Thus there is no grammatical or textual motivation to remove the *that* here in Helaman 10:10; the critical text will maintain this unique reading with the *that*.

Summary: Maintain the subordinate conjunction *that* in Helaman 10:10: "and behold if ye shall say **that** God shall smite this people / it shall come to pass" (the reading in 𝒫, here the earliest extant source).

■ **Helaman 10:11**

thus saith the Lord God
who is [the ᴀʙᴄᴅᴇғɢɪᴊʟᴍɴᴏǫʀᴛ | ʜᴋᴘꜱ] Almighty
except ye repent
ye shall be smitten even unto destruction

The 1874 RLDS edition dropped the definite article *the* before the word *Almighty*. This reading has continued in the RLDS text, although perhaps *Almighty* should be spelled with a lowercase *a* ("the Lord God who is almighty"). The loss of the *the* is probably a typo rather than the result of conscious editing, especially since the capitalization was not changed.

There are no examples elsewhere in the text of *almighty* occurring as a predicate adjective. In three cases, *almighty* modifies a common noun:

1 Nephi 17:46	the power of his almighty word
Alma 54:6	the sword of his almighty wrath
Mormon 9:26	the almighty power of the Lord

In a number of cases, *almighty* is used to directly modify *God* and is therefore capitalized:

"the Almighty God"	4 times
"O Lord God Almighty"	2 times
"the Lord God Almighty"	2 times

Besides the case here in Helaman 10:11 of "the Almighty", there is one other example of "the Almighty", in a quote from Isaiah 13:6 (in the King James Bible):

> 2 Nephi 23:6
>> howl ye / for the day of the Lord is at hand
>> it shall come as a destruction from **the Almighty**

Thus "who is the Almighty" is supported by usage elsewhere in the text, but "who is almighty" is not. Of course, either reading is possible in English, so we simply follow the earliest reading. The critical text will maintain the original reading here in Helaman 10:11, "who is the Almighty".

Summary: Retain the definite article *the* before *Almighty* in Helaman 10:11.

Helaman 11

■ **Helaman 11:1**

And [*now it* 1ABCFGHIJKLMNOPQRST | *it now* DE] *came to pass*
in the seventy and second year of the reign of the judges
that the contentions did increase

Here the 1841 British edition mixed up the word order, switching *now it* to *it now*. The 1849 LDS edition followed this secondary reading, but the 1852 LDS edition restored the original word order. As might be suspected, there are no actual instances in the text of "and it now came to pass", but there are 105 of "and now it came to pass" (see the discussion under Alma 45:15). The critical text will follow the expected word order.

Summary: Maintain the normal word order for the phrase "and now it came to pass" in Helaman 11:1 and elsewhere in the text.

■ **Helaman 11:3**

and it came to pass [*that* 1ABCDEFGIJLMNOPQRST | HK] *in this year*
Nephi did cry unto the Lord saying . . .

Here the earliest text has the subordinate conjunction *that* before "in this year". The 1874 RLDS text accidentally omitted the *that* here, but it was restored to the RLDS text in 1908. The normal situation is to have a *that* between "it came to pass" and "in this year" (at least six other times in the text). There is one example of a *that* after this prepositional phrase: "and it came to pass also in this year **that** there were some dissenters which had gone forth unto the Lamanites" (Alma 63:14). And there is one example where there is no *that* at all: "and now it came to pass in this year . . . there were a great division among the people" (4 Nephi 1:35). Finally, there is one unclear case with variation in the earliest textual sources; see under Mormon 1:8 for discussion of that case.

Summary: Maintain in Helaman 11:3 the *that* between "it came to pass" and "in this year", the reading of the earliest extant source (𝓟 in this case).

■ **Helaman 11:6**

and this work of destruction did also continue
in the seventy and fifth [NULL >+ *year* 1 | *year* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]

Here in the printer's manuscript, Oliver Cowdery initially wrote "in the seventy and fifth". Somewhat later he supralinearly inserted the expected *year* with slightly heavier ink flow, perhaps after

redipping his quill. There are no examples in the original text of the specification for a year without the word *year* unless the word *year* appears earlier in the same sentence. For a list of cases where *year* is properly ellipted in the original text, see under Helaman 3:3. All the evidence elsewhere in the text argues that the word *year* was in the original text for Helaman 11:6 and also in ⊙, no longer extant here.

Summary: Accept in Helaman 11:6 the corrected reading in 𝒫, "in the seventy and fifth **year**".

■ **Helaman 11:7**

and they began to remember

  □ *the Lord their God* **and they began to remember**   1ABCDEFIJLMNOPQRST
  □ NULL   GHK

the words of Nephi

Here the typesetter for the 1858 Wright edition accidentally skipped the words "the Lord their God and they began to remember"; his eye skipped from the first to the second instance of "and they began to remember", thus omitting that second instance and the immediately preceding "the Lord their God". The first two RLDS editions followed the shortened reading, but the third RLDS edition (in 1908) restored the correct longer reading.

Summary: Maintain in Helaman 11:7 the original longer reading, "and they began to remember the Lord their God and they began to remember the words of Nephi".

■ **Helaman 11:14**

O Lord thou didst hearken unto my **words**
when I said let there be a famine
that the pestilence of the [*word* > *sword* 1 | *sword* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *might cease*

Here Oliver Cowdery initially wrote *word* instead of the correct *sword* in the printer's manuscript. His error was very likely influenced by the visual similarity between *word* and *sword* and may have also been influenced by the preceding *words* in "unto my words". Virtually immediately Oliver caught his error here and inserted inline an *s* before the *w* (there is no change in the level of ink flow for the inserted *s*). This momentary error reminds us of the case in 1 Nephi 12:18 where *sword* was misread as *word,* an error that has never been corrected in any printed edition (see the discussion under that passage). Of course, here in Helaman 11:14 *sword* is a much more reasonable reading than *word.*

   One potential problem here in Helaman 11:14 is that modern readers might wonder how the sword could be considered a pestilence. We expect pestilences like disease and vermin, but not the sword. Moreover, pestilence is always distinguished from the sword and from famine elsewhere in the Book of Mormon text:

   Alma 10:22   but it would be by famine and by pestilence and the sword
   Alma 10:23   then ye shall be smitten by famine and by pestilence and by the sword

Helaman 13:9   yea I will visit them with the sword and with famine
                            and with pestilence

And we can find similar examples in the books of Jeremiah and Ezekiel in the King James Bible, as in Jeremiah 27:8: "that nation will I punish saith the LORD with the sword and with the famine and with the pestilence". But the King James Bible has one example where *pestilence* is figuratively referred to as "the sword of the Lord", although the literal sword of David's enemies is not called a pestilence:

> 1 Chronicles 21:12
>   either three years' famine
>   or three months to be destroyed before thy foes
>   while that the sword of thine enemies overtaketh *thee*
>   or else three days the sword of the LORD—even the pestilence in the land—
>   and the angel of the LORD destroying throughout all the coasts of Israel

David chose the third of these curses, and indeed the angel that kills seventy thousand men is seen by David as "having a drawn sword in his hand" (1 Chronicles 21:14–16). Thus the sword of the Lord can be referred to as a "pestilence in the land".

The Oxford English Dictionary, under the noun *pestilence,* gives examples from Middle and Early Modern English with figurative meanings for the noun that will work here in Helaman 11:14. For instance, definition 3, designated as obsolete, states that a pestilence can be 'that which plagues, injures, or troubles in any way'. In fact, one of the citations from Early Modern English specifically refers to war as a pestilence:

> Thomas Starkey (1538)
>   In no cuntrey may be any grettur pestylens . . . then cyuyle warre.
>   'in no country may be any greater pestilence . . . than civil war'

Thus the reference to the sword, the symbol of war, as a pestilence is quite acceptable in Helaman 11:14. Despite the uniqueness of the phrase "the pestilence of the sword" in the Book of Mormon text, the critical text will maintain this reading.

Summary: Accept Oliver Cowdery's corrected reading in Helaman 11:14, the use of *sword* in "the pestilence of the sword"; the reference to the sword (that is, war) as a pestilence is supported by usage from Early Modern English, including the King James Bible in 1 Chronicles 21:12.

■ **Helaman 11:14**

for thou [*saidst* 1AIJLMNOPQRST | *said* BCDEFG | *hast said* HK] *that . . .*

The original text here reads *thou saidst,* with the standard *-st* ending for the past-tense *said* when the subject is *thou*. This reading was changed to *thou said* in the 1837 edition, which continued in the editions until the 1870s. The 1874 RLDS edition corrected *thou said* by adding the perfect auxiliary *have,* giving *thou hast said* (but ultimately, in 1908, the RLDS text restored the original *thou saidst* by reference to the printer's manuscript). In the 1879 LDS edition, the correct *thou saidst* was restored to the LDS text. Orson Pratt, the editor for that edition, may have consulted the

1830 edition, but that would not have been necessary since *thou said* is grammatically nonstandard. In any event, the current texts, both LDS and RLDS, maintain the original reading, *thou saidst.*

In most cases, the earliest text has the *-(e)st* ending for the simple past-tense verb form when the subject is *thou,* but there are a few cases where the *-(e)st* is lacking. In the following list, I first give one example of the standard usage, then every case where the *-(e)st* is missing (marked with an asterisk), whether in the earliest textual source or secondarily in an edition:

    □ *thou didst* (18 times) versus *thou did* (2 times)

        1 Nephi 20:6 (extant in 𝓞; quoting Isaiah 48:6)
          and thou **didst** not know them

    * 2 Nephi 24:12 (not extant in 𝓞; quoting Isaiah 14:12, which has *didst*)
          art thou cut down to the ground
          which **did** weaken the nations

    * Ether 12:31 (edited to *thus didst thou* in the 1879 LDS edition)
          for thus [*did* 1ABCDEFGHKPS | *didst* IJLMNOQRT] thou manifest thyself
            unto thy disciples

    □ *thou said(e)st* (2 times) versus *thou said* (0 times)

        Alma 11:25 (*saidest* edited to *saidst* by John Gilbert for the 1830 edition)
          for thou [*saidest* >jg *saidst* 1 | *saidst* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] unto me

    * Helaman 11:14 (changed to *said* in the 1837 edition)
          for thou [*saidst* 1AIJLMNOPQRST | *said* BCDEFG | *hast said* HK] that . . .

    □ *thou hadst* (1 time) versus *thou had* (1 time)

        1 Nephi 20:18 (quoting Isaiah 48:18, extant in 𝓞)
          O that thou **hadst** hearkened to my commandments

    * Alma 11:25 (edited to *thou hadst* in the 1911 LDS edition)
          when thou [*had* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPS | *hadst* QRT] it in thy heart
          to retain them from me

    □ *thou comforted(e)st* (1 time) versus *thou comforted* (0 times)

        2 Nephi 22:1 (quoting Isaiah 12:1, which has *comfortedest,* the current LDS reading)
          and thou [*comfortedst* 1ABCDEGHKPS | *comfortedest* FIJLMNOQRT] me

    □ *thou receivedst* (0 times) versus *thou received* (1 time)

    * Alma 8:15 (edited to *thou receivedst* in the 1920 LDS edition)
          from the time which thou [*received* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQS | *receivedst* RT]
          thy first message from him

In the earliest text, then, there are four instances with no inflectional ending for the simple past-tense verb form when the subject is *thou.* And there is one case, here in Helaman 11:14, where that ending was omitted in one of the later editions. Ultimately, the LDS text has none of these nonstandard forms except for the one in 2 Nephi 24:12 where the *thou* is in an earlier clause. The critical text will restore these few instances where the earliest extant text lacks the *-(e)st* ending. For

further discussion, see under 2 Nephi 24:12 for the use of *did* in the relative clause "art thou cut down to the ground which **did** weaken the nations".

Summary: Maintain in Helaman 11:14 the standard *thou saidst,* in this case the reading of the earliest textual sources.

■ **Helaman 11:15**

and thou seest that they have repented
because of **the** *famine*
and **the** *pestilence and destruction*
which [*has* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNPQRT | *have* OS] *come unto them*

The question here concerns the antecedent of the relative pronoun *which:* namely, does it include "the famine"? And if not, is "the pestilence and destruction" acting as a singular or as a plural? The 1907 LDS vest-pocket edition and the 1953 RLDS edition changed the original singular verb form *has* to the plural *have,* probably because the editors (or typesetters) of these editions viewed the antecedent as plural (irrespective of whether it included *famine*).

Note that here in Helaman 11:15 there is no repeated *the* before *destruction*. This same non-parallel conjunctiveness is found in Helaman 10:6:

> Helaman 10:6
>
> that ye shall have power over this people
> and shall smite the earth **with** famine
> and **with** pestilence and destruction

In this earlier passage, the preposition *with* is not repeated before *destruction*, but it is found before both *famine* and *pestilence;* the definite article *the* patterns the same way in Helaman 11:15. These two passages thus support the idea that "pestilence and destruction" can be considered a unit—that is, as a singular.

On the other hand, the context here in Helaman 11 implies that "the famine" as well as "the pestilence and destruction" is something that "has come unto them", which may mean that we have a plural sense here in verse 15 even if "pestilence and destruction" is acting as a unit. Note the following example where *famine* is conjoined with *pestilence* and *destruction:*

> 2 Nephi 10:6
>
> wherefore because of their iniquities /
> destructions famines pestilences and bloodsheds shall come upon them

This passage refers to destructions, famines, and pestilences all coming upon these people—that is, we have the same nominal and verbal phraseology: the three nouns *famine, pestilence,* and *destruction* (although the grammatical number is different), plus the verbal expression "come upon someone", equivalent to "come unto someone". This parallelism argues that the intent in Helaman 11:15 is to say that "the famine" and "the pestilence and destruction" had come upon the Nephites, not just "the pestilence and destruction". The repeated *the* implies that we have a plural antecedent for the relative pronoun *which*. Therefore, from a grammatical point of view, the *has* of the current LDS text could be edited to *have*. The critical text, of course, allows *has* to serve as

the verb form for plural subjects; for a list of examples, see under Mosiah 7:20. For other cases where there is a question of whether a conjunctive subject is to be considered singular or plural, see under Alma 29:5 (for "good and evil") and Helaman 3:32 (for "peace and great joy").

Summary: The antecedent for the relative pronoun *which* in Helaman 11:15 is probably the whole conjoined noun phrase ("the famine and the pestilence and destruction"); the repeated *the* implies that this noun phrase is plural, and therefore the singular verb form *has* should probably be edited to *have* in the standard text; the critical text will, of course, maintain the earliest reading with the *has*.

■ **Helaman 11:16**

and if so O Lord
thou canst bless them
according to thy [*word* 1|*words* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
which thou hast said

The printer's manuscript, here the earliest extant source, has the singular *word;* the 1830 compositor (accidentally, it would seem) set the plural *words.* Elsewhere the text has instances of both *thy word* and *thy words,* two of which refer to deity:

	the Lord's	*a person's*
thy word	1	2
thy words	1	8

The statistics are more distinguishing for the phrase *my word(s),* with 12 examples of the singular *my word* and 18 of the plural *my words* in referring to deity; for a complete discussion, see under 1 Nephi 16:24. In one nearby example (Helaman 10:4), the Lord, in speaking to Nephi, declares, "for I have beheld how thou hast with unwearyingness declared **the word** which I have given unto thee unto this people", which uses the same singular *word* in referring to the Lord's word as here in Helaman 11:16: "thou canst bless them according to **thy word** which thou hast said". The critical text will follow the earliest extant reading here in Helaman 11:16, namely, "according to thy **word**". For lists of other places in the text where *word* and *words* have been mixed up, see under Alma 35:3, Alma 37:20, and Alma 42:31. Also see under Mosiah 20:21 for discussion regarding the phrase "the word(s) of the Lord".

Summary: Restore in Helaman 11:16 the singular *word* since it is the reading of the earliest extant source (here the printer's manuscript); in general, the text allows either the singular *word* or the plural *words* in referring to the word(s) of the Lord.

■ **Helaman 11:18**

but they did esteem him as a great prophet
and [NULL >+ *a* 1|*a* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *man of God*

Oliver Cowdery initially wrote "as a great prophet and man of God" in the printer's manuscript. Somewhat later, he supralinearly inserted a repeated indefinite article *a* before "man of God". The ink flow is slightly heavier and definitely broader, so there was some change in the quill prior to

this correction. The correction was probably the result of proofing 𝒫 against 𝒪, no longer extant here. Since the initial reading is fully acceptable, Oliver's only motivation for inserting the *a* in 𝒫 would have been to make sure that 𝒫 read like 𝒪.

There are two other examples involving the indefinite article *a* where the noun *prophet* is conjoined with another noun, and in both cases the *a* is repeated, just like here in Helaman 11:18:

> Mosiah 8:16
> and Ammon saith that
> a seer is a revelator and **a** prophet also

> Helaman 9:16
> that he might raise himself
> to be a great man chosen of God and **a** prophet

The original (and current) text of the Book of Mormon has numerous examples of the repeated *a* in conjuncts of noun phrases; for a nearby example where the *a* was lost, see under Helaman 1:5 (although in that case the initial *a,* not the repeated *a,* was lost). For a complete list of the repeated *a* in the Book of Mormon text, see under CONJUNCTIVE REPETITION in volume 3. For each instance, we follow the earliest textual sources in determining whether the indefinite article should be repeated or not.

Summary: Accept Oliver Cowdery's insertion of the repeated *a* in Helaman 11:18 ("as a great prophet and **a** man of God"); the accidental loss of such repetition has occurred fairly often in the history of the text.

■ **Helaman 11:21**

[& 1|*And* A|*and* BCDEFGHIJLMNOPQRST| K] *thus ended the seventy*
[& 1|*and* ABCDEFGHIJLMNOPQRST|*and and* K] *seventh year*

In the 1892 RLDS edition, the *and* at the beginning of this sentence was accidentally shifted to later in the sentence, creating a dittography ("thus ended the seventy **and and** seventh year". This error was not noticed because the end of the line came between the two *and*'s. There doesn't seem to have been any intent here to consciously delete the *and* at the beginning of the sentence.

In the original text, there are 50 instances of "and thus ended something". But there are no instances in the original text where a clause actually begins with "thus ended something". There is one case where there is a preceding "it came to pass that", but that too has an initial *and:* "**and** it came to pass that **thus ended** this year" (Helaman 11:32). There is one case, in Alma 16:21, where Joseph Smith removed the *and* in his editing for the 1837 edition; in that case, the *and* also served as a Hebraistic separator between a preceding present participial *after*-clause and its following main clause (for discussion, see under that passage). The point here is that no clause in the text ever begins with "thus ended something"; there is either an immediately preceding *and* or the Hebraistic "and it came to pass that".

Summary: Maintain the occurrence of *and* before "thus ended the seventy and seventh year" in Helaman 11:21, the earliest extant reading; for all other occurrences in the original text of the expression "thus ended something", the clause begins with an *and.*

■ **Helaman 11:22**

save it were a few contentions
[NULL > *concerning* 1 | *concerning* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *the points of doctrine which had been laid down by the prophets*

Here in the printer's manuscript, Oliver Cowdery initially skipped the word *concerning*. He wrote "save it were a few contentions" at the end of the line in 𝒫; then he started the next line with "the points of doctrine". Virtually immediately Oliver caught his error and supralinearly inserted the participial preposition *concerning* (there is no change in the level of ink flow for the correction). The temporary loss of *concerning* was probably the result of the transition to a new line in 𝒫, plus the visual similarity between *concerning* and the previous word, *contentions*.

It is nonetheless possible that 𝒪 was missing the preposition here and Oliver Cowdery decided that *concerning* was the best candidate. For example, the original text could have had *regarding* as the preposition here ("save it were a few contentions **regarding** the points of doctrine"). But it should be noted that the participial preposition *regarding* never occurs in the Book of Mormon. In addition, the text otherwise uses only *concerning* whenever it needs to describe the issue that the noun *contention* refers to:

Alma 50:25   a **contention** which took place among them **concerning** the land of Lehi

Alma 51:2   a **contention** among the people **concerning** the chief judge Parhoron

Alma 51:12   their **contentions concerning** the chief judge Parhoron

Helaman 1:2   a serious **contention concerning** who should have the judgment seat

Helaman 2:1   a **contention** again among the people **concerning** who should fill the judgment seat

Another possible preposition for Helaman 11:22 is *about* (thus "a few contentions **about** the points of doctrine"). Although the noun phrase "contention(s) **about** something" is not found in the text, there is one example of the verb phrase "to contend **about** something":

Alma 21:11   and they contended with many **about** the word

So in theory Helaman 11:22 could have originally read "a few contentions **about** the points of doctrine". But since Helaman 11:22 has the noun *contention,* not the verb *contend,* it is more likely that the correct preposition in this case is *concerning* rather than *about*.

Summary: Maintain the participial preposition *concerning* in Helaman 11:22, the corrected reading in 𝒫; all other references in the text to the subject matter of a contention use the word *concerning*.

■ **Helaman 11:24**

there were a certain number of the dissenters from the people of Nephi which had some years before gone over unto the Lamanites and [*took* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQS | *taken* RT] *upon themselves the name of Lamanites*

The problem here is whether the original *took* is acting as the simple past-tense form of the verb *take* ("which . . . took upon themselves the name of Lamanites") or as the past-participial form

("which had . . . took upon themselves the name of Lamanites"). The editors for the 1920 LDS edition interpreted *took* as the past participle; they therefore grammatically emended *took* to the standard past-participial form *taken.* For another example of this same editorial decision, see under Alma 8:26. For some other examples of this same conjunctive construction in the original text, see under 1 Nephi 1:14. The critical text will, of course, restore the earliest reading here in Helaman 11:24, "and **took** upon themselves the name of Lamanites", irrespective of how *took* should be interpreted. In each case of *took* versus *taken,* the critical text will follow the earliest textual sources. For further discussion of past-participial *took,* see under PAST PARTICIPLE in volume 3.

Summary: Restore the original verb form *took* in Helaman 11:24: "and **took** upon themselves the name of Lamanites"; this verb form may be either the simple past-tense form *took* or the equivalent of the standard past-participial form *taken.*

■ **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
receiving daily an addition to their numbers
[*in as much* 1 | *inasmuch* ABCDEFGIJLMNOPQRST | *insomuch* HK] *as there were dissenters*
that went forth unto them

Here the 1874 RLDS edition accidentally replaced *inasmuch* with the visually similar, but semantically different, *insomuch.* In this instance, the phrase "inasmuch as" means 'to the degree that'. The 1908 RLDS edition restored the correct *inasmuch* to the RLDS text. See under 2 Nephi 1:20 for one other case where these two words were momentarily mixed up in the transmission of the text.

Summary: Maintain the original *inasmuch* in Helaman 11:25, the reading of the earliest extant sources (including the printer's manuscript).

■ **Helaman 11:30–31**

and they were also visited with much destruction
[NULL >+ & 1 | *and* ABCDEFGHKPS | *And* IJLMNOQRT] *they were again obliged*
    to return out of the wilderness

Here in the printer's manuscript, Oliver Cowdery initially omitted the *and.* Later, probably when he proofed 𝒫 against 𝒪, Oliver supralinearly inserted an ampersand with slightly heavier ink flow. The connective *and* seems necessary here, given the connective style of the Book of Mormon text. The critical text will maintain the *and* here at the beginning of verse 31.

Summary: Maintain in Helaman 11:31 the *and* at the beginning of the sentence (thus "**and** they were again obliged to return out of the wilderness"); the inserted *and* in 𝒫 appears to be the result of proofing 𝒫 against 𝒪 and not editing.

■ **Helaman 11:32**

*and the robbers did still increase and wax strong
insomuch that they did defy the whole* **armies** *of the Nephites
and also of the Lamanites*

Joanne Case suggests (personal communication, 10 June 2004) that the noun phrase "the whole armies" seems strange. In English we expect *whole* to occur with singular noun forms. Thus one wonders if "the whole armies" could be an error for "the whole army". There is evidence in the manuscripts that Oliver Cowdery sometimes mixed up *army* and *armies:*

> Alma 47:27 (initial error in ⊙)
> and it came to pass that Amalickiah commanded that
> his [*army > armies* 0 | *armies* 1ABCDEFGIJLMNOPQRST | *servants* HK]
> should march forth

> Alma 52:20 (initial error in 𝒫)
> and it came to pass that they sent embassies
> to the [*army* 0ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST | *armies > army* 1] of the Lamanites

Elsewhere in the Book of Mormon text, the attributive adjective *whole* almost always precedes a singular noun. The only cases in the text where we get plurals after *whole* is with the word *soul,* with two original instances and one that has been introduced into the LDS text (marked below with as asterisk):

> Omni 1:26 (⊙ is not extant)
> yea come unto him
> and offer your **whole souls** as an offering unto him

> Mosiah 2:20 (changed from *souls* to *soul* in the 1906 LDS edition)
> if you should render all the thanks and praise
> which your **whole** [*souls* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMPS | *soul* NOQRT] hath power
>   to possess . . .

> * Mosiah 2:21 (changed from *soul* to *souls* in the 1852 LDS edition)
> if ye should serve him
> with all your **whole** [*soul* 1ABCDEGHKPS | *souls* FIJLMNOQRT]
> and yet ye would be unprofitable servants

The plural *whole souls* is therefore possible. For each case of the plural, there is a plurality of individuals, each with a whole soul.

Similarly, one can make the same interpretation regarding *whole armies* in Helaman 11:32. The phrase *whole army* is used when the text is speaking of a single army in the field:

> Alma 47:13   if he would make him Amalickiah the second leader
>   over the **whole army**
>
> Alma 56:24   they durst not pass by us with their **whole army**
>
> Alma 56:52   the **whole army** of the Lamanites halted and turned upon Helaman
>
> Alma 57:25   and to our great astonishment and also the joy of our **whole army**
>
> Alma 57:26   their preservation was astonishing to our **whole army**

Alma 58:22	the Lamanites did suffer their **whole army**—save a few guards only—to be led away into the wilderness
Alma 58:25	and supposing that they had driven their **whole army** . . .
Helaman 1:20	and did march forth with his **whole army** into the city

But in Helaman 11:32, the text says that the robbers could withstand any of the whole armies of the Nephites and Lamanites. The plural is possible and should therefore be retained in the critical text, especially since it is the earliest extant reading.

Summary: Maintain the plural *whole armies* in Helaman 11:32, the consistent reading in all the textual sources; each of the armies of the Nephites and Lamanites can be considered a whole army; thus the plural usage "the whole armies" is possible and will be retained in the critical text.

■ **Helaman 11:34**

[*&* > NULL 1 | ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *now this great evil which came unto the people because of their iniquity did stir them up again in remembrance of the Lord their God*

Oliver Cowdery started to write an ampersand at the beginning of this sentence; but before completing the ampersand, he stopped and crossed it out. His correction undoubtedly reflects the reading of the original manuscript. Elsewhere in the original text, there are 51 examples of "now this" at the beginning of a sentence, so the corrected text here in Helaman 11:34 conforms to the most frequent possibility. But "and now this" is also possible; it occurs five times in the original text. Thus there would have been no grammatical motivation for Oliver to edit the text here in Helaman 11:34.

Summary: Accept Oliver Cowdery's immediate deletion of the ampersand at the beginning of Helaman 11:34 since the reading without the *and* in 𝒫 very likely agrees with the reading in 𝒪, no longer extant here.

■ **Helaman 11:34**

now this great evil which came [*unto* 1ABCDEFGIJLMNOPQRST | *upon* HK] *the people because of their iniquity* . . .

The first RLDS edition (1874) replaced the preposition *unto* with the more expected *upon.* Nonetheless, either reading is possible in the Book of Mormon text. Earlier in this chapter, there is one more example of this usage with *unto:*

| Helaman 11:32 | and they did cause great fear to come **unto** the people |

This nearby example provides strong support for the occurrence of *unto* in verse 34 rather than the more expected *upon.* All other examples, however, have the preposition *upon* rather than *unto:*

| Mosiah 29:34 | but that the burden should come **upon** all the people |
| Helaman 9:5 | lest all the judgments . . . should come **upon** the people |

3 Nephi 3:16	that they did cause fear to come **upon** all the people
3 Nephi 7:5	and all this iniquity had come **upon** the people
Ether 11:6	for they had testified that a great curse should come upon the land and also **upon** the people
Ether 13:13	and by night he went forth viewing the things which should come **upon** the people
Ether 13:14	viewing the destructions which came **upon** the people by night

In each of these cases, the critical text will follow the earliest reading, thus *unto* here in Helaman 11:34 (and earlier in Helaman 11:32).

Summary: Accept in Helaman 11:34 the reading in 𝒫, "this great evil which came **unto** the people", the earliest extant reading; a nearby example in verse 32 also refers to fear "coming **unto** the people".

■ **Helaman 11:38**

and thus ended the eighty and [*fifth* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLNOPQRST | *fifty* M] *year*

Here in verse 38, the compositor for the 1905 LDS edition accidentally set "the eighty and **fifty** year", replacing *fifth* with *fifty*. This typo is an instance of perseverance of the *ty* at the end of preceding *eighty*. This same number was correctly set in the preceding verse (that is, "in the eighty and **fifth** year"). Interestingly, the typo in verse 38 was not caught when the stereotyped plates were corrected prior to publishing the third printing of the 1905 edition (in 1907).

Summary: Maintain in Helaman 11:38 the occurrence of *fifth* in the compound ordinal number "eighty and fifth".

Helaman 12

■ **Helaman 12:3**

yea except he doth visit them with death and with terror and with famine
and with all manner of [*pestilences* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLNOPS | *pestilence* MQRT]
they will not remember him

As discussed under 2 Nephi 10:6, the original text has examples of both singular *pestilence* and plural *pestilences*. In each instance, the critical text will follow the earliest textual sources. Here in Helaman 12:3, 𝓅 and all the early editions had the plural, but the 1905 LDS edition changed the plural to the singular. The subsequent LDS text has continued with the singular, but the critical text will restore the plural.

Summary: Restore in Helaman 12:3 the plural *pestilences,* the reading in 𝓅 (the earliest extant source).

■ **Helaman 12:4**

yea how quick to hearken
unto the [*words* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMOPQRST | *word* N] *of the evil one*

Here the earliest textual sources have the plural *words*. The 1906 LDS edition substituted the singular *word* for the plural. Subsequent LDS editions have retained the correct plural since the 1906 edition never served as a copytext. Overall, there are 42 instances in the text of "hearken (un)to the **words** of X", but only 5 of the singular "hearken (un)to the **word** of X"; thus the plural dominates. Here in Helaman 12:4, we have the only passage that refers to the word(s) of Satan. But there are references to hearkening (or not hearkening) to the words of wicked people, as in Jacob 7:23: "and they searched the scriptures and hearkened no more to the **words** of this wicked man". For each case of "hearken (un)to the word(s) of X", the critical text will follow the grammatical number of the earliest textual source(s), thus "the **words** of the evil one" here in Helaman 12:4.

Summary: Maintain in Helaman 12:4 the plural *words* in "hearken unto the **words** of the evil one", the reading of the earliest extant source (here the printer's manuscript).

■ **Helaman 12:5**

yea how slow to walk in wisdom's [*paths* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMOPQRST | *path* N]

Here the 1906 LDS edition replaced the plural *paths* with *path;* but since that edition was never used as a copytext, that error was not perpetuated in any subsequent LDS edition. As explained

under Mosiah 2:36, the plural *paths* "in wisdom's paths" is the correct expression for the Book of Mormon.

Summary: Maintain in Helaman 12:5, as in Mosiah 2:36, the plural *paths* in the phrase "in wisdom's paths", the reading of the earliest textual sources.

■ **Helaman 12:6**

behold they do not desire that
the Lord their God who hath created them
should rule and reign over them
[1|, ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQ|; RST]
notwithstanding his great goodness and his mercy towards them
[1|; ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQS|, RT]
they do set at naught his counsels
and they will not that he should be their guide

In theory, the clause headed by *notwithstanding* here in Helaman 12:6 could belong either to the preceding text or to the following. The 1830 compositor set the punctuation so that the clause was attached to the preceding text (he placed a semicolon after the clause), while the editors for the 1920 LDS edition moved the semicolon to before the clause, thus attaching the clause to the following text. The 1953 RLDS edition placed a semicolon before the *notwithstanding* yet left the one after the clause, thus totally isolating that clause from its surrounding text.

In this passage there is a natural connection between God's goodness and mercy, on the one hand, and his desire to counsel and guide his people, on the other hand. In other words, there is an appropriate connection between the *notwithstanding*-clause and the following text. The decision in the 1920 LDS edition to associate the *notwithstanding*-clause with the following text is the more natural reading and will be followed in the critical text. See under Alma 17:15 for discussion of other *notwithstanding*-clauses for which there has been some confusion over whether the clause should be associated with the preceding or the following text.

Summary: Maintain in Helaman 12:6 the punctuation introduced in the 1920 LDS edition; the *notwithstanding*-clause associates more appropriately with the following text.

■ **Helaman 12:7–8**

yea even they are less than the **dust** *of the earth*
for behold the [*durt* >+ *dust* 1| *dust* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *of the earth*
moveth hither and thither

Here in Helaman 12:8, Oliver Cowdery initially wrote *durt* in the printer's manuscript, which could be interpreted as a misspelling for *dirt*. Nonetheless, he corrected *durt* to *dust* by overwriting the *r* with an *s* (the ink flow for the *s* that overwrites the initial *r* is somewhat heavier). The original manuscript undoubtedly read *dust*. This reading is especially supported by the immediately preceding occurrence of "the dust of the earth" in verse 7. Oliver's error was probably a scribal slip.

Elsewhere in the Book of Mormon, there are two references to *dirt* (in Alma 49:2 and Alma 53:4), but both these occurrences refer to the dirt of battlements. Moreover, these two cases of

dirt are always spelled as *dirt* in the manuscripts, never as *durt*. Overall in the text, including these two examples in Helaman 12, we get only "the **dust** of the earth" (six times), never "the **dirt** of the earth":

Mosiah 2:25	thou art even as much as the **dust** of the earth
Mosiah 2:25	yet thou wast created of the **dust** of the earth
Mosiah 4:2	and they had viewed themselves in their own carnal state even less than the **dust** of the earth
Helaman 12:7	yea even they are less than the **dust** of the earth
Helaman 12:8	for behold the **dust** of the earth moveth hither and thither
Mormon 9:17	man was created of the **dust** of the earth

Summary: Accept in Helaman 12:8 Oliver Cowdery's correction in 𝒫 to "the **dust** of the earth".

■ **Helaman 12:13–14, 16–18**

(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 . . .*

(5) *and behold if a man* [*hideth >*js *hide* 1 | *hideth* A | *hide* BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *up a treasure in the earth . . .*

For each of these *if*-clauses, Joseph Smith (in his editing of the text for the 1837 edition) made sure that the subjunctive verb form was selected rather than the indicative form. For all verbs except *be,* the subjunctive verb form is equivalent to the infinitive form; thus we get the verb forms *say* and *hide* with third person singular subjects. The indicative verb forms, on the other hand, end in either *-(e)th* or its equivalent *-(e)s* (in modern English), thus *saith* and *hideth* in this passage. In the first two cases (in verses 13 and 14), Oliver Cowdery originally wrote the subjunctive form *say* in the printer's manuscript, although he immediately corrected the example in verse 13 to *saith* (spelled as *saieth*). He did not correct the example in verse 14 to *saith,* although the 1830 typesetter did. The original manuscript apparently had the indicative verb form for four of these five cases (all but the one in verse 14)—and maybe even that one was actually *saith* rather than *say,* given Oliver's tendency to write *say* instead of *saith* (as exemplified in verse 13). For another case where Oliver initially wrote *say* in 𝒫 rather than the correct *saith,* see the nearby discussion under Helaman 12:26.

As already noted, the current text is systematic here in Helaman 12:13–14, 16–18 in its use of the subjunctive verb form. As discussed under Mosiah 2:38, in the Book of Mormon the finite verb in an *if*-clause typically takes the indicative *-(e)th* ending rather than the subjunctive form, although that too is possible. The evidence discussed under Mosiah 2:38 shows that both indicative and subjunctive forms are possible in *if*-clauses and that we should let the earliest textual sources for each passage determine the correct reading. Applying that procedure here in Helaman

12:13–14, 16–18, the *-(e)th* forms should be restored in four out of the five cases; only in the second case, in verse 14, does the earliest extant text (the printer's manuscript) read *say* rather than *saith*.

Summary: Restore the original indicative forms *saith* and *hideth* in Helaman 12:13, 16–18; only in verse 14 for this passage will the subjunctive verb form, *say,* be retained since that is the reading of the earliest extant source, the printer's manuscript.

■ **Helaman 12:13–21**

yea and **if** *he saith unto the earth : move*
(1) [*&* 1 | *and* A | BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *it is moved*

yea **if** *he say unto the earth : thou shalt go back that it lengthen out the day for many hours*
(2) [*&* 1 | *and* A | BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *it is done*

   and thus according to his word the earth goeth back
   and it appeareth unto man that the sun standeth still
   yea and behold this is so / for sure it is the earth that moveth and not the sun

and behold also **if** *he saith unto the waters of the great deep : be thou dried up*
(3) [*&* 1 | *and* A | BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *it is done*

behold **if** *he saith unto this mountain : be thou raised up and come over and fall upon that city*
   that it be buried up
(4) [*&* 1 | *and* A | BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *behold it is done*

and behold **if** *a man hideth up a treasure in the earth and the Lord shall say : let it be accursed*
   because of the iniquity of him that hath hid it up
(5) *behold it shall be accursed*

and **if** *the Lord shall say : be thou accursed that no man shall find thee from this time*
   henceforth and forever
(6) [*&* 1 | *and* A | BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *behold no man getteth it henceforth and forever*

and behold **if** *the Lord shall say unto a man : because of thine iniquities*
   thou shalt be accursed forever
(7) [*&* >js NULL 1 | *and* A | BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *it shall be done*

and **if** *the Lord shall say : because of thine iniquities thou shalt be cut off from my presence*
(8) [*&* 1 | *and* A | BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *he will cause that it shall be so*

Here in this part of Helaman 12, we have seven original occurrences of the Hebraistic *if-and* construction, whereas in English we expect *if-then* (or simply *if* without the *then*). These seven occurrences of the Hebraistic *and* are listed above as 1–4 and 6–8. In his editing for the 1837 edition, Joseph Smith removed all these *and*'s (although he marked only one of these deletions in the printer's manuscript). As explained under 1 Nephi 17:50, the critical text will restore all original instances of *if-and,* providing there is support in the earliest textual sources for the Hebraistic *and.* Note in particular that it would be difficult to claim here in Helaman 12:13–21 that this series of extra *and*'s were all accidentally added during the early transmission of the text.

Nonetheless, in the middle of this series of *if-and*'s, there is one exceptional case (in verse 18, listed above as 5) for which the earliest textual source (the printer's manuscript) does not have the *if-and* construction; instead 𝔓 reads without the extra *and.* It could well be that the original text

here actually read "**and** behold it shall be accursed". But elsewhere in the earliest text, there is evidence that the use of Hebraistic *and* is selective, sometimes occurring and sometimes not. In one case, when copying from 𝒪 into 𝒫, Oliver Cowdery accidentally removed one of these Hebraistic *and*'s, replacing "**and** it **shall** be earth" with "it **should** be earth" (omitting the *and* and replacing the *shall* with *should*):

> 1 Nephi 17:50
>> **if** he should command me that I should say unto this water : be thou earth
>> [*& it shall* 0 | *it should* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] be earth

Yet in 1 Nephi 17:50, there are actually three *if*-clauses, two without the *and* and one with it, at least in the earliest textual source (in this case, the original manuscript):

> 1 Nephi 17:50 (the earliest text, 𝒪)
>> **if** God had commanded me to do all things
>> (1) I could do it
>>
>> **if** he should command me that I should say unto this water : be thou earth
>> (2) **and** it shall be earth
>>
>> and **if** I should say it
>> (3) it would be done

Similarly, in Helaman 10 there is a passage with two instances of the Hebraistic *if-and,* but those two instances are followed by an *if*-clause for which the following main clause lacks the *and:*

> Helaman 10:8–10 (the earliest text, 𝒫)
>> and thus **if** ye shall say unto this temple : it shall be rent in twain
>> (1) **and** it shall be done
>>
>> and **if** ye shall say unto this mountain : be thou cast down and become smooth
>> (2) **and** it shall be done
>>
>> and behold **if** ye shall say that God shall smite this people
>> (3) it shall come to pass

Some of these cases without the *and* do not involve a direct quote (namely, the first and third examples in 1 Nephi 17:50 and the last one in Helaman 10:8–10), but that difference serves as only a partial explanation since the *and* is lacking, for instance, here in Helaman 12:18 (the one with the fifth *if*-clause); in this case, we have a direct quote. Basically what we see is that in each of three different passages (1 Nephi 17:50, Helaman 10:8–10, and Helaman 12:13–21) there are exceptions to the Hebraistic *if-and* construction. This exceptionality implies that the variability is inherent. In fact, the Book of Mormon text has numerous examples of *if*-clauses that have no Hebraistic *and* for the following main clause. Based on this variability, there is no compelling reason to suppose that Helaman 12:18 or Helaman 10:10 or the two cases in 1 Nephi 17:50 originally had a Hebraistic *and*. For further discussion of the Hebraistic *and,* see under HEBRAISMS in volume 3.

Summary: Restore each of the seven cases of original *if-and* in Helaman 12:13–21 but leave the one case (in Helaman 12:18) where the Hebraistic *and* is lacking in the earliest textual source (here the printer's manuscript).

■ **Helaman 12:15**

for [*sure* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQS | *surely* RT] *it is the earth that moveth
and not the sun*

In modern English we expect the full adverbial form *surely;* thus the editors for the 1920 LDS edition replaced the original bare adverb *sure* with *surely.* It could well be that *sure* actually is an error in 𝓟 (the earliest extant source for this passage). There is a similar example in 3 Nephi 23:2, and there the text reads *surely:* "for **surely** he spake as touching all things concerning my people". 𝓞 is not extant in 3 Nephi 23, but both 𝓟 and the 1830 edition read *surely* (3 Nephi 23 is 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). Yet there are examples in the earliest text of the bare adverb, such as *plain* rather than *plainly* (see the discussion under 2 Nephi 25:20). For a general discussion of the bare adverb, see under ADVERBS in volume 3. The critical text will follow the earliest extant sources in determining whether any given adverb is bare or ends in the expected *-ly.*

Summary: Restore in Helaman 12:15 the original bare adverb *sure,* the reading of the earliest extant source (here the printer's manuscript).

■ **Helaman 12:20–21**

*and behold if the Lord shall say unto a man :
because of thine iniquities thou shalt be accursed forever
and it shall be* [*done* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMOPQRST | *so* N]

*and if the Lord shall say :
because of thine iniquities thou shalt be cut off from my presence
and he will cause that it shall be* [*so* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMOPQRST | *done* N]

In these two verses, the 1906 LDS large-print edition switched the phrases "it shall be **done**" and "it shall be **so**". This switch was undoubtedly an accident. The copytext for the 1906 edition was the 1879 LDS edition; and since its verses were set as paragraphs (even as they are today), it was easy enough for the 1906 typesetter to mix up the end of these two verses, especially since some of the phrases in both verses are identical:

> Helaman 12:20–21 (1879 edition, copytext for the 1906 edition)
>
> 20. And behold, if the Lord shall say unto a man, because of thine iniquities, thou shalt be ᶠaccursed for ever, it shall be done.
>
> 21. And if the Lord shall say, because of thine iniquities, thou shalt be cut off ᵍfrom my presence, he will cause that it shall be so.

Since the 1906 edition never served as a copytext, this error was never transmitted into any subsequent LDS edition.

Nonetheless, one may wonder here if the instance of "it shall be **so**" in verse 21 (the earliest reading) is an error for "it shall be **done**", especially since elsewhere in this sequence of main clauses, there are no instances with *so,* only with *done* (including the immediately preceding one in verse 20):

Helaman 12:14	and it is done
Helaman 12:16	and it is done
Helaman 12:17	and behold it is done
Helaman 12:20	and it shall be done

Yet it should be pointed out that the instance in verse 21 is not quite the same since in this case (but not in the preceding cases) we have a causative expression:

| Helaman 12:21 | and he will cause that it shall be so |

Since the use of *so* in verse 21 is perfectly acceptable in English, the critical text will retain it, despite its unique occurrence in this passage.

Summary: Maintain in Helaman 12:21 the reading of the earliest textual source: "and he will cause that it shall be **so**"; the use of *so* here is probably not an error for *done*.

■ **Helaman 12:22**

and woe unto
[NULL >js *him to* 1| A| *him to* BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *whom he shall say this*

In his editing for the 1837 edition, Joseph Smith felt some awkwardness in "woe unto whom he shall say this", and he therefore inserted the words *him to* before the relative pronoun *whom*. Elsewhere in the text, we have 28 examples of "woe unto X" that are postmodified by a relative clause. There are, for instance, three other examples in the book of Helaman:

Helaman 13:11	but woe **unto him** that repenteth not
Helaman 15:2	yea and woe **unto them** which are with child
Helaman 15:3	yea woe **unto this people** which are called the people of Nephi

But there are no other examples like the earliest text in Helaman 12:22 ("woe unto whom he shall say this"), which suggests that this reading without *him to* could be an error. Perhaps *him to* was accidentally omitted when Joseph Smith dictated the text to Oliver Cowdery or when Oliver copied the text into the printer's manuscript (the original manuscript is not extant here). There is evidence elsewhere in the Book of Mormon text for Joseph's emended language:

| 2 Nephi 27:15 | the Lord God shall say **unto him to whom** he shall deliver the book |
| 4 Nephi 1:27 | and did administer that which was sacred **unto him to whom** it had been forbidden |

There is also an example of this same phraseology in the King James Bible:

| Leviticus 6:5 | *and* give it **unto him to whom** it appertaineth |

Nonetheless, the original text here in Helaman 12:22 is not that difficult to understand. Moreover, there are examples in the King James Bible of "(un)to whom" for which there is no explicit antecedent, just like originally here in Helaman 12:22. Here is one example of where we get "to whom" rather than the expanded "unto him to whom":

| Exodus 33:19 | and will be gracious **to whom** I will be gracious |

In examples like this one, the *whom* is equivalent to the relative pronoun *whomsoever;* that is, the *whom* acts like a universal quantifier. In the same way, the earliest reading for Helaman 12:22 can be interpreted as equivalent to saying "woe unto **whomsoever** he shall say this". The critical text will therefore restore the original usage in Helaman 12:22 since it will work.

The possibility that *whom* here in Helaman 12:22 is actually an error for *whomsoever* seems highly unlikely. There is no evidence in the history of the text, including its early transmission, of *who(m)soever* and *who(m)* ever being mixed up. On the other hand, there is evidence of mix-ups in the printer's manuscript between *whosoever* and *whoso.* For discussion of those cases, see under 3 Nephi 11:23 and Ether 10:6.

Summary: Restore the original text in Helaman 12:22: "and woe **unto whom** he shall say this"; here the relative pronoun *whom* is equivalent to *whomsoever* and does not need any explicit antecedent, as in many examples in the King James Bible.

■ **Helaman 12:24**

and may God grant
in his great [*fullness* >% *fulness* 1 | *fulness* ABDEFGILMNOQRT | *fullness* CHJKPS]
that men might be brought unto repentance

Here in the printer's manuscript, Oliver Cowdery started to write the word *fullness* with two *l*'s, as *fullness,* but then he immediately corrected the word by erasure and overwriting to *fulness.* Oliver appears to have consistently spelled *fullness* with two *l*'s in the original manuscript (4 out of 4 times, wherever the word is extant in 𝒪). And when he copied 𝒪 into 𝒫, for the initial portion that covers the small plates of Nephi, he normally spelled the word in 𝒫 with two *l*'s (9 out of 11 times). But later, in the large plates of Nephi, he spelled the word in 𝒫 with a single *l* (15 times). There is one other place in 𝒫 where he initially spelled the word as *fullness* (in Ether 2:8), but there (as here in Helaman 12:24) he immediately corrected the two *l*'s to a single *l* by erasure and overwriting. The 1830 compositor, on the other hand, almost always set the word with one *l,* and the LDS text has continued with the single-*l* spelling. The 1840 edition introduced the double-*l* spelling into the printed text, which the RLDS text has maintained. It appears that Oliver, as he proofed the 1830 sheets, eventually learned to spell the word as *fulness* (according to the compositor's spelling); Oliver therefore changed his original spelling with two *l*'s to a single *l* in his later copying from 𝒪 into 𝒫.

Lyle Fletcher has suggested (personal communication, 23 August 2006) that the word *fullness* here in Helaman 12:24 is an error for *goodness.* 𝒪 is not extant here but could have read *goodness,* which Oliver Cowdery then accidentally copied into 𝒫 as *fullness* (his initial spelling). Note that the double-*l* spelling, *fullness,* matches the length of the word *goodness.* Another possibility is that Joseph Smith himself, when he read off the text to Oliver, accidentally read *fullness* rather than the correct *goodness.*

Usage elsewhere in the text supports the suggested emendation. There are no other examples of "great fullness" in the text. Elsewhere the text refers to the fullness of various sorts but never to the fullness of God himself:

the gospel	10 times
God's wrath	10 times
joy	4 times
time	3 times
the Gentiles	2 times
iniquity	2 times
one's intent	1 time

In contrast, there are five examples of "great goodness", and all refer to the great goodness of God:

2 Nephi 4:17	notwithstanding the great goodness of the Lord
2 Nephi 9:10	O how great the goodness of our God
Helaman 12:1	the Lord in his great infinite goodness doth bless and prosper those
Helaman 12:6	notwithstanding his great goodness and his mercy towards them
3 Nephi 4:33	because of the great goodness of God in delivering them

Note in particular that two of these instances of "great goodness" occur earlier in this same chapter, Helaman 12. And there are also 26 instances of *goodness* alone elsewhere in the text, of which 24 refer to the goodness of God.

If there is such an error here in the text for Helaman 12:24, there is no independent support elsewhere in the manuscripts for that specific error; that is, there are no examples of mix-ups elsewhere in the text between *fullness* and *goodness,* nor is there any nearby use of the word *fullness* that may have prompted the replacement of *goodness* with *fullness* (the nearest prior instance of *fullness* is in 2 Nephi 11:7 and the nearest subsequent instance is in 3 Nephi 16:4). There is an instance of the word *fulfilling* in Helaman 12:26, two verses later, that could be appealed to here ("to a state of endless misery / **fulfilling** the words which saith"). But that word would have occurred between four and five lines later in 𝒪 and thus seems rather unlikely as the source for replacing *goodness* with *fullness*. If there is an error here, the error seems to have occurred independently of the surrounding text and its meaning.

Forest Simmons has suggested (personal communication, 2 November 2007) another possible explanation for how *fullness* could have replaced *goodness* in Helaman 12:24: namely, Oliver Cowdery accidentally wrote *gratefulness* instead of *great goodness* in 𝒪, which he then changed to *great fulness* when he copied from 𝒪 into 𝒫. The words *grateful* and *gratefulness* do not occur in the Book of Mormon, nor would *gratefulness* work here in the text (we are the ones that should be grateful). Of course, Simmons is proposing that *gratefulness* is an error for *great goodness* and that *great fulness* was Oliver's later attempt to deal with the impossibility of *gratefulness*.

Despite these arguments against "in his great fullness" here in Helaman 12:22, David Calabro points out (personal communication) that in the New Testament the King James Bible has a number of references to God's fullness, including these:

John 1:16

and of **his fullness** have all we received and grace for grace

Ephesians 3:19

that ye might be filled with **all the fullness of God**

Ephesians 4:13

till we all come in the unity of the faith and of the knowledge of the Son of God
unto a perfect man / unto the measure of the stature of **the fullness of Christ**

Colossians 1:19

for it pleased *the Father* that in him should **all fullness** dwell

These examples of *fullness* suggest God's perfection as well as his complete love, thus his desire for all to repent and come unto him: "and may God grant in his great fullness that men might be brought unto repentance". In other words, the use of *fullness* in Helaman 12:24 will work, despite its unique usage in the text of the Book of Mormon. The critical text will therefore retain the reference to God's great fullness in this passage, even though the use of *great* with *fullness* does seem unnecessary.

Summary: Maintain in Helaman 12:24 the reading with *fullness:* "and may God grant in his great fullness that men might be brought unto repentance"; although this reference to God's fullness is a unique reading in the Book of Mormon, biblical usage argues that one can refer to God's fullness in perfection and love, which would include his desire for all to repent; although usage elsewhere in the Book of Mormon argues that "in his great **fullness**" could be an error for "in his great **goodness**", the critical text will retain the reading of all the (extant) textual sources.

■ **Helaman 12:25**

and I would that all men might be saved
[*for* > *but* 1 | *But* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *we read that*
in that great and last day there are some which shall be cast out
yea which shall be cast off from the presence of the Lord

In the printer's manuscript, Oliver Cowdery initially wrote the conjunction *for* at the end of the line; then virtually immediately he crossed it out and supralinearly inserted *but* near the end of the line (there is no change in the level of ink flow for the correction). The connector *but* obviously works much better since the following sentence contrasts with Mormon's initial desire that all might be saved. The *but* was probably the reading of the original manuscript since the correction appears to be virtually immediate.

Summary: Accept in Helaman 12:25 Oliver Cowdery's correction in 𝒫 of *for* to *but,* the probable reading of 𝒪; the *for* does not really make sense here.

■ **Helaman 12:25**

but we read that in [*that* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLNOPS | *the* MQRT] *great and last day*
there are some which shall be cast out

Here the 1905 LDS edition replaced the demonstrative determiner *that* with the definite article *the.* The current LDS text continues this reading ("in **the** great and last day"). This change appears to be accidental. As discussed under 2 Nephi 33:12, there are examples in the original text of both

"**that** great and last day" and "**the** great and last day". In each case, the critical text will follow the reading of the earliest textual sources, thus restoring here in Helaman 12:25 the demonstrative *that*.

Summary: Restore the demonstrative *that* in Helaman 12:25: "in **that** great and last day".

■ **Helaman 12:26**

fulfilling the words which [*say > saieth >*js *say* 1 | *saith* A | *say* BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
they that have done good shall have everlasting life

Here in the printer's manuscript, Oliver Cowdery initially wrote the plural form *say* rather than the singular form *saith*. Virtually immediately he corrected the *say* to *saith* (spelled as *saieth*); he crossed out the *say* and supralinearly wrote *saieth* (there is no change in the level of ink flow for this correction). As explained under the 1 Nephi preface for the clause "Nephi's brethren rebelleth against him", the original text allows verb forms ending in *-(e)th* to occur with plural subjects; thus "the words which saith" is possible in the Book of Mormon text. In his editing for the 1837 edition, Joseph Smith edited the *saith* in this passage to the standard plural form *say*. The critical text will restore the original *saith* here in Helaman 12:26.

This passage provides evidence that Oliver Cowdery tended to write *say* instead of *saith*, as discussed earlier in this chapter regarding the use in *if*-clauses of the indicative *saith* in opposition to the subjunctive *say* (see the discussion under Helaman 12:13−14, 16−18).

Summary: Restore the original *saith* in Helaman 12:26, the corrected reading in 𝒫; in the original Book of Mormon text, plural subjects frequently took verb forms ending with the historical third person singular ending *-e(th)*.

Helaman 13

■ **Helaman 13:1**

while the Lamanites did observe
[NULL > *strictly* 1 | *strictly* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *to keep the commandments of God . . .*

Here Oliver Cowdery supralinearly inserted *strictly* after *did observe*. The insertion is without change in ink flow and was probably virtually immediate. Undoubtedly, the original manuscript had *strictly*. One wonders, however, if Oliver inserted *strictly* in the right place. For instance, it could go after the verb *keep*—or even right before *keep* since so-called split infinitives occur elsewhere in the Book of Mormon text (as in Helaman 6:29, "to still carry on the work of darkness").

There are three other occurrences of *strictly* in the text, and one of them places *strictly* immediately after the verb *observe* and before the infinitival *to keep:*

> Mosiah 13:30
> a law which they were to observe **strictly** from day to day
> to keep them in remembrance of God and their duty towards him

Thus Oliver Cowdery's insertion of *strictly* after *observe* in Helaman 13:1 is probably correct.

Summary: Maintain in Helaman 13:1 the corrected reading in 𝒫, with *strictly* coming immediately after the verb *observe* ("while the Lamanites did observe strictly to keep the commandments of God").

■ **Helaman 13:2**

and it came to pass that he did preach
[*many day* 1 | *many-day* A | *many days* BCEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST | *manv days* D] *repentance unto the people*

Here the printer's manuscript reads "many day repentance". The 1830 typesetter interpreted *many day* as a modifier of *repentance;* thus he inserted a hyphen between *many* and *day*. But the 1837 edition corrected the reading *many-day* to the adverbial phrase *many days*. Another possibility, a theoretical one, is that the original text here in Helaman 13:2 read *many a day;* but as explained under Mosiah 18:7, there are quite a few occurrences in the original text of the adverbial "many days" but none of "many a day". The expression "many a <singular noun>" is found a few times in the King James Bible: "many a time" occurs three times in Psalms, and "many a curse" is found in Proverbs 28:27. Still, there are no examples of "many a <singular noun>" in the Book of Mormon, so the original text for Helaman 13:2 probably did not read "many a day".

Similarly, there is no independent evidence in the Book of Mormon text for adjective phrases like *many-day.* But there is considerable evidence in the manuscripts that *days* was sometimes written as *day* (for a list of examples, see under Helaman 8:16). In fact, in Mosiah 18:7 the printer's manuscript reads *after many day,* the same error as here in Helaman 13:2. The 1830 typesetter made the change to "many days" in Mosiah 18:7, while in Helaman 13:2 the 1837 edition made the change. In both instances, the critical text will follow the emendation to the adverbial phrase "many days".

Summary: The 1837 emendation "many days" in Helaman 13:2 is undoubtedly the reading of the original text and most likely the reading of the original manuscript; the earliest extant source is the printer's manuscript and it reads *many day;* there is no evidence that this phrase is acting as an adjective, nor is it an error for "many a day".

■ **Helaman 13:3**

whatsoever things should come [*into* 1BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST | *in* A] *his heart*

The reading in the 1830 edition, with the preposition *in,* is a typo; the earliest textual source, the printer's manuscript, reads *into,* which is what we expect in English. The 1837 edition restored the original *into.* Although there are no other occurrences of "come in(to) one's heart" in the Book of Mormon, there are four in the King James Bible, all of which have *into* rather than *in:*

2 Kings 12:4	*and* all the money that cometh **into** any man's heart to bring into the house of the LORD
2 Chronicles 7:11	and all that came **into** Solomon's heart
Jeremiah 7:31	neither came it **into** my heart
Acts 7:23	it came **into** his heart to visit his brethren the children of Israel

The critical text will maintain the preposition *into* in Helaman 13:3.

Summary: Retain the preposition *into* in Helaman 13:3 ("whatsoever things should come **into** his heart"), the reading of the earliest extant source (the printer's manuscript).

■ **Helaman 13:5**

behold I Samuel a Lamanite do speak the words of the Lord
which he doth put into [*mine* >+ *my* 1 | *my* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *heart*
and behold he hath put it into **my** *heart to say unto this people that . . .*

Here Oliver Cowdery initially wrote *mine heart*. He and Joseph Smith undoubtedly pronounced the initial *h* in *heart,* so the source for this error is probably the King James biblical style that permits *mine heart* and *thine heart.* Oliver caught his error virtually immediately here in 𝓟 and rewrote the *i* as a *y* (there is no change in ink flow for this part of the correction); somewhat later, perhaps after redipping his quill, he crossed out the *ne* and the dot for the initial *i* (the ink flow for these two crossouts is somewhat heavier).

The Book of Mormon text has two occurrences of the archaic *mine heart* (in 1 Nephi 11:1 and Alma 29:1) but 35 occurrences of *my heart* (compared with 38 occurrences of *mine heart* in the King James Bible and 84 of *my heart*). Note, in particular, the use of *my heart* in the very next clause in Helaman 13:5: "he hath put it into **my** heart".

Similarly, there is one occurrence of *thine heart* in the Book of Mormon (in 1 Nephi 21:21, an Isaiah quote) but four occurrences of *thy heart*. Compare this with 107 occurrences of *thine heart* in the King James Bible against 19 occurrences of *thy heart*.

There are several other cases where *mine* and *my* compete with each other when followed by a vowel-initial word (or an *h*-initial word for which the *h* was silent for many speakers of Early Modern English). See, for instance, the discussion under Jacob 5:47 regarding the competition between *mine hand* and *my hand* in the Book of Mormon text. For other nouns, see under POSSESSIVE PRONOUNS in volume 3. For each case of *mine* versus *my* (as well as *thine* versus *thy*), the critical text will follow the earliest extant reading, thus *my heart* twice here in Helaman 13:5.

Summary: Accept in Helaman 13:5 Oliver Cowdery's correction in 𝒫 of *mine heart* to *my heart* as the original reading.

■ **Helaman 13:5**

and behold he hath put it into my heart to say unto this people
that the [*sword* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLNOPRST | *swords* MQ] *of justice hangeth over this people*

The 1905 LDS edition accidentally set the plural *swords* instead of the singular *sword*. This typo was corrected in the 1920 LDS edition. Elsewhere the Book of Mormon refers only to "the **sword** of justice" (eight times), including later on in this very same verse:

> Helaman 13:5
> and four hundred years passeth not away
> save the **sword** of justice falleth upon this people

Included in the eight examples is 1 Nephi 12:18, which in the original manuscript reads as "and a great and a terrible gulf divideth them yea even the **sword** of the justice of the eternal God" (that is, not as "the **word** of the justice of the eternal God", the reading of the current text). One other passage also supports the singular *sword* when referring to God's judgment:

> Alma 54:6
> behold I would tell you something concerning the justice of God
> and the **sword** of his almighty wrath which doth hang over you

Thus the original singular usage in Helaman 13:5 is definitely correct.

Summary: In the Book of Mormon, the noun *sword* always takes the singular number when referring to God's judgment, including twice in Helaman 13:5.

■ **Helaman 13:9–10**

and four hundred years shall not pass away
before I will cause that they shall be smitten
yea I will visit them with the sword and with famine and with pestilence
yea I will visit them in my fierce anger
and there shall be those of the fourth generation
[1RT |, ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQS]
[NULL > *which* >js *who* 1 | *which* A | *who* BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
[NULL > *shall live* 1 | *shall live* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
[1 |, ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
of your enemies
[1 |, ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
to behold your utter destruction

In the printer's manuscript, Oliver Cowdery initially wrote "those of the fourth generation of your enemies", then inserted "which shall live" after *generation*. The level of ink flow for the correction is unchanged, so the change appears to be virtually immediate. The resulting phrase is very awkward, and one wonders if the relative clause "which shall live" was inserted in the wrong place in 𝓟. One possibility is that the relative clause should have occurred after *enemies:*

> Helaman 13:10 (possible emendation)
> and there shall be those of the fourth generation of your enemies
> which shall live to behold your utter destruction

Such an emendation avoids the commas that previous editors and typesetters have used in trying to help readers make sense of this passage.

Despite these arguments, there is clear evidence that the Book of Mormon text sometimes allows prepositional phrases to be displaced. For some discussion and examples, see under Mosiah 26:23; also see the many examples listed under DISPLACED PREPOSITIONAL PHRASES in volume 3. In particular, there are a couple of examples involving the word *generation* where there is an intervening prepositional phrase or a delayed one that results in an unexpected word order:

> Mosiah 12:2
> it shall come to pass that
> this generation **because of their iniquities** shall be brought into bondage

> 3 Nephi 27:31
> for I mean them which are now alive **of this generation**

To get a normal order in English for Mosiah 12:2, the prepositional phrase "because of their iniquities" should come either before "this generation" or after the prepositional phrase "into bondage". In 3 Nephi 27:31, in standard English we expect something like "for I mean those of this generation who are now alive". These awkward passages seem to imply that the original word order in Helaman 13:10 may very well be correct, despite its difficulty. The critical text will therefore maintain the unexpected word order: "and there shall be those of the fourth generation which shall live of your enemies to behold your utter destruction".

Summary: Maintain in Helaman 13:10 the original awkward word order where "of your enemies" is separated from "those of the fourth generation" by the relative clause "which shall live"; displaced prepositional phrases are fairly frequent in the earliest text and will be maintained or restored, as the case may be, whenever they are supported by the earliest extant sources.

■ **Helaman 13:10**

and those of the fourth generation shall **visit** *your destruction*

The verbal expression "shall visit your destruction" seems unusual. Elsewhere in the Book of Mormon, we have nine examples of the phraseology "to visit a person **with** destruction" or "to visit a person (**un**)**to** destruction":

Jacob 2:33	save I shall visit them with a sore curse even **unto** destruction
Mosiah 29:27	yea then is the time he will visit you **with** great destruction
Alma 9:18	and ye shall be visited **with** utter destruction
Alma 10:22	that ye would even now be visited **with** utter destruction
Alma 33:10	and thou didst visit them in thine anger **with** speedy destruction
Alma 60:29	yea and it shall fall upon you and visit you even **to** your utter destruction
Helaman 7 preface	that he will visit them in his anger **to** their utter destruction
Helaman 11:30	and they were also visited **with** much destruction
3 Nephi 3:4	they would visit you **with** utter destruction

One interesting characteristic of all but one of these examples is that *destruction* is modified in attributive position by an intensifying adjective ("great destruction", "utter destruction", "speedy destruction", "much destruction"), whereas here in Helaman 13:10 there is simply "your destruction". But Jacob 2:33 reads without any modifier either ("even unto destruction").

This Book of Mormon reading here in Helaman 13:10 is supported by the simpler phraseology "to visit destruction on X", as in the following recent example from <www.google.com>: "If it happens again I will visit destruction upon you. With a hammer." Examples like this support the unique expression "to visit your destruction" here in Helaman 13:10.

The phraseology "to visit X", with the sense of destruction (but not directly stated), can be found in three other places in the Book of Mormon text:

Mosiah 11:22
and it shall come to pass that they shall know that I am the Lord their God
and am a jealous God **visiting the iniquities** of my people

Mosiah 12:1
therefore I will **visit them** in my anger
yea in my fierce anger will I **visit them** in their iniquities and abominations

Mosiah 13:13
for I the Lord thy God am a jealous God
visiting the iniquities of the fathers upon the children
unto the third and fourth generation of them that hate me

The last passage is from the Ten Commandments (found in Exodus 20:5 and three other places in the Pentateuch). Other passages in the King James Bible also refer to the Lord visiting people's sins, iniquities, or transgressions:

Exodus 32:34	in the day when I visit I will **visit their sin** upon them
Leviticus 18:25	and the land is defiled / therefore I do **visit the iniquity** thereof upon it
Psalm 89:32	then will I **visit their transgression** with the rod and **their iniquity** with stripes
Jeremiah 14:10	he will now remember their iniquity and **visit their sins**
Lamentations 4:22	he will **visit thine iniquity** / O daughter of Edom
Amos 3:14	that in the day that I shall **visit the transgressions** of Israel upon him / I will also visit the altars of Bethel

The last example continues by making it clear that visiting the altars of Bethel means destroying them: "and the horns of the altar shall be cut off and fall to the ground". Thus the expression "to visit one's destruction", although idiomatic, is similar to the equally idiomatic "to visit one's iniquity".

The Oxford English Dictionary lists examples from earlier English where the verb *visit* means 'to inflict punishment on someone' (with citations under definitions 5 and 6 dating from late Middle English up into the 1800s), including this one under definition 5c that has *punishment* as the direct object for the verb *visit*:

J. Gilbert (1836)
It is said to be of the essence of the legal penalty
to **visit punishment** on the person of the offender.

This usage, although indicated as rare in the OED, parallels the occurrence of "to visit destruction" here in Helaman 13:10 ("and those of the fourth generation shall visit your destruction").

A different possibility for Helaman 13:10 is that the verb *visit* is an error for some other verb, such as *witness*. There are several examples where someone's destruction is witnessed:

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

Alma 14:9
they took Alma and Amulek and carried them forth to the place of martyrdom
that they might **witness the destruction** of those which were consumed by fire

Moroni 9:22
and I pray unto God that he would spare thy life
to **witness** the return of his people unto him or **their utter destruction**

Nonetheless, each of these examples refers to witnesses who are not the one causing the destruction, whereas in Helaman 13:10, if we follow this emendation using *witness,* we would have the Lamanites witnessing the Nephites' destruction as if they weren't the ones responsible for it.

Ultimately, the reading in Helaman 13:10, although unusual, appears to be fully intended. The critical text will therefore retain the verb *visit* in "and those of the fourth generation shall **visit** your destruction", where "shall visit your destruction" means 'will destroy you'.

Summary: Maintain the earliest reading in Helaman 13:10: "and those of the fourth generation shall **visit** your destruction"; this expression is supported indirectly by usage in the King James Bible as well as examples from earlier and current English of the expression "to visit destruction (up)on X" plus parallel expressions such as "to visit punishment (up)on X".

■ **Helaman 13:15**

yea and woe be
unto [*this* > *the* 1|*the* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *city of Gideon*

Oliver Cowdery initially wrote "this city of Gideon"; then he overwrote the *i* with an *e* but finally decided not to cross out the *s.* Instead, he crossed out the whole word and supralinearly inserted the correct *the,* giving "the city of Gideon". The correction does not have any change in the level of ink flow, so it appears to have been virtually immediate. The original manuscript probably read "the city of Gideon", and the probable source for "this city of Gideon" is the preceding five occurrences of "this great city" in verses 12 – 14:

> Helaman 13:12 – 14
> yea woe unto **this** great city of Zarahemla . . .
> yea woe unto **this** great city
> for I perceive saith the Lord that there are many
> —yea even the more part of **this** great city—
> that will harden their hearts against me saith the Lord . . .
> but behold if it were not for the righteous which are in **this** great city
> behold I would cause that fire should come down out of heaven and destroy it . . .
> yea woe be unto **this** great city
> because of the wickedness and abominations which is in her

Elsewhere in the text, there are no examples of "this city of X", only "the city of X". For a list of other cases where Oliver Cowdery accidentally wrote *this* instead of *the,* see under 2 Nephi 10:23.

Summary: Accept in Helaman 13:15 Oliver Cowdery's corrected *the* in 𝓟, thus producing the expected "**the** city of Gideon" in place of his initial "**this** city of Gideon".

■ **Helaman 13:16**

because of the wickedness and [*the* 1| ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *abominations*
which is in them

As explained in the history of the 1830 edition (see volume 3 of the critical text), somewhere between verses 7 and 18 of Helaman 13 (inclusively), the 1830 compositor started to set type from the original manuscript rather than its copy, the printer's manuscript. He continued setting type from 𝓞 until he got to the end of Mormon. Since we cannot be precisely sure where in Helaman 13

the switch to Ⓞ took place, we must consider whether here in verse 16 the 1830 edition was set from Ⓞ or from Ⓟ. If from Ⓟ, then we can be sure that the 1830 compositor is responsible for the loss of the repeated *the* in "the wickedness and **the** abominations". If the 1830 compositor set his type from Ⓞ, then he may have still been the one responsible for omitting an original repeated *the*. But in that case it is also possible that Ⓞ itself did not have the repeated *the* and that the 1830 compositor correctly set the text without the repeated *the;* under this alternative, Oliver Cowdery, the scribe in Ⓟ, accidentally added the repeated *the* as he copied from Ⓞ into Ⓟ.

Nearby we have three other examples of *wickedness* conjoined with *abominations,* namely, two preceding instances (in verses 14 and 15) and one following (in verse 17):

> Helaman 13:14
>
> yea woe be unto this great city
> because of the wickedness and abominations which is in her

> Helaman 13:15
>
> yea and woe be unto the city of Gideon
> for the wickedness and abominations which is in her

> Helaman 13:17
>
> and behold a curse shall come upon the land
> saith the Lord of Hosts
> because of the people's sake which is upon the land
> yea because of their wickedness and their abominations

The two preceding instances lack the repeated *the* (both read "the wickedness and abominations which is in her"). On the other hand, the following instance (in verse 17) repeats the determiner, in this case *their:* "their wickedness and **their** abominations". It seems quite reasonable that the 1830 compositor could have been influenced by the two instances of "the wickedness and abominations" in verses 14 and 15 to omit in verse 16 the repeated *the* in the phrase "the wickedness and **the** abominations". It seems less likely that Oliver Cowdery would have added a repeated *the* in Ⓟ, especially given the two preceding instances without the repetition.

More generally, there are eight other occurrences of "the wickedness and abominations" in the text, but only one of "the wickedness and **the** abominations". Interestingly, this single exception was initially written in Ⓟ as "the wickedness and abominations", but then almost immediately Oliver Cowdery corrected the text by supralinearly inserting the repeated *the:*

> Mosiah 3:7
>
> so great shall be his anguish for the wickedness
> and [NULL > *the* 1|*the* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] abominations of his people

There would have been no motivation to add the repeated *the* in this other case unless it was actually in Ⓞ. Thus "the wickedness and **the** abominations" was most probably the reading of the original text in Mosiah 3:7. We also note here that there are many more examples in the history of the text where the repeated *the* has been accidentally omitted rather than added (see the list under CONJUNCTIVE REPETITION in volume 3). In English, the repeated *the* is not expected; thus it is more likely that the 1830 compositor is the one responsible for the textual variant here in Helaman 13:16. The critical text will therefore restore the more difficult reading in Helaman 13:16, "because of the wickedness and **the** abominations which is in them".

Summary: Restore in Helaman 13:16 the repeated *the,* the reading in 𝒫 ("the wickedness and **the** abominations which is in them"); the two preceding cases of this expression, in verses 14 and 15, lack the repeated *the* ("the wickedness and abominations which is in her"), which apparently led the 1830 compositor (irrespective of whether he set the text from 𝒪 or 𝒫) to accidentally omit the repeated *the.*

■ **Helaman 13:17**

and behold a curse shall come upon the land
saith the Lord of Hosts
because of the [*peopless* 1 | *people's* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQS | *peoples'* RT] *sake*
[*which >*js *who* 1 | *which* A | *who* BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
[*is* 1A | *are* BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *upon the land*
yea because of **their** *wickedness and* **their** *abominations*

Here the editors for the 1920 LDS edition emended *people's* to *peoples'.* The change is marked in the 1920 committee copy, so it was intentional. This change was perhaps made under the influence of the subsequent plurals (the edited plural verb form *are* and two instances of the plural possessive pronoun *their*). But nowhere else in the text are there any instances of the plural *peoples* (nor the possessive plural *peoples'*). We get only the singular form *people,* even though it occurs with both singular and plural demonstrative adjectives (as "this people" and "these people") and singular and plural verbs ("people is" and "people are"). There are no other examples in the text of "the people's sake", but there is one of "for the sake of our people" (in Jacob 1:4). The singular possessive *people's* is undoubtedly the correct form here in Helaman 13:17. Don Brugger points out (personal communication) that here in Helaman 13 (see verses 5–16) Samuel the Lamanite is speaking to only one people, namely, the Nephites, as is specifically noted in the immediately preceding verse: "yea and woe be unto all the cities which are in the land round about which is possessed by the Nephites because of the wickedness and the abominations which is in them" (Helaman 13:16).

We should also note here the use of the relative pronoun *which* (later edited to *who*) to refer to *people* rather than to the nearest noun *(sake).* Another example where the relative pronoun does not refer to *sake* but to the preceding noun (in this case *Christ*) is found in Alma 4:13: "and suffering all manner of afflictions for **Christ**'s sake **which** should come according to the spirit of prophecy".

Summary: Restore in Helaman 13:17 the 1830 spelling *people's;* the Book of Mormon never uses the plural *peoples,* much less the possessive plural *peoples'.*

■ **Helaman 13:17**

yea because of their wickedness
and their [*abomination* 1 | *abominations* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]

Here we have to decide whether the original manuscript read *abomination* (the reading in the printer's manuscript) or *abominations* (the 1830 reading). It is possible that the 1830 edition was here set from 𝒪 rather than 𝒫, although the physical evidence itself is indecisive. Elsewhere in the original text, *wickedness* is normally conjoined with the plural form, *abominations* (42 times). But in the earliest extant text the singular *abomination* can be conjoined with *wickedness* (3 times):

1 Nephi 14:4

> for behold this is according to the captivity of the devil
> and also according to the justice of God
> upon all those who will work wickedness and **abomination** before him

Helaman 4:11

> now this great loss of the Nephites and the great slaughter which was among them
> would not have happened had it not been
> for their wickedness and their **abomination** which was among them
> yea and it was among those also which professed to belong to the church of God

Mormon 3:11

> and it came to pass that I Mormon did utterly refuse
> from this time forth to be a commander and a leader of this people
> because of their wickedness and **abomination**

So in theory, either reading (*abomination* or *abominations*) is possible here in Helaman 13:17.

There are seven additional cases in the textual history where there is a variant reading between the singular *abomination* and the plural *abominations*. One important factor stands out in each of these variants: the error in number always derives from the number of the preceding noun. In other words, if the singular *abomination* is changed to the plural *abominations,* the immediately preceding noun is plural, while if the plural *abominations* is changed to the singular *abomination,* the immediately preceding noun is singular:

□ *switch from singular to plural*

2 Nephi 25:2 (error in the 1830 edition)

> for their works were works of darkness
> and their **doings** of [*abomination* 1ps|
>   *abominations* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOQRT]

Jacob 2:28 (momentary error by Oliver Cowdery in 𝒫)

> for I the Lord God delighteth in the chastity of women
> and **whoredoms** is [*a bominations > abominations > abomination* 1|
>   *an abomination* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] before me

□ *switch from plural to singular*

1 Nephi 14:10 (error in the 1840 edition)

> wherefore whoso belongeth not to the church of the Lamb of God
> belongeth to that great church which is the **mother**
> of [*abominations* 1ABDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST|*abomination* C]

Mosiah 29:18 (error by Hyrum Smith in 𝒫, later corrected by Oliver Cowdery
    when he proofed 𝒫 against 𝒪)

> yea remember king Noah
> his **wickedness** and his [𝓈3 *abomination* > 𝓈1 *abominations* 1|
>   *abominations* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]

Alma 13:17 (error in the 1920 LDS edition)

> and his people had waxed strong in **iniquity**
> and [*abominations* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQS|*abomination* RT]

Alma 37:29 (error in the 1874 RLDS edition)
    and ye shall teach them to abhor such **wickedness**
    and [*abominations* 01ABCDEFGIJLMNOPQRST | *abomination* HK]
    and murders

4 Nephi 1:39 (error in the 1852 LDS edition)
    and it was because of the **wickedness**
    and [*abominations* 1ABCDEGHKPS | *abomination* FIJLMNOQRT]
      of their fathers

In fact, three of the changes from plural to singular involve the singular word form *wickedness* (Mosiah 29:18, Alma 37:29, and 4 Nephi 1:39), which suggests that here in Helaman 13:17 the original manuscript read "their wickedness and their abominations" and that *abominations* was accidentally changed by Oliver Cowdery to *abomination* when he copied the text from 𝒪 into 𝒫.

If the plural form is the original reading in Helaman 13:17, then we get a series of plural instances of *abominations* conjoined with *wickedness* for the larger passage:

Helaman 13:14–17 (proposed original text)
    yea woe be unto this great city
    because of the **wickedness** and **abominations** which is in her
    yea and woe be unto the city of Gideon
    for the **wickedness** and **abominations** which is in her
    yea and woe be unto all the cities
    which are in the land round about which is possessed by the Nephites
    because of the **wickedness** and the **abominations** which is in them
    and behold a curse shall come upon the land
    saith the Lord of Hosts
    because of the people's sake which is upon the land
    yea because of their **wickedness** and their **abominations**

But this systematicity is not statistically significant since there are only three firm instances in the earliest text of the singular phraseology "wickedness and abomination" (in contrast to at least 42 instances of the plural phraseology "wickedness and abominations"). Yet it is true that the three singular instances occur as isolates, never in a series of instances.

This evidence, taken in its totality, argues that the original manuscript (and the original text) in Helaman 13:17 read "their wickedness and their abominations", which means that the 1830 reading is the correct one. The critical text will adopt that reading as the most probable one. This analysis also implies that here in verse 17 the 1830 edition was set from 𝒪 rather than 𝒫, where 𝒪 read in the plural.

Summary: Maintain the 1830 reading in Helaman 13:17, with its plural *abominations* in the phrase "their wickedness and their abominations"; the singular *abomination,* the reading in 𝒫, was probably an error introduced by Oliver Cowdery when he copied from 𝒪 into 𝒫.

■ **Helaman 13:18**

that whoso shall hide up treasures in the earth
shall find them again no more because of the great curse of the land
save [*it* 1 | *he* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *be a righteous man*
and shall hide it up unto the Lord

Here both the 1830 edition and the printer's manuscript are definitely firsthand copies of the original manuscript. 𝓟 has the pronoun *it* while the 1830 edition has *he*. We find in the very next verse an almost identical expression, and there both the 1830 edition and 𝓟 have the pronoun *it:*

> Helaman 13:19
>
> for none hideth up their treasures unto me save **it** be the righteous

There are no other occurrences in the text of "save he be", but there are 47 other examples of "save it be". This overall preference for "save it be" (as well as the specific occurrence of the phrase in the immediately following verse) could have influenced Oliver Cowdery to accidentally write "save it be" in 𝓟 rather than "save he be", thus eliminating a unique reading, "save he be", from the text. Also note that the *it* could have been prompted by the two nouns *curse* and *land* in the immediately preceding phrase ("because of the great **curse** of the **land**").

In the Book of Mormon, the verb in *save*-clauses typically takes the subjunctive form when the subject is the indefinite *it* (mostly phrases of the form "save it be" and "save it were"). But when the subject is not *it,* the verb in the *save*-clause is almost always in the indicative. Even so, there are a few examples where the verb form takes the subjunctive, as in these two examples from the original text where the subject is the pronoun *he:*

> 2 Nephi 9:20
>
> and there is not any thing **save he know** it

> 3 Nephi 8:1
>
> and there was not any man which could do a miracle in the name of Jesus
> **save he were** cleansed every whit from his iniquity

In the first example, Joseph Smith emended the subjunctive *know* to the indicative *knows* in his editing for the 1837 edition (for discussion, see under that passage). In any event, these two examples show that there is internal evidence for the subjunctive usage "save he be", the reading in the 1830 edition for Helaman 13:18.

Although "save it be" is very frequent in the Book of Mormon text, none of these occurrences are conjoined with a following predicate (except possibly here in 𝓟 for Helaman 13:18). And it is that predicate which argues that "save he be" should be the reading of the original text for this passage:

> Helaman 13:18
>
> save he be a righteous man
> and shall hide it up unto the Lord

In other words, "save he . . . shall hide it up unto the Lord". Quite clearly, "save it . . . shall hide it up unto the Lord" is unacceptable. It should be pointed out, however, that this conjunctive phraseology suggests two possible emendations for which the phrase "save it be" could be maintained:

Helaman 13:18 (insert a subject *he* in the conjoined predicate)
    save **it** be a righteous man
    and **he** shall hide it up unto the Lord

Helaman 13:18 (replace *and* with a relative pronoun such as *which, who,* or *that*)
    save **it** be a righteous man
    which shall hide it up unto the Lord

There is evidence elsewhere in the text for the loss of the subject pronoun *he* (see the list of examples under Jacob 5:1–2). But there is no evidence for mix-ups between *and* and relative pronouns. So only the first of these two conjectural emendations has any independent support from errors in the transmission of the text.

Ultimately, the critical text will accept the reading of the 1830 edition in Helaman 13:18 as the original reading, mainly because it works perfectly well. The pronoun *he* is precisely what the following conjoined predicate requires ("save he . . . shall hide it up unto the Lord"). And the substitution of an original *he* with *it* (the reading in 𝓟) is quite probable given the dominance of the phrase "save it be" elsewhere in the text.

Summary: Accept in Helaman 13:18 the 1830 reading "save **he** be" as the probable reading of the original manuscript; Oliver Cowdery seems to have accidentally substituted *it* for *he* in 𝓟, probably because "save it be" is such a common expression in the Book of Mormon text.

■ **Helaman 13:18–20**

(1) *that whoso shall hide up* **treasures** *in the earth*
(2) *shall find* **them** *again no more because of the great curse of the land*
(3) *save he be a righteous man and shall hide* **it** *up unto the Lord*

(4) *for I will saith the Lord that they shall hide up their* **treasures** *unto me*
(5) *and cursed be they who hideth not up their* **treasures** *unto me*
(6) *for none hideth up their* **treasures** *unto me save it be the righteous*
(7) *and he that hideth not up his* [*treasure* 1AHKP | *treasures* BCDEFGIJLMNOQRST] *unto me*
(8) *cursed is he and also the* **treasure**
(9) *and none shall redeem* **it** *because of the curse of the land*

    and the day shall come
(10) *that they shall hide up their* [*treasure > treasures* 1 | *treasures* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
    because they have set their hearts upon riches
    and because they have set their hearts upon their riches
(11) *and will hide up their* **treasures** *when they shall flee before their enemies*
(12) *because they will not hide* **them** *up unto me*
(13) *cursed be they and also their* **treasures**

In these three verses, we have considerable shifting between singular and plural forms referring to *treasure(s)*. In verse 18, the plural *treasures* (1) is first referred to by the pronoun *them* (2) but then later on in the verse by *it* (3). In verse 19, the first half consistently refers to plural *treasures* (4–6), but in the second half the original text consistently refers to singular *treasure* (7–8), followed by one singular pronominal use, "and none shall redeem **it**" (9). However, the 1837 edition changed the

singular *treasure* in the second half of verse 19 to *treasures* (7), probably unintentionally since the following clause continues the singular uses in "and also the **treasure** and none shall redeem **it**" (8–9). In verse 20, Oliver Cowdery initially wrote the singular *treasure* (10) in 𝓟, but then virtually immediately he corrected it to *treasures* (there is no change in the level of ink flow for the plural *s* that he inserted at the end of the line). The 1830 edition (which is here an independent firsthand copy of the original manuscript) also has *treasures,* so the original manuscript undoubtedly had the plural *treasures* at the beginning of verse 20. Throughout the rest of verse 20, the text uses the plural *treasures* as well as the plural pronoun *them* to refer to them (11–13). Thus we have considerable mixing in the original text for Helaman 13:18–20:

□ verse 18	*plural*		treasures, them
	singular		it
□ verse 19	*plural*		treasures, treasures, treasures
	singular		treasure, treasure, it
□ verse 20	*plural*		treasures, treasures, them, treasures

Since both the 1830 edition and the printer's manuscript are firsthand copies of the original manuscript for this part of the text, the variability between singular and plural in Helaman 13:18–20 is quite clearly a part of the original manuscript and undoubtedly the original text. Therefore, the original singular *treasure* in the second half of Helaman 13:19 should be restored ("and he that hideth not up his **treasure** unto me / cursed is he and also the treasure and none shall redeem it").

Don Brugger (personal communication) points out that in this passage the variability in the grammatical number for the word *treasure(s)* is actually completely systematic: if the text refers to one person, we get the singular *treasure;* if the subject refers to a plurality of persons, we get the plural *treasures*. We can see this when we add the subjects to the above analysis:

□ verse 18	*plural*	1–2	whoso	treasures, them
	singular	3	he	it
□ verse 19	*plural*	4	they	their treasures
	plural	5	they	their treasures
	plural	6	none	their treasures
	singular	7	he	his treasure
	singular	8	he	treasure
	singular	9	none	it
□ verse 20	*plural*	10	they	their treasures
	plural	11	they	their treasures
	plural	12	they	them
	plural	13	they	their treasures

In other words, a person has his own treasure, but people have their treasures. It should be noted that some of these subject forms, when considered in isolation, could be either singular or plural. For instance, the *none* under 6 should be interpreted as a plural ("for **none** hideth up **their** treasures unto me save it be **the righteous**") while the *none* under 9 can be interpreted as a singular ("for **none** shall redeem it because of the curse of the land"). For further discussion of *none* as either

a singular or a plural in the text, see under Ether 4:3. Similarly, the word *whoso* and its related *whosoever* can take on either a singular or a plural interpretation in the Book of Mormon text; for examples of both possibilities, see the discussion under 1 Nephi 17:48 (which originally read "and **whoso** shall lay **their** hands upon me").

A desire for more consistency within connected clauses could lead one to grammatically emend the *it* at the end of Helaman 13:18 to *them* in the standard text, especially since earlier in that verse *them* is used to refer to *treasures:*

> Helaman 13:18 (grammatical emendation of *it* to *them*)
> that whoso shall hide up **treasures** in the earth shall find **them** again no more
> because of the great curse of the land
> save he be a righteous man and shall hide **them** up unto the Lord

But notice that such an emendation would actually create a textual exception in this passage by referring to a single person ("save he be a righteous man") as having treasures. The critical text will maintain the systematic relationship in this passage between the grammatical number of the subject and the word *treasure* (and at the same time maintaining the reading of the earliest textual sources).

Elsewhere in the text, the plural *treasures* always takes plural subjects (eight times). On the other hand, the singular *treasure* is normally used to refer to what one values or is important (twice in 2 Nephi 9:30 and once each in Helaman 5:8 and 3 Nephi 13:21). In these passages, the word *treasure* can be applied to more than one person. But there is one other passage that specifically refers to physical treasure, and in that case the subject is singular and the text consistently uses the singular *treasure:*

> Helaman 12:18–19
> and behold if **a man** hideth up **a treasure** in the earth
> and the Lord shall say : let **it** be accursed
> because of the iniquity of **him** that hath hid **it** up
> behold **it** shall be accursed
> and if the Lord shall say : be **thou** accursed
> that no man shall find **thee** from this time henceforth and forever
> and behold no man getteth **it** henceforth and forever

Here in verse 19 the Lord speaks directly to the treasure (and even uses the archaically singular *thou* and *thee*).

Summary: In accord with the earliest textual sources, restore the original singular *treasure* for the second half of the verse in Helaman 13:19 ("and he that hideth not up his **treasure** unto me"); this change also makes the text consistently singular in that part of the verse; also maintain the plural *treasures* throughout Helaman 13:20; the singular *it* will be maintained near the end of Helaman 13:18 even though earlier in that verse the text refers to treasure(s) only in the plural; overall, a single person has a treasure, but persons have treasures.

■ **Helaman 13:20**

and the day shall come
[when > that 1 | that ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] they shall hide up their treasures
because they have set their hearts upon riches

> The original manuscript must have read "**that** they shall hide up their treasures" since Oliver Cowdery's correction to *that* in the printer's manuscript agrees with the *that* of the 1830 edition (here both 𝒫 and the 1830 edition are firsthand copies of 𝒪). The correction in 𝒫 appears to be immediate (there is no change in the level of ink flow for the supralinear *that*).

> As a connector, either *that* or *when* can occur after the phrases "the time cometh" and "the day cometh" (here I include syntactic variants such as "the time shall come" and "the day shall come"), with 43 instances of *that* and 7 of *when*. Since either reading is possible here in Helaman 13:20, there would have been no grammatical motivation for Oliver Cowdery to edit the text in this case.

> As noted under Helaman 13:16, both 𝒫 and the 1830 edition are firsthand copies of the original manuscript from at least Helaman 13:18 through the end of Mormon. In many instances, a corrected reading in 𝒫 will agree with the 1830 reading for this part of the text. In such cases, it will normally not be needed to discuss such variation since the text is firm and 𝒪 very likely read as corrected in 𝒫 and set by the 1830 typesetter. In some cases, the variation may be of some interest, in which case I will discuss it, but normally I will not. However, in volume 3 of the critical text, when I discuss the transmission of the earliest text, I will provide a list of all these cases.

Summary: Accept *that* as the connector after "the day shall come" in Helaman 13:20; the virtually immediate correction in 𝒫 agrees with the 1830 reading.

■ **Helaman 13:20**

and because they have set their hearts upon their riches
[& 1 | I ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOQR | and PST] will hide up their treasures
when they shall flee before their enemies
because they will not hide them up unto me
cursed be they and also their treasures

> Here the original manuscript undoubtedly had an ampersand that the 1830 typesetter misread as *I* (in Oliver Cowdery's hand, the capital *I* and the ampersand are visually similar). For the entire text of the Book of Mormon, the Lord does not hide up treasures; only people do:

Helaman 12:18	if a man hideth up a treasure in the earth
Helaman 12:18	because of the iniquity of him that hath hid it up
Helaman 13:18	whoso shall hide up treasures in the earth shall find them again no more
Helaman 13:18	save he be a righteous man and shall hide it up unto the Lord
Helaman 13:19	they shall hide up their treasures unto me
Helaman 13:19	and cursed be they who hideth not up their treasures unto me
Helaman 13:19	for none hideth up their treasures unto me save it be the righteous
Helaman 13:19	and he that hideth not up his treasure unto me / cursed is he

Helaman 13:20	and the day shall come that they shall hide up their treasures
Helaman 13:20	and because they have set their hearts upon their riches
	and will hide up their treasures when they shall flee . . .
Helaman 13:20	because they will not hide them up unto me / cursed be they
Helaman 13:35	yea we have hid up our treasures
Mormon 1:18	the inhabitants thereof began to hide up their treasures in the earth

Here in Helaman 13:20, the 1908 RLDS edition and the 1981 LDS edition restored the correct *and*.

Summary: In Helaman 13:20 the 1830 typesetter's *I* was a visual misreading of the ampersand in 𝒪; on the other hand, Oliver Cowdery correctly copied the ampersand from 𝒪 into 𝒫.

■ **Helaman 13:22**

ye do not remember the Lord your God in the things
[1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQS | *with* RT] *which he hath blessed you*

In this passage, both the printer's manuscript and the 1830 read "in the things which he hath blessed you". Both these two textual sources are firsthand copies of the original manuscript, so 𝒪 itself very likely read that way. Here the editors for the 1920 LDS edition inserted the preposition *with* at the beginning of the relative clause, thus "**with** which he hath blessed you". Several questions can be asked: (1) was it necessary to insert a preposition? if so, (2) should it have been *with*? and (3) should it have been inserted at the beginning or at the end of the relative clause?

First of all, grammatical analysis argues for some preposition here since otherwise we end up with two direct objects for the verb *bless*, (1) the relative pronoun *which* (which refers to the previous *things*) and (2) the object pronoun *you*. Elsewhere in the text, there is evidence for the preposition *in* as well as *with* when the verb is *bless*:

1 Nephi 16:39	insomuch that the Lord did bless us again **with** food
1 Nephi 18:24	wherefore we were blessed **in** abundance
Mosiah 2:41	they are blessed **in** all things both temporal and spiritual
Helaman 6:17	the Lord had blessed them so long **with** the riches of the world

The example in Mosiah 2:41 suggests that here in Helaman 13:22 the preposition could be *in*. Given the preceding *in* ("in the things"), such a conjecture would end up with two nearby *in*'s, "**in** the things **in** which he hath blessed you". In fact, one could argue that the proximity of two *in*'s led to the loss of the second one. On the other hand, one could argue that the earliest text, "in the things which he hath blessed you", isn't really that awkward given that there already is a preceding *in*.

There is some scribal evidence that supports *with,* the 1920 emendation, as the original reading: namely, there is an instance where Oliver Cowdery, as he was taking down Joseph Smith's dictation, initially wrote an original *with which* as simply *which*:

2 Nephi 1:23
shake off the chains
[NULL >+ *with* 0 | *with* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] which ye are bound

There is also an instance in the printer's manuscript of this kind of momentary loss of *with* at the beginning of a relative clause; in that case, the initial error was made by scribe 2 of 𝒫, who virtually immediately corrected the text by supralinearly inserting the *with:*

> 3 Nephi 20:19
>> for I will make my people
>> [NULL > *with* 1 | *with* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] whom
>>> the Father hath covenanted
>> yea I will make thy horn iron and I will make thy hoofs brass

With respect to the question of whether the preposition, either *with* or *in,* should come at the beginning or at the end of the relative clause, the evidence is mixed. With the preposition *with,* there are three examples elsewhere in the text with an initial *with,* but there are also two where *with* occurs at the end of the relative clause (each marked below with an asterisk):

1 Nephi 7:17	that I may burst these bands **with which** I am bound
2 Nephi 1:23	shake off the chains **with which** ye are bound
Alma 14:26	and they brake the cords **with which** they were bound
* Alma 31:28	and all their precious things **which** they are ornamented **with**
* Alma 57:28	we did inquire of Gid concerning the prisoners **which** they had started to go down to the land of Zarahemla **with**

There is also one example in the current text of *with which* that is not original to the text but derives from Joseph Smith's editing for the 1837 edition:

> Ether 10:26
>> and they did make all manner of tools
>> [*inthewhich* >js *with which* 1 | *in the which* A |
>>> *with which* BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
>> they did work their beasts

When the preposition is *in,* there is also evidence for either position (each case listed below where *in* is at the end of the relative clause is marked with an asterisk):

* 1 Nephi 13:32	in that state of awful wickedness **which** thou beholdest that they are **in**
Alma 12:24	there was a space granted unto man **in which** he might repent
Alma 56:9	here is one thing **in which** we may have great joy
Helaman 5:21	yea even in that same prison **in which** Ammon and his brethren were cast by the servants of Limhi
* 3 Nephi 1:25	they soon became converted and were convinced of the error **which** they were **in**

Another way to analyze this question of prepositional positioning is to consider other cases where the antecedent for the relative pronoun is *thing(s).* For most of these cases, the preposition comes at the beginning of the relative clause; only in two cases does it come at the end of the relative clause (each is marked below with an asterisk):

1 Nephi 10:16	all these things **of which** I have spoken
1 Nephi 22:3	the things **of which** I have read
1 Nephi 22:6	these things **of which** are spoken
* Alma 31:22	things to come **which** they knew nothing **about**
* Alma 31:28	all their precious things **which** they are ornamented **with**
Alma 36:26	these things **of which** I have spoken
Alma 40:9	the thing **of which** I do know
Alma 40:22	those things **of which** have been spoken by the mouths of the prophets
Alma 56:9	one thing **in which** we may have great joy

So the odds are that the preposition was between *things* and *which* rather than at the end of the relative clause, if we presume that there was a preposition in the original text. And there is evidence that the preposition itself could be either *with* or *in*.

Of considerable relevance to this discussion is the following proposed emendation made earlier in this analysis (in part 1 of volume 4):

> 2 Nephi 2:22
> and all things which were created must have remained
> **in** the same state [ɪABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQS | *in* RT] which they were
> after that they were created

Under that passage, I argued that if the preposition *in* was originally in the relative clause, it would have come at the end of the relative clause rather than at the beginning (the editors for the 1920 LDS edition put it at the beginning):

> 2 Nephi 2:22 (proposed emendation)
> and all things which were created must have remained
> in the same state which they were **in**
> after that they were created

So for 2 Nephi 2:22 I ended up accepting this emendation. But it should be noted that the earliest text there reads much like here in Helaman 13:22, namely, with a preceding *in* that is not repeated in the relative clause:

2 Nephi 2:22	**in** the same state which they were
Helaman 13:22	**in** the things which he hath blessed you

Further evidence for this construction can be found later in the text:

> Ether 13:15
> and it came to pass that **in** that same year
> [ɪABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQS | *in* RT] which he was cast out
>   from among the people
> there began to be a great war among the people

And as with these two other cases, the 1920 LDS edition inserted a preposition before *which* (in this third case, it was *in,* as in 2 Nephi 2:22).

All three readings support one another and argue that in each case the earliest reading without the initial preposition should be restored in the critical text. Although the original reading is unexpected and somewhat awkward, it has been retained in the RLDS editions for each of these three cases. This decision means that the proposed emendation in 2 Nephi 2:22 will need to be reversed. I will consider that case more fully at the end of this volume of the critical text, in the addenda where I evaluate a few additional revisions to the text.

Summary: Remove in Helaman 13:22 the preposition *with* that the 1920 LDS edition added to the relative clause; the earliest reading, "in the things which he hath blessed you", is not all that difficult, and it is supported by the earliest reading in 2 Nephi 2:22 ("in the same state which they were") and in Ether 13:15 ("in that same year which he was cast out from among the people").

■ **Helaman 13:22**

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

The 1852 LDS edition changed the singular *heart is* to the plural *hearts are,* undoubtedly because in the following clause the plural pronoun *they* refers to "your hearts". The 1858 Wright edition and the 1953 RLDS edition also made this grammatical change. There is one other reference in the Book of Mormon to the heart swelling, although not with pride but with thanksgiving: "yea a man whose heart did swell with thanksgiving to his God" (Alma 48:12).

Elsewhere in the text, there is an occasional use of the singular *heart* in contexts where readers expect the plural. For some examples, plus discussion, see under Alma 32:28. As explained there, the critical text will restore all instances of the singular *heart* when supported by the earliest textual sources, even when the context indicates that the plural is expected. Thus here in Helaman 13:22, the critical text will restore the singular *heart is,* despite its blatant conflict in number with the following plural pronoun *they.*

Summary: Restore the original singular *heart is* in Helaman 13:22; the original text allowed cases of singular *heart* despite the expectation of the plural *hearts* in the larger passage.

■ **Helaman 13:22**

yea your heart is not drawn out unto the Lord
but they do swell with great pride unto boasting
and unto great [*swelling* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPRST | *swellings* Q]
[1 |, ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
[*envyings* 1ABCDEGHIJKLMNOPQRST | *envying > envyings* F]
strifes malice persecutions and murders
and all manner of iniquities

In this passage, we have some minor variation in grammatical number for two of the conjoined nouns. In the first case, the 1911 LDS edition changed *swelling* to *swellings,* but the subsequent LDS edition (1920) restored the earlier singular, *swelling.* In the text there are no other uses in the text of *swelling* as a noun, only as an adjective:

| Alma 30:31 | and he did rise up in great **swelling** words before Alma |
| Alma 32:28 | and when you feel these **swelling** motions . . . |

Here in Helaman 13:22, the singular *swelling* is immediately followed by plural conjuncts ("envyings, strifes"), which suggests that the plural *swellings* is possible. Indeed, the 1911 reading was very likely influenced by those two following plural nouns. Since either *swelling* or *swellings* is theoretically possible, the critical text will follow the singular *swelling* here in Helaman 13:22.

Another possibility here in Helaman 13:22 is that the word *swelling* is actually an adjective (as in the two Alma passages), so that what we have here is "great swelling envyings". The 1830 typesetter decided otherwise since he placed a comma between *swelling* and *envyings*. He was undoubtedly led to this conclusion by the preceding gerund, *boasting;* note the parallelism of "unto boasting and unto great swelling". Moreover, the word *envying(s)* is never modified by an adjective elsewhere in the text, thus Mormon 8:28: "even to the **envying** of them who belong to their churches". (All other instances of *envying(s)* in the text are listed below in the next paragraph; in none of these cases is *envying(s)* modified by an adjective.)

The second case of variation in this passage involves the plural *envyings*. In the first printing of the 1852 LDS edition, the word was set as the singular *envying*. In that instance, the preceding singular *swelling* was the probable source for the mis-setting of *envyings* as *envying*. In the second printing of that edition, the plural *envyings* was restored, probably by reference to the 1840 edition. Elsewhere in the earliest text, in conjuncts involving *envying(s),* all examples but one are in the plural (the singular one is marked below with an asterisk):

2 Nephi 26:21	which causeth **envyings** and strifes and malice
Alma 1:32	in sorceries and in idolatry or idleness and in babblings and in **envyings** and strife
Alma 4:9	there was **envyings** and strifes and malice and persecutions
Alma 16:18	all lyings and deceivings and **envyings** and strifes and malice and revilings
3 Nephi 21:19	all lyings and deceivings and **envyings** and strifes and priestcrafts and whoredoms
3 Nephi 30:2	and your **envyings** and your strifes
4 Nephi 1:16	there were no **envyings** nor strifes nor tumults nor whoredoms nor lyings nor murders
* Mormon 8:36	unto **envying** and strifes and malice and persecutions

(See the discussion under Mormon 8:36 for the possibility that the singular *envying* is an error for *envyings.*) In any event, the critical text will maintain the plural *envyings* here in Helaman 13:22 since it is the earliest reading.

Summary: Maintain in Helaman 13:22 the singular *swelling* and the plural *envyings* in the list of conjuncts ("and unto great **swelling** / **envyings** strifes malice persecutions and murders"); in this case, both 𝓟 and the 1830 edition agree, which argues that 𝓞 (not extant here) read the same.

■ **Helaman 13:23**

for this cause hath the Lord God caused that a curse should come
upon the land [& 1 | and ᴀʙᴄᴇꜰɢʜɪᴊᴋʟᴍɴᴏᴘǫʀꜱᴛ | d] also upon your riches
and this because of your iniquities

The 1841 British edition accidentally dropped the *and* between the two prepositional phrases headed by *upon,* giving the asyndetic construction "upon the land / also upon your riches". The 1849 LDS edition restored the correct reading with the *and*. Undoubtedly, the original text had the *and* here. Such asyndetic conjoining of prepositional phrases is unexpected but not impossible in the Book of Mormon text. Elsewhere in the text there is one instance where two *upon*-phrases are conjoined without any conjunctive element:

> Alma 5:53
> yea will ye still persist in the wearing of costly apparel
> and setting your hearts **upon** the vain things of the world / **upon** your riches

𝓞 is not extant for Alma 5:53, so it is possible that originally there was some conjunctive element before "upon your riches" that was somehow lost during the early transmission of the text. Note that other conjuncts involving *riches* and *vain things* always have an explicit connector, usually *and:*

Alma 4:8	to set their hearts upon riches **and** upon the vain things of the world
Alma 7:6	ye have not set your hearts upon riches **and** the vain things of the world
Alma 39:14	seek not after riches **nor** the vain things of this world
Helaman 7:21	ye have set your hearts upon the riches **and** the vain things of this world
3 Nephi 6:15	tempting them to seek for power and authority and riches **and** the vain things of the world

Nonetheless, there is evidence in the earliest text for the occasional asyndetic construction (consider, for instance, the phraseology without the expected *and* in Mosiah 22:8: "thus we will depart with our women and our children / our flocks and our herds into the wilderness"). The critical text will, of course, maintain the syndetic reading with the *and* here in Helaman 13:23 ("upon the land **and** also upon your riches") since this is the reading of the earliest extant text.

Summary: Maintain the conjunction *and* that connects the two *upon*-phrases in Helaman 13:23: "a curse should come upon the land **and** also upon your riches".

■ **Helaman 13:24**

yea woe unto this people because of this time which has arriven
that ye **do** *cast out the prophets*
and **do** *mock them and cast stones at them*
and **do** *slay them*
and [do do 1ᴀ | do ʙᴄᴅᴇꜰɢʜɪᴊᴋʟᴍɴᴏᴘǫʀꜱᴛ] all manner of iniquity unto them

Both 𝓟 and the 1830 edition read "and **do do** all manner of iniquity". Here the first *do* is the auxiliary verb and the second *do* is the main verb. 𝓞 undoubtedly had both *do*'s since in this part of

the text the 1830 edition and 𝒫 are each firsthand copies of 𝒪. The 1837 edition reduced the double *do* to a single *do* (thus omitting the auxiliary *do*). Nonetheless, each of the preceding conjoined predicates maintained their initial *do* auxiliary: "**do** cast out . . . **do** mock them and cast stones . . . **do** slay them". Although there are no other examples in the text of the present-tense *do do*, there are 15 of the past-tense *did do*, of which three were emended to simply *did* in the 1837 edition (see the discussion under 1 Nephi 2:14, 2 Nephi 5:18, and Ether 11:14 for these three cases).

One might wonder here in Helaman 13:24 if there isn't a missing *do* before the conjoined verb phrase "and cast stones at them"; that is, perhaps the original text read "and do mock them and **do** cast stones at them". Note, however, that the verb phrases "mock them" and "cast stones at them" may be expected to occur together: one could mock the prophets and at the same time cast stones at them. On the other hand, casting out the prophets and slaying them could be considered separate actions. One could argue that here in Helaman 13:24 there is an auxiliary *do* for each of four actions: (1) casting out prophets, (2) mocking and casting stones at prophets, (3) slaying prophets, and (4) doing "all manner of iniquity unto them" (thus ending with a general all-purpose action). Still, the casting of stones at a prophet could lead to his death, so perhaps the boundaries between types is not that firm.

Another example where the auxiliary *do* may not be repeated for semantically similar verb phrases is found earlier in this book:

> Helaman 3:8
>> and it came to pass that 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

In this passage, there is no *did* before the first occurrence of *spread* ("they did multiply and spread"). One reason for this lack of repetition may be that the verbs *multiply* and *spread* can be considered semantically related and part of the same action, with the result that the closeness is represented by not repeating the auxiliary *do* for this pair of verbs. We may have a similar situation in Helaman 13:24, and thus the critical text will accept the earliest reading without any *do* for the conjoined verb phrase "cast stones at them".

Summary: Restore the auxiliary *do* in Helaman 13:24: "and **do** do all manner of iniquity unto them"; this usage is supported by many instances of *did do* elsewhere in the text; on the other hand, the auxiliary *do* is not always repeated for closely related actions, such as "and **do** mock them and cast stones at them" in this passage as well as in Helaman 3:8: "they **did** multiply and spread".

■ **Helaman 13:25–26**

and now when ye talk
ye say : if our days had been in the days of our fathers of old
[*ye* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLNP | *we* MOQRST] *would not have slain the prophets*
[*ye* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLNP | *we* MOQRST] *would not have stoned them and cast them out*
behold ye are worse than they

The original manuscript apparently had *ye* twice in the direct quote found in the second half of Helaman 13:25; the 1830 edition and the printer's manuscript each read *ye* for both instances.

Beginning with the 1905 LDS edition (but excluding the 1906 large-print LDS edition), the LDS text has read *we,* which is consistent with the first-person direct quote. This emendation was also adopted by the 1953 RLDS edition.

One could argue here in Helaman 13:25 that there has been a shift from first person to second person in the middle of the sentence in this narrative. There is one example of this kind of shifting in the text but only between complete sentences (see under Alma 56:52 for discussion of this example). Moreover, that example appears to be a third-person abridgment in the midst of a longer first-person narrative. But here in Helaman 13:25, it seems more likely that we have a scribal error—namely, Oliver Cowdery misheard *we* as the phonetically similar *ye* in these two places, especially since he had just heard two occurrences of *ye,* correctly used, in the first half of the verse ("and now when **ye** talk / **ye** say . . ."). Stan Larson identifies the two subsequent instances of *ye* as errors for *we* in a footnote on page 569 of his 1978 article "Conjectural Emendation and the Text of the Book of Mormon" (*Brigham Young University Studies* 18/4: 563–569).

There is one clear example in the original manuscript where Oliver Cowdery initially mixed up *we* and *ye,* although this is an example where the correct reading is *ye:*

> Alma 37:16
>> but if [*we* >% *ye* 0 | *ye* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] keep
>> the commandments of God . . .

In the following example, one that occurred in the printer's manuscript, Oliver initially wrote *ye* instead of the correct *we;* and in this instance, there was a preceding *ye* that seems to have prompted the error (just as we are proposing here in Helaman 13:25):

> Helaman 5:8
>> yea that **ye** may have that precious gift of eternal life
>> which [*ye* > *we* 1 | *we* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] have reason
>> to suppose hath been given to our fathers

David Calabro (personal communication) suggests another possible emendation for Helaman 13:25—namely, the first *our* could be a mistake for *your:*

> Helaman 13:25–26 (alternative emendation)
>> and now when ye talk
>> ye say if **your** days had been in the days of our fathers of old
>> ye would not have slain the prophets
>> ye would not have stoned them and cast them out
>> behold ye are worse than they

In this emendation, the entire quote following *ye say* becomes indirect. Calabro notes that it is not necessary to emend the second *our* to *your* (thus maintaining "in the days of **our** fathers of old"). In fact, one could argue that the second *our* led to the replacement of the original *your* with *our.* Since both 𝓟 and the 1830 edition are firsthand copies of 𝓞 (no longer extant here), 𝓞 itself must have read *our* in "if our days", which means that the error (if there is one here) entered the text when Joseph Smith dictated the text to Oliver Cowdery. Such a replacement of *your* with *our* looks more like a visual error since *your* and *our* have different vowels, which would mean that Joseph himself misread the *your* as *our.*

One problem with this alternative emendation is that there is no evidence in the early transmission of the text for accidental mix-ups of *your* and *our* (unlike the mix-ups of *ye* and *we*, listed above). Still, there is one example in the printed history where the 1841 compositor set *your* rather than *our:*

> Alma 60:20
> have **ye** forgat the commandments of the Lord **your** God
> yea have **ye** forgat the captivity
> of [*our* 1ABCGHIJKLMNOPQRST | *your* DE | *your* > *our* F] fathers

As discussed under that passage, the 1841 compositor seems to have been influenced by the preceding occurrence of *your* in that passage (and perhaps also the two occurrences of *ye*).

Either emendation will work for Helaman 13:25. Ultimately, the question is which error is more plausible. Mishearing *we* as *ye*, especially when prompted by surrounding occurrences of *ye*, seems to be more likely than Joseph Smith misreading *your* as *our* because of a following *our*. The critical text will accept the first emendation but recognize that the second one is also possible.

Summary: The two instances of *ye* in the direct quote in Helaman 13:25 appear to be an early mishearing on Oliver Cowdery's part; Joseph Smith probably dictated two occurrences of the phonetically similar *we*, but Oliver wrote down *ye* twice in the original manuscript immediately after hearing two correct instances of *ye;* another possibility is that the original text in Helaman 13:25 read "if **your** days had been in the days of our fathers of old", which Joseph Smith could have misread as "if **our** days had been in the days of our fathers of old" (under the influence of the second *our* in the clause).

■ **Helaman 13:26**

> *for as the Lord liveth*
> *if a prophet* **come** *among you*
> *and* **declareth** *unto you the word of the Lord*
> *which* **testifieth** *of your sins and iniquities*
> *ye are angry with him*

We notice here that the first verb in the *if*-clause takes the subjunctive form *come,* but the second one takes the indicative form ending in *-(e)th,* namely *declareth.* One could argue that the form *declareth* was affected by the following *testifieth,* which also ends in *-(e)th.* This issue has already been discussed under Mosiah 2:38; there I list several other instances in the earliest text with this mixture of moods within *if*-clauses. The critical text will maintain this kind of variant usage.

Summary: The earliest text allows subjunctive and indicative verb forms to be conjoined within the same *if*-clause, as here in Helaman 13:26 ("if a prophet **come** among you and **declareth** unto you the word of the Lord").

■ **Helaman 13:26**

yea you will say that he is a false prophet
and that he is a sinner and of the devil
because he [*testifieth* 1ABCDEFGHIKLMNOPQRST | *testified* J] *that your deeds are evil*

Here the 1888 LDS edition accidentally replaced the present-tense *testifieth* with the past-tense *testified*. This change was not transmitted into any subsequent LDS edition since the 1888 edition never served as a copytext for any other edition.

Although the past-tense form will work here in Helaman 13:26, usage earlier in this verse shows that the present-tense form is correct:

> Helaman 13:26
>> if a prophet come among you and declareth unto you the word of the Lord
>> which **testifieth** of your sins and iniquities
>> ye are angry with him

In fact, the larger passage (verses 26–28) expresses everything in the present tense. The critical text will maintain the present-tense *testifieth* both times here in verse 26.

Summary: Maintain the two instances of present-tense *testifieth* in Helaman 13:26, the reading of both 𝓟 and the 1830 edition.

■ **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 this passage, the plural *hearts* occurs first ("walk after the pride of your own hearts"), but then in the following text there is a singular *heart* ("and do whatsoever your heart desireth"). The original manuscript apparently had the singular *heart* since both the printer's manuscript and the 1830 edition do. But this singular *heart* in 𝓞 could still be an error for *hearts*. In the original text, the historical third-person singular ending *-(e)th* could occur with plural subjects, so "whatsoever your hearts desireth" is quite possible. Here in Helaman 13:27, the 1905 LDS edition emended the singular *heart* to *hearts,* most likely in an attempt to make the noun agree with the preceding plural *hearts* in "walk after the pride of your own hearts". Nevertheless, the singular *-(e)th* ending was left at the end of *desireth*. The 1911 LDS edition also followed this plural reading, but the 1920 LDS edition restored the singular *heart,* the reading of all the earliest textual sources.

In the original text for Helaman 13:22, the usage is similar. There a singular *heart* is referred to by means of a plural pronoun. In fact, the previous verse has an instance of plural *hearts,* so we end up with a second example in the earliest text where both *heart* and *hearts* are found in the same passage without any change in the number of the subject:

Helaman 13:21–22 (earliest text)
    and also are your riches cursed
    because ye have set **your hearts** upon them . . .
    ye do not remember the Lord your God in the things
    which he hath blessed you
    but ye do always remember your riches
    not to thank the Lord your God for them
    yea **your heart** is not drawn out unto the Lord
    but **they** do swell with great pride unto boasting

For further discussion of this issue, see under Alma 32:28. Here in Helaman 13:27, the critical text will maintain the variation in grammatical number for *heart(s)*.

Summary: Allow in Helaman 13:27 the occurrence of both singular *heart* and plural *hearts* within the same narrative sequence.

■ **Helaman 13:27–28**

and if a man shall come among you and say this
ye will *receive him*
and [*he will > ye will* 1 | *ye will* APS | BCDEFGHIJKLMNOQRT] *say that* **he** *is a prophet*
yea **ye will** *lift him up*
and **ye will** *give unto him of your substance*
ye will *give unto him of your gold and of your silver*
and **ye will** *clothe him with costly apparel*

The original text for this passage has a whole series using the phrase *ye will*. In one case, the 1837 edition (accidentally, it would appear) omitted the *ye will*. The 1908 RLDS edition restored the phrase to the RLDS text, but it has never been restored to the LDS text. In accord with the earliest textual sources as well as the parallelism throughout this passage, the critical text will restore the *ye will*.

It is worth noting that for this second instance of *ye will* Oliver Cowdery initially wrote *he will* in 𝓟. He was apparently influenced by the *he* in the following *that*-clause ("that **he** is a prophet") as well as the preceding reference to *him* ("ye will receive **him**"). Virtually immediately Oliver caught his error here: he crossed out the *he* and supralinearly inserted the correct *ye* (there is no change in the level of ink flow). 𝓞 undoubtedly read *ye will* here since the 1830 edition, also a firsthand copy of 𝓞, has *ye will*.

Summary: Restore in Helaman 13:27 the one case of *ye will* that was accidentally deleted in the 1837 edition; throughout this passage, there is a systematic repetition of *ye will*.

■ **Helaman 13:28**

and because he speaketh flattering words unto you and he saith that all is well
[*&* 1 | *and* A | BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *then ye will not find no fault with him*

Here the 1837 edition removed another Hebraistic use of the conjunctive *and:* namely, in the original text an *and* separates a preceding subordinate clause (in this case, a *because*-clause) from its following main clause ("then ye will not find no fault with him"). See, for instance, the nearby

discussion under Helaman 12:13–21 regarding Hebraistic *if*-clauses. For other instances of this Hebrew-like construction in the original text, see under HEBRAISMS in volume 3.

Summary: Restore in Helaman 13:28 the Hebraistic *and* that separates the *because*-clause from its following main clause.

■ **Helaman 13:28**

and then ye will **not** *find* [*no* 1| ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *fault with him*

Here the 1830 edition and the printer's manuscript disagree. 𝓟 has a multiple negative ("**not** find **no** fault"), while the 1830 edition lacks the *no* ("not find fault"). We therefore have two possibilities for the reading in 𝓞: if 𝓞 read "not find no fault", then the 1830 compositor must have removed the multiple negative when he set the 1830 text from 𝓞; but if 𝓞 read "not find fault", then Oliver Cowdery must have added the multiple negative when he copied the text from 𝓞 into 𝓟. We have to consider both these cases since there is clear evidence that the earliest text had instances of multiple negation; see, for instance, the discussion under 2 Nephi 26:32 as well as the more general one under NEGATION in volume 3.

When we consider Oliver Cowdery's manuscript practice, we find that there is one clear case where he created a multiple negative in 𝓟, but this only momentarily; in that instance, Oliver accidentally added a *not* which he then crossed out almost immediately:

> Ether 6:25
> and he commanded them that
> they should [*not* > NULL 1| ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] constrain **no** man
>   to be their king

𝓞 is not extant here, but spacing between extant fragments argues that there wasn't any *not* in 𝓞 unless it was supralinearly inserted.

On the other hand, we have two clear cases where the 1830 compositor, John Gilbert, removed a multiple negative; in each case, he omitted a *not:*

> 2 Nephi 26:32
> and that they should [*not* >jg NULL 1| ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] do **none**
>   of these things

> Ether 12:6
> for ye receive **no** witness
> [*not* 1| ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] until after the trial of your faith

In the second instance, spacing between extant fragments of 𝓞 argues that there was a *not* in 𝓞.

Thus we have clear evidence that the 1830 compositor sometimes eliminated multiple negatives when he set the type. On the other hand, there is no firm evidence that Oliver Cowdery ever permanently introduced a multiple negative into the text. Consequently, here in Helaman 13:28 it is more likely that the 1830 compositor omitted the *no* from an original "not find no fault" (instead of Oliver accidentally adding *no* to an original "not find fault").

There is one other factor that provides some support, although minor, for the occurrence of *no* before *fault* as part of the original reading. Elsewhere in the scriptures, when the word *fault* is

negated, the negative word is the quantifier *no,* the negative preposition *without,* or a conjunctive *nor* or *or* coming right before the noun *fault* rather than a *not* occurring with the verb. There is one other occurrence in the Book of Mormon of *fault* occurring in a negative context, and this occurrence reads *no fault:*

> Mormon 8:17   but behold we know **no fault**

In other words, we do not get "we do not know any fault" (or "we do not know no fault"). In the King James Bible, the same usage consistently occurs (but without any possibility of multiple negation):

> 1 Samuel 29:3   and I have found **no fault** in him
> Daniel 6:4   but they could find **none occasion nor fault**
> Daniel 6:4   neither was there **any error or fault** found in him
> Luke 23:4   I find **no fault** in this man
> Luke 23:14   behold I . . . have found **no fault** in this man
> John 18:38   I find in him **no fault** *at all*
> John 19:4   I find **no fault** in him
> John 19:6   for I find **no fault** in him
> Revelation 14:5   for they are **without fault** before the throne of God

There is one other case in this part of the text where the 1830 compositor seems to have removed a multiple negative:

> 3 Nephi 17:17
> and **no** tongue [*cannot* 1 | *can* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] speak . . .

As in Helaman 13:27, both 𝓟 and the 1830 edition are firsthand copies of 𝓞 in 3 Nephi 17:17. The critical text will assume that the 1830 compositor was responsible once more for removing a multiple negative. For discussion, see under 3 Nephi 17:17.

Summary: Restore in Helaman 13:28 the reading of 𝓟 with its multiple negative: "and then ye will **not** find **no** fault with him"; the original text has a number of cases of multiple negation; in this instance, the 1830 compositor removed the multiple negative by deleting the *no;* usage elsewhere in the Book of Mormon and the King James Bible argues that the occurrence of *no* before *fault* is expected.

■ **Helaman 13:31**

and behold the time cometh
- ☐ *that he* **curseth** *your riches*   1ABCDEFGHIJKLM*PS
  that **it becometh** *slippery*
- ☐ *that he* **will curse** *your riches*   MᶜNOQ
  that **they shall become** *slippery*
- ☐ *that he* **curseth** *your riches*   RT
  that **they become** *slippery*

Here the 1906 LDS edition introduced two different types of change. First, a future modal auxiliary was inserted in each *that*-clause (*curseth > will curse* and *becometh > shall become*). Second, the pronoun *it* was changed to *they* since the referent was *riches,* which is a plural in standard English

(as in "their riches were lost"). These changes were also made in the plates for the third printing (in 1907) of the 1905 LDS edition. For the 1920 LDS edition, however, the editors restored the original verb forms by removing the future auxiliaries (*will* and *shall*), but they kept the plural *they,* which required (in standard English) that the verb form be *become* rather than the original *becometh.*

The grammatical change of *it* to *they* is motivated by other markers of plurality for *riches* in the Book of Mormon text, including the use of plural pronouns for *riches* later in this verse:

Helaman 13:31
and behold the time cometh that he curseth your riches
that it becometh slippery
that ye cannot hold **them**
and in the days of your poverty ye cannot retain **them**

We get the same use of plural pronouns as well as a plural verb form later in this passage:

Helaman 13:33
O that we had remembered the Lord our God in the day that he gave us our riches
and then **they** would not have become slippery that we should lose **them**
for behold our riches **are** gone from us

Even so, there are instances in the text where the singular pronoun *it* is used to refer to a plural. Some of these, but not all, have been edited to *them:*

1 Nephi 17:50
if God had commanded me to do **all things**
I could do [*it* 0A | *it* >js *them* 1 | *them* BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]

1 Nephi 19:24
hear ye **the words of the prophet** which was written unto all the house of Israel
and liken [*it* 0A | *it* >js *them* 1 | *them* BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] unto yourselves

Mosiah 28:17
now after Mosiah had finished translating **these records**
behold **it** gave an account of the people which was destroyed

Helaman 6:32
and it came to pass that
all these iniquities did come unto them in the space of not many years
insomuch that a more part of **it** had come unto them in the sixty and seventh year

Ether 3:26
for the Lord had said unto him in times before
that if he would believe in him
that he could shew unto him **all things**
it should be shewn unto him

In each of these cases, we have a plural noun phrase that can be collectively treated as a singular and thus referred to as *it*. Similarly, here in Helaman 13:31, the plural *riches* is a collective, and thus the singular pronoun *it* can be used to refer to one's riches, at least in the original text of the Book of Mormon.

As far as the use of the two future modal auxiliaries is concerned, usually the text uses such modals in futuristic *that*-clauses following the expression "the time cometh" (13 examples with *shall* and 2 with *will*). Nonetheless, there are a couple examples where the simple present-tense indicative occurs for this expression:

> Mosiah 29:27
>> and if the time cometh that the voice of the people **doth choose** iniquity
>> then is the time that the judgments of God will come upon you

> Mormon 8:41
>> and the time soon cometh that he **avengeth** the blood of the saints upon you

Thus there is no overwhelming reason to follow the 1906 emendations that added *will* and *shall* to these futuristic *that*-clauses.

Summary: Follow the earliest reading in Helaman 13:31, with its singular pronoun *it* in reference to *riches* and with the original present-tense verb forms *curseth* and *becometh* (thus "he **curseth** your riches that **it becometh** slippery").

■ **Helaman 13:31**

and in the days of your [*poverity* 1 | *poverty* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
ye cannot retain them

Here in 𝓟, Oliver Cowdery wrote *poverty* as *poverity*. Although normally Oliver wrote the word correctly (five times in 𝓞 and six times in 𝓟), he occasionally miswrote it (but only in 𝓟) as a word ending in *-ity*, here in Helaman 13:31 and two times earlier in the text:

> Alma 32:15
>> yea much more blessed than they who art compelled to be humble
>> because of their exceeding [*poverty* 0ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST | *poverity* 1]

> Alma 34:40
>> that ye do not revile against those who do cast you out
>> because of your exceeding [*poverty* 0ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST | *poverity* 1]

For these other two instances, 𝓞 is extant and correctly reads as *poverty*. Thus Oliver is the one responsible for *poverity*; it does not represent some kind of archaic or dialectal form for the word *poverty* (nor is this form of the word found in the Oxford English Dictionary).

Summary: Maintain the word *poverty* throughout the text; in a few places, Oliver Cowdery wrote the word as *poverity* in 𝓟, but that form of the word is clearly innovative and not original to the Book of Mormon text.

■ **Helaman 13:32**

for your [*destruction* > *desolation* 1 | *desolation* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
   is already come upon you
and your **destruction** *is made sure*

Here in the printer's manuscript, Oliver Cowdery initially wrote "for your destruction is already come upon you"; virtually immediately he corrected *destruction* to *desolation* (the level of ink flow for the supralinear *desolation* is unchanged). Oliver's error was very likely in anticipation of the following clause: "and your destruction is made sure". In addition, he probably expected destruction rather than desolation to come upon someone; elsewhere in the text, there are 12 cases of "destruction(s) coming upon someone", as in 2 Nephi 25:10: "wherefore it hath been told them concerning the destruction which should come upon them". The only instance of "desolation(s) coming upon someone" is here in Helaman 13:32. The 1830 edition, also a firsthand copy of 𝓞, reads *desolation* in this passage, so 𝓞 must have also read this way. The unique reading with *desolation* in this passage is apparently intended, and the critical text will therefore maintain it.

Summary: Maintain in Helaman 13:32 the corrected reading in 𝓟 ("for your **desolation** is already come upon you)"; despite its uniqueness, this expression appears to have been the reading in 𝓞 since the 1830 edition also reads this way.

■ **Helaman 13:33**

yea in that day
[*shall ye* 1A | *ye shall* BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *say*
O that we had remembered the Lord our God

Here the 1837 edition switched the order of the auxiliary verb *shall* and the subject pronoun *ye,* from "in that day **shall ye** say" to "in that day **ye shall** say". Either the inverted or the noninverted word order is possible after the sentence-initial adverbial phrase "in that day", as in the following examples where the subject is a pronoun (the ones with the inverted order are each marked with an asterisk):

*	2 Nephi 13:7	in that day **shall he** swear saying . . .
	2 Nephi 15:30	and in that day **they shall** roar against them
*	2 Nephi 22:4	and in that day **shall ye** say . . .
*	2 Nephi 25:8	for in that day **shall they** understand them
	Mosiah 17:18	and in that day ye **shall be** hunted
*	Helaman 13:20	and in that day **shall they** be smitten
	3 Nephi 20:39	yea in that day **they shall** know that I am he that doth speak

The first three, citations from Isaiah (the King James text), also show the variation in word order. Here in Helaman 13:33, both 𝓟 and the 1830 edition have the same inverted word order, so 𝓞 must have also read this way.

Summary: Restore the inverted subject-verb word order in Helaman 13:33 ("yea in that day **shall ye** say . . .").

■ **Helaman 13:33**

and then they would not have become slippery
that we should [*lose* 1ABCGIJKLMNOPQRST | *loose* DEFH] *them*

Here we have a typo in the 1841 British edition, the replacement of the correct *lose* with *loose*. This error remained in the LDS text for the next two editions (1849 and 1852), probably because one can think of these riches as slippery and loose (although there is no textual support for collocations in the Book of Mormon of *slippery* and *loose*). Of course, the expression "that we should loose them" doesn't really work here since these people are not loosening their riches (that is, making them loose). The critical text will maintain *lose* here in Helaman 13:33.

Interestingly, the first RLDS edition (1874) also has the reading *loose*. The text of that edition derives from the 1840 edition and the 1858 Wright edition, not the 1852 LDS edition. But the numbered paragraphs found in the 1852 LDS edition (the first primitive verse system) were adopted into the 1874 RLDS edition. It is theoretically possible that the *loose* of the 1874 RLDS edition derives from the 1852 LDS edition, but more likely this particular instance of *loose* in the 1874 RLDS edition was an independent typo.

Oliver Cowdery frequently spelled *lose* as *loose* in the manuscripts. All four extant occurrences in 𝓞 read *loose* rather than *lose,* of which three out of four are in Oliver's hand. Out of 20 instances of *lose* in 𝓟 (all in Oliver's hand), two are spelled *loose* while one was initially spelled *loose* but then corrected to *lose*. Besides here in Helaman 13:33, the spelling *loose* for *lose* also occurs one other place in the printed history, namely, once more in the 1841 British edition: "and perhaps thou wouldst **loose** thy soul" (Alma 20:18); in this passage, 𝓟 and all the other editions read "and perhaps thou wouldst **lose** thy soul".

Summary: Maintain in Helaman 13:33 the verb *lose,* the reading of all the earliest sources, rather than *loose,* especially since it really doesn't make sense to say that these people were loosening their riches.

■ **Helaman 13:34**

behold we [*layeth* >js *lay* 1 | *layeth* A | *lay* BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *a tool here*
and on the morrow it is gone

In the Book of Mormon text, the historical third person singular ending *-(e)th* is often found for verbs taking plural subjects, usually third person plural forms, but occasionally with second person plurals (as discussed under Alma 41:9). Here in Helaman 13:34 we have a case where the subject is the first person plural pronoun *we*. Joseph Smith replaced this instance of *we layeth* to *we lay* in his editing for the 1837 edition, but the critical text will restore the original *we layeth.* For cases where the *-(e)th* originally occurred with the first person singular pronoun *I,* see under 2 Nephi 4:15. For a general discussion, see under INFLECTIONAL ENDINGS in volume 3.

Summary: Restore in Helaman 13:34 the *-(e)th* ending for the first person plural subject pronoun *we;* such extensions of the historical third person singular ending can be found throughout the original Book of Mormon text.

■ **Helaman 13:36**

O that we had repented
in the [day 1ABCDEFGHIJLMNOPQRST | *days > day* K]
that the word of the Lord came unto us

> In the first printing of the 1892 RLDS edition, the compositor set "in the **days** that the word of the Lord came unto us". In a subsequent printing from the 1892 plates, the correct singular *day* was restored to the RLDS text. This correction could have been made by reference to the language of the preceding verses and without reference to any prior edition:

> > Helaman 13:33–34
> > O that we had remembered the Lord our God
> > in the **day** that he gave us our riches
> > and then they would not have become slippery
> > that we should lose them
> > for behold our riches are gone from us . . .
> > and behold our swords are taken from us
> > in the **day** we have sought them for battle

Summary: Maintain in Helaman 13:36 the singular *day* in the phrase "in the **day** that the word of the Lord came unto us", the reading of the earliest textual sources.

■ **Helaman 13:36**

and all things [are 1ABDEFIJLMNOQRT | *have* CGHKPS] *become slippery*

> As discussed under 2 Nephi 22:2, there are a few instances in the original text where the perfect auxiliary was *be* rather than *have*. In older English, the *be* verb was used in this way with verbs of motion or change, as in the familiar phrase "the hour **is** come" (Mark 14:41) rather than "the hour **hath** come" (or in modern English, "the hour **has** come"). The same usage occurs with the verb *become,* as in Genesis 3:22: "behold the man **is** become as one of us". For a complete discussion regarding this usage in the original text of the Book of Mormon, see under PERFECT in volume 3.

Summary: Maintain in Helaman 13:36 the archaic use of the perfect auxiliary *be* with the verb *become* ("and all things **are** become slippery"), the reading of the earliest textual sources (𝟊 and the 1830 edition, both firsthand copies of 𝒪).

■ **Helaman 13:37**

canst thou not turn away
[NULL >? *thine angar* O | *thine anger* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *from us*

> The original manuscript is not extant here, but spacing between nearby extant fragments suggests that Oliver Cowdery initially wrote "canst thou not turn away from us", which he then corrected by supralinearly inserting *thine angar* in 𝒪. Given his typical spelling of *anger* as *angar* in extant portions of 𝒪 (14 out of 17 times), Oliver probably spelled the word here in 𝒪 as *angar*.

Oliver Cowdery's supposed initial omission in 𝒪 of *thine anger* was perhaps influenced by the phraseology "turn away from us". Both the 1830 edition and the printer's manuscript (each a firsthand copy of 𝒪 for this passage) agree by having *thine anger.* Moreover, there are nine other occurrences in the text of "turn away one's anger" and seven of "one's anger is (not) turned away", including four in Helaman 11:11–17 and two nearby ones in this chapter of Helaman:

> Helaman 13:11
> > but if ye will repent and return unto the Lord your God
> > I will turn away **mine anger**

> Helaman 13:39
> > and I pray that **the anger of the Lord** be turned away from you
> > and that ye would repent and be saved

The reading of the current text is undoubtedly correct with its inclusion of *thine anger* here in Helaman 13:37.

Summary: The original text undoubtedly had the direct object *thine anger* in Helaman 13:37, the reading of both 𝒫 and the 1830 edition; it appears that in 𝒪, not extant here, this noun phrase was supralinearly inserted.

Helaman 14

■ **Helaman 14:3**

insomuch that [in 1ABCDEFGIJLMNOPQRST| HK] the night before he cometh
there shall be no darkness

> Here in Helaman 14:3, the 1874 RLDS edition omitted the preposition *in,* thus changing the
> adverbial prepositional phrase "in the night before he cometh" to the adverbial noun phrase
> "the night before he cometh". Although this secondary reading will work, there are no examples
> of readings like that elsewhere in the text. The 1908 RLDS edition restored the correct reading.
> The critical text will maintain the original *in,* the reading of both 𝓟 and the 1830 edition.

Summary: Maintain in Helaman 14:3 the original preposition *in* in the adverbial prepositional phrase
"**in** the night before he cometh".

■ **Helaman 14:3**

insomuch that in the night before he cometh there shall be no darkness
insomuch that it shall appear unto man as if it **was** *day*

> One wonders if the indicative verb form *was* ("as if it **was** day") is a mistake for the subjunctive
> *were* ("as if it **were** day"). Here the 1830 edition and the printer's manuscript agree, so the origi-
> nal manuscript undoubtedly read *was* (𝓞 is not extant for most of this passage). But perhaps the
> *was* is an error for *were* that entered the text as Joseph Smith dictated the text to Oliver Cowdery.
>
> Normally in the text, we get *were* rather than *was* in subordinate *as if* clauses where the sub-
> ject is *it.* There are nine examples in the text with *were,* as in the following example in the very
> next verse:

> > Helaman 14:4
> > therefore there shall be one day and a night and a day
> > as if it **were** one day and there were no night

> Even so, there is one other example in the text with *was:*

> > 3 Nephi 8:6
> > and there was terrible thunder
> > insomuch that it did shake the whole earth
> > as if it **was** about to divide asunder

In this instance, as in Helaman 14:3, both 𝓟 and the 1830 edition are firsthand copies of 𝓞, so once more we have an example of the indicative *was* in 𝓞 (and presumably in the original text). In contrast to this second example with *was,* two of the ones with *were* refer to the earth dividing asunder:

> 1 Nephi 17:45
>
> wherefore he hath spoken unto you like unto the voice of thunder
> which did cause the earth to shake as if it **were** to divide asunder

> Helaman 5:33
>
> and the walls did tremble again
> and the earth shook as if it **were** about to divide asunder

Even though *were* is more frequent than *was* in this context, *was* is still possible. For each case of "as if it was/were . . .", we follow the earliest textual sources.

Summary: Accept the occasional use of the indicative *was* in the expression "as if it was . . .", here in Helaman 14:3 as well as in 3 Nephi 8:6; in both cases, both 𝓟 and the 1830 (each firsthand copies of 𝓞 for this part of the text) support the *was;* the normal Book of Mormon expression uses the subjunctive *were* ("as if it were . . .").

■ **Helaman 14:4**

for ye shall know of the rising of the sun
and also of its [*sitting* 1 | *setting* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]

The printer's manuscript here uses the verb *sit* rather than the expected *set.* We cannot be sure whether the original manuscript, not extant here, read *sitting* or *setting.* The 1830 edition, also a firsthand copy of 𝓞 for this part of the text, has the expected *setting.* If 𝓞 read *sitting,* then the 1830 typesetter decided to correct it to the expected *setting.* On the other hand, if 𝓞 read *setting,* then Oliver Cowdery replaced it with *sitting.* As explained under 1 Nephi 11:1, the earliest Book of Mormon text has a number of cases where *sit* and *set* are mixed up (nearly 10 percent of the time), at least from the perspective of standard grammar. For each of these cases, the critical text will follow the earliest textual sources, even if the reading is nonstandard. The problem here in Helaman 14:4 is that it is not clear how 𝓞 originally read. And even if 𝓞 read *sitting,* that may have been an error for *setting* that was introduced into the text as Joseph Smith dictated it to Oliver.

There is only one example in the manuscripts of Oliver Cowdery accidentally mixing up these two verbs. Once, while copying from 𝓞 into 𝓟, he wrote *setting,* but then later (probably when he proofed 𝓟 against 𝓞) he corrected the *e* of setting with an *i* (the overwriting is with somewhat heavier ink flow):

> Ether 12:37
>
> thou shalt be made strong
> even unto the [*setting* >+ *sitting* 1 | *sitting* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] down
> in the place which I have prepared in the mansions of my Father

And, it should be noted, Oliver's error in Ether 12:37 was to write *setting* rather than *sitting,* the opposite of him potentially writing *sitting* in Helaman 14:4 instead of *setting.* In fact, Oliver frequently

initially wrote *i*'s as *e*'s, so the initial writing of *setting* in Ether 12:37 may have simply been a scribal error on Oliver's part that he later corrected. Finally, we should note that in all other cases, Oliver showed no hesitation in deciding what form of *sit* or *set* he should write; that is, there is no other manuscript variation between these two verbs.

On the other hand, there are four cases where the 1830 typesetter consciously emended the text to read *set* (and incorrectly in the last case, at least from a prescriptive point of view):

> Jacob 3:10 (*sot* appears to be a scribal slip for *sat*)
>> wherefore ye shall remember your children
>> how that ye have grieved their hearts because of the example
>> that ye have [*sot* 1|*set* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] before them

> Mosiah 10:2
>> and I [*sat* 1|*set* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] guards round about the land
>> that the Lamanites might not come upon us again unawares and destroy us

> Mosiah 11:11
>> and the seats
>> which was [*sat* 1|*set* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] apart for the high priests
>> which was above all the other seats
>> he did ornament with pure gold

> Moroni 7:27 (should be *sat* in standard English rather than *set*)
>> hath miracles ceased because that Christ hath ascended into heaven
>> and hath [*sit* 1|*set* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQ|*sat* RST] down
>> on the right hand of God

(See under each of these passages for discussion; also see under SIT in volume 3.) These examples argue that the 1830 typesetter is more likely the one responsible for the variation here in Helaman 14:4. In other words, he replaced the original but nonstandard *sitting* in 𝓞 with *setting* in the 1830 edition.

Historically and dialectally, we can find evidence that "the sun sits", including these examples from *Literature Online* <lion.chadwyck.com>:

> William Sherlock (1694)
>> as the rising and **sitting** of the Sun

> Thomas Chatterton (1770)
>> the sun **sat** lowering in the western sky

> Joseph Holt Ingraham (1845)
>> "He must be expelled from your roof ere another sun **sits**,
>> or I and my child will go!"

Note especially the first example with its use of the present participle *sitting* conjoined with the present participle *rising,* just like here in Helaman 14:4 ("the **rising** of the sun and also of its **sitting**"). The critical text will therefore accept the nonstandard *sitting* here in Helaman 14:4 as the reading of the original text (as well as the reading in 𝓞).

Summary: Restore in Helaman 14:4 the nonstandard use of *sitting* in reference to the setting of the sun; nonstandard uses of *sit* instead of *set* are fairly common in the earliest Book of Mormon text; such usage can also be found in dialectal and in earlier English.

■ **Helaman 14:4–5**

 and this shall be unto **you** *for a sign*
 for **ye** *shall know of the rising of the sun and also of its sitting*
→ *therefore* **they** *shall know of a surety that there shall be two days and a night . . .*
 and behold there shall be a new star arise
 such an one as **ye** *never have beheld*
 and this also shall be a sign unto **you**

Ross Geddes (personal communication, 22 September 2004) wonders here if *they* should be *ye*. The surrounding text uses the second person plural pronouns *ye* and *you,* as noted above in bold. In support of this emendation, we have the following case of *they* that was emended to *ye* in some LDS editions early in the 20th century:

 3 Nephi 3:15
  yea he said unto **them** : as the Lord liveth
  except **ye** repent of all **your** iniquities and cry unto the Lord
  that [*they* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNPS | *ye* OQRT] would in no wise be delivered
   out of the hands of those Gaddianton robbers

In this case, however, the use of the subordinate conjunction *that* ("that they would in nowise be delivered") allows for a shift to an indirect quote and thus a return to the third person plural that is used in the surrounding text. For further discussion of this case, see under 3 Nephi 3:15.

Here in Helaman 14:4, 𝒪 undoubtedly read *they* since both 𝒫 and the 1830 edition are first-hand copies of 𝒪 for this part of the text. If *they* is an error, then it must have occurred as Joseph Smith dictated the text to Oliver Cowdery. The problem with the emendation *ye* for *they* in Helaman 14:4 is that these two pronouns are phonetically and orthographically dissimilar, so it seems unlikely that they would have been mixed up. (This conclusion also applies to the case in 3 Nephi 3:15.) In fact, there is no independent evidence for mix-ups of *ye* and *they* anywhere else in the history of the text, neither in the manuscripts nor in the printed editions. There is one case where it appears that the two pronouns *ye* and *we* were mixed up (in Helaman 13:25), but these two pronouns are phonetically and orthographically similar.

Ultimately, it seems that the original text occasionally has shifts in person. As an example of this, see the discussion under Alma 56:52 regarding an example where the shift in person covers at least a whole sentence. Although the shift between second and third person here in Helaman 14:4–5 is somewhat jarring, the text itself remains understandable. Perhaps Samuel the Lamanite momentarily distinguished between his current listeners and those who would observe these events five years from then. Despite its difficulty, the critical text will maintain the shift in this passage from *ye* to *they* and then back to *ye*.

Summary: Maintain in Helaman 14:4–5 the shift from second to third person (from *ye* to *they*) and then back to the second person (from *they* to *ye*).

■ **Helaman 14:5**

and behold there shall
[*be* 1CGHKPS | ABDEFIJLMNOQRT] *a new star arise*
such an one as ye never have beheld

The original manuscript is not extant for any part of this sentence, which means that spacing between extant fragments of 𝓞 cannot help determine the reading in 𝓞. The 1830 edition is missing the *be* verb, whereas the printer's manuscript has it. The phraseology with the *be* is the more difficult reading for modern readers, and one might expect change to occur in the direction of omitting the *be*. In the 1840 edition the *be* was restored to the text, and the RLDS text continues with it (especially since 𝓟 has the *be*). It is possible, although not probable, that Joseph Smith referred to the original manuscript in making this change. The improbability arises because we can find no firm evidence except in 1 Nephi for Joseph's restoration of original manuscript readings in the 1840 edition. (For evidence of the use of 𝓞 in the 1840 editing, see the discussion under the 1 Nephi preface regarding the clause "they call **the name of** the place Bountiful".)

There is independent evidence in the original text for the expression "there shall be none <infinitive verb form>", namely, originally in 2 Nephi 1:6: "there shall **be** none come into this land". Joseph Smith removed the *be* in this particular case; but as explained under 2 Nephi 1:6, the critical text will restore the *be* since it appears to be fully intended in the earliest text. Of course, the use of *be* in both 2 Nephi 1:6 and Helaman 14:5 is mutually supporting.

Summary: Restore the *be* in Helaman 14:5, the reading in 𝓟 (and the 1840 edition): "and behold there shall **be** a new star arise"); although unexpected, such a construction is supported by the original text in 2 Nephi 1:6 ("there shall **be** none come into this land").

■ **Helaman 14:7**

and it shall come to pass that
ye shall [*all* 1ABDEFIJLMNOPQRST | CGHK] *be amazed and wonder*

The 1840 edition dropped the quantifier *all*. The error persisted in the RLDS textual tradition until the 1908 RLDS edition restored the *all*. This omission of *all* was probably the 1840 typesetter's error and not the result of Joseph Smith's editing for that edition, simply because there is no motivation for making such a change. The error probably occurred because *shall* ends in *all,* which allowed the typesetter's eye to accidentally skip over the second sequence of the letters *all*. For a second case where *shall all* was reduced to *shall* in the 1840 edition, see under 3 Nephi 29:2. For another case where an earlier *shall all* was replaced with simply *shall* (this time by the 1830 typesetter), see under 2 Nephi 13:24. And in Ether 4:3 the 1840 typesetter omitted the *all* in "they have **all** dwindled in unbelief". All of these instances where *all* was omitted in the 1840 edition were typos; the 1830 omission, on the other hand, may have been intentional.

Summary: Both the 1830 edition and the printer's manuscript have *all* in Helaman 14:7; the 1840 change is undoubtedly a typo rather than due to editing.

■ **Helaman 14:11**

for for this intent [*I have* 1ABDEFIJLMNOPQS|*have I* CGHKRT] *come up*
upon the walls of this city

The 1840 edition and the 1920 LDS edition switched the word order after the prepositional phrase
"for this intent", from the noninverted order ("for this intent **I have** come up") to the inverted
order ("for this intent **have I** come up"). The 1840 change may have been accidental. The 1908
RLDS edition restored the original noninverted order to the RLDS text. The later LDS change was
intentional since it is marked in the 1920 committee copy.

Elsewhere in the text, we have examples of both word orders after "for this intent":

  □ *noninverted order*

  Jacob 4:5   and for this intent **we keep** the law of Moses
  Moroni 8:6   for for this intent **I have** written this epistle

  □ *inverted order*

  Jacob 4:4   for for this intent **have we** written these things
  Helaman 15:4   and for this intent **hath the Lord** prolonged their days
  Mormon 5:14   and for this intent **shall they** go

Thus either order is possible, and therefore the original noninverted order in Helaman 14:10 ("I have
come") will be restored in the critical text. For further discussion regarding inverted versus non-
inverted word order after a sentence-initial adverbial phrase, see under Mosiah 20:15.

Summary: Restore in Helaman 14:11 the original noninverted word order in "for for this intent **I have**
come up".

■ **Helaman 14:13**

and if ye believe on his name
ye will repent of all your sins
that thereby ye may have
[1|*a* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *remission of them*
through his merits

The printer's manuscript doesn't have the indefinite article *a* before *remission,* but the 1830 edi-
tion does. Since for this part of the text both these sources are firsthand copies of the original
manuscript, we need to determine which variant was the more probable reading in 𝒪 (which is
not extant here). If 𝒪 read *a remission,* then Oliver Cowdery must have accidentally omitted the *a*
when he copied from 𝒪 into 𝒫. On the other hand, if 𝒪 read *remission,* then the 1830 compositor
must have added the *a* when he set the type.

Elsewhere in the current text, *remission* usually occurs with a determiner—with either the
indefinite article *a* (18 times) or the definite article *the* (4 times). Based on the earliest textual
sources, there are also five occurrences without any determiner, of which three are of the specific
form "repentance and remission of sins" (in 3 Nephi 7:16, 3 Nephi 7:23, and Moroni 3:3). At least

in that expression, the lack of a determiner seems firm. The two other occurrences without a determiner could well have had an *a* in the original text; the original manuscript is not extant in either instance:

> Mosiah 3:13   the same might receive **remission** of their sins
> Moroni 8:25   and the fulfilling the commandments bringeth **remission** of sins

One important point to note here is that in none of these other instances of *remission* has there been any loss or gain of the indefinite article *a:* that is, no *a* has been lost from any of the other cases of *a remission,* even temporarily, in the manuscripts (or in the editions); nor for any of the other cases has an *a* ever been added in the editions (or in the manuscripts, even momentarily). So as far as the indefinite article for *remission* is concerned, we cannot rely on transmission errors to evaluate the case here in Helaman 14:13. But when we look at the addition and omission of the indefinite article *a* before other nouns, we find evidence that Oliver Cowdery sometimes dropped the *a,* even when the resulting language was clearly unacceptable:

> Alma 20:13
> thou art going to deliver these Nephites
> which are sons of [NULL >+ *a* 1 | *a* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] liar

> 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

> Alma 42:4
> and thus we see that there was a time granted unto man to repent
> yea [*a* 0ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST | NULL >+ *a* 1] probationary time
> a time to repent and serve God

In all three cases, Oliver's manuscript corrections are not virtually immediate; in each case, there is a difference in the level of ink flow, which suggests a later correction. In fact, in one case (Alma 42:2), Oliver not only omitted the *a* in both 𝓞 and 𝓟 but he corrected only the error in 𝓞. In that case, the 1830 compositor supplied the necessary *a*.

On the other hand, there is one case (but only one) where the 1830 compositor added the indefinite article *a* (although unnecessarily), but in that case he was motivated to supply the *a* since the preceding text read *a death:*

> Alma 11:42
> now there is **a** death which is called
> [1 | *a* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] temporal death

In other words, the 1830 compositor rarely supplied an indefinite article *a* and then only when he would have been motivated to do so. Here in Helaman 14:13, the only motivation we can find for adding an *a* is that *a remission* is more frequent than *remission* alone. But there is clearly nothing wrong with the reading in 𝓟, "that thereby ye may have remission of them through his merits". The 1830 compositor did not add any *a* to the two other instances of unconjoined *remission* (in Mosiah 3:13 and Moroni 8:25). To be sure, Oliver Cowdery never omitted an *a* from the 18 other cases of *a remission.* But since we do find evidence that Oliver occasionally omitted fully necessary

instances of the indefinite article *a,* the critical text will accept the 1830 reading in Helaman 14:13 as the correct reading and assume that the reading in 𝒫 involved a loss of *a.* Basically, the odds are somewhat greater that Oliver Cowdery omitted the *a* than the 1830 compositor added it.

Summary: Retain the 1830 reading with *a* before *remission* in Helaman 14:13; scribal errors on Oliver Cowdery's part suggest that he accidentally omitted the *a* in this case when he copied from 𝒪 into 𝒫; there is less evidence that the 1830 compositor would have added the *a* before *remission* when he set the type.

■ **Helaman 14:15**

that thereby men may be brought into the presence of the Lord

Lyle Fletcher has suggested (personal communication, 29 September 2004) that the word *back* is missing from the text here and that it should read as "that thereby men may be brought **back** into the presence of the Lord". 𝒪 is extant for that part of the text from the end of *thereby* to the beginning of the first *the,* and it clearly lacks the word *back.* So if the original text had the *back,* it must have been omitted during the dictation of the text. Other passages, including a nearby one in verse 17, could be used to support this conjectural emendation:

> Alma 42:23   and the resurrection of the dead bringeth **back** men
>   into the presence of God
>
> Helaman 14:17   the resurrection of Christ redeemeth mankind . . .
>   and bringeth them **back** into the presence of the Lord
>
> Mormon 9:13   they are brought **back** into the presence of the Lord
>
> Ether 3:13   therefore ye are brought **back** into my presence

But there is one other case that does not have the *back:*

> Alma 36:15
>   O thought I that I could be banished
>   and become extinct both soul and body
> →   that I might not be brought to stand in the presence of my God
>   to be judged of my deeds

In this passage, 𝒪 is not extant for "I might not be brought to". But there is no room in the lacuna for *back* after *brought* except by supralinear insertion.

     For two other expressions where *back* is implied but not stated, see under Mosiah 28:17 and Alma 58:24. In all these cases, including Helaman 14:15, we follow the earliest textual sources in determining whether *back* is actually in the text. Thus *back* will not be added here in Helaman 14:15.

Summary: Maintain the original reading in Helaman 14:15 without the word *back* in the expression "that thereby men may be brought into the presence of the Lord"; usage elsewhere in the text shows that *back* is optional for the expression "to be brought (back) into the presence of the Lord".

■ **Helaman 14:16**

yea behold this death bringeth to pass the resurrection
and redeemeth all mankind from the first death
[1|; ABCDEFGHKPS|— IJLMNOQRT]
that spiritual death
[1ABCDEFGHKPS|; IJLMNOQRT]
for all mankind by the fall of Adam
being cut off from the presence of the Lord
are considered as dead

The 1830 typesetter treated "that spiritual death" as connected with the following text rather than as an appositive that restates "the first death". He placed a semicolon after "the first death" and no punctuation after "that spiritual death". For the 1879 LDS edition, Orson Pratt redid the punctuation in accord with the more appropriate reading, replacing the 1830 semicolon with a dash and inserting a semicolon after "that spiritual death". A similar kind of appositive usage occurs later in this same chapter:

> Helaman 14:18
> and there cometh upon them again a spiritual death
> [NULL >jg , 0| 1|, ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
> yea a second death
> [NULL >jg , 0| 1|, ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
> for they are cut off again as to things pertaining to righteousness

In this second example, the text renames "a spiritual death" as "a second death"; this interpretation is facilitated by the use of the *yea,* which makes the appositive relationship clear, unlike the case in verse 16.

Summary: Accept Orson Pratt's 1879 change in the punctuation for Helaman 14:16 that leads to correctly interpreting "that spiritual death" as an appositive describing "the first death".

■ **Helaman 14:16**

for all mankind by the fall of Adam
being cut off from the presence of the Lord
[*are* 1AIJLMNOQRT|*or* BCDEFGHKPS] *considered as dead*

Here the original manuscript is not extant for the predicate "are considered as dead". Both the 1830 edition and the printer's manuscript read *are,* so the original manuscript undoubtedly read *are.* The 1837 edition reads *or,* which is probably a typo rather than due to editing (*are* and *or* are visually similar and were thus mixed up by the 1837 typesetter). The RLDS text continues to have *or* here (although 𝓟 reads *are*). The 1879 LDS edition restored the original *are* to the LDS text, probably by reference to the 1830 edition.

It is possible that the original text read *or* and that Oliver Cowdery misheard Joseph Smith's *or* as *are.* If so, the original text here reads as an incomplete sentence since the *or* ends up creating a

present participial fragment ("being cut off from the presence of the Lord or considered as dead"). The critical text will maintain the *are* of the two earliest extant sources, 𝓟 and the 1830 edition.

Summary: Accept *are* as the most probable reading of the original manuscript in Helaman 14:16; the 1837 change to *or* creates an awkward sentence fragment and was undoubtedly a typo.

■ **Helaman 14:16**

both as to [01ABCDEFIJLMNOPQRST | *the* GHK] *things temporal and to things spiritual*

The 1858 Wright edition added *the* before "things temporal" but not before "things spiritual", thereby violating the original parallelism in this conjoining of prepositional phrases. The 1908 RLDS edition restored the original reading. As discussed under Alma 32:3–4, either phraseology, "as to things" or "as to **the** things", is possible, although the first is considerably more frequent in the Book of Mormon text. For each case of "as to (the) things", the critical text will follow the earliest extant reading, thus "both as to things temporal and to things spiritual" here in Helaman 14:16.

Summary: Maintain in Helaman 14:16 the original parallelism of the phrase "as to things temporal and to things spiritual" (that is, without a *the* before *things* in both cases).

■ **Helaman 14:18**

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

As discussed under Mosiah 19:15, the original Book of Mormon text used the noun *condition(s)* only in the plural (14 times). In five of these cases, however, the plural *conditions* has been replaced, twice nonpermanently, with the singular *condition* (the singular is what we expect in modern English). Here in Helaman 14:18, 𝓟 reads in the plural and the 1830 edition has the singular. For this part of the text, both sources are firsthand copies of 𝓞. Although it is theoretically possible that 𝓞 read in the singular, as "the condition of repentance", it is unlikely since all other instances in the text are in the plural and there has been a rather persistent tendency to change the plural to the singular. It is therefore highly probable that the 1830 typesetter is the one responsible for the variation here in Helaman 14:18. The critical text will restore the original plural.

Summary: Restore in Helaman 14:18 the original plural *conditions* ("the conditions of repentance"); the original text apparently had no examples of the singular *condition*.

■ **Helaman 14:20**

behold in [*the* 1 | *that* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *day that he shall suffer death the sun shall be darkened*

Here the extant portion of the original manuscript has only the initial *t* of either *the* or *that* for the phrase "in the/that day". The printer's manuscript has *the;* the 1830 edition has *that.* Both 𝓟

and the 1830 edition are firsthand copies of 𝒪 for this part of the text. One of these two readings was the reading in 𝒪, but which one?

Elsewhere in the text, there are 11 occurrences of "in **that** day that". However, in eight of these cases, the second *that* is the subordinate conjunction *that,* as in the following example where the subordinate conjunction *that* is repeated:

> 1 Nephi 14:1
> and it shall come to pass
> **that** if the Gentiles shall hearken unto the Lamb of God **in that day**
> **that** he shall manifest himself unto them in word and also in power

(For further discussion of this expression, see under 2 Nephi 24:3–4.) But in three cases we have "in **that** day that" where the second *that* is a relative pronoun (with essentially the meaning 'when'):

> 1 Nephi 2:23
> for behold **in that day that** they shall rebel against me
> I will curse them even with a sore curse

> 2 Nephi 28:16
> and **in that day that** they are fully ripe in iniquity
> they shall perish

> Ether 4:7
> and **in that day that** they shall exercise faith in me . . .
> then will I manifest unto them the things which the brother of Jared saw

In contrast to these three cases, there are seven cases of "in **the** day that" where *that* is a relative pronoun, of which three are found nearby in Helaman 13–15:

> 2 Nephi 21:16 (Isaiah 11:16 in the King James Bible)
> like as it was to Israel **in the day that** he came up out of the land of Egypt

> Jacob 6:2 (the 1920 LDS edition deleted the *in*)
> and **in the day that** he shall set his hand again the second time
>   to recover his people . . .

> Omni 1:9
> and he wrote it **in the day that** he delivered them unto me

> Helaman 13:33
> O that we had remembered the Lord our God
> **in the day that** he gave us our riches

> Helaman 13:36
> O that we had repented
> **in the day that** the word of the Lord came unto us

> Helaman 15:2
> yea except ye repent
> your women shall have great cause to mourn
> **in the day that** they shall give suck

3 Nephi 25:3 (Malachi 4:3 in the King James Bible)

> for they shall be ashes under the soles of your feet
> **in the day that** I shall do this

Thus either reading is possible here in Helaman 14:20.

The reading in 𝒫, "in **the** day that", could be viewed as the correct reading in Helaman 14:20 since all other instances of "in the/that day that" in the book of Helaman (three of them) read as "in **the** day that". As further support for "in the day that", note that in the text immediately following we have three instances of "**the** time that" instead of "**that** time that":

Helaman 14:20−21

> and there shall be no light upon the face of this land
> even from **the time that** he shall suffer death for the space of three days
> to **the time that** he shall rise again from the dead
> yea at **the time that** he shall yield up the ghost
> there shall be thunderings and lightnings for the space of many hours

All of these examples in the book of Helaman argue that the reading in 𝒫 for Helaman 14:20, "in **the** day that he shall suffer death", is the expected reading.

On the other hand, one could argue that the two preceding instances of "in the day that" in Helaman 13:33, 36 (and perhaps the three following instances of "the time that" in Helaman 14:20−21) led Oliver Cowdery to accidentally change an original "in **that** day that" to "in **the** day that" near the beginning of Helaman 14:20. And there is strong support from transmission errors to support such a hypothesis. When we consider the manuscript errors made by Oliver, we discover that he frequently replaced an original *that* with *the,* sometimes momentarily but other times permanently, when he copied from 𝒪 into 𝒫 (each persevering instance is marked below with an asterisk):

> * 1 Nephi 14:15
>
> > I beheld that the wrath of God was poured out upon
> > [*that* ᴏᴛ | *the* 1ᴀʙᴄᴅᴇꜰɢʜɪᴊᴋʟᴍɴᴏᴘǫʀs] great and abominable church
>
> Omni 1:16 (initial error in 𝒫)
>
> > and they had dwelt there
> > from [*the > that* 1 | *that* ᴀʙᴄᴅᴇꜰɢʜɪᴊᴋʟᴍɴᴏᴘǫʀsᴛ] time forth
>
> * Alma 47:34
>
> > Amalickiah took [*that* ᴏ | *the* 1ᴀʙᴄᴅᴇꜰɢʜɪᴊᴋʟᴍɴᴏᴘǫʀsᴛ] same servant
> > that slew the king
>
> Alma 50:15 (initial error in 𝒪)
>
> > and they also began
> > in [*the > that* ᴏ | *that* 1ᴀʙᴄᴅᴇꜰɢʜɪᴊᴋʟᴍɴᴏᴘǫʀsᴛ] same year
> > to build many cities on the north
>
> * Alma 50:37
>
> > and it came to pass that
> > in [*that* ᴏ | *the* 1ᴀʙᴄᴅᴇꜰɢʜɪᴊᴋʟᴍɴᴏᴘǫʀsᴛ] same year
> > that the people of Nephi had peace restored unto them

Alma 58:17 (initial error in 𝒫)

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

In contrast, there is only one case where the 1830 compositor replaced an earlier *the* with *that:*

Alma 43:50

and in [*the* 1PS | *that* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOQRT] selfsame hour
that they cried unto the Lord for their freedom
the Lamanites began to flee before them

Yet as explained under Alma 43:50, it is not clear that 𝒪 actually read *the* in that passage; it may have actually read *that.* For that part of the text, from Alma 41:8 to Alma 46:30, signature 22 of the 1830 edition was set from 𝒫 but proofed against 𝒪 (for a summary of the evidence, see under Alma 42:31).

So the use of *that* in the 1830 edition, for both Alma 43:50 and Helaman 14:20, may actually be the reading in 𝒪 rather than a mistake made by the 1830 compositor when he originally set the text from 𝒫. What this means is that there may be no examples where the 1830 compositor accidentally replaced *the* with *that.* In any event, the odds are considerably stronger that Oliver Cowdery is responsible for the introduction of *the* in Helaman 14:20 (and also in Alma 43:50). The critical text will therefore assume that 𝒪 originally read "in **that** day that" here in Helaman 14:20. For further discussion of the case of Alma 43:50, see the addenda at the end of this volume of the critical text.

Summary: Maintain in Helaman 14:20 the 1830 reading, "behold in **that** day that he shall suffer death"; not only is there support for this reading elsewhere in the text, but transmission errors show that Oliver Cowdery was prone to replace the determiner *that* with *the;* on the other hand, the 1830 compositor was not particularly inclined, if at all, to replace *the* with *that.*

■ **Helaman 14:20**

the sun shall be darkened and refuse to give
[*her >+ his* 1 | *his* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *light unto you*
and also the moon and the stars

The original manuscript is not fully extant for "to give his/her light". The initial *h* is partially extant, but the following two letters are not. So we cannot be sure whether 𝒪 read *his* or *her.* The 1830 edition reads *his.* In the printer's manuscript, Oliver Cowdery initially wrote *her;* then somewhat later with slightly heavier ink flow he crossed out the *her* and supralinearly inserted *his.* His correction probably occurred while proofing against 𝒪. Since both the 1830 edition and the corrected reading in 𝒫 read *his,* 𝒪 undoubtedly did too.

Earlier in the text, there is one other example where *his* was accidentally changed to *her.* Interestingly, this passage also refers to the sun being darkened:

2 Nephi 23:10 (Isaiah 13:10, King James Bible)
>   the sun shall be darkened
>   in [*his* 1PST | *her* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOQR] going forth
>   and the moon shall not cause **her** light to shine

Here the 1830 edition accidentally replaced *his* with *her,* most likely under the influence of the following use of *her* when referring to the moon. In the 20th century, the LDS and RLDS editions restored the original *his* in 2 Nephi 23:10, each time by reference to 𝓟.

Summary: Maintain in Helaman 14:20 the occurrence of *his* in "the sun shall . . . refuse to give **his** light", just as in 2 Nephi 23:10 where the text uses *his* to refer to the sun.

■ **Helaman 14:20**

and there shall be no light
upon the face of [*the* 1 | *this* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *land*

Here the printer's manuscript reads "upon the face of **the** land" while the 1830 edition reads "upon the face of **this** land". Both seem possible as readings for the original manuscript. Elsewhere the text prefers "the face of **the** land" over "the face of **this** land", but both definitely exist. For specific variants, we get the following statistics for the earliest text (excluding this case in Helaman 14:20):

	the	*this*
"the face of ___ land"	39	7
"**all** the face of ___ land"	24	3
"the **whole** face of ___ land"	6	1
"the face of **all** ___ land"	2	0
"the face of ___ **whole** land"	1	0
TOTAL	72	11

In Helaman 14:20, Samuel the Lamanite is referring to the lack of daylight in their part of the world at the time of Christ's birth. Later in verse 28, he refers to the signs and wonders (namely, destructions) that will be observed in that part of the world at the time of Christ's death; and here Samuel uses *this land,* not *the land:*

Helaman 14:28
>   and the angel said unto me that
>   many shall see greater things than these
>   to the intent that they might believe
>   that these signs and these wonders should come to pass
>   upon all the face of **this** land

In the early transmission of the text (in the manuscripts and in the 1830 edition), we find a considerable number of cases where the scribes, both Oliver Cowdery and scribe 2 of 𝓟, mixed up *this* and *the.* I first list the cases where Oliver is clearly responsible for the mix-up, of which several involve the word *land* (each of those involving *land* is marked with an asterisk):

* 2 Nephi 1:8 (*this land > the land*, error in 𝔓)

  for behold many nations would overrun
  [*this* 0 | *the* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] land

Alma 40:7 (*this time > the time*, initial error in 𝔓)

  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

Alma 45:14 (*this prophecy > the prophecy*, initial error in 𝒪)

  and now because of iniquity
  [*the >% this* 0 | *this* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] prophecy shall be fulfilled

Alma 50:28 (*the people > this people*, initial error in 𝒪)

  when [*this >% the* 0 | *the* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] people of Morionton . . .

* Alma 52:10 (*the land > this land*, initial error in 𝒪)

  desiring him that he would be faithful in maintaining
  that quarter of [*this >% the* 0 | *the* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] land

Alma 56:17 (*the little force > this little force*, error in 𝔓)

  therefore you may well suppose
  that [*the* 0 | *this* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] little force
  which I brought with me . . .

Alma 63:13 (*this year > the year*, initial error in 𝔓)

  therefore in [*this* 0ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST | *the >+ this* 1] year
  they had been conferred upon Helaman

Helaman 2:12 (*this Gaddianton > the Gaddianton*, initial error in 𝔓)

  and more of [*the > this* 1 | *this* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] Gaddianton
  shall be spoken hereafter

* Helaman 3:12 (*this land > the land*, initial error in 𝒪)

  there were many of the people of Ammon . . . did also go forth
  into [*the > this* 0 | *this* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] land

Helaman 13:15 (*the city > this city*, initial error in 𝔓)

  yea and woe be
  unto [*this > the* 1 | *the* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] city of Gideon

* 3 Nephi 3:24 (*this land > the land*, initial error in 𝔓)

  and there were a great many thousand people . . .
  which did gather themselves together
  in [*the > this* 1 | *this* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] land

There are two other cases where Oliver Cowdery may have mixed up *this* and *the*. The first is in 2 Nephi 10:23, where 𝔓 reads "to choose **this way** of everlasting death". In that passage, the 1830 compositor emended *this way* to *the way* in order to make the reading agree with the parallel "or **the way** of eternal life" that follows. In that case, Oliver appears to have replaced an original *the way* with *this way,* either when he took down Joseph Smith's dictation or when he copied from 𝒪

into 𝒫 (see the discussion under 2 Nephi 10:23). The second case is in Alma 27:10, where Oliver may have replaced an original *this land* with *the land* (see the discussion under Alma 27:10–12).

The unknown scribe 2 of 𝒫 is responsible for the following clear cases where *this* and *the* were mixed up:

> Mosiah 29:25 (*this people > the people*, initial error in 𝒫)
>   therefore choose you
>   by the voice of [*the >+ this* 1 | *this* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] people
>   judges
>
> Alma 4:9 (*this eighth year > the eighth year*, initial error in 𝒫)
>   and thus in [*the > this* 1 | *this* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] eighth year . . .
>
> 3 Nephi 20:22 (*this people > the people*, initial error in 𝒫)
>   and the powers of heaven shall be in the midst
>   of [*the >+ this* 1 | *this* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] people
>
> Mormon 7:8 (*this record > the record*, error by scribe 2 of 𝒫, later corrected
>   by Oliver Cowdery)
>   not only in [s2 *the >+* s1 *this* 1 | *this* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] record . . .

John Gilbert, the 1830 compositor, also mixed up *this* and *the,* but there is only one clear example (once more the asterisk means that the error involves the word *land*):

> * Mosiah 1:10 (*this land > the land*, error by the 1830 compositor)
>   my son 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

Although this example involves *land,* the direction of the mix-up is the opposite of what we need here in Helaman 14:20. In Mosiah 1:10, the 1830 compositor replaced *this land* with *the land*. What is lacking is any evidence that he tended to replace *the land* with *this land*. (As mentioned above, there is one case, in 2 Nephi 10:23, where the 1830 compositor changed *this way* to *the way*, probably consciously.)

The number of scribal mix-ups is large, but most of these involve momentary errors in the manuscripts. In the typeset text, as we might suspect, there is little if any evidence for momentary mis-settings involving *this* and *the*. If we compare the clear 1830 changes (made by John Gilbert) with those manuscript cases where the mix-up was not corrected by the original scribe (either Oliver Cowdery or scribe 2 of 𝒫), we get the following statistics:

> Oliver Cowdery   2 times   2 Nephi 1:8, Alma 56:17
> scribe 2 of 𝒫   1 time   Mormon 7:8
> John Gilbert   1 time   Mosiah 1:10

There are a number of other cases of variation involving *the* and *this* where it is not clear whether the manuscript scribe or the 1830 compositor made the error. All these instances are found in that portion of the text, from Helaman 13 through Mormon 9, where the 1830 edition is a firsthand copy of 𝒪:

Helaman 14:21 (error by either Oliver Cowdery or the 1830 compositor)
>   and the rocks which is upon the face
>   of [*the* 1PS | *this* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOQRT] earth

3 Nephi 5:11 (error by either Oliver Cowdery or the 1830 compositor)
>   and behold I do make [*the* >+ *this* 1 | *the* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOQRT | *this* PS] record
>   on plates which I have made with mine own hands

3 Nephi 5:12 (error by either Oliver Cowdery or the 1830 compositor)
>   and behold I am called Mormon
>   being called after the land of Mormon
>   the land in the which Alma did establish the church
>   among [*this* 1PS | *the* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOQRT] people

4 Nephi 1:19 (error by either scribe 2 of 𝓟 or the 1830 compositor)
>   he that kept [*the* 1PS | *this* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOQRT] last record

Mormon 1:16 (error by either scribe 2 of 𝓟 or the 1830 compositor)
>   and I did endeavor to preach unto [*the* 1 | *this* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] people

In the first case, it is possible that Oliver Cowdery miswrote an original *the* as *this* in 𝓞; for discussion of that case, see below under Helaman 14:21. For the other cases, see the discussion under each passage.

Here in Helaman 14:20, the critical text will accept the 1830 reading, "upon the face of **this** land", as the original one for the following two reasons: (1) the use of *this* is supported by the nearby reading in Helaman 14:28 ("upon all the face of **this** land"); and (2) Oliver Cowdery tended to replace *this land* with *the land* in his manuscript work, with three clear cases: 2 Nephi 1:8, Helaman 3:12, and 3 Nephi 3:24. On the other hand, there are no cases, even potential ones, where the 1830 compositor replaced *the land* with *this land* (excluding the possibility here in Helaman 14:20).

Summary: Maintain in Helaman 14:20 the 1830 reading "upon the face of **this** land"; the use of *this* rather than *the* (the reading in 𝓟) is supported by the use of *this* in Helaman 14:28 ("upon all the face of **this** land"); there is also considerable evidence that Oliver Cowdery tended to accidentally write *the land* in place of *this land*.

■ **Helaman 14:20**

even from the time that he shall suffer death
for the space of three days to the time
[*that* 1ABCEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST | D] *he shall rise again from the dead*

Here the 1841 British edition omitted the relative pronoun *that*. It was restored in the subsequent LDS edition (1849). Either reading is, of course, theoretically possible. And in fact, the Book of Mormon has a contrastive pair where one instance has the relative pronoun *that* and the other does not:

>   Mosiah 2:34   even down to the time   our father Lehi left Jerusalem
>   Alma 18:36   even down to the time **that** their father Lehi left Jerusalem

For each case of "<preposition> the time", the critical text will follow the earliest textual sources with respect to any following relative pronoun (or lack of one). Thus here in Helaman 14:20 the relative pronoun *that* will be maintained.

Summary: Maintain the relative pronoun *that* in "to the time **that** he shall rise again from the dead", the reading in both 𝓟 and the 1830 edition.

■ **Helaman 14:21**

yea at the time that
he shall [*yield* 1ABCDEFGIJLMNOPQRST | *give* HK] *up the ghost*
there shall be thunderings and lightnings for the space of many hours

The expression "yield up the ghost" occurs nowhere else in the Book of Mormon, whereas "give up the ghost" occurs twice in the text (in fact, in the same passage) and at some distance earlier in the text:

> Jacob 7:20–21
> and it came to pass that when he had said these words
> he could say no more and he **gave up** the ghost
> and when the multitude had witnessed that he spake these things
> as he was about to **give up** the ghost
> they were astonished exceedingly

Here in Helaman 14:21, the 1874 RLDS edition replaced *yield* with *give,* a semantic replacement that was very likely a typo and not the result of editing. The 1908 RLDS edition restored the original *yield*.

There is one other passage in the Book of Mormon where *yield* is used to refer to death:

> Mosiah 2:26
> I am old and am about to **yield up** this mortal frame to its mother earth

Moreover, the expression "give up the ghost" occurs 16 times in the King James Bible, but interestingly there are also a few occurrences of "yield up the ghost" in the biblical text:

> Genesis 49:33
> and when Jacob had made an end of commanding his sons
> he gathered up his feet into the bed and **yielded up** the ghost
> and was gathered unto his people

> Matthew 27:50
> Jesus when he had cried again with a loud voice **yielded up** the ghost

> Acts 5:10
> then fell she down straightway at his feet and **yielded up** the ghost

So the unique use of "yield up the ghost" in the Book of Mormon text is supported directly by King James usage and indirectly by a similar use of the verb *yield up* in the Book of Mormon.

Summary: Accept in Helaman 14:21 the unique occurrence of "yield up the ghost", the reading of the earliest textual sources.

■ **Helaman 14:21**

and the rocks which is upon the face
of [the 1ps | this ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOQRT] earth
which is both above the earth and beneath
which ye know at this time is solid
—or the more part of it is one solid mass—
shall be broken up

Here the printer's manuscript reads "upon the face of **the** earth", while the 1830 edition reads "upon the face of **this** earth"; as one might expect, the printed editions have followed the 1830 reading, except for the RLDS editions from 1908 on. The 1908 RLDS edition, following the reading in 𝓟, restored that definite article *the*. Note, however, that nearby, in verse 20, the editors for the 1908 RLDS edition did not make the change to "upon the face of **the** land", the reading in 𝓟; instead, they kept the *this* in "upon the face of **this** land" (see under Helaman 14:20).

Internal evidence argues that Helaman 14:21 should read "upon the face of **the** earth", the reading in 𝓟. There is only one case in the Book of Mormon text of "the face of **this** earth":

    1 Nephi 22:18
        behold my brethren I say unto you
        that these things must shortly come
        yea even blood and fire and vapor of smoke must come
        and it must needs be upon the face of **this** earth

More generally, the phrase *this earth* occurs only one more time in the text:

    1 Nephi 17:39
        he ruleth high in the heavens
        for it is his throne
        and **this earth** is his footstool

Excluding Helaman 14:21, the two references to *this earth* refer to the entire earth, not to some part of it (see the discussion below regarding the phrase "upon the face of **this** earth" in 1 Nephi 22:18).

So except for the one case of "the face of this earth" in 1 Nephi 22:18, the text otherwise has instances of only "the face of the earth". For specific variants, we get the following statistics for the earliest text (excluding the case here in Helaman 14:21):

"the face of the earth"	39 times
"**all** the face of the earth"	10 times
"the **whole** face of the earth"	0 times
"the face of **all** the earth"	2 times
"the face of the **whole** earth"	7 times
TOTAL	58 times

David Calabro points out (personal communication) that the phrase "the face of **this** earth" (and its variants) is found nowhere in the King James Bible, while there are numerous instances of "the face of **the** earth". In fact, the frequencies of the biblical variants are statistically similar to the Book of Mormon's:

"the face of the earth"	25 times
"**all** the face of the earth"	3 times
"the **whole** face of the earth"	0 times
"the face of **all** the earth"	4 times
"the face of the **whole** earth"	6 times
TOTAL	38 times

The case of "upon the face of **this** earth" in 1 Nephi 22:18 is unique in its reference: here Nephi is referring to the last days and that great fire that will destroy the wicked and preserve the righteous (as explained in the preceding 1 Nephi 22:15–17). That fire, it would appear, will engulf the whole earth. On the other hand, when the Book of Mormon refers to the three days of darkness and destruction that occurred among the Nephites and Lamanites at the time of the Savior's death, the text otherwise uses *the,* not *this,* before *earth* in the phrase "the face of **the** (whole) earth":

1 Nephi 12:5	I saw the vapor of darkness that it passed from off the face of **the** earth
Helaman 14:22	and in broken fragments upon the face of **the** whole earth
Helaman 14:27	and that darkness should cover the face of **the** whole earth
3 Nephi 8:17	and thus the face of **the** whole earth became deformed
3 Nephi 8:18	yea they were broken up upon the face of **the** whole earth

In all these cases, "the face of **the** (whole) earth" is equivalent to "the face of **the** (whole) land". Yet when the word is actually *land,* the text has instances of both "the face of **the** land" and "the face of **this** land" when referring to the three days of darkness and destruction:

1 Nephi 12:4	I saw a mist of darkness on the face of **the** land of promise
Helaman 14:20	and there shall be no light upon the face of **this** land
Helaman 14:28	and these wonders should come to pass upon all the face of **this** land
3 Nephi 8:3	that there should be darkness for the space of three days over the face of **the** land
3 Nephi 8:12	the whole face of **the** land was changed
3 Nephi 8:18	and in cracks upon all the face of **the** land
3 Nephi 8:19	and then behold there was darkness upon the face of **the** land
3 Nephi 8:20	there was thick darkness upon the face of all **the** land
3 Nephi 8:22	for so great were the mists of darkness which were upon the face of **the** land
3 Nephi 9:1	there was a voice heard among all the inhabitants of the earth upon all the face of **this** land
3 Nephi 10:9	and the darkness dispersed from off the face of **the** land

There is additional internal evidence in support of *the earth* in Helaman 14:21: namely, the similarity in language between verses 21 and 22 of Helaman 14 argues that the original text in both places read "upon the face of **the** (whole) earth":

Helaman 14:21 (𝒫)	*Helaman 14:22*
the rocks which is	in broken fragments
upon the face of the earth	**upon the face of the** whole **earth**
which is **both**	yea **both**
above the earth and beneath	**above the earth and beneath**

Of course, one could argue that in Helaman 14:21 an original *this earth* was changed to *the earth* under the influence of the following occurrence of *the earth* ("which is both above **the** earth and beneath"). But the use of the parallel "upon the face of **the** whole earth" in verse 22 argues that *the earth* is indeed correct in verse 21.

All in all, there does appear to be something wrong with the phrase "upon the face of **this** earth", the 1830 reading. The critical text will assume that the original text read "upon the face of **the** earth" here in Helaman 14:21. Further, the source for the reading with *this* appears to be the previous occurrence of "upon the face of **this** land" in verse 20. There are actually two possibilities for Helaman 14:21:

> (1) The original text read "upon the face of **the** earth" in verse 21, but Oliver Cowdery accidentally wrote down "upon the face of **this** earth" because he had just written down "upon the face of **this** land", the reading in the previous verse. When Oliver copied the text into 𝒫, he changed the *this* to *the* because he expected "upon the face of **the** earth", which happened to be the correct reading. The 1830 compositor, on the other hand, followed his copytext (namely, 𝒪) and set *this,* thus maintaining the error that Oliver had introduced into 𝒪.

> (2) Oliver Cowdery correctly wrote down "upon the face of **the** earth" in 𝒪, but then the 1830 compositor accidentally changed the *the* to *this* under the influence of the preceding "upon the face of **this** land", the reading in the previous verse.

When we look at the error tendencies for Oliver Cowdery and the 1830 compositor, we discover that the first scenario is the more likely one, even though it involves two textual changes. As explained under Helaman 14:20, Oliver frequently mixed up both *the* and *this,* and in both directions. In taking down Joseph Smith's dictation, his first error (changing *the* to *this*) would have been the result of the preceding *this* in verse 20; his second error, reverting to the expected *the* for the phrase "upon the face of **the** earth", would have occurred when he copied from 𝒪 into 𝒫. On the other hand, the 1830 compositor rarely mixed up *the* and *this;* in fact, the only example (in Mosiah 1:10) shows him replacing *this* with *the,* the opposite of what we have here in Helaman 14:21. Thus it would have been more likely for the compositor to have correctly set the reading of his copytext. But the important point is that under either scenario, the original text read "upon the face of **the** earth", which is how the critical text will read here.

Summary: Restore in Helaman 14:21 the original determiner *the* in "upon the face of **the** earth", the reading in 𝒫; this reading is supported by usage elsewhere in the text, in particular the parallel phraseology nearby in Helaman 14:22 ("upon the face of **the** whole earth"); 𝒪 itself may have actually read *this,* but as an error that entered during the dictation of the text and was then perpetuated by the 1830 compositor when he set the type from 𝒪; another possibility is that 𝒪 read correctly as *the* and the 1830 compositor was responsible for the change to *this;* in either case, the *this* appears to be an error resulting from the phrase "upon the face of **this** land" in the previous verse.

■ **Helaman 14:21–22**

(1) *and the rocks which* [*is* 1A | *are* BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *upon the face of the earth*
(2) *which* [*is* >js *are* 1 | *is* A | *are* BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *both above the earth and beneath*
(3) *which ye know at this time* [*is* 1APS | *are* BCDEFGHIJKLMNOQRT] *solid*
(4) *—or the more part of* **it is** *one solid mass—*
    shall be broken up
(5) *yea* **they** *shall be rent in twain*

> In this passage, Joseph Smith edited three of the four instances of *is* to *are*. For each case of gram-matical emendation, he seems to have interpreted *the rocks* as the referent for the relative pronoun *which,* thus the need for the plural *are*. But for the fourth instance of *is,* Joseph left the *is* in the singular, undoubtedly because its subject noun phrase was the singular "the more part of it". Interestingly, the 1908 RLDS edition restored the original singular *is* in the third case, perhaps because the editors felt that the referent for the relative pronoun *which* was the singular *the earth* rather than the plural *the rocks*. One could also interpret the occurrence of *it* in the fourth case as referring to *the earth,* although more likely the *it* actually refers to *the rocks* since the next verse uses the plural pronoun *they* in a *yea*-clause to restate the previous statement that refers to the rocks being broken up ("yea they shall be rent in twain"). Usage elsewhere in the Book of Mormon shows that the singular pronoun *it* can refer to a collective plural (such as the rocks of the earth). For another example of this kind of usage, see under Helaman 13:18–20 for the use of the pronoun *it* to refer to *treasures*. Here in Helaman 14:21–22, the critical text will restore all the original instances of *is* that Joseph edited to *are*.

> *Summary:* Restore or maintain, as the case may be, each instance in Helaman 14:21 of original *is;* usage elsewhere in the text shows that the singular pronoun *it* as well as the singular *is* can be used to refer to collective plurals, such as the rocks of the earth.

■ **Helaman 14:22**

> *yea they shall be rent in twain*
> *and shall ever after be found in seams and in cracks*
> *and in broken fragments upon the face of the whole earth*
> *yea* [*both* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *above the earth*
> *and* [*both* 1A | BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *beneath*

> Here in Helaman 14:22 there is some difficulty with the agreed reading of the printer's manu-script and the 1830 edition (they each read "**both** above the earth and **both** beneath"). In the 1837 edition, the second *both* was removed, undoubtedly because it was definitely inappropriate, at least for English.

> The original manuscript is not extant for this phrase, but spacing between extant fragments provides insufficient room in the manuscript line for both instances of *both*. In the transcription of 𝓞 for this part of the text (volume 1 of the critical text), I propose that Oliver Cowdery ini-tially wrote the impossible "yea above the earth and **both** beneath" (in other words, he wrote *both* in the wrong place); Oliver then inserted *both* in the correct place, right after *yea,* but he forgot to delete the earlier incorrect placement of *both,* thus ending up in 𝓞 with the impossible "yea

both above the earth and **both** beneath" (see lines 33–34 on page 398′ of ☉). As a result, the two firsthand copies of ☉—namely, 𝒫 and the 1830 edition—ended up with two instances of *both*.

The 1837 change makes the reading consistent with all other usage involving *both* in the Book of Mormon text (and with what we expect in English): when followed by a conjunctive structure, *both* appears only at the beginning of the structure (that is, before the first conjunct) and never before any of the later conjuncts. In fact, in the previous verse (Helaman 14:21), we have another example of "both above the earth and beneath", and that one occurs without any textual variation.

David Calabro suggests (personal communication) that the repeated use of *both . . . both* in 𝒫 and in the 1830 edition (and presumably in ☉) may be a Hebraism and actually intended. In Hebrew, the additive particle *gam* (which can be interpreted, especially when used alone, as meaning 'also') is sometimes repeated before both conjuncts, as in 1 Samuel 2:26, where *gam* could be literally translated both times as *both:* "and the boy Samuel grew in stature and in favor **both** with the LORD and **both** with men". The King James Bible, however, does not literally repeat the *gam* in its translation but instead translates the second *gam* with a different word, namely, *also:* "and the child Samuel grew on and was in favor **both** with the LORD and **also** with men". But it should be noted that this translation itself is a Hebraistic literalism since in English we do not expect the *also*. What we expect is "both with the Lord and with men" (or more simply, "with both the Lord and men"). The King James Bible has a number of additional instances of "both X and also Y" that correspond in Hebrew either to "gam X gam Y" or to "gam X wə-gam Y" (where the clitic *wə* is the characteristic Hebrew word for *and*):

Genesis 46:34	**both** we *and* **also** our fathers
Genesis 47:3	**both** we *and* **also** our fathers
1 Samuel 12:14	**both** ye and **also** the king that reigneth over you
1 Samuel 26:25	thou shalt **both** do great *things* and **also** shalt still prevail

There are also a few Greek instances of "X te kai Y" and "te X kai Y" in the New Testament that the King James Bible translated as "both X and also Y":

Acts 14:1	**both** of the Jews and **also** of the Greeks
Acts 14:5	**both** of the Gentiles and **also** of the Jews
Acts 20:21	**both** to the Jews and **also** to the Greeks
Acts 25:24	**both** at Jerusalem and ***also*** here

Here *te* and *kai* function as additive particles in Greek, with *kai* being the normal indicator of the conjunction *and*.

So the literalistic translation of the repeated additive particle into Early Modern English, whether from Hebrew or Greek, is "both X and also Y". And interestingly, there are a number of examples of this literalistic usage in the Book of Mormon text:

1 Nephi 8:1	**both** of grain of every kind and **also** of the seeds of fruits of every kind
1 Nephi 13:42	**both** unto the Jews and **also** unto the Gentiles
Helaman 16:15	**both** of the Nephites and **also** of the Lamanites
Mormon 2:8	**both** on the part of the Nephites and **also** on the part of the Lamanites

We could therefore say that the proposed "both X and both Y" is excessively literalistic. The odds are that the one example of this in the earliest text of the Book of Mormon is an error. Moreover, because the lacuna in 𝒪 is too short for both instances of *both* (except if one of the *both*'s was supralinearly inserted), we very likely have an error in 𝒪 that was only partially corrected. The critical text will therefore reject the earliest reading in Helaman 14:22 ("both above the earth and **both** beneath") and accept the 1837 reading ("both above the earth and beneath").

Summary: Accept the 1837 editing out of the second *both* in Helaman 14:22, giving "yea **both** above the earth and beneath", in agreement with usage in the previous verse and elsewhere in the text.

■ **Helaman 14:23**

and there shall be many places which are now called valleys
which shall become mountains
whose [*heighth* 1 | *height* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
[*thereof* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQS | RT] *is great*

As discussed under Alma 50:2, the earliest text had *heighth* instead of the standard *height.* Here in Helaman 14:23, 𝒪 most likely read *heighth,* which the 1830 compositor emended to *height* when he set the text from 𝒪.

This passage also shows a vacuous use of the word *thereof.* As discussed under Alma 46:12, there are a number of places in the original text where *thereof* appears to have no referent. Such instances were, for the most part, removed from the LDS text in the 1920 edition. The critical text will restore them.

Summary: Restore the original *heighth* and *thereof* in Helaman 14:23: "which shall become mountains whose **heighth thereof** is great".

■ **Helaman 14:28**

    and the angel said unto me
(1) **that** *many shall see greater things than these*
    to the intent that they might **believe**
(2) **that** *these signs and wonders should come to pass upon all the face of this land*
    to the intent that there should be no cause for unbelief among the children of men

Ross Geddes has pointed out (personal communication, 28 August 2005) that in all the printed editions of the Book of Mormon the second *that*-clause is treated as the complement to the verb *believe* (the result of there being no punctuation between the verb *believe* and the following *that*). Geddes argues that the angel makes two declarations, numbered above as 1 and 2: "many shall see greater things than these" and "these signs and wonders should come to pass upon all the face of this land" (the modal *should* here means 'shall'). Each declaration has its own purpose, expressed by an immediately following subordinate clause initiated by "to the intent": the righteous believe because the Lord reveals even greater events before they have happened, while the world will have no excuse for not believing after these events have actually occurred.

The verb *believe* that ends the subordinate clause "to the intent that they might believe" does not need any complement, as shown by the following example:

> Helaman 16:5
>> telling them of things which must shortly come
>> that they might know and remember at the time of their coming
>> that they had been made known unto them beforehand
>> **to the intent that they might believe**

In fact, this later passage in the book of Helaman is saying the same thing as the first declaration here in Helaman 14:28. Thus there is a real need to separate *believe* in Helaman 14:28 from the following *that* with a comma—or even better, with a dash—to help the reader realize that the second *that*-clause parallels the first *that*-clause.

Summary: Place a dash before the second *that*-clause in Helaman 14:28 so that the reader will not interpret this clause as complementing the immediately preceding verb, *believe,* but instead as the start of a second *that*-clause that contrastively parallels the first *that*-clause.

Helaman 15

■ **Helaman 15:2**

yea except ye repent
your women shall have great cause to mourn
in the day [*that* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRT | s] *they shall give suck*

> The 1953 RLDS edition removed, probably accidentally, the relative pronoun *that* in Helaman 15:2. The original manuscript is not extant here, but spacing between extant fragments supports the original occurrence of *that*. And here the 1830 edition and the printer's manuscript independently support this reading.
>
> When "in the day" is postmodified by a relative clause, the relative pronoun is normally *that* (seven times in the original text, including the example here in Helaman 15:2; see the list under Helaman 14:20). In another case, the relative pronoun is the adverbial *when:* "and I rejoice in the day **when** my mortal shall put on immortality" (Enos 1:27). But there is one place in the earliest text where the relative clause lacks the relative pronoun: "our swords are taken from us in the day we have sought them for battle" (Helaman 13:34). For each case of "in the day <relative clause>", the critical text will maintain or omit the relative pronoun in accord with the earliest extant text, thus "in the day **that** they shall give suck" here in Helaman 15:2.

Summary: In accord with the earliest textual sources, maintain the relative pronoun *that* in Helaman 15:2: "in the day **that** they shall give suck".

■ **Helaman 15:3**

yea woe unto this people which are called the people of Nephi
except they shall repent when they shall see
all [*those* 1A | *these* BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *signs and wonders*
which shall be shewed unto them

> The 1837 edition changed the demonstrative *those* in "all those signs and wonders" to *these*, probably unintentionally. Joseph Smith did not mark the change in 𝓟 when he edited the text for the 1837 edition. As described under Mosiah 28:1 and Alma 3:25, there are many mix-ups of *these* and *those* in the early transmission of the text. In each case, the critical text will follow the earliest extant reading, thus *those* here in Helaman 15:3. Since both the printer's manuscript and the 1830 edition have *those*, the original manuscript (not extant here) undoubtedly did too. Elsewhere in the text, we have examples of either *those* or *these* with "signs and wonders":

Helaman 14:28	that **these** signs and **these** wonders should come to pass upon all the face of this land
3 Nephi 1:22	that they might not believe in **those** signs and wonders which they had seen
3 Nephi 2:1	and the people began to forget **those** signs and wonders which they had heard

The original text in Helaman 15:3, "all **those** signs and wonders", agrees with the two examples in 3 Nephi in that the demonstrative *those* is not repeated; the *these* is repeated in Helaman 14:28 ("**these** signs and **these** wonders").

Summary: Restore in Helaman 15:3 the demonstrative *those* ("all those signs and wonders"), the original reading; this reading agrees with the nonrepeated *those* in 3 Nephi 1:22 and 3 Nephi 2:1.

■ **Helaman 15:3**

except they shall repent when they shall see all those signs and wonders
which shall be [*showed > shewed* 1 | *showed* ABCDEFIJMOQRT | *shewed* GHKPS | *shown* LN]
   unto them

The original manuscript probably had *shewed* here, even though the compositor for the 1830 edition ended up setting *showed*. In the printer's manuscript, Oliver Cowdery initially wrote *showed,* but then virtually immediately he corrected it to the archaic *shewed.* There seems little reason for Oliver to have made this correction unless 𝒪 itself read *shewed,* especially since we have no specific examples where Oliver permanently switched *shew* and *show* in his copywork. For instance, there are 42 cases where 𝒪 is extant for either *shew* or *show,* and in all 42 cases Oliver copied the text into 𝒫 without mixing up the two word forms (40 are *shew* and 2 are *show*). Only once in the manuscripts did Oliver momentarily mix up the two forms, namely, here in Helaman 15:3 when he initially wrote *showed* in 𝒫, then virtually immediately corrected it to *shewed.*

In striking contrast to Oliver Cowdery's accuracy in copying *shew* and *show,* there are nine clear cases where the 1830 compositor mixed up *shew* and *show* when he set the type. Five times he replaced an earlier *shew* with *show:*

2 Nephi 10:2	[*shewn* 1D	*shown* ABCEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
2 Nephi 31:4	[*shewed* 1GHKPS	*showed* ABCDEFIJLMNOQRT]
2 Nephi 31:17	[*shewn* 1PS	*shown* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOQRT]
Alma 20:1	[*shew* 1PS	*show* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOQRT]
Alma 30:51	[*shewed* 01DPS	*showed* ABCEFGHIJKLMNOQRT]

And four times he changed an earlier *show* to *shew:*

2 Nephi 29:14	[*show* 1GHJKNOQRT	*shew* ABCDEFILMPS]
Jacob 2:15	[*show* 1DJNOQRT	*shew* ABCEFGHIKLMPS]
Alma 7:15	[*show* 1JNOQRT	*shew* ABCDEFGHIKLMPS]
Helaman 5:26	[*shown* 1JNOQRT	*shewn* ABCEFGHIKLMPS	*shew* D]

In two more cases, here in Helaman 15:3 and in 3 Nephi 19:2, the verb form is *shew* in 𝒫 but *show* in the 1830 edition:

Helaman 15:3 [*showed > shewed* 1 | *showed* ABCDEFIJMOQRT |
shewed GHKPS | *shown* LN]

3 Nephi 19:2 [*shew* 1GHKPS | *show* ABCDEFIJLMNOQRT]

For these two cases, it is highly probable that the 1830 compositor is the one responsible for the variation, not Oliver Cowdery. The critical text will assume so; thus Helaman 15:3 will read *shewed* and 3 Nephi 19:2 *shew.*

The form *shewed* here in Helaman 15:3 is the past participial form. An alternative form is *shewn* (or if the past participle is *showed,* the alternative form is *shown*). In the original text, out of 38 instances of the past participle, 32 took the *-n* ending. Of those, only one was *shown* in the earliest text (in 1 Nephi 14:26); the rest were *shewn.* Of the remaining 6 instances ending in *-ed,* only one has ever been changed to the *-n* ending, namely, here in Helaman 15:3, but only in the 1902 and the 1906 LDS editions (in those two editions *showed* was replaced by *shown,* probably independently). There is one case where Oliver Cowdery momentarily wrote *shewed* in 𝓞 but then immediately corrected it to *shewn:*

Ether 5:4 [*shewed >% shewn* 0 | *shewn* 1ABCDEFGHIKLMPS | *shown* JNOQRT]

For each case of the past participle, the critical text will follow the earliest textual sources, thus *shewed* here in Helaman 15:3, not *shewn* (or the later *shown*). For a complete listing of all the cases of *shew* and *show,* see under SHEW in volume 3.

Summary: The original manuscript in Helaman 15:3 very likely read *shewed* (the corrected reading in 𝓟), not *showed* (the reading in the 1830 edition); there is no evidence that Oliver Cowdery ever permanently mixed up these two verb forms when he copied from 𝓞 into 𝓟, but the 1830 compositor frequently did; thus we accept the reading in 𝓟 as the correct reading in Helaman 15:3 (and similarly in 3 Nephi 19:2).

■ **Helaman 15:5**

and they do observe
[NULL >? *to keep* 0 | *to keep* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *his commandments*
and his statutes and his judgments
according to the law of Moses

Here both the 1830 edition and the printer's manuscript read "and they do observe to keep his commandments", so the original manuscript must have read as such. Spacing between extant fragments indicates that *to keep* was probably inserted supralinearly in 𝓞. The original text of the Book of Mormon has 11 examples of "observe to keep the commandment(s)", but none of "observe the commandment(s)". In Mosiah 4:30, the 1837 edition accidentally omitted the infinitive phrase *to keep,* which appears to be what happened initially in 𝓞 for this passage in Helaman 15:5. For a complete discussion of "observe to keep the commandment(s)", plus a list of its examples, see under Mosiah 4:30.

It should also be pointed out that there are a few cases where the direct object for the verb *observe* is the semantic equivalent of *commandments,* but not that word; in fact, in all these

instances, the passage actually has some form of "keep the commandments" (marked below in each case with an arrow):

Mosiah 6:6

    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

Mosiah 13:25

    have ye taught this people that they should **observe to do all these things**
→ for to **keep these commandments**

Alma 30:3

→ yea and the people did observe to **keep the commandments** of the Lord
    and they were strict in **observing the ordinances of God**
    according to the law of Moses

Alma 63:2

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

Summary: Following both 𝓅 and the 1830 edition, we can conclude that in Helaman 15:5 𝓞 undoubtedly read "they do observe to keep his commandments", even though *to keep* was probably inserted supralinearly in 𝓞.

■ **Helaman 15:7**

that as many of them as are brought to the knowledge of the truth
and to know [*of* 1ABCDEFGIJLMNOPQRST| HK] *the wicked and abominable traditions*
    of their fathers
and are led to believe the holy scriptures . . .

As explained under Alma 17:16, there has been a tendency in the history of the text to omit *of* from the verb phrase "to know *of* something". Here in Helaman 15:7, the 1874 RLDS edition omitted the *of,* but it was restored to the RLDS text in the 1908 RLDS edition. The use of *of* is expected here and is supported by usage in an earlier passage that also refers to the conversion of the Lamanites:

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

The critical text will maintain the preposition *of* here in Helaman 15:7.

Summary: Maintain in Helaman 15:7 the preposition *of* in "to know **of** the wicked and abominable traditions of their fathers", the reading of both 𝓅 and the 1830 edition.

■ **Helaman 15:7**

yea the prophecies of the holy prophets which are written
which leadeth them to faith [on 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMOPQRST | in N] the Lord

The Book of Mormon text has examples of both "faith **on** someone" and "faith **in** someone"; in fact, in every case that someone is the Lord. Yet the text is almost totally systematic in its choice of *on* or *in* in terms of the specific words used to refer to the Lord:

□ faith **in** X (36 times)

Christ	14 times
him	9 times
me	5 times
God	4 times
the Holy One of Israel	1 time
Jesus Christ	1 time
my Well Beloved	1 time
the Lamb of God	1 time

□ faith **on** X (13 times)

the Lord Jesus Christ	6 times
the Lord	5 times
the Son of God	1 time
the Lamb of God	1 time

The only case where there is actual variation is with "the Lamb of God", with one instance of "faith **in** the Lamb of God" (1 Nephi 12:10) and one of "faith **on** the Lamb of God" (Alma 7:14). But for the specific phrase *the Lord,* the text strongly supports *on,* not *in* (5 to 0); thus the original reading here in Helaman 15:7 is completely appropriate.

There is more choice when comparing the phrases "faith **in** something" and "faith **on** something". For discussion of variation in the preposition for those cases of "faith in/on his name", see under Moroni 7:38 (where the original text read "faith **in** his name" but the 1874 RLDS edition changed the preposition to *on*).

Summary: Maintain in Helaman 15:7 the original use of *on* in the phrase "faith **on** the Lord"; elsewhere the text systematically supports the preposition *on,* not *in,* for the specific phrase *the Lord.*

■ **Helaman 15:8**

therefore as many as have come to this
ye know of yourselves are firm and steadfast in the faith
and in the [things 1PS | thing ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOQRT] wherewith they have been made free

Here the 1830 edition has the singular *thing,* but the printer's manuscript has the plural *things.* The original manuscript is not extant here; but for this part of the text, both these readings are firsthand copies of 𝒪, so the question is which one is the correct reading. In accord with the reading of 𝒫, the 1908 RLDS edition restored the plural *things;* the LDS text has retained the 1830 reading, the singular *thing.*

The stronger tendency for the scribes was to accidentally drop the plural *s,* but there are also cases where the plural *s* was accidentally added. In the following analysis (which excludes the case here in Helaman 15:8), I list all the manuscript mix-ups involving *thing* and *things.* In most cases, the scribes caught their obvious errors. If a mix-up is not an obvious error, I mark it with an asterisk. For each case, I also cite the correct reading:

OLIVER COWDERY

◻ errors corrected by Oliver Cowdery

things > thing

ℂ Alma 63:13 these **things**

ℙ 1 Nephi 11:31 all these **things**

 1 Nephi 14:29 * the **things** which my father saw

 1 Nephi 15:1 all these **things**

thing > things

ℙ 1 Nephi 15:11 * the **thing** which the Lord hath said

 Jacob 7:14 * the **thing** which thou knowest

◻ errors left uncorrected by Oliver Cowdery

things > thing

ℙ 1 Nephi 18:6 * whatsoever **things** we had brought

 3 Nephi 1:18 these **things**

thing > things

ℙ Alma 57:14 * whatsoever **thing** they could get

SCRIBE 2 OF ℂ

◻ errors corrected by scribe 2 of ℂ

things > thing

ℂ 1 Nephi 13:29 many plain and precious **things**

SCRIBE 3 OF ℂ

◻ errors corrected by scribe 3 of ℂ

things > thing

ℂ 1 Nephi 8:38 many **things**

◻ errors left uncorrected by scribe 3 of ℂ

things > thing

ℂ 1 Nephi 7:13 all **things** which the Lord hath spoken

SCRIBE 2 OF ℙ

◻ errors corrected by scribe 2 of ℙ

things > thing

ℙ Alma 7:17 * the **things** which I have spoken

 Alma 11:44 all **things** shall be restored

 3 Nephi 23:1 these **things**

 Mormon 1:1 * the **things** which I have both seen and heard

 Mormon 8:12 all **things**

  thing > things
   𝒫 3 Nephi 23:11   this **thing**

 □ errors left uncorrected by scribe 2 of 𝒫

  things > thing
   𝒫 Alma 12:1   to explain **things**
      3 Nephi 27:21   * the **things** that ye must do

HYRUM SMITH

 □ errors left uncorrected by Hyrum Smith

  things > thing
   𝒫 Mosiah 29:30   these **things**

Oliver Cowdery (when he proofed 𝒫 against 𝒪) corrected the error that scribe 2 of 𝒫 made in 3 Nephi 27:21. When he copied from 𝒪 into 𝒫, Oliver also corrected the obvious error that scribe 3 of 𝒪 made in 1 Nephi 7:13. The 1830 compositor corrected the obvious error made by scribe 2 of 𝒫 in Alma 12:1 as well as the obvious error made by Hyrum Smith in Mosiah 29:30. We should note here that the more frequent tendency in the manuscripts was to replace *things* with *thing* (17 times) rather than *thing* with *things* (4 times).

 On the other hand, the 1830 compositor made only a few errors in typesetting *thing(s)*, none of which are obvious (which means that each of these is marked with an asterisk to indicate that either reading is possible):

1830 COMPOSITOR

   things > thing
     1 Nephi 5:5   * in the which **things** I do rejoice
   thing > things
     1 Nephi 15:11   * the **thing** which the Lord hath said
     Alma 24:24   * the **thing** which they had done

It should be pointed out that other 1830 typos involving *thing(s)* could have been caught and corrected when the 1830 sheets were proofed.

 From all of these errors, we can identify those that would specifically help in analyzing the variation here in Helaman 15:8. First, there is one clear case where Oliver Cowdery, as he copied from 𝒪 into 𝒫, replaced an original plural *things* with a singular *thing*:

 1 Nephi 18:6
  we did go down into the ship with all our loading and our seeds
  and whatsoever [*things* 0 | *thing* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
  we had brought with us

On the other hand, there are two clear cases where the 1830 compositor set an original singular *thing* as a plural *things*:

1 Nephi 15:11

> do ye not remember
> the [*thing* 0 | *things* >% *thing* 1 | *things* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
> which the Lord hath said
>
> > [In this instance Oliver Cowdery initially wrote *things,* but then he
> > immediately erased the plural *s;* despite the correction in 𝔓, the 1830
> > compositor ended up setting *things.*]

Alma 24:24

> for they repented of the [*thing* 1 | *things* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
> which they had done

Thus errors in the early transmission of the text provide support for either *things* or *thing* as the
reading of the original manuscript in Helaman 15:8.

When we turn to internal evidence (that is, usage elsewhere in the text), we again find evi-
dence to support either *things* or *thing.* First of all, let us consider one type of usage that favors
the plural *things,* namely, the six other instances in the text of *things* (but not *thing*) followed by
a relative pronoun that begins with the morpheme *where* (like *whereof* and *whereby,* similar to
the *wherewith* here in Helaman 15:8):

Mosiah 2:27	to be judged of God of the **things whereof** he hath commanded you
Mosiah 4:29	I cannot tell you all the **things whereby** ye may commit sin
Alma 5:45	these **things whereof** I have spoken are true
Alma 10:10	the **things whereof** he hath testified are true
Alma 10:12	there was more than one witness which testified of the **things whereof** they were accused
Alma 12:28	it was expedient that man should know concerning the **things whereof** he had appointed unto them

Yet despite this regularity, there would be nothing wrong in Helaman 15:8 with the singular form,
"and in the **thing wherewith** they have been made free" (the reading in the 1830 edition); there
just needs to be a situation where the singular is expected.

Turning to evidence that supports the singular *thing,* we note that the text has three other
occurrences of "in the thing(s)" followed by a relative clause:

Jacob 7:14

> what am I that I should tempt God to shew unto thee a sign
> **in the thing which** thou knowest to be true
> yet thou wilt deny **it**

Helaman 13:21–22

> for behold he saith that ye are cursed because of your riches
> and also are your riches cursed because ye have set your hearts upon **them**
> and hath not hearkened unto the words of him who gave **them** unto you
> ye do not remember the Lord your God
> **in the things which** he hath blessed you
> but ye do always remember your riches
> not to thank the Lord your God for **them**

Ether 8:13–14
 will ye swear unto me that ye will be faithful unto me
 in the thing which I shall desire of you . . .
 and whoso should divulge **whatsoever thing** Akish made known unto them
 the same should lose his life

For each of these examples, there is some other nearby pronoun or general noun that has the same number as *thing(s):* in the first example, the later *it* is used to refer to "the **thing** which thou knowest to be true"; in the second example, the plural *them* refers to riches and by implication to "the **things** which he hath blessed you"; and in the third example, the singular *whatsoever thing* parallels the preceding "in the **thing** which I shall desire of you". But of some importance here, the first example (in Jacob 7:14) is one of those cases where Oliver Cowdery initially wrote *things* in 𝓟 (in that case he immediately erased the plural *s* to give the correct *thing*). This initial error on Oliver's part in Jacob 7:14 argues that he could have made the same mistake in Helaman 15:8 when he copied from 𝓞 into 𝓟, but that time he did not catch his error.

The question in Helaman 15:8 is whether Samuel the Lamanite is speaking of one thing or many things in which the Lamanites "have been made free". In this passage, Samuel is referring to those Lamanites who had been converted. David Calabro points out that the previous text identifies several things that could have made these Lamanites free, namely, (1) knowledge of their true history, (2) belief in the scriptures and prophecies, (3) faith in the Lord, and (4) repentance:

Helaman 15:7–8
 and behold ye do know of yourselves
 for ye have witnessed it
(1) that as many of them as are brought to the knowledge of the truth
 and to know of the wicked and abominable traditions of their fathers
(2) and are led to believe the holy scriptures
 yea the prophecies of the holy prophets which are written
(3) which leadeth them to faith on the Lord
(4) and unto repentance
 which faith and repentance bringeth a change of heart unto them
 therefore as many as have come to this
 ye know of yourselves are firm and steadfast in the faith

On the other hand, one could argue that it is the last part of this passage (with its reference either to their "change of heart" or to their being "firm and steadfast in the faith") that has made the Lamanites free. So the preceding text can be used to support either the plural reading *things* (in 𝓟) or the singular reading *thing* (in the 1830 edition).

A more convincing parallel for determining the number for *thing(s)* here in Helaman 15:8 derives from four other relative clauses that refer to people being made free. In each of these cases, the referent for the relative pronoun is the singular noun *liberty:*

Mosiah 23:13
 even so I desire that ye should stand fast
 in this **liberty** wherewith ye have been made free

Alma 58:40
 nevertheless they stand fast
 in that **liberty** wherewith God hath made them free

Alma 61:9
> my soul standeth fast
> in that **liberty** in the which God hath made us free

Alma 61:21
> yea and also all those who stand fast
> in that **liberty** wherewith God hath made them free

In these four passages, the phraseology parallels Helaman 15:8. Note, in particular, how these four passages refer to "standing fast", which has the same meaning as being "firm and steadfast in the faith" (the language in Helaman 15:8). So it seems that *the thing* in Helaman 15:8 (the 1830 reading) could be referring to the liberty that results from continuous righteous living. This interpretation even suggests that the original text in Helaman 15:8 might have read *liberty* instead of *thing*. But since both the 1830 edition and the printer's manuscript have *thing(s),* the original manuscript undoubtedly read *thing(s),* not *liberty*. Overall, it seems doubtful that *liberty* would have been mixed up with *thing(s)* during the dictation of the text. As one might expect, there are no examples of such mix-ups in the text for these two words. Instead, the only nouns that *things* is ever mixed up with more than once in the text are the semantically related *words* and *sayings;* for some discussion, see under 1 Nephi 3:28 and 2 Nephi 33:4 (for *things* versus *words*) and under Mosiah 6:3 and Mosiah 13:25 (for *things* versus *sayings*). Nor is there any semantic similarity between *thing* and *liberty*. But the four references to liberty and being made free suggest that *thing* may stand for the word *liberty,* which is a singular.

Ultimately, one could argue here in Helaman 15:8 for *things* (the reading in 𝓟) or *thing* (the 1830 edition). Language usage elsewhere in the text provides a slight preference for the singular *thing,* the more difficult reading, especially since we can interpret the word *thing* as implicitly referring to liberty. Jacob 7:14 provides specific evidence that Oliver Cowdery could write *things* in place of *thing* in the phrase "in the thing" when it was postmodified by a relative clause. Moreover, here in Helaman 15:8 Oliver could have easily thought that these converts would have been free in more than one way, thus leading him to change the singular *thing* to the plural *things*. The critical text will therefore maintain the 1830 reading: "and in the **thing** wherewith they have been made free".

Summary: Based on usage elsewhere in the text, the 1830 reading for Helaman 15:8, the difficult "in the **thing** wherewith they have been made free", is slightly more probable as the reading of the original manuscript; the reading in 𝓟, "in the **things** wherewith they have been made free", appears to be the result of Oliver Cowdery adding a plural *s* to *things* when he copied the text from 𝓞 into 𝓟; a similar example of this tendency to change "in the **thing**" to "in the **things**" can be found in Jacob 7:14.

■ **Helaman 15:9**

and ye know also that they have buried their weapons of war
and they fear to take them up
lest by any means they [*shall* 1A | *should* BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *sin*

Both the 1830 edition and the printer's manuscript have the modal *shall* in this *lest*-clause. The 1837 edition changed the *shall* to *should,* probably accidentally. A similar example of *shall* being replaced with *should* in a *lest*-clause occurred later in the text, in the 1888 LDS edition:

Mormon 8:17

therefore he that condemneth let him be aware
lest he [*shall* 1ABCDEFGHIKLMNOPQRST | *should* J] be in danger of hell fire

Either reading is theoretically possible here in Helaman 15:9 and in Mormon 8:17, although the modal verb *should* is much more frequent in *lest*-clauses than *shall* (which probably explains the tendency to replace *shall* with *should*). For the overall text, we get the following statistics for the use of modals in *lest*-clauses:

should	48 times
NULL (no modal)	21 times
shall	15 times
could	2 times
would	2 times
might	1 time

In each case, we select the modal found in the earliest text. The original use of *shall* in the *lest*-clause here in Helaman 15:9 is perfectly acceptable and will be restored in the critical text. For a comparison of the modals used in a similar conditional clause (namely, in the *that*-clause that complements the verb phrase "will/wilt . . . suffer"), see under Alma 56:46.

Summary: Restore the original modal *shall* in Helaman 15:9: "lest by any means they **shall** sin" (the reading in 𝘗 and the 1830 edition, both firsthand copies of 𝒪).

■ **Helaman 15:13**

and this is according to the prophecy
that they [*shall* 01ABCDEGHIJKLMNOPQRST | *should > shall* F]
[*again* 01APST | BCDEFGHIJKLMNOQR] *be brought to the true knowledge*

Here we have two minor changes. First consider the omission, probably accidental, in the 1837 edition of the word *again*. The text just before has already referred to the Lamanites in the last days as being brought once again to the truth:

Helaman 15:11

until the time shall come which hath been spoken of by our fathers
and also by the prophet Zenos and many other prophets
concerning the restoration of our brethren the Lamanites
again to the knowledge of the truth

In Helaman 15:13, the *again* was restored to the RLDS text in 1908, to the LDS text in 1981.

There has been some tendency in the history of the text to accidentally omit *again*. Out of 18 more examples of this error, there are two that the 1837 typesetter was responsible for:

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* 1APS | BCDEFGHIJKLMNOQRT] to prophesy among them

> 3 Nephi 2:18
>> and in the fifteenth year
>> they did come forth [*again* 1APS| BCDEFGHIJKLMNOQRT]
>> against the people of Nephi

The second change here in Helaman 15:13 occurred later, in the 1852 LDS edition; in the first printing of that edition, the typesetter accidentally replaced the original modal *shall* with *should*. The correct *shall* was restored in the second printing for that edition, probably by reference to the 1840 edition. A similar replacement of *shall* with *should* occurred earlier in verse 9 of this chapter (but in the 1837 edition); see the nearby discussion under Helaman 15:9. Either reading, *shall* or *should,* will theoretically work here in verse 13. The critical text will follow the earliest reading, thus "they **shall** again be brought to the true knowledge".

Summary: Maintain in Helaman 15:13 the reading of the earliest text: "they **shall again** be brought to the true knowledge" (with its use of the modal *shall* and the adverb *again*).

■ **Helaman 15:13**

and this is according to the prophecy
that they shall again be brought to the true knowledge
which is the knowledge of **their** *Redeemer*
and **their** *great and* [*their* 01A| BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *true shepherd*
and be numbered among his sheep

The 1837 edition deleted the repeated *their* in "their great and **their** true shepherd", probably accidentally (the change was not marked by Joseph Smith in the printer's manuscript). Of course, normal English phraseology avoids such pronominal repetition when attributive adjectives are conjoined within a noun phrase, so the loss of the repeated *their* is quite natural.

There are a few cases in the text involving *great* where a determiner is repeated before conjoined adjectives within a noun phrase, but these examples are limited to the articles *a* and *the*:

1 Nephi 12:18	a great and **a** terrible gulf
1 Nephi 14:7	a great and **a** marvelous work
Jacob 4:16	the great and **the** last and **the** only sure foundation
3 Nephi 21:9	a great and **a** marvelous work

Of course, the article does not have to be repeated, as in these examples from 1 Nephi:

1 Nephi 8:26	a great and spacious building
1 Nephi 12:5	the great and terrible judgments of the Lord
1 Nephi 13:28	the great and abominable church
1 Nephi 18:13	a great and terrible tempest

More generally, however, there are no other examples where the determiner *their* is repeated for conjoined adjectives, nor is any other possessive pronoun (*my, thy, his, her, its, our,* or *your*) repeated in such an adjectival context. In fact, conjunctive adjectives are rare when the determiner is a possessive pronoun. Other than the example here in Helaman 15:13 (where the *their* is repeated in the earliest text), there is only this example:

Mosiah 4:5

if the knowledge of the goodness of God
at this time hath awakened you to a sense of your nothingness
and your [*worthlessness > worthless* 1 | *worthless* ABDEFIJLMNOPQRST |
    worthlessness CGHK] and fallen state . . .

Even here, initially in 𝒫 and in the 1840 edition, the expression "and your worthless and fallen state" was sufficiently unexpected that the adjective *worthless* was replaced with the noun *worthlessness,* thus giving two conjoined noun phrases ("and your **worthlessness** and **fallen state**") rather than two conjoined adjectives ("and your **worthless** and **fallen** state"). In the original text, then, there are only two instances of conjoined adjectives where the determiner is a possessive pronoun: in one case, the possessive pronoun is repeated (here in Helaman 15:13); in the other, it is not (in Mosiah 4:5).

One wonders if the repeated *their* in Helaman 15:13 was accidentally added when the text was dictated. The repetition of *their* in the immediately preceding text ("the knowledge of **their** Redeemer and **their** great and . . .") could have led to such an error. There is evidence elsewhere for the occasional addition of a repeated *their:*

Mosiah 23:28 (*their* added by the 1830 typesetter)

that they would spare them and **their** wives
and [1 | *their* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] children

3 Nephi 9:7 (*their* momentarily added by Oliver Cowdery in 𝒫)

to hide **their** wickedness
and [*their* >+ NULL 1 | ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] abominations
from before my face

But because there are only two instances of conjoined adjectives where the determiner is a possessive pronoun, there seems little motivation for making one of them agree with the other in either the repetition or the lack of repetition of the possessive pronoun. As noted above, there are examples of conjoined adjectives where the determiner is either the indefinite article *a* or the definite article *the;* and in those cases, sometimes the article is repeated, sometimes not. We have the same situation, although much less frequently, with conjoined adjectives when the determiner is a possessive pronoun. The critical text will therefore restore the repeated *their* in Helaman 15:13 since it is extant in 𝒪. And in this case, 𝒫 and the 1830 edition (both firsthand copies of 𝒪) agree with 𝒪, so all the early textual evidence consistently supports the possibility of repeating the *their* here in Helaman 15:13.

Summary: In accord with the reading of the original manuscript, restore the repeated *their* in Helaman 15:13 ("their great and **their** true shepherd"); there is some indirect evidence (based on the repetition of the articles *a* and *the* in similar constructions) that supports repeating the possessive pronoun for conjoined adjectives within the same noun phrase.

■ **Helaman 15:16**

but I will cause that in the [*days* 1 | *day* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *of my wisdom*
they shall return again unto me / saith the Lord

The original manuscript is not extant here. The 1830 edition has the singular *day;* the printer's manuscript has the plural *days*. The more frequent tendency in the text has been to drop the plural *s* from *days*. For a list of at least six examples where Oliver Cowdery replaced *days* with *day,* see under Helaman 8:16. For one more possible example, see the discussion under Alma 50:23. There are a few examples in the history of the text where a singular *day* has been replaced with the plural *days;* but all of the clear examples are found in the printed editions, and only one of them (marked below with an asterisk) has persisted beyond a single edition:

> 2 Nephi 20:3 (1953 RLDS edition)
>> and what will ye do
>> in the [*day* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRT | *days* s] of visitation

> * Helaman 8:16 (1837 edition)
>> and now behold Moses did not only testify of these things
>> but also all the holy prophets
>> from his [*day* 1A | *days* BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
>> even to the days of Abraham

> Helaman 13:36 (1892 RLDS edition, initial printing)
>> O that we had repented
>> in the [*day* 1ABCDEFGHIJLMNOPQRST | *days* > *day* K]
>> that the word of the Lord came unto us

Here in Helaman 15:16, the singular phraseology, "in the day of my wisdom", is clearly the better reading. The Lord is referring to a day of his own choosing, in his own wisdom, when the Lamanites will be restored to the truth and "return again unto me". Moreover, the text otherwise uses the singular *day* when referring to the time of the restoration of the house of Israel (including the restoration of the Lamanites in the last days). The singular *day* is found in some 23 other passages like Helaman 15:16, as in these examples:

> 2 Nephi 3:13
>> **in that day** when my work shall commence among all my people
>> unto the restoring thee / O house of Israel

> 2 Nephi 29:1
>> **at that day** when I shall proceed to do a marvelous work among them . . .
>> that I may set my hand again the second time to recover my people
>> which are of the house of Israel

> 3 Nephi 21:26
>> and then shall the work of the Father commence **at that day**
>> even when this gospel shall be preached among the remnant of this people . . .
>> **at that day** shall the work of the Father commence
>> among all the dispersed of my people
>> yea even the tribes which have been lost
>> which the Father hath led away out of Jerusalem

More generally, the Book of Mormon consistently uses the singular *day* to refer to any major event in the last days: the day of the restoration of the gospel, the day of the second coming, the day of resurrection, the day of judgment, and so on. Usage therefore supports the use of "in the **day** of my wisdom" in Helaman 15:16, the reading of the 1830 edition (and both the current LDS and RLDS texts).

Summary: Accept in Helaman 15:16 the singular reading "in the **day** of my wisdom" (the 1830 reading) since in 23 other references to the restoration of Israel (including the restoration of the Lamanites) the Book of Mormon consistently uses the singular *day*.

■ **Helaman 15:17**

[*&* 1 | *and* ABCDEFGIJLMNOPQRST | HK] *as surely as the Lord liveth shall these things be* / *saith the Lord*

The 1874 RLDS edition omitted the *and* before "as surely as". This omission appears to be accidental. The 1908 RLDS edition restored the original *and*. Elsewhere in the text, we always get a conjunctive word (either *and, for,* or *behold*) before "as sure(ly) as" or "assuredly as" (as can be seen under Alma 37:45 in its list of these expressions in the original text).

Summary: Maintain the conjunction *and* that precedes "as surely as" in Helaman 15:17; elsewhere in the text there is always some conjunctive word that introduces "as sure(ly) as" (and the related "assuredly as").

Helaman 16

■ **Helaman 16:1**

there were many which heard the words of Samuel the Lamanite
which he [*spake* 01ABCDEFGHIJKLMOPQRST | *spoke* N] *upon the walls of the city*

Here the 1906 LDS edition replaced the archaic *spake* with *spoke,* the modern English form. But
this edition was never used as a copytext, so its reading was not followed by any subsequent LDS
edition. As explained under 1 Nephi 12:19, the original text apparently had no instances of the
modern *spoke,* only the archaic *spake.*

■ **Helaman 16:1**

and as many as believed on his [*words* 1APS | *word* BCDEFGHIJKLMNOQRT]
went forth and sought for Nephi

The 1837 edition changed the plural *words* to *word.* Yet elsewhere at the beginning of this chapter,
we always get the plural *words* when referring to belief in Samuel's word(s):

Helaman 16:2	but as many as there were which did not believe
	in the **words** of Samuel were angry with him
Helaman 16:3	there were many more which did believe on his **words**
Helaman 16:5	therefore as many as believed on the **words** of Samuel
	went forth unto him to be baptized
Helaman 16:6	but the more part of them did not believe in the **words** of Samuel

In general, when referring to belief in someone's word(s), but not referring to the Lord's word(s),
the plural *words* thoroughly dominates (47 to 2):

□ *singular*

"to believe on X's **word**"   2 times (Mosiah 18:7, Alma 1:7)

□ *plural*

"to believe X's **words**"   19 times (1 Nephi 2:16, etc.)
"to believe in X's **words**"   18 times (1 Nephi 2:17, etc.)
"to believe on X's **words**"   10 times (Mosiah 28:7, etc.)

If that person is the Lord, the examples of singular *word* and plural *words* are about equally
divided, with six instances of *word* and four of *words:*

□ *singular*

"to believe X's **word**"   1 time (Alma 5:11)
"to believe in X's **word**"   4 times (Alma 9:17, Alma 14:8, Alma 32:16, Helaman 6:36)
"to believe on X's **word**"   1 time (Alma 32:22)

□ *plural*

"to believe X's **words**"   3 times (Ether 3:11, Ether 4:10, Ether 4:12)
"to believe in X's **words**"   1 time (3 Nephi 2:11)

For each of these cases, the critical text will follow the earliest textual sources in determining whether we have the singular *word* or the plural *words*. Thus here in Helaman 16:1, the critical text will restore the plural *words* ("as many as believed on his **words**"). The RLDS 1908 edition restored the plural to the RLDS text, in accord with the reading in 𝓟. The LDS text has retained the singular *word*.

There have been other cases of change in the grammatical number for *word(s)* when referring to belief:

Alma 5:11 (editing by Joseph Smith for the 1837 edition)
did he not speak
the [*word* >js *words* 1 | *word* A | *words* BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] of God
and my father Alma believed **them**

Helaman 6:36 (typo in the 1852 LDS edition)
and thus we see that the Lord began to pour out his Spirit upon the Lamanites
because of their easiness and willingness to believe
in his [*word* 1ABCDEGHKPS | *words* FIJLMNOQRT]

3 Nephi 1:16 (apparently a change from *words* to *word* in the 1830 edition)
for they knew that the great plan of destruction
which they had laid for those who believed
in the [*words* 1MPQRST | *word* ABCDEFGHIJKLNO] of the prophets
had been frustrated

See under each of these passages for discussion.

Summary: Restore the plural *words* in Helaman 16:1 ("as many as believed on his words"), which is consistent with four nearby references to belief in the words of Samuel the Lamanite.

■ **Helaman 16:1**

and now it came to pass that there were many
which heard the words of Samuel the Lamanite
which he spake upon the walls of the city
and as many as believed on his words went forth and sought for Nephi
and when they [*came* 1 | *had came* A | *had come* BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *forth and found him*
they confessed unto him their sins and denied not

The 1830 edition and the printer's manuscript disagree here. The question is whether the original manuscript read *had came* or simply *came*. If the first case is correct, then Oliver Cowdery accidentally dropped the *had* while copying from 𝓞 into 𝓟. This error could have occurred because

all the surrounding verbs are in the simple past tense. If the second case is correct, then the 1830 typesetter accidentally added the *had*. The previous clause indicates that these believers already "went forth", so perhaps the 1830 typesetter expected the past perfect *had* in the subsequent clause ("and when they had came forth"), even though the first use of *forth* refers to motion away from Samuel the Lamanite and the second *forth* refers to motion towards Nephi. In any event, in the 1837 edition the standard past-participial form *come* replaced the dialectal *came* after *had*. For discussion of the use of *had came* in the original text, see under 1 Nephi 5:1, 4 (or more generally under PAST PARTICIPLE in volume 3).

Either the past participial *had came* (equivalent to *had come*) or the simple past-tense *came* is theoretically possible as the original reading here in Helaman 16:1. In the original text, we have 18 occurrences of "when X came" and 14 of "when X **had** came/come" (here I exclude the case here in Helaman 16:1). However, all 14 examples with the past perfect *had* involve recapitulation; that is, a previous clause mentions an event, and then the following *when*-clause restates that event. Usually the restatement is a direct repetition, as in the following example:

> Alma 8:6, 8 (direct)
> and he **came** to a city which was called Ammonihah . . .
> and it came to pass that when Alma **had came** to the city of Ammonihah . . .

(Here in Alma 8, both 𝒫 and the 1830 edition have the original nonstandard *had came,* as does the 1830 edition in Helaman 16:1, rather than *had come;* in both passages, the 1837 edition made the grammatical change from *had came* to *had come*.) Sometimes the restatement is indirect:

> Alma 47:12, 13 (indirect)
> and he sent again the fourth time his message unto Lehonti
> desiring that he would **come** down
> and that he would bring his guards with him
> and it came to pass that
> when Lehonti **had come** down with his guards to Amalickiah . . .

On the other hand, in the 18 cases of the simple past-tense *came* occurring in a *when*-clause, only three examples involve restatement:

> Mosiah 2:1, 5 (indirect)
> the people gathered themselves together throughout all the land
> that they might **go up** to the temple to hear the words
> which king Benjamin should speak unto them . . .
> and it came to pass that when they **came up** to the temple
> they pitched their tents round about

> Ether 15:8 (direct)
> and it came to pass that he **came** to the waters of Ripliancum
> which by interpretation is large or to exceed all
> wherefore when they **came** to these waters
> they pitched their tents

> Ether 15:21–22 (direct)
> and on the morrow they fought even until the night **came**
> and when the night **came** they were drunken with anger

Because of restatement, the use of the past perfect ("had came/come") is expected in Helaman 16:1. But as mentioned above, such an expectancy could have motivated the 1830 typesetter to add the *had* here.

One important factor to consider in this analysis is the error tendency on the part of Oliver Cowdery as scribe compared with the error tendency on the part of the 1830 typesetter. Elsewhere in the manuscripts, there is evidence that Oliver sometimes omitted the past perfect auxiliary *had*. There are two clear cases where he initially omitted the *had* in the manuscripts:

> Omni 1:13 (*had* initially omitted in 𝓟)
>> and it came to pass that he did according as
>> the Lord [NULL > *had* 1 | *had* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] commanded him

> Alma 46:21 (*had* initially omitted in 𝓞)
>> 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 [*rent* >% *had* 0 | *had* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] rent their garments

There is a third case for which it appears that Oliver omitted the *had* when he copied from 𝓞 into 𝓟. In that instance, the 1830 typesetter supplied the *had,* but probably only after the 1830 signature had been proofed against 𝓞:

> Alma 44:8 (*had* apparently omitted in 𝓟)
>> and now it came to pass that
>> when Zerahemnah [1 | *had* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] heard these sayings
>> he came forth and delivered up his sword . . .

In other words, the typesetter did not independently decide to add the *had*. He did it only because 𝓞 itself had it (for further discussion of this more complicated case, see under Alma 44:8). In contrast to these errors by Oliver Cowdery, there is one case where the 1830 typesetter supplied the *had* on his own:

> 1 Nephi 19:3
>> and after that I [01 | *had* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] made these plates
>> by way of commandment . . .

It therefore appears that Oliver Cowdery was somewhat more prone to omit the past-perfect *had* than the 1830 typesetter was inclined to add it. And since the use of the perfect in *when*-clauses is a characteristic sign of recapitulation, the original text for Helaman 16:1 probably had the *had*. We cannot be sure, of course, but at least the odds are somewhat greater that in Helaman 16:1 the original manuscript had the *had*.

Summary: Accept in Helaman 16:1 the 1830 reading with the past perfect *had* ("when they **had** came forth") as the probable reading of the original manuscript and the original text; in this instance, Oliver Cowdery seems to have accidentally omitted the *had* from this phrase when he copied the text from 𝓞 into 𝓟; the critical text will restore the nonstandard use of *had came* in place of the standard *had come.*

■ **Helaman 16:2–3**

and they cast stones at him upon the wall
and also many shot arrows at him as he stood upon the wall
but the Spirit of the Lord was with him
insomuch that they could not hit him with their stones neither with their arrows
now when they saw [1PST | *this* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOQR]
[1PST |, ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOQR]
that they could not hit him
[1 |, ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
there were many more which did believe on his words

The 1830 edition has the demonstrative pronoun *this,* with the result that it assigns an appositive interpretation to the following *that*-clause. On the other hand, the *this* is missing from the printer's manuscript. The 1908 RLDS edition, based on the reading of 𝓟, removed the *this,* as did the 1981 LDS edition. However, this later change in both the LDS and RLDS texts was undoubtedly made on the assumption that the 1830 edition was set from 𝓟 in Helaman 16, which is not the case.

The use of *this* followed by an appositive *that*-clause appears to be unique in the Book of Mormon text. Nonetheless, it is fully understandable, and there is nothing grammatically wrong with it. Since the 1830 edition is a firsthand copy of the original manuscript for this part of the text, it is very probable that 𝓞 also read this way. It seems rather unlikely that the 1830 typesetter would have inserted the *this* unless it was actually in his copytext, which was 𝓞 (not 𝓟).

Elsewhere the text has ten occurrences of a demonstrative pronoun *this* followed by a *that*-clause, but in each instance the *that*-clause is a resultive clause and does not act as an appositive (that is, as a restatement of the pronoun *this*); in three of these cases, the *this* serves as the direct object in the predicate (each of these is marked below with an asterisk):

*	2 Nephi 9:22	and he suffereth **this** that the resurrection might pass upon all men
*	2 Nephi 29:9	and I do **this** that I may prove unto many that I am the same
	Alma 7:11	and **this** that the word might be fulfilled which saith . . .
	Alma 13:16	and **this** that they might look forward to him
	Alma 26:30	and all **this** that perhaps we might be the means of saving some soul
*	Alma 38:9	I have told you **this** that ye might learn wisdom
	Alma 56:37	and **this** that they might not be surrounded by our people
	Helaman 6:22	and **this** that they might distinguish a brother who had entered into the covenant
	Helaman 8:18	and **this** that it should be shewn unto the people . . .
	Ether 3:18	and all **this** that this man knew that he was God

But at least the three starred examples show that the demonstrative pronoun *this* can stand as the direct object in a predicate, just as it does here in Helaman 16:3.

When we consider other instances of adding or omitting *this* in the manuscripts and the editions, every one of them is a case of loss, not addition:

Mosiah 24:13 (loss in the 1830 edition)
and I will covenant with [*this* 1PS | ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOQRT] my people

Alma 18:11 (initial loss in 𝒫 by Oliver Cowdery)
    now I surely know
    that [NULL >+ *this* 1 | *this* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] is the Great Spirit

Alma 32:5 (loss in the 1837 edition)
    and they have cast us out
    because of [*this* 01A | BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] our exceeding poverty

Alma 32:28 (initial loss in 𝒪 by Oliver Cowdery)
    it must needs be
    that [NULL >+ *this* 0 | *this* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] is a good seed

3 Nephi 4:25 (initial loss in 𝒫 by Oliver Cowdery)
    and [NULL >+ *this* 1 | *this* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] did they do in the nighttime

3 Nephi 11:15 (loss in the 1837 edition)
    and [*this* 1ACEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST | BD] they did do

3 Nephi 11:35 (initial loss in 𝒫 by Oliver Cowdery)
    I say unto you
    that [NULL > *this* 1 | *this* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] is my doctrine

Ether 5:2 (initial loss in 𝒫 by Oliver Cowdery)
    that ye may shew the plates unto those who shall assist
    to bring [*forth* >+ *forth this* 1 | *forth this* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] work

Thus it is very unlikely that the 1830 typesetter added a *this* here in Helaman 16:3. The critical text will assume that Oliver Cowdery accidentally omitted the *this*. In order to show the appositive relationship for the following *that*-clause, the 1830 punctuation—namely, separating commas—could be restored; or to make the reading even clearer, dashes could be used:

Helaman 16:3
    now when they saw this
    —that they could not hit him—
    there were many more which did believe on his words

Summary: Restore the *this* in Helaman 16:3 so that the following *that*-clause acts as an appositive; the *this* seems to have been accidentally dropped when Oliver Cowdery copied this passage from 𝒪 into 𝒫; the 1830 edition, also here a firsthand copy of 𝒪, kept this unusual but possible construction.

■ **Helaman 16:4**

for behold Nephi was baptizing
and [*a* 1 | ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *prophesying*
and preaching
and crying repentance unto the people

Here the printer's manuscript has the prepositional *a* before the present-participial *prophesying,* but the 1830 edition lacks it. One possibility is that Oliver Cowdery, the scribe for 𝒫, may have accidentally added the *a*. Note, for instance, that none of the three other present-participial conjuncts in this sentence have the prepositional *a*. When we look at the earliest text, we find that

most instances of the prepositional *a* occur in nonconjunctive contexts, as originally in 1 Nephi 8:28: "they were ashamed because of those that were **a** scoffing at them". But there are two other passages where the prepositional *a* occurs in a conjunctive context; both refer to mourning and are very similar in their structure:

> Mosiah 21:9
>> and now there was a great mourning and lamentation among the people of Limhi
> (1) the widow [*a* 1| ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] **mourning** for her husband
> (2) the son and the daughter [*amourning* 1|*mourning* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
>> for their father
>> and the brothers for their brethren

> Alma 28:4–5
>> and now this was a time
>> that there was a great mourning and lamentation heard
>> throughout all the land among all the people of Nephi
> (1) yea the cry of widows **mourning** for their husbands
> (2) 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
> (3) [*a* 0|NULL > *a* 1| ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] **mourning** for their kindred
>> which had been slain

In the first passage, the earliest text (here the printer's manuscript) has two instances of *a mourning,* but the 1830 compositor removed both *a*'s when he set the type for that passage. In the second passage, as explained under Alma 28:5, the original text apparently had the prepositional *a* for the second and third instances of *mourning* but not for the first one. Oliver Cowdery, in his own editing in 𝓞, removed the second one (perhaps because the first one lacked the *a*) but kept it in the third case when he copied the text from 𝓞 into 𝓟 (although initially he omitted it there). Once more, in this third case, the 1830 compositor removed the *a* from before *mourning* when he set the type.

From the example in Alma 28:4–5 we may conclude that in conjunctive contexts the prepositional *a* can occur for some of the conjuncts but be lacking for others. Thus the reading in 𝓟 for Helaman 16:4 is possible. (There is one other case where Oliver appears to have editorially removed an original prepositional *a,* namely, in Alma 55:8; for discussion, see under that passage.)

Excluding the case here in Helaman 16:4, there are a total of 25 cases where the copytext for the 1830 compositor had the prepositional *a;* and in ten of those cases, the compositor omitted the *a,* including a preceding case here in the book of Helaman:

> Helaman 7:11
>> and it came to pass that there was certain men passing by and saw Nephi
>> as he was [*a* 1| ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] pouring out his soul unto God
>>> upon the tower

On the other hand, there is not one example where Oliver Cowdery added a prepositional *a* when he copied from 𝓞 into 𝓟. Wherever 𝓟 has the prepositional *a* and 𝓞 is extant, then 𝓞 has the *a* (there are seven examples). There is one case in 𝓞 where Oliver accidentally inserted the prepositional *a,* but there he immediately caught his error and erased the *a:*

Alma 56:31
> as if we were [*a* >% NULL 0| 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] going
> to the city beyond

Thus here in Helaman 16:4 the odds are considerably greater that the 1830 compositor deleted the *a* than Oliver Cowdery added it. The critical text will therefore restore the reading in 𝓟 with its mixture in usage: "Nephi was baptizing and **a** prophesying and preaching and crying repentance unto the people". For a complete discussion of this archaic aspect of the text, see under PREPOSITIONAL A in volume 3.

Summary: Restore in Helaman 16:4 the prepositional *a*, the reading in 𝓟: "Nephi was . . . **a** prophesying"; the 1830 compositor frequently deleted the prepositional *a* when he set the type, but evidence from extant portions of 𝓞 show that Oliver Cowdery never added any prepositional *a* on his own when he copied from 𝓞 into 𝓟.

■ **Helaman 16:6**

therefore when they saw that they could not hit him with their stones and their arrows
they cried [*out* 1ABCDEGHKPS| FIJLMNOQRT] *unto their captains saying . . .*

The 1852 LDS edition accidentally omitted the adverb *out*. The original manuscript is not extant here, but spacing between extant fragments definitely has room for the *out*. Both the 1830 edition and the printer's manuscript have the *out*, so 𝓞 undoubtedly did too. Not counting two Isaiah quotes, there are ten other occurrences of "cry out" in the Book of Mormon text. Five of them refer to yelling out in opposition to someone or something (twice in Alma 10 and three times in Helaman 8–9). The five other cases are similar to the usage here in Helaman 16:6:

Mosiah 19:7	and now the king **cried out** in the anguish of his soul saying . . .
Alma 38:8	and never until I **did cry out** unto the Lord Jesus Christ for mercy did I receive a remission of my sins
Helaman 8:7	for there were some which **did cry out** : let this man alone
3 Nephi 11:16	they **did cry out** with one accord saying . . .
3 Nephi 20:9	and they **did cry out** with one voice and gave glory to Jesus

Summary: In accord with the earliest textual sources, restore the adverb *out* in Helaman 16:6 ("they cried **out** unto their captains saying . . .").

■ **Helaman 16:7**

and as they went forth to lay their **hands** *on him*
behold he did cast himself down from the wall
and did flee out of their [*lands* 0ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST| *hands* 1]
yea even unto his own country

The original manuscript is extant for the word *lands* in the conjoined predicate "and did flee out of their lands". The 1830 compositor set the text correctly here, but Oliver Cowdery miscopied

lands as *hands* in the printer's manuscript, probably because right above in the preceding line of 𝕆 the word *hands* occurred ("to lay their **hands** on him").

The immediately following *yea*-phrase in this passage ("yea even unto his own country") works best if that phrase restates some aspect of the preceding text. Obviously, fleeing "unto his own country" is semantically related to the statement that Samuel the Lamanite fled "out of their lands". Moreover, Samuel was never in the hands of these Nephites, despite all their exertions to seize him (as described here in verses 6–7).

The expression "to flee out of the land (of X)" occurs seven times in the text, so this expression is perfectly acceptable:

1 Nephi 3:18	he hath been commanded to flee out of the **land**
1 Nephi 3:18	it must needs be that he flee out of the **land**
2 Nephi 1:3	that we should flee out of the **land** of Jerusalem
Omni 1:12	that he should flee out of the **land** of Nephi
Mosiah 11:13	at the time they fled out of the **land**
Alma 21:13	and the remainder of them fled out of the **land** of Middoni
Ether 9:9	Nimrah gathered together a small number of men and fled out of the **land**

Stan Larson, on pages 250–251 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 *lands* is incorrect since all the other examples, listed above, refer to people fleeing from a single land, not from lands. Of course, at the time of Larson's thesis, this fragment of 𝕆 had not yet been discovered, nor was there any recognition at that time that the 1830 edition had been set from 𝕆 for this part of the text. 𝕆 is extant and reads *lands,* so this unique instance of fleeing "out of their lands" should not be rejected on the basis that all other passages refer to fleeing out of a single land. To be sure, there are numerous references in the text to the land of the Nephites as "their lands" (although not with the verb *flee*), as in Mormon 4:15: "insomuch that they did beat again the Lamanites and drive them out of their **lands**". Obviously, Samuel the Lamanite could be said to have been preaching in the lands inhabited by the Nephites, even though the text refers only to his preaching in the land of Zarahemla (Helaman 13:2).

There is one occurrence in the text of fleeing "out of someone's hands", so that reading is not impossible:

Alma 27:5
    let us gather together this people of the Lord
    and let us go down to the land of Zarahemla to our brethren the Nephites
    and flee out of the **hands** of our enemies
    that we be not destroyed

𝕆 is extant for this passage and reads *hands,* not *lands.* The expression "hand(s) of one's enemies" is quite common in the text, occurring 29 other times. In Alma 27:5, it seems unlikely that *hands* is a mistake for *lands*.

Summary: Accept the phrase "and did flee out of their **lands**" in Helaman 16:7, the reading in both 𝓞 and the 1830 edition; Oliver Cowdery mistakenly wrote *lands* as *hands* in 𝓟; the following *yea*-phrase ("yea even unto his own country") supports the use of *lands* in this verse.

■ **Helaman 16:10**

and thus ended also the eighty and seventh year of the reign of the judges
[& 1| ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *the more part of the people
remaining in their pride and wickedness*
and *the lesser part walking more circumspectly before God*

The original manuscript is not extant for most of this verse. The gap between extant fragments is sufficiently large here that one cannot tell if 𝓞 had an ampersand before "the more part". The 1830 edition has no *and,* but the printer's manuscript has the ampersand. One could argue that 𝓞 had the ampersand but that the 1830 typesetter deleted it because he didn't want to create a sentence fragment. On the other hand, it is possible that 𝓞 did not have an extra *and* here and that Oliver Cowdery, under the influence of the following "**and** the lesser part", accidentally added the *and* (as an ampersand) when he copied the text from 𝓞 into 𝓟.

There are a number of instances in the original text where a sentence ends with a present-participial clause connected to the main clause by an *and.* Since such usage is nonstandard, these instances have all been edited out of the text:

> Mosiah 23:13–14 (*trusting* changed to *trust* in the 1920 LDS edition)
> even so I desire that ye should stand fast
> in this liberty wherewith ye have been made free
> and that ye trust no man to be a king over you
> **and also trusting** no one to be your teachers nor your ministers
> except he be a man of God walking in his ways and keeping his commandments

> Mosiah 28:4 (*and* moved to after *suffering much* in the 1920 LDS edition)
> nevertheless they suffered much anguish of soul because of their iniquities
> **and suffering** much fearing that they should be cast off forever

> Mosiah 28:20 (*commanding* changed to *commanded* in the 1837 edition)
> he took the plates of brass and all the things which he had kept . . .
> and conferred them upon him
> **and commanding** him that he should keep and preserve them
> and also keep a record of the people
> handing them down from one generation to another
> even as they had been handed down from the time that Lehi left Jerusalem

> Alma 16:3 (*taking* changed to *taken* in the 1852 LDS edition)
> they had destroyed the people which were in the city of Ammonihah
> and also some around the borders of Noah
> **and taking** others captive into the wilderness

> Alma 49:27 (*and* removed in the 1920 LDS edition)
> yea he was exceeding wroth and he did curse God and also Moroni
> **and swearing** with an oath that he would drink his blood

Helaman 4:21–22 (*thus seeing* changed to *they saw* in the 1920 LDS edition)
 and they saw that they had been a stiff-necked people
 and that they had set at naught the commandments of God
 and that they had altered and trampled under their feet the laws of Mosiah
 or that which the Lord commanded him to give unto the people
 and thus seeing that their laws had become corrupted
 and that they had become a wicked people
 insomuch that they were wicked even like unto the Lamanites

For the particular editing, which varies from case to case, see under each of these passages.

Helaman 16:10 has an explicit subject for both of its present-participial clauses: "(and) **the more part of the people** remaining in their pride and wickedness and **the lesser part** walking more circumspectly before God". On the other hand, none of the present-participial clauses listed above have an explicit subject. It should also be noted that the 1830 compositor, John Gilbert, did not remove any of the *and*'s from the other examples (nor did he otherwise edit them). But the explicit subject in Helaman 16:10 may have made the nonstandard syntax more prominent, which could have then caused Gilbert to remove the seemingly anomalous *and*.

When we look at Oliver Cowdery's scribal practice, we find that he occasionally added an extra *and*, yet in most instances he caught his error. Here are a couple of examples where Oliver initially added an *and* after a subordinate clause and before the main clause, thus inadvertently creating a Hebrew-like expression (but only momentarily):

2 Nephi 2:18 (initial error in 𝒫)
 and because that he had fallen from heaven and had became miserable forever
 [& > NULL 1| ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] he sought also the misery
  of all mankind

Alma 56:50 (initial error in 𝒪)
 and had I not returned with my two thousand
 [& >% NULL 0| 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] they would have obtained
  their purpose

In other words, Oliver would sometimes create sentence fragments by accidentally adding an *and*. So there is some possibility that the *and* in 𝒫 for Helaman 16:10 could be an error on Oliver's part. On the other hand, it should be noted that in Alma 49:27 (listed earlier) Oliver Cowdery initially omitted the extra *and* in both manuscripts:

Alma 49:27 (initial omission in both 𝒪 and 𝒫)
 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

This means that Oliver's more specific tendency was actually to remove this kind of *and* before sentence-final present-participial clauses, not to add it.

In contrast, when we look at the 1830 compositor's practice, especially in the latter part of his typesetting for the Book of Mormon, we find that he seems to have decided to remove extra *and*'s that lead to sentence fragments. In the first three-fourths of the text, he occasionally omitted these *and*'s:

1 Nephi 16:10

> and it came to pass that
> as my father arose in the morning and went forth to the tent door
> [& 01| ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] to his great astonishment
> he beheld upon the ground a round ball of curious workmanship

Alma 8:13

> now when the people had said this and had withstood all his words
> and reviled him and spit up him and caused that he should be cast out of their city
> [*and* 1| ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] he departed thence
> and took his journey towards the city which was called Aaron

The 1830 compositor maintained most instances of the Hebraistic *and* for the first part of the text, with the result that such *and*'s were removed only later in the 1837 edition (see, for instance, the discussion under Helaman 12:13–21). But for the last fourth of the text, the 1830 compositor removed most of these extra *and*'s. We have, for example, four instances of what appear to be superfluous *and*'s in that portion of 𝓟 where the scribe was the unknown scribe 2 (from 3 Nephi 19:21 through Mormon 9:37). And in each of those cases, the 1830 compositor omitted the extra *and*. In fact, in one of those cases (marked below with an asterisk), scribe 2 of 𝓟 also omitted the *and,* but Oliver Cowdery supplied it when he proofed 𝓟 against 𝓞, thus showing that 𝓞 definitely had the unexpected *and:*

> * 3 Nephi 23:8
>
> > and when Nephi had brought forth the records and laid them before him
> > [𝓈2 NULL > 𝓈1 & 1| ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] he cast his eyes upon them
> > and saith . . .

> 4 Nephi 1:47
>
> > and it came to pass that after three hundred and five years had passed away
> > —and the people did still remain in wickedness—
> > [& 1| ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] Amos died

> Mormon 1:5
>
> > and I Mormon being a descendant of Nephi
> > —and my father's name was Mormon—
> > [& 1| ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] I remembered the things
> > which Ammaron commanded me

> Mormon 3:4
>
> > and it came to pass that after this tenth year had passed away
> > making in the whole three hundred and sixty years from the coming of Christ
> > [& 1| ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] the king of the Lamanites sent an epistle unto me

There is not one firm example of scribe 2 of 𝓟 accidentally adding an *and,* but there are 13 where he accidentally omitted an *and,* as in the example from 3 Nephi 23:8 listed above.

There are two more instances of the Hebraistic *and* in the book of Ether. For that portion of the text, not only was Oliver Cowdery once more the scribe in 𝓟 but also the 1830 compositor returned to using 𝓟 as his copytext. And for the book of Ether the compositor continued to remove the extra *and*'s:

Ether 15:15

    and it came to pass that
    when they were all gathered together
    every one to the army which he would
    with their wives and their children
    —both men women and children being armed with weapons of war
    having shields and breastplates and headplates
    and being clothed after the manner of war—
    [*&* >jg NULL 1| ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] they did march forth
    one against another to battle

Ether 15:30

    and it came to pass that
    when Coriantumr had leaned upon his sword
    —that he rested a little—
    [*&* >jg NULL 1| ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] he smote off the head of Shiz

There is one more instance in the book of Ether where the 1830 compositor removed an extra *and*. In this case, he also removed the repeated subject that occurred after a parenthetical interruption:

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

In this case, as in the two later examples in Ether 15, John Gilbert used his pencil to mark the deletion directly in 𝒫 itself.

Thus the evidence is quite overwhelming that for the last fourth of the text the 1830 compositor was trying to remove these *and*'s that lead to sentence fragments. Although the example of the extra *and* here in Helaman 16:10 is syntactically different from the other cases, it is clearly nonstandard and would have undoubtedly been recognized as such by the compositor. In other words, here in Helaman 16:10 John Gilbert is most likely the one responsible for the textual variation. The critical text will therefore restore the nonstandard use of *and*, the reading in 𝒫, especially since there are quite a few examples of this kind of present-participial usage in the earliest text (but now all removed from the standard LDS text).

Summary: Restore in Helaman 16:10 the reading in 𝒫 with its extra *and* before the sentence-final present-participial clause: "and thus ended also the eighty and seventh year of the reign of the judges **and** the more part of the people remaining in their pride and wickedness and the lesser part walking more circumspectly before God"; the 1830 compositor removed the *and,* which he would have judged as anomalous; usage elsewhere in the earliest text supports the possibility of extra *and*'s before present-participial clauses at the ends of sentences.

■ **Helaman 16:11**

and [*thus* 1 | *these* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *were the conditions*
also in the eighty and eighth year of the reign of the judges

The original manuscript is not extant for Helaman 16:11. The 1830 edition has *these* and the
printer's manuscript has *thus*. Sentences in the preceding verses begin with *and thus:*

> Helaman 16:8–10
>
>> and behold he was never heard of more among the Nephites
>> and **thus** were the affairs of the people
>> and **thus** ended the eighty and sixth year of the reign of the judges
>>> over the people of Nephi
>> and **thus** ended also the eighty and seventh year of the reign of the judges
>> and the more part of the people remaining in their pride and wickedness
>> and the lesser part walking more circumspectly before God

In verse 11, therefore, the *thus* of 𝓟 is consistent with those preceding occurrences, but they could
also be the source for changing an original *these* in 𝓞 to *thus* in 𝓟.

Elsewhere in the text there are a number of parallel occurrences involving *thus* with an exis-
tential use of the main verb *be* followed by a noun phrase, including the following examples
involving *were:*

> Alma 58:5
>
>> but behold this did not profit us but little
>> for the Lamanites were also receiving great strength from day to day
>>> and also many provisions
>> and **thus were** our circumstances at this period of time

> 3 Nephi 7:13
>
>> and thus ended the thirtieth year
>> and **thus were** the affairs of the people of Nephi

> 4 Nephi 1:40
>
>> and it came to pass that two hundred and forty and four years had passed away
>> and **thus were** the affairs of the people

The example from 3 Nephi 7:13 is especially helpful since it repeats the *thus* in nearly the same
way as the text does in 𝓟 for Helaman 16:10–11 ("and thus ended also the eighty and seventh
year . . . **and thus were** the conditions also in the eighty and eighth year").

Elsewhere in the text, whenever we get a sentence-initial phrase of the form "these were the X's"
or "these are the X's", the reference is to a specific listing of X's that follows or precedes:

> Mosiah 27:34 (list precedes)
>
>> and four of them were the sons of Mosiah
>> and their names were Ammon and Aaron and Omner and Himni
>> **these were** the names of the sons of Mosiah

> Alma 2:22 (list precedes)
>
>> now those which he had sent out to watch the camp of the Amlicites
>> were called Zeram and Amnor and Manti and Limher
>> **these were** they which went out with their men to watch the camp of the Amlicites

Alma 3:14–17 (list precedes)
> and I will set a mark upon them . . .
> and again I will set a mark upon him that mingleth his seed with thy brethren . . .
> and again I will set a mark upon him that fighteth against thee and thy seed . . .
> he that departeth from thee shall no more be called thy seed
> and I will bless thee etc. and whomsoever shall be called thy seed
>> henceforth and forever
> and **these were** the promises of the Lord unto Nephi and to his seed

Alma 11:4–6 (list follows)
> now **these are** the names of the different pieces of their gold and of their silver
> according to their value . . . now the reckoning is thus :
> a senine of gold / a seon of gold / a shum of gold / and a limnah of gold
> a senum of silver / an amnor of silver / an ezrum of silver / and an onti of silver

Alma 17:5 (list follows)
> 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 (list follows)
> now **these were** their journeyings :
> having taken leave of their father Mosiah in the first year of the reign of the judges
> having refused the kingdom which their father was desirous to confer upon them
> and also this was the minds of the people
> 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

Alma 17:29–30 (list precedes)
> now when Ammon saw this / his heart was swollen within him with joy
> for said he : I will shew forth my power unto these my fellow servants
> —or the power which is in me—
> in restoring these flocks unto the king
> that I may win the hearts of these my fellow servants
> that I may lead them to believe in my words
> now **these were** the thoughts of Ammon
> when he saw the affliction of those which he termed to be his brethren

Alma 23:8–13 (list follows and is then referred to twice afterwards)
> 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
> and **these are** they that laid down the weapons of their rebellion

Alma 31:6–7 (list precedes)

    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

    and also Amulek and Zeezrom which were at Melek

    and he also took two of his sons

    now the eldest of his sons he took not with him and his name was Helaman

    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

Alma 56:13–15 (list follows and is then referred to afterwards)

    and now **these are** the cities which the Lamanites have obtained possession of

    by the shedding the blood of so many of our valiant men :

    the land of Manti or the city of Manti

    and the city of Zeezrom and the city of Cumeni and the city of Antiparah

    and **these are** the cities which they possessed when I arrived at the city of Judea

Helaman 1:3–4 (list follows and is then referred to twice afterwards)

    now **these are** their names which did contend for the judgment seat

    which did also cause the people to contend : Parhoron Paanchi and Pacumeni

    now **these are** not all the sons of Parhoron—for he had many—

    but **these are** they which did contend for the judgment seat

3 Nephi 19:4 (list precedes)

    and it came to pass that on the morrow when the multitude was gathered together

    behold Nephi and his brother whom he had raised from the dead

      whose name was Timothy

    and also his son whose name was Jonas

    and also Mathoni and Mathonihah his brother

    and Kumen and Kumenonhi and Jeremiah and Shemnon

    and Jonas and Zedekiah and Isaiah

    now **these were** the names of the disciples whom Jesus had chosen

I exclude from the above list 23 instances of "these are/were the words"; although technically no list precedes or follows this phraseology, each of these is always followed by a direct quotation of the words. There are two other examples of *these are* in the current text (in Mormon 7:1 and Ether 2:15); these two passages refer to words and thoughts, yet each originally read *this is* and does not technically involve a list; for discussion, see under those passages.

Elsewhere in the text, there is only one case where there has been some mix-up between *these* and *thus* in the transmission of the text. In 1 Nephi 8:34, the original manuscript read *thus,* but Oliver Cowdery accidentally copied this word as *these* into the printer's manuscript:

    1 Nephi 8:34
    [*thus* 0 | *these* 1 | *These* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
    [Ⴝ3 *is* >+ Ⴝ2 *are* 0 | *are* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
    the words of my father

As discussed under that passage, the phrase *thus is* refers to Lehi's actual words in the previous verse; again there is no list per se. Instead, with the phrase "these are the words", we would expect

a following direct quotation. For some examples of direct quotations being introduced by "these are the words", see under 3 Nephi 3:1–2.

It should be noted that there are many mix-ups in the history of the text between the visually similar *this* (the singular form of *these*) and *thus*. Yet almost all of these mix-ups (29 out of 31 cases) are the result of a momentary scribal slip in the manuscripts. There is one case in the manuscripts of *thus* being permanently replaced with *this*, namely, in 𝓟 by Oliver Cowdery (see under Alma 24:18); similarly, there is one case in the printed editions of *this* being replaced with *thus,* namely, in the 1830 edition by the compositor (see under Ether 1:43). For one accepted case of conjecture, see under Alma 11:21; there *thus* appears to have been accidentally replaced by *this* when Oliver Cowdery copied from 𝓞 into 𝓟.

In accord with usage elsewhere in the text, the critical text will accept the reading in 𝓟 for Helaman 16:11 as the original reading (and the probable reading in 𝓞): "and **thus** were the conditions also in the eighty and eighth year". The 1830 compositor, setting his text from 𝓞, seems to have misread the original *thus* as *these*.

Summary: Restore in Helaman 16:11 the reading in 𝓟: "and **thus** were the conditions also in the eighty and eighth year"; *thus* is expected here because of the reference in verses 8–10 to the conditions in the immediately preceding years; the 1830 reading, "and **these** were the conditions also in the eighty and eighth year", would be appropriate if there was a specific list of those conditions, but there is not.

■ **Helaman 16:13**

but [*behold* 1| ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *it came to pass*
in the ninetieth year of the reign of the judges
there were great signs given unto the people and wonders

The printer's manuscript has the word *behold,* but the 1830 edition lacks it. The original manuscript is not extant here for over five lines of text, so it is difficult to determine whether 𝓞 had the *behold*. Either reading is theoretically possible, but the occurrence of *behold* seems reasonable because in this year something new happened ("there were great signs given unto the people and wonders"). Elsewhere in the original text, there are 24 occurrences of "but it came to pass" and 4 of "but **behold** it came to pass" (Mosiah 18:32, Alma 52:15, Alma 53:16, and Helaman 11:29). So the occurrence of *behold* is quite possible here in Helaman 16:13. In the history of the text, there are no clear examples where *behold* was ever added to the text. There are, on the other hand, numerous examples in the manuscripts where the scribes initially omitted *behold:*

2 Nephi 30:1 (Oliver Cowdery's initial error in 𝓟)

for [NULL >+ *behold* 1| *behold* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
except ye shall keep the commandments of God
ye shall all likewise perish

Jacob 6:1 (Oliver Cowdery's initial error in 𝓟)

and now [NULL >+ *behold* 1| *behold* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] my brethren
as I said unto you that I would prophesy . . .

Alma 5:16 (scribe 2's initial error in 𝓟)

for [*your* > NULL 1| ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] behold
your works have been the works of righteousness

Alma 10:10 (scribe 2's initial error in 𝓟)

for [NULL > *bhold* 1| *behold* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
I say unto you that . . .

Alma 32:41 (Oliver Cowdery's initial error in 𝓞)

and [*it shall* > *behold* 0| *behold* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
it shall be a tree springing up unto everlasting life

Alma 38:8 (Oliver Cowdery's initial error in 𝓞)

but [*I* >% NULL 0| 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] behold
I did cry unto him

Alma 44:18 (Oliver Cowdery's initial error in 𝓞)

yea [NULL > *behold* 0| *behold* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
they were pierced and smitten

Alma 46:21 (Oliver Cowdery's initial error in 𝓞)

when Moroni had proclaimed these words
[NULL >+ *behold* 0| *behold* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
the people came running together

Helaman 8:28 (Oliver Cowdery's initial error in 𝓟)

and [NULL > *behold* 1| *behold* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
they both belong to your secret band

3 Nephi 17:1 (Oliver Cowdery's initial error in 𝓟)

and he saith unto them
[NULL > *behold* > *Behold* 1| *Behold* AHKLOPRST| *behold* BCDEFGIJMNQ]
my time is at hand

3 Nephi 28:37 (scribe 2's error in 𝓟)

but [§2 NULL >+ §1 *behold* 1| *behold* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] since I wrote
I have inquired of the Lord

Mormon 7:1 (scribe 2's error in 𝓟)

and now [§2 NULL >+ §1 *behold* 1| *behold* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
I would speak somewhat unto the remnant of this people

In the two last cases, Oliver Cowdery supplied the *behold* when he proofed scribe 2's work in 𝓟
against 𝓞.

There is one case in the printed editions where a compositor omitted *behold:*

1 Nephi 14:28 (error made by the 1840 compositor)

and [*behold* 01ABDEFIJLMNOPQRST| CGHK]
I Nephi am forbidden that I should write the remainder of the things which I saw

Although by a different compositor, this error supports the possibility that the 1830 compositor
could have omitted *behold* in Helaman 16:13. On the other hand, there are no examples where

behold has ever been accidentally added to the text (except possibly in 𝔓 for Helaman 16:13). There are two manuscript cases, both in Oliver's hand, that superficially appear to involve adding *behold,* but in both these cases the nature of the error is different:

> Helaman 5:8 (a momentary skipping of *my sons*)
>
> and now [*behold* > NULL 1| ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] my sons
> **behold** I have somewhat more to desire of you

> Helaman 14:2 (a momentary switch in the word order for *behold then*)
>
> and [*then* > NULL 1| ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] behold
> [NULL > *then* 1|*then* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] cometh the Son of God

Thus all the evidence argues for accidentally omitting *behold,* not adding it, which means that the original text (and 𝒪) probably had *behold* in Helaman 16:13. The critical text will assume as much.

Summary: Restore *behold* in Helaman 16:13 ("but **behold** it came to pass"), the reading in 𝔓; the 1830 compositor appears to have accidentally omitted the *behold* when he set the type here from 𝒪.

■ **Helaman 16:14**

and angels did appear unto men
[1|, ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
[NULL >? *wise men* 0|*wise men* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
[1|, ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
and did declare unto them glad tidings of great joy

There is not enough room in the lacuna between extant fragments of 𝒪 for "unto men wise men". In my transcript for 𝒪, I proposed that *wise men* was supralinearly inserted. However, the lacuna is sufficiently long that various other insertions could be proposed.

Ross Geddes has suggested (personal communication, 22 September 2004) that "unto men wise men" may be an error since what we expect here is something like "unto men **yea** wise men" or "unto men **even** wise men" rather than this bare appositive restatement "unto men wise men". In order to accept the noun phrase *wise men* as an appositive to *men,* the 1830 typesetter placed commas around *wise men*. Geddes suggests an intriguing third possibility for the original text, namely "unto **many** wise men". Such a phrase could have been misheard as "unto **men** wise men" when Joseph Smith dictated the text to Oliver Cowdery. It seems reasonable to assume that Joseph's pronunciation of *many* would have been /mɛni/, the common pronunciation in English since Early Modern English. One of Joseph's scribes, scribe 3 of 𝒪, definitely had that pronunciation, as evidenced by that scribe's spellings for the word:

menny	12 times
many	8 times
meny	2 times

The Oxford English Dictionary lists the Middle English spellings *meni, meny,* and *menie* for the word dating back to the 1200s; according to the OED, the spelling *menny* occurs in citations as early as the 1500s. So when Joseph pronounced *many* as /mɛni/, Oliver could have heard /mɛn/, especially since *men* actually occurs two words later in "unto **many** wise **men**".

In support of this last emendation, there are a couple of other instances in the text of "many <adjective> men": the Words of Mormon 1:17 reads "and there were **many holy men** in the land", and 3 Nephi 3:3 reads "to suppose that ye can stand against so **many brave men**". There are a few other instances of "many . . . men" in the text:

Alma 30:18   yea leading away **many** women and also **men**
Alma 56:13   by the shedding the blood of so **many** of our valiant **men**
Alma 61:5   with as **many men** as it were possible that I could get
Ether 13:15   for there were **many** which rose up who were mighty **men**

Yet none of these six examples show any variation in *many* due to influence from the following *men*.

Basically, the question here in Helaman 16:14 is whether *men* can be followed by an appositive like *wise men*. There are examples elsewhere in the text of appositives similar to this one, but none are fully parallel. For instance, *wise men* in "unto men wise men" does not have any determiner, unlike other noun-phrase appositives in the text:

Mosiah 23:4
   and they came to a land
   yea even a very beautiful and pleasant **land**
   a land of pure water

Alma 27:30
   and thus they were a zealous and beloved **people**
   a highly favored people of the Lord

Alma 54:13
   yea and we will seek our **lands**
   the lands of our first inheritance

Helaman 14:16
   yea behold this death bringeth to pass the resurrection
   and redeemeth all mankind from the first **death**
   that spiritual death

Note that the last one does not have any postmodifying prepositional phrase headed by *of,* so we end up with a simple noun phrase for the appositive, just like here in Helaman 16:11 (even though in Helaman 14:16 we still have a determiner, *that,* while Helaman 16:11 has no determiner).

The appositive *wise men* here in Helaman 16:14 has a corrective function: it restricts the number of referents, from *men* to *wise men*. There are a number of other instances in the text where appositives have a corrective function, including these which involve either restriction or expansion:

2 Nephi 9:4 (restricted from a general *thou,* a plural usage, to "many of you")
   for I know that thou hast searched much—many of you—
   to know of things to come

Alma 13:12 (expanded from a general *many* to "an exceeding great many")
   and there were many—an exceeding great many—
   which were made pure and entered into the rest of the Lord their God

Alma 52:38 (restricted from all the Lamanite chief captains to those who remained alive)
and it came to pass that when the Lamanites had heard these words
their chief captains—all those which were not slain—
came forth and threw down their weapons of war at the feet of Moroni

Alma 58:18 (restricted from all of Helaman's men to those who were with him)
I caused that my men—those which were with me—
should retreat into the wilderness

Ultimately, we have to recognize that "unto men wise men" is possible. Moreover, we cannot find any scribal evidence to support emending *men* to *many*. Yet there is considerable scribal evidence for the occasional loss of *yea:*

▫ Oliver Cowdery's loss of *yea* in the manuscripts:

initially in 𝕆	4 times
initially in 𝕇	12 times
in 𝕇 when copying from 𝕆	3 times

Thus "unto men **yea** wise men" is quite possible in terms of scribal errors. We get comparable results for the loss of *even* in the manuscripts, which gives support for "unto men **even** wise men":

▫ Oliver Cowdery's loss of *even* in the manuscripts

initially in 𝕆	2 times
initially in 𝕇	5 times
in 𝕇 when copying from 𝕆	1 time

In other words, we find scribal support for Geddes's two other emendations, "unto men **yea** wise men" and "unto men **even** wise men", but not for "unto **many** wise men". Given the number of possible emendations here, the critical text will maintain the earliest extant reading, "unto men wise men", the reading in 𝕇 and the 1830 edition, especially since that reading is actually possible.

Summary: Maintain in Helaman 16:14 the reading of both 𝕇 and the 1830 edition, "unto men wise men", where *wise men* acts as a noun-phrase appositive for the preceding *men*.

■ **Helaman 16:14**

[*&* 1| ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *thus in this year the scriptures began to be fulfilled*

The original manuscript is not extant here. The printer's manuscript has an ampersand before *thus,* but the 1830 edition lacks the *and*. Chances are greater that the 1830 typesetter accidentally missed the *and* (written as an ampersand) than Oliver Cowdery accidentally added the ampersand. When we consider errors of transmission involving *and thus,* we find evidence for the loss of *and* from *and thus* but no examples of adding *and* before *thus*. But it should be noted that all of the examples are found in printed editions of the Book of Mormon:

Alma 28:5 (omission in the 1840 edition)
[*&* 01 | *and* ABDEFIJLMNOQRT | CGHK | *And* PS] thus the cry of mourning
was heard among every one of them

Helaman 1:32 (omission in the first printing of the 1852 LDS edition)
[*&* 01 | *And* ABCDEGHIJKLMNOPQRST | NULL > *and* F] thus
had Coriantumr plunged the Lamanites into the midst of the Nephites

Helaman 11:21 (omission in the 1892 RLDS edition)
[*&* 1 | *And* A | *and* BCDEFGHIJLMNOPQRST | K] thus ended
the seventy and seventh year

The connective *and thus* occurs several hundred times in the Book of Mormon text. But many sentences begin with simply *thus,* although not as frequently as with *and thus* (for instance, in 1 Nephi there are 13 instances of *and thus* at the beginning of sentences but only 5 of *thus*). Either reading is possible here in Helaman 16:14, so there would have been little conscious motivation for either Oliver Cowdery to add an extra *and* or for the 1830 typesetter to delete the *and*. Given the tendency to accidentally omit *and* before *thus* in the printed editions, the odds are greater that here in Helaman 16:14 the 1830 typesetter is the one responsible for the variation; in other words, he seems to have accidentally omitted the *and* in his typesetting.

Summary: Restore in Helaman 16:14 the *and* before *thus,* the reading in 𝒫; the chances are greater that the 1830 typesetter accidentally omitted the *and* than Oliver Cowdery accidentally added it when he copied from 𝒪 into 𝒫.

■ **Helaman 16:16**

but behold we know that
all these great and marvelous [*words* > *works* 1 | *works* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
cannot come to pass
[1 | *of* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *which hath been spoken*

The printer's manuscript doesn't have the preposition *of* at the front of the relative clause, but the 1830 edition does. The original manuscript is not extant here. If the *of* was in 𝒪, it could have been accidentally dropped by Oliver Cowdery when he copied the text from 𝒪 into 𝒫. (There is evidence that Oliver tended to omit the *of* at the beginning of relative clauses. For some discussion and examples, see under Alma 40:19.) Or if the *of* wasn't there in 𝒪, the 1830 typesetter might have added it because it seems necessary. Another possibility is that Joseph Smith dictated an *of* at the end of the relative clause ("which hath been spoken **of**") but that Oliver accidentally missed it when writing down 𝒪. Under this interpretation, the *of* at the beginning of the relative clause in the printed editions would be due to an emendation on the part of the 1830 typesetter. It is doubtful that 𝒪 had an *of* at the end of the relative clause since this would mean that Oliver dropped the *of* when copying to the printer's manuscript and that the 1830 typesetter moved the *of* to the front of the relative clause. In other words, it doesn't seem very plausible that there was an error here for both firsthand copies of the original manuscript (although that isn't completely impossible).

When we consider all other instances in the text of the relative clause "which have been spoken" (where *have* can take variant forms such has *hath, has,* and *had*), we find that *of* never occurs when the reference is to things actually spoken. There are 37 examples of this relative clause in the text; in 19 of these examples the antecedent for the relative pronoun *which* is *words*. On the other hand, when this relative clause "which have been spoken" refers to a topic, then the *of* always occurs (15 times, not counting this case in Helaman 16:16); sometimes the *of* occurs at the beginning of the relative clause, sometimes after *spoken* (each of the latter is marked with an asterisk):

3-witness statement	the tower **of which** hath been spoken
8-witness statement	the plates **of which** hath been spoken
* Mosiah 4:8	and there is none other salvation save this **which** hath been spoken **of**
* Mosiah 4:14	the evil spirit **which** hath been spoken **of** by our fathers
* Mosiah 27:8	and denied that **which** had been spoken **of** by our fathers
* Alma 12:24	the death **which** has been spoken **of** by Amulek
* Alma 12:24	that endless state **which** has been spoken **of** by us
Alma 12:25	the resurrection of the dead **of which** has been spoken
Alma 27:16	the place **of which** has been spoken
Alma 40:19	the souls and the bodies of those **of which** have been spoken
Alma 40:22	the restoration of those things **of which** have been spoken by the mouths of the prophets
Alma 40:24	the restoration **of which** has been spoken by the mouths of the prophets
Alma 41:1	the restoration **of which** has been spoken
* Helaman 15:11	the time shall come **which** hath been spoken **of** by our fathers
Ether 13:15	their secret plans of wickedness **of which** hath been spoken

What is interesting here in Helaman 16:16 is that Oliver Cowdery started to write *words* rather than the correct *works* in 𝔓. He immediately caught his error and corrected *words* to *works*. But apparently his initial *words* prompted him to omit the preposition *of* since that would have been appropriate if *words* had been the actual reading (that is, if the text had read "all these great and marvelous **words** cannot come to pass which hath been spoken"). Here in Helaman 16:16, 𝔒 undoubtedly read *works* since the 1830 edition and the corrected reading in 𝔓 agree in reading *works*. And this firm reading implies that the relative clause "which hath been spoken" should take the preposition *of* since *works* is a topic. The critical text will therefore maintain the 1830 reading for this passage.

Summary: Maintain in Helaman 16:16 the preposition *of* at the beginning of the relative clause "**of** which hath been spoken" (the 1830 reading) since the referent is *works,* a topic; Oliver Cowdery seems to have omitted the *of* in 𝔓 since he initially thought that *works* was *words.*

■ **Helaman 16:17–18**

[1ABCDEFGH | *17* IJLMNOQRT | *76* K | *129* PS]
and they began to reason and to contend among themselves
[1 | , ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *saying*
[1 | , ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQS | : RT]

[1ABCDEFGHKPS | *18* IJLMNOQRT]
[*that* 1BCDEFGHKPS | *That* AIJLMNOQRT] *it is not reasonable*
that such a being as a Christ shall come

> Paul Huntzinger points out (personal communication, 9 January 2004) that the punctuation and the stranding of "saying that" across two verses (in the LDS edition, the result of Orson Pratt's 1879 versification of the text) is incorrect. The *that* is not part of the quote per se, and it should be associated with the preceding *saying*. In the standard text, the punctuation between *saying* and *that* should be removed, although such a change should probably be accompanied by a change in the beginning of verse 18, such as placing the entire phrase *saying that* at the beginning of the verse:

> > Helaman 16:17–18 (revised accidentals for the LDS text)
> > 17 And they began to reason and to contend among themselves,
> > 18 Saying that it is not reasonable that such a being as a Christ shall come;

> The critical text will follow this interpretation of *saying that.*

Summary: Revise the punctuation for Helaman 16:17–18 so that the subordinate conjunction *that* belongs to the immediately preceding *saying;* the verse boundary should be shifted here so that *saying that* does not straddle the two verses but instead either ends verse 17 or begins verse 18.

■ **Helaman 16:18**

why will he not shew himself unto us
as well as unto [*they* >js *them/those* 1 | *they* A | *them* BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
[*which* >js *who* 1 | *which* A | *who* BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *shall be at Jerusalem*

> The original text had the subject pronoun *they* here. In his editing for the 1837 edition, Joseph Smith grammatically corrected the printer's manuscript from *they* to what seems to be *them*. He also changed *which* to *who,* typical of his editing for the 1837 edition. The change to *who* is clear, but Joseph's handwriting is quite uneven for the change of *they* to *them*. In fact, it is possible that Joseph actually intended to write *those* instead of *them*. In my opinion, the correction looks more like *them,* which is how the compositor for the 1837 edition set it. The critical text will restore the original *they* here as well as the *which* ("unto **they which** shall be at Jerusalem"), despite the ungrammaticality of the subject form *they* as the object of the preposition *unto*. In each case of *they, them,* or *those* as the antecedent for a relative pronoun, the critical text will follow the earliest reading. For a general discussion of the grammatical issues here, see under PRONOMINAL DETERMINERS in volume 3; also see the discussion under WHICH in volume 3 for the change of *which* to *who*.

Summary: Restore in Helaman 16:18 the original *they* as the object pronoun for the preposition *unto;* despite its ungrammaticality, the original text allowed such usage; also restore the archaic use of *which* for *who* in this passage.

■ **Helaman 16:19**

yea why will he not shew himself in this land
as well as in the land [*of* 1ABCDEFGIJLMNOQRT | *at* HKPS] *Jerusalem*

Here the first RLDS edition (1874) accidentally replaced the preposition *of* with *at,* probably because of the use of "at Jerusalem" in the previous verse, especially given the parallelism between the two questions:

> Helaman 16:18–19
>> why will he not shew himself unto us
>> as well as unto they which shall be **at** Jerusalem
>> yea why will he not shew himself in this land
>> as well as in the land **of** Jerusalem

The reading with *at* in verse 19 has continued in all subsequent RLDS editions.

The correct preposition is *of,* the reading of both 𝔓 and the 1830 edition. Such usage is also consistent with all other usage in the text: there are 41 other occurrences of the specific phrase "the land **of** Jerusalem" but none of "the land **at** Jerusalem". As explained under Alma 7:10, the text does not at all avoid the unexpected reading "the land **of** Jerusalem".

Summary: The correct reading throughout the text is "the land **of** Jerusalem", including Helaman 16:19 ("as well as in the land **of** Jerusalem").

■ **Helaman 16:21**

and they will
by the cunning and [*the* ABDEFIJLMNOPQRST | CGHK] *mysterious arts of the evil one*
work some great mystery

The 1840 edition omitted the repeated *the* in this conjoined phrase, probably accidentally. It was restored to the RLDS text in 1908. The Book of Mormon text typically repeats the definite article before conjoined adjectives and noun phrases, and in quite a few instances the repeated *the* has been accidentally omitted. As editor for the 1840 edition, Joseph Smith generally left instances of the repeated *the* in the text. The repeated *the* was also omitted in the 1907 LDS edition for the phrase "the cunning and **the** craftiness of king Laman" in Mosiah 9:10. See under that passage for further discussion. For a complete list of cases where the repeated *the* has been omitted in the text, see the discussion under CONJUNCTIVE REPETITION in volume 3.

Summary: Maintain the repeated *the* in Helaman 16:21: "by the cunning and **the** mysterious arts of the evil one".

3 Nephi

3 Nephi 1

■ **3 Nephi 1:3**

then he departed out of the land
and [whether >+ whither 1 | whither ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] he went
no man knoweth

As explained under 1 Nephi 22:4, Oliver Cowdery frequently mixed up *whether* and *whither* in the manuscripts. Here in the printer's manuscript, he originally wrote *whether* but later changed the *e* to *i* (the overwriting is with heavier ink flow). Obviously, Nephi departed out of the land, so there is no question about "whether he went". Instead, the question is where he went.

Summary: Maintain *whither* in 3 Nephi 1:3 since the text is questioning where Nephi went, not if he went.

■ **3 Nephi 1:3**

and his son Nephi did keep the [record 1PS | records ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOQRT] in his stead
*yea the **record** of this people*

Through all of 3 Nephi, both the 1830 edition and the printer's manuscript are firsthand copies of the original manuscript (which is no longer extant in 3 Nephi except for a number of small fragments). Here in 3 Nephi 1:3, 𝒫 has the singular *record,* but the 1830 edition has the plural *records*. In the following phrase beginning with *yea,* both sources have the singular *record* ("yea the record of this people"), which suggests that the preceding singular reading of 𝒫 is the correct reading. The 1908 RLDS edition restored the singular to the RLDS text by reference to 𝒫.

As explained under Omni 1:9, there are references in the text to both "keeping a record" and "keeping records", with the plural dominating. In fact, in the previous verse we have an example of the plural *records* with the verb *keep:*

> 3 Nephi 1:2
> giving charge unto his son Nephi which was his eldest son
> concerning the plates of brass and all the **records** which had been kept

Nonetheless, when the text specifically refers to a person X by name and his keeping the record(s) in place of another person Y, we get only the singular *record:*

4 Nephi 1:19–20 (Amos, the son of Nephi)
    and it came to pass that Nephi
    he that kept this last **record**
    —and he kept **it** upon the plates of Nephi—died
→   and his son Amos kept **it** in his stead
    and he kept **it** upon the plates of Nephi also
    and he kept **it** eighty and four years

4 Nephi 1:21 (Amos, the son of Amos)
    and it came to pass that Amos died also
    —and it was an hundred and ninety and four years from the coming of Christ—
→   and his son Amos kept **the record** in his stead
    and he also kept **it** upon the plates of Nephi
    and **it** was also written in the book of Nephi which is this book

4 Nephi 1:47 (Ammaron, the brother of Amos)
    and it came to pass that after three hundred and five years had passed away
    —and the people did still remain in wickedness—
    and Amos died
→   and his brother Ammaron did keep **the record** in his stead

Thus we always get an expression of the form "X keeps the record in Y's stead" (with each instance above indicated by an arrow). In fact, in all these examples (including the one in 3 Nephi 1:3), the name of the record keeper X is modified by a noun phrase referring to his relationship to Y, the preceding record keeper (as either "his son" or "his brother"). Thus the close parallelism between these four instances strongly supports the singular *record*.

One possibility here in 3 Nephi 1:3 is that 𝓞 read *record* and the 1830 typesetter made the change to the plural. There is, however, only one example (in Omni 1:9) where the typesetter made such an error; yet in that case, 𝓟 initially read in the plural, and although Oliver Cowdery erased the plural *s,* he did so insufficiently, with the result that the typesetter read the word as the plural *records.* Oliver, on the other hand, is much more prone to mix up *record* and *records,* although not permanently:

Omni 1:9 (initial error in 𝓟 immediately corrected by erasure)
    and after this manner
    we keep the [*records >% record* 1 | *records* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]

Mosiah 1:6 (initial error in 𝓟 virtually immediately corrected)
    and behold also the plates of Nephi
    which contain the [*record > records* 1 | *records* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
    and the sayings of our fathers

Alma 18:36 (initial error in 𝓟 virtually immediately corrected)
    and rehearsed and laid before him
    the [*record > records* 1 | *records* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
    and the holy scriptures of the people

Alma 45:2 (obvious error in 𝓞 corrected when copying into 𝓟)
    concerning [*those/theese* 0 | *these* 1 | *those* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
    [*Reckord* 0 | *reckords* 1 | *records* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] which have been kept

Helaman preface (initial error in 𝒫 immediately corrected by erasure)
according to the [*Reckord* 0 | *Records >% Record* 1 |
record ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] of Helaman and his sons

Helaman 3:15 (obvious errors in 𝒪 virtually immediately corrected)
there are many [*Book > Books* 0 | *Books* 1 | *books* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
and many [*Reckord > Reckords* 0 | *records* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
of every kind

So ultimately neither Oliver Cowdery nor the 1830 typesetter was overly prone to permanently reverse the number for *record(s)*. In fact, here in 3 Nephi 1:3 there is always the possibility that 𝒪 itself read in the plural, but incorrectly. Since the scribal evidence is not particularly strong here, the best solution is to go with the reading that works best, namely, the singular *record* (the reading in 𝒫): "and his son Nephi did keep the **record** in his stead".

Summary: Restore the singular *record* in 3 Nephi 1:3 ("and his son Nephi did keep the **record** in his stead") since 4 Nephi has three examples of the same precise expression and each one has *record* rather than *records*.

■ **3 Nephi 1:6**

therefore your joy and your faith concerning this thing
[*hath* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNPQRST | *have* 0] *been vain*

The 1907 LDS vest-pocket edition changed the singular *hath* to the plural *have*, but this editing has not been followed by subsequent LDS editions. The question is whether "your joy and your faith" should be considered a conjunctive plural, thus requiring a plural verb form in standard English. The use of *hath* here in the original text does not prove that the conjunct is a singular conjoining of semantically related nouns since *hath* was used with both singular and plural third person subjects in the original text. The use of the repeated possessive pronoun *your* suggests that the conjunctive noun phrase is semantically plural.

In the earliest text for the nearby book of Helaman, there are a couple of other conjunctive examples of this same problem involving the semantic number: "there **was** continual peace and great joy" (Helaman 3:32) and "the famine and the pestilence and destruction which **has** come unto them" (Helaman 11:15). For discussion, see under each of these passages.

Summary: Maintain the verb form *hath* in 3 Nephi 1:6 ("your joy and your faith concerning this thing hath been vain"); even if the subject here is plural, the original text permitted the historical third person singular present-tense form *hath* to take plural subjects.

■ **3 Nephi 1:6**

therefore your joy and your faith concerning this thing
hath been [1ABCDEFGIJLMNOPQRST | *in* HK] *vain*

■ **3 Nephi 1:8**

that they might know that their faith had not been [1ABCDEFGIJLMNOPQRST | *in* HK] *vain*

> Here we have two original occurrences of "to be vain" that were changed in the 1874 RLDS edition by adding the preposition *in,* giving "to be **in** vain" (which is what we expect in modern English). In these two instances, the 1908 RLDS edition restored the original reading without the *in.* As discussed under Jacob 7:24, the original text has instances of both forms, with and without the *in.* In each case, we follow the earliest reading, thus "to be vain" here in 3 Nephi 1:6, 8.

Summary: Accept in 3 Nephi 1:6, 8 the two instances of "to be vain", the earliest reading; both "to be vain" and "to be **in** vain" are found in the Book of Mormon text.

■ **3 Nephi 1:8**

but behold they did watch steadfastly
for that day and that night and that day
which [*should* 1PRST | *shall* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOQ] *be as one day*
as if there were no night
that they might know that their faith had not been vain

> The printer's manuscript has the past-tense modal *should,* while the 1830 edition has the present-tense modal *shall.* The whole passage otherwise uses past-tense verb forms (*did watch, were, might know, had not been*); this consistency supports the use of *should* rather than *shall.* Normally, the Book of Mormon text has the past-tense *should* rather than the present-tense *shall* when the surrounding context is in the past tense, even when referring to future events:

> > 1 Nephi 10:11
> >> and it came to pass that after my father had spoken these words
> >> he spake unto my brethren concerning the gospel
> >> which **should** be preached among the Jews

> > 1 Nephi 19:10
> >> according to the words of Zenos
> >> which he spake concerning the three days of darkness
> >> which **should** be a sign given of his death unto them
> >> who **should** inhabit the isles of the sea

> > 2 Nephi 31:4
> >> wherefore I would that ye should remember that I have spoken unto you
> >> concerning that prophet which the Lord shewed unto me
> >> that **should** baptize the Lamb of God
> >> which **should** take away the sin of the world

> > Jacob 1:6
> >> and we also had many revelations and the spirit of much prophecy
> >> wherefore we knew of Christ and his kingdom which **should** come

Alma 16:16

    and there was no unequality among them
    for the Lord did pour out his Spirit on all the face of the land
    for to prepare the minds of the children of men
    or to prepare their hearts to receive the word
    which **should** be taught among them at the time of his coming

3 Nephi 26:3

    and he did expound all things
    even from the beginning until the time that he **should** come in his glory
    yea even all things which **should** come upon the face of the earth
    even until the elements **should** melt with fervent heat
    and the earth **should** be wrapped together as a scroll
    and the heavens and the earth **should** pass away

Ether 13:3

    and that it was the place of the New Jerusalem
    which **should** come down out of heaven
    and the holy sanctuary of the Lord

In addition, there is definite evidence that the 1830 typesetter was inclined to replace instances of *should* with *shall*, especially when the text is referring to the future:

2 Nephi 25:19

    for according to the words of the prophets
    the Messiah cometh in six hundred years from the time that my father left Jerusalem
    and according to the words of the prophets and also the word of the angel of God
    his name [*should* 1 | *shall* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] be Jesus Christ
      the Son of God

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

Helaman 8:14

    and as he lifted up the brazen serpent in the wilderness
    even so [*should* 1 | *shall* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] he be lifted up
    which should come

Moroni 9:24

    wherefore write somewhat a few things if thou art spared
    and [*I should* 1OPS | *I shall* ABCDEFGHIJKLMQRT | *should I* N] perish
    and not see thee

For a fifth possibility, see under 3 Nephi 26:9. Interestingly, the 1830 typesetter never once made the opposite change, of *shall* to *should*.

    There is only one clear case where Oliver Cowdery permanently changed an original *shall* to *should* in his copywork:

1 Nephi 17:50
> if he should command me that I should say unto this water : be thou earth
> [*& it shall* 0 | *it should* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] be earth

Yet this change is not simply an instance of replacing *shall* with *should;* it also represents Oliver's decision to remove the original Hebraistic *and* that separated the *if*-clause and its following main clause. Other than this complicated case, there are no instances where Oliver permanently made the change from *should* to *shall* in his copywork. To be sure, there are a number of cases where Oliver initially wrote *should* instead of *shall,* including several here in 3 Nephi:

Helaman 7:9 (error in 𝓟 virtually immediately corrected)
> but behold I am consigned that these are my days
> and that my soul [*should > shall* 1 | *shall* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] be
> filled with sorrow

3 Nephi 9:5 (error in 𝓟 virtually immediately corrected)
> that the blood of the prophets and the saints
> [*should > shall* 1 | *shall* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] not come up any more
> unto me against them

3 Nephi 9:7 (error in 𝓟 virtually immediately corrected)
> that the blood of the prophets and the saints
> [*should > shall* 1 | *shall* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] not come up any more
> unto me against them

3 Nephi 16:3 (error in 𝓟 corrected later, probably when 𝓟 was proofed against 𝓞)
> but I have received a commandment of the Father
> that I [*should >+ shall* 1 | *shall* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] go unto them

There is also one related case in 3 Nephi 9:8 where Oliver initially mixed up *shall* and *should* (see the discussion under that passage). On the other hand, there is one case where he initially wrote *shall* instead of *should:*

Alma 37:4 (error in 𝓟 virtually immediately corrected)
> until they [*should* 0ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST | *shall > should* 1] go forth
> unto every nation

So Oliver definitely tended to mix up *shall* and *should* in his copywork, but only once (in 1 Nephi 17:50) did he make that change permanently (and that change involved the more significant issue of removing a Hebraistic *and*). If we count only the permanent changes in the text, the 1830 typesetter was definitely more prone to switch these two modals than Oliver was. The critical text will therefore accept the reading of the printer's manuscript here in 3 Nephi 1:8; the 1830 typesetter seems to have once more removed an unusual *should* in favor of the expected *shall.*

Summary: Restore the *should* in 3 Nephi 1:8 ("that day and that night and that day which **should** be as one day"), the reading of the printer's manuscript; there is considerable evidence that the 1830 typesetter tended to replace *should* with *shall* if the context referred to a future event; the use of *should* is also consistent with the other past-tense verb forms used throughout this passage.

■ **3 Nephi 1:12**

and it came to pass that he cried mightily unto the Lord
all [*that* 1pst | *the* abcdefghijklmnoqr] *day*

The printer's manuscript has "all **that** day", whereas the 1830 edition has "all **the** day". The 1908
RLDS edition restored the reading of the printer's manuscript, as did the 1981 LDS edition. Both
of these corrections were made under the assumption that here the 1830 edition descends from 𝓟
(when in fact it was copied from 𝓞).

The phrase "all **that** day" is supported by usage elsewhere. In the current text, we get 12
occurrences of "all **the** day", but in each instance this phrase is followed by *long* ("all the day
long"). When there is no *long,* we get occurrences of only "all **that** day":

Alma 2:19 the Nephites did pursue the Amlicites **all that day**
Alma 56:40 and thus we did flee **all that day** into the wilderness
Ether 15:15 and they fought **all that day** and conquered not
Ether 15:20 and it came to pass that they fought **all that day**
Ether 15:24 and they contended in their mights with their swords
and with their shields **all that day**

It thus appears that in 3 Nephi 1:12 the 1830 reading, "all **the** day", was an error.

There are two examples in his copywork where Oliver Cowdery initially wrote *that* instead of
the correct *the,* and in both those cases Oliver caught his error:

1 Nephi 1:4 (error in 𝓟 virtually immediately corrected)
and in that same year there came many prophets
prophesying unto the people that they must repent
or [*that > the* 1 | *the* abcdefghijklmnopqrst] great city Jerusalem
must be destroyed

Alma 52:26 (error in 𝓞 virtually immediately corrected)
and thus Moroni had obtained a possession
of [*that > the* 0 | *the* 1abcdefghijklmnopqrst] city Mulek

On the other hand, there are two instances where the 1830 typesetter replaced *that* with *the,*
probably accidentally:

Mosiah 9:7
and he also commanded that his people should depart
out of [*that* 1ps | *the* abcdefghijklmnoqrt] land

Alma 57:29
now Gid was the chief captain over the band
which was appointed to guard them
down to [*that land* 0 | *the land of Zarahemla > that land* 1 |
the land abcdefghijklmnopqrst]

It should be noted that all of these errors, both Oliver's and the 1830 typesetter's, deal with geogra-
phy *(city, land)* rather than with time *(day).* In any event, the error here in 3 Nephi 1:12 could have
occurred in either 𝓟 or the 1830 edition. The critical text will therefore follow the systematic usage
found elsewhere in the text, "all **that** day" (in distinction to "all **the** day **long**").

Summary: Maintain in 3 Nephi 1:12 the determiner *that* in the phrase "all that day", the reading in 𝒫; here the 1830 typesetter apparently replaced the *that* with *the,* thus creating a unique reading for the text (an instance of "all the day" without a following *long*).

■ **3 Nephi 1:13**

and on the morrow come I into the world
to shew unto the world that I will fulfill
[*all that* 1 | *all that which* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *I have caused*
to be spoken by the mouth of my holy prophets

The printer's manuscript reads "**all that** I have caused . . .", whereas the 1830 edition reads "**all that which** I have caused . . .". The original manuscript is not extant here for "all that (which)", but spacing between extant fragments implies that Oliver Cowdery (at least initially) wrote either *all that* or *all which* and that perhaps later he supralinearly inserted the *which* or the *that* as a correction (although the possibility remains that he didn't make any correction at all). In the transcript for 𝒪, I proposed that Oliver Cowdery originally wrote *all which* and then later inserted the *that* (see lines 22–23 on page 403′ of 𝒪). Then when Oliver copied the text from 𝒪 into 𝒫, he misinterpreted the *that* as a correction for *which* (even though the *which* was not crossed out) and ended up writing *all that* in 𝒫. The 1830 compositor, on the other hand, set *all that which,* the corrected reading in 𝒪. It's also possible that the *which* should have been crossed out in 𝒪 but that Oliver had neglected to do so.

The normal expression in the Book of Mormon is simply "all that" (that is, without the following *which*), but other possibilities also exist. We get the following statistics for relative pronouns in expressions of the form "all <relative clause>":

"all that"	32 times
"all who"	7 times
"all which"	4 times
"all that which"	2 times
"all whosoever"	1 time

In other words, the unexpected "all that which" does occur:

2 Nephi 25:6	according to **all that which** Isaiah hath spoken
Alma 58:41	the possession of **all that which** the Lamanites hath taken from us

One would expect that there would be a stronger tendency to omit the *which* in an original "all that which" than to add the *which* to an original "all that". Nonetheless, it should be kept in mind that the earliest text has 176 instances of *that which* without a preceding *all*, as in 1 Nephi 19:23: "wherefore I did read unto them **that which** was written by the prophet Isaiah". So there is nothing textually wrong with the fuller "all that which" in 3 Nephi 1:13 and in two other places in the text.

There is considerable evidence that the scribes sometimes omitted the relative pronoun *which* momentarily. For a list of cases, see under Alma 5:3; that passage is interesting in that it shows the 1830 compositor adding a *which,* probably because it was expected (see the discussion under that passage). But here in 3 Nephi 1:13, the reading with the *which* is rather awkward, which

means there would have been little motivation in this case for the 1830 compositor to add the *which* on his own. Moreover, there is virtually no independent evidence for *which* ever being added to the text, even momentarily. There is one possible interpretation (which I ultimately reject) of a textual variant that assumes an accidental insertion of *which;* for discussion of that case, see under Ether 14:24. The critical text will accept the 1830 reading here in 3 Nephi 1:13 as the most plausible reading for 𝓞, although apparently as a corrected reading in 𝓞.

Summary: Maintain the 1830 reading for 3 Nephi 1:13: "I will fulfill **all that which** I have caused to be spoken by the mouth of my holy prophets"; the reading in 𝓟, without the *which,* appears to be a copy error on the part of Oliver Cowdery.

■ **3 Nephi 1:14**

behold I come unto my own **to** *fulfill all things which I have made known*
    unto the children of men from the foundation of the world
and [*to* 1APRST| BCDEFGHIJKLMNOQ] *do the will both of the Father and of the Son*

Here the repeated infinitival *to* was accidentally omitted by the 1837 typesetter. As discussed under Helaman 7:5, either reading is theoretically possible, so here we follow the earliest extant sources (𝓟 and the 1830 edition) and their reading with the repeated *to.* The 1908 RLDS edition restored the *to* to the RLDS text by reference to 𝓟, while the *to* was restored to the LDS text in 1920 (most likely by reference to the 1830 edition, not the 1908 RLDS edition). For a complete discussion of the repeated infinitival *to,* see under CONJUNCTIVE REPETITION in volume 3.

Summary: Maintain the repeated *to* in 3 Nephi 1:14, the reading of 𝓟 and the 1830 edition: "to fulfill all things . . . and **to** do the will both of the Father and of the Son".

■ **3 Nephi 1:15**

for [*he beheld* 1| *behold* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
at the going down of the sun there was no darkness
and the people began to be astonished
because there was no darkness when the night came

Here in 3 Nephi 1:15, the original manuscript probably read *beheld* (that is, without a preceding *he*), which is clearly an error. If 𝓞 had read *he beheld,* then the change to *behold* in the 1830 edition would have involved two changes, which is quite unlikely. Similarly, if 𝓞 had read *behold,* then the reading of the printer's manuscript, *he beheld,* would have involved two changes, another unlikely scenario. It is easier to assume that both the 1830 compositor and Oliver Cowdery (in 𝓟) attempted to emend an obviously incorrect *beheld* in 𝓞. In the printer's manuscript, Oliver emended this reading by inserting the subject pronoun *he,* while in the 1830 edition the compositor changed *beheld* to *behold.*

    Although either reading (*he beheld* or *behold*) is possible, the 1830 compositor's emendation, *behold,* is probably the correct one. First of all, the phrase "for behold" is much more frequent than "for he beheld" (259 versus 4 in the earliest text, not counting 3 Nephi 1:15). Secondly, if

"for he beheld" were correct, we would normally expect a following subordinate conjunction *that* (either after or before the prepositional phrase "at the going down of the sun"). Elsewhere in the text, there are ten instances of "he beheld" followed by a sentence complement, and in each case the subordinate conjunction *that* is there, as in Alma 32:6: "for he beheld **that** their afflictions had truly humbled them".

But most significantly, we have substantial manuscript evidence that Oliver Cowdery quite often accidentally wrote *beheld* in place of *behold,* including the following two cases where 𝓞 is extant and incorrectly reads *beheld:*

> Alma 51:9
>> but [*Beheld* 0 | *behold* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
>> this was a critical time for such contentions to be among the people of Nephi

> Alma 63:12
>> now [*beheld* 0 | *behold* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
>> all those engravings which were in the possession of Helaman
>> were written and sent forth among the children of men throughout all the land

For other instances where Oliver momentarily wrote *beheld* instead of *behold* in the manuscripts, see the list under Jacob 5:37.

Given all these factors, it is very probable that in the original manuscript Oliver Cowdery incorrectly wrote *beheld* instead of *behold.* The critical text will therefore accept the 1830 emendation as the original reading.

Summary: Maintain in 3 Nephi 1:15 the 1830 reading, "for **behold** at the going down of the sun"; Oliver Cowdery frequently wrote *beheld* in place of *behold* in the manuscripts, sometimes without correction; in 3 Nephi 1:15, he apparently made that mistake in 𝓞; when he copied from 𝓞 into 𝓟, Oliver decided to emend the reading by adding the subject pronoun *he;* the 1830 compositor, on the other hand, correctly emended the *beheld* in 𝓞 to *behold* when he set the type.

■ **3 Nephi 1:16**

and there were many which had not believed the words of the prophets
[01ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQS | *who* RT] *fell to the earth*
and became as if they were dead

The editors for the 1920 LDS edition inserted the relative pronoun *who* since the original text here in 3 Nephi 1:16 seems awkward and perhaps even ungrammatical ("and there were many . . . fell to the earth"). However, this construction is original to the Book of Mormon text, and there are still examples in the text of "there were many" followed by a subjectless finite predicate, with some intervening text but no relative pronoun:

> Helaman 3:12
>> there were many of the people of Ammon
>> which were Lamanites by birth
>> **did** also **go** forth into this land

3 Nephi 19:3

> there were many
> —yea an exceeding great number—
> **did labor** exceedingly all that night

The critical text will therefore restore the original text here in 3 Nephi 1:16.

Elsewhere in the text, there are similar existential expressions that end with a subjectless finite predicate (again, without any relative pronoun):

Enos 1:23 ("there was nothing . . . would keep them from going down")

> I say there was nothing short of these things
> and exceeding great plainness of speech
> **would keep** them from going down speedily to destruction

Alma 42:16–17 ("except there were a punishment . . . should be affixed")

> now repentance could not come unto men
> 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
> now how could a man repent except he should sin

See under each of these passages for further examples.

Summary: Restore in 3 Nephi 1:16 the original reading without the expected relative pronoun for a sentence-final finite predicate: "and there were many which had not believed the words of the prophets **fell** to the earth and **became** as if they were dead"; similar examples of this kind of existential construction occurred fairly frequently in the original text (and most are still found in the current text).

■ **3 Nephi 1:16**

for they knew that the great plan of destruction
which they had laid for those who believed
in the [*words* 1MPQRST | *word* ABCDEFGHIJKLNO] *of the prophets*
had been frustrated

Here the printer's manuscript reads "the **words** of the prophets", while the 1830 edition reads "the **word** of the prophets". The 1905 LDS edition replaced *word* with *words* since the plural seemed more natural. The RLDS text adopted the plural reading in the 1908 edition, probably because 𝒫 had the plural. Either reading is theoretically possible, although elsewhere in the text, there are 13 occurrences of "the **words** of the prophets" but none of "the **word** of the prophets". In fact, two of the examples of "the words of the prophets" are close by, including another one earlier in this same verse:

3 Nephi 1:16

> and there were many
> which had not believed the **words** of the prophets
> fell to the earth

3 Nephi 1:20

> and it had come to pass yea all things
> every whit according to the **words** of the prophets

Thus the original manuscript probably read *words* both times in 3 Nephi 1:16.

Oliver Cowdery sometimes mistakenly wrote *words* instead of *word*, but in every case where the evidence is unambiguous he caught his error:

1 Nephi 17:22 (initial error in 𝓟 virtually immediately corrected)

> and hath led us away because we would hearken
> unto his [*word* 0GHKPS | *words* > *word* 1 | *words* ABCDEFIJLMNOQRT]

Jacob 2:11 (initial error in 𝓟 immediately corrected by erasure)

> get thou up into the temple on the morrow
> and declare the [*words* >% *word* 1 | *word* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
> which I shall give thee unto this people

Alma 23:3 (initial error in 𝓞 immediately corrected by erasure)

> therefore he sent this proclamation throughout the land unto his people
> that the [*words* >% *word* 0 | *word* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] of God
> might have no obstruction

Alma 32:42 (initial error in 𝓞 immediately corrected by erasure)

> and because of your diligence and your faith and your patience
> with the [*words* >% *word* 0 | *word* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
> in nourishing it . . .

On the other side of the argument, there is one case where the 1830 typesetter replaced *words* with *word* (thus providing support for 𝓟 as having the original reading in 3 Nephi 1:16):

Jacob 3:11

> O my brethren hearken unto my [*words* 1T | *word* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRS]

It should be noted that there are several more mix-ups of *word* and *words* in this part of the text where both 𝓟 and the 1830 edition are firsthand copies of 𝓞:

3 Nephi 3:16

> and so great and marvelous were
> the [*word* 1 | *words* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] and prophecies of Lachoneus
> that they did cause fear to come upon all the people

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 each of these cases, as here in 3 Nephi 1:16, there is sufficient evidence from transmission errors to support either the manuscript scribe or the 1830 typesetter as the source for the variation. This means that the critical text will essentially follow the reading that works best contextually—that is, the reading that is most consistent with usage elsewhere in the text.

Summary: Accept in 3 Nephi 1:16 the plural *words,* the reading in 𝓟 ("those who believed in the **words** of the prophets"); the 1830 typesetter, it would appear, accidentally replaced *words* with *word;* elsewhere the text has instances of only "the **words** of the prophets".

■ **3 Nephi 1:16**

for the [*sign* 1APST | *signal* BCDEFGHIJKLMNOQR] *which had been given*
was already at hand

The Book of Mormon doesn't use the word *signal* anywhere else, so the 1837 change from *sign* to *signal* in 3 Nephi 1:16 was probably just a typo. Elsewhere in the text, there are 68 other occurrences of the word *sign(s),* including 11 more (all in Helaman 14 and 3 Nephi 1–2) that refer to Samuel's prophecy of the sign that would occur at the birth of the Savior. Thus the restoration of *sign* here in 3 Nephi 1:16 for the 1908 RLDS edition and for the 1981 LDS edition is wholly appropriate.

Summary: Maintain in 3 Nephi 1:16 the word *sign* (the reading of both 𝓟 and the 1830 edition) as the correct reading; the 1837 change to *signal* was probably a typo.

■ **3 Nephi 1:17**

and they began to know that the Son of God must shortly appear
yea [*&* 1 | ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *in fine*
all the people upon the face of the whole earth
from the west to the east / both in the land north and in the land south
were so exceedingly astonished that they fell to the earth

Here the printer's manuscript reads "yea & in fine", while the 1830 edition is missing the *and* ("yea in fine"). Each is a firsthand copy of the original manuscript. Spacing between extant fragments of 𝒪 is so large here that we cannot tell if Oliver Cowdery wrote an ampersand in 𝒪 or not. The 1908 RLDS edition did not restore the *and* here, even though 𝓟 has it.

Elsewhere in the text there are six occurrences of "yea **and** in fine" and three of "yea in fine", so either reading is possible. None of these other examples show textual variation for any of the words in the phrase. But when we look at the much more common phrase "yea and", we find a rather frequent tendency for the *and* to be dropped after *yea.* Interestingly, most of the examples are from the printed editions, including one from the 1830 edition (marked below with an asterisk):

> 2 Nephi 9:5 (1837 edition)
>
> > yea [*&* 1 | *and* A | BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] I know that ye know that . . .
>
> 2 Nephi 25:5 (1858 Wright edition)
>
> > yea [*&* 1 | *and* ABCDEFIJLMNOPQRST | GHK] my soul delighteth
> > in the words of Isaiah

  * Jacob 2:6 (1830 edition)

     yea [& 1| ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] it grieveth my soul

  Alma 8:29 (1874 RLDS edition)

     yea [& 1|*and* ABCDEFGIJLMNOPQRST| HK] I will not turn my fierce anger away

  Alma 28:5 (Oliver Cowdery as he copied from 𝓞 into 𝓟)

     yea [& 0| 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] the brother for the father

  Alma 32:28 (1852 LDS edition)

     yea [& 01|*and* ABCDEGHKPS| FIJLMNOQRT] it beginneth
     to be delicious to me

  Alma 36:22 (1837 edition)

     yea [& 01|*and* A| BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] methought I saw . . .

  Alma 36:27 (1874 RLDS edition)

     yea [& 01|*and* ABCDEFGIJLMNOPQRST| HK] in all manner of afflictions

  Alma 58:3 (Oliver Cowdery's initial error in 𝓞 immediately corrected)

     yea [*it* >% & > NULL 0| 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
     [NULL > & 0|& 1|*and* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] it became expedient that . . .

  Helaman 7:21 (1874 RLDS edition)

     yea [& 1|*and* ABCDEFGIJLMNOPQRST| HK] that ye might get gold and silver

  4 Nephi 1:6 (1874 RLDS edition)

     yea [& 1|*and* ABCDEFGIJLMNOPQRST| HK] even until fifty and nine years
     had passed away

On the other hand, the instances where *and* has been added are fewer, but there is one that Oliver Cowdery himself added to the text (marked below with an asterisk):

  * Alma 38:7 (Oliver Cowdery as he copied from 𝓞 into 𝓟)

     yea [0|& 1|*and* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] I have seen an angel face to face

  Alma 45:11 (1841 British edition)

     yea [01ABCEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST|*and* D] famine and bloodshed

  Alma 48:11 (Oliver Cowdery's initial error in 𝓞 immediately corrected)

     yea [& > *a* 0|*a* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] man that did not delight in bloodshed

  Alma 50:19 (1874 RLDS edition)

     yea [01ABCDEFGIJLMNOPQRST|*and* HK] we can behold
     that his words are verified

Comparing Oliver Cowdery's errors against the 1830 compositor's, we find evidence for Oliver adding *and* after *yea* (in Alma 38:7) and the 1830 compositor omitting it after *yea* (in Jacob 2:6). More generally, in the copying process there has been a stronger tendency to omit small words rather than to add them. For a preliminary discussion of this issue, see pages 121–125 of my article "Critical Methodology and the Text of the Book of Mormon", *Review of Books on the Book of Mormon* 6/1 (1994): 121–144. For the complete discussion, see volume 3 of the critical text. This tendency is clear with respect to the phrase *yea and,* for which there are 11 instances of omission

of the *and* and 4 of addition. Here in 3 Nephi 1:17 the odds favor the reading in 𝒫 over the 1830 reading; the critical text will therefore restore the *and* to this passage.

Summary: Restore the *and* of the printer's manuscript in 3 Nephi 1:17 ("yea **and** in fine"); the 1830 compositor appears to have accidentally skipped over the ampersand as he set the type from 𝒪.

■ **3 Nephi 1:22**

and it came to pass [1 | *that* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *from this time forth there began to be lyings sent forth among the people by Satan*

The printer's manuscript and the 1830 edition differ here with respect to whether *that* should follow an immediately preceding "it came to pass". In quite a few cases, there is clear evidence that Oliver Cowdery omitted the *that* after "it came to pass", usually momentarily but one time permanently (marked below with an asterisk):

* ⃰ 1 Nephi 7:7 (omitted when text copied from 𝒪 into 𝒫)

  and it came to pass [*that* 0 | 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] in the which rebellion they were desirous to return unto the land of Jerusalem

  Alma 24:1 (initial error in 𝒪, corrected somewhat later)

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

  Alma 44:13 (initial error in 𝒪, immediately corrected)

  and it came to pass [*the* > *that* 0 | *that* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] the soldier which stood by which smote off the scalp of Zerahemnah . . .

  Alma 51:7 (initial error in 𝒪, immediately corrected by erasure)

  and it came to pass [*the* >% *that* 0 | *that* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] the voice of the people came in the favor of the freemen

  Alma 62:15 (initial error in 𝒫, virtually immediately corrected)

  and it came to pass [NULL > *that* 1 | *that* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] as they were marching towards the land . . .

  Alma 62:28 (initial error in 𝒫, virtually immediately corrected)

  and it came to pass [NULL > *that* 1 | *that* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] as many as were desirous unto them it was granted

  3 Nephi 4:5 (initial error in 𝒫, corrected somewhat later but in the wrong place)

  and it came to pass [1 | *that* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] in [NULL >+ *that* 1 | ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] the nineteenth year Giddianhi found that it was expedient that . . .

  3 Nephi 8:1 (initial error in 𝒫, virtually immediately corrected)

  and now it came to pass [NULL > *that* 1 | *that* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] according to our record . . .

  Ether 13:18 (initial error in 𝒫, corrected somewhat later)

  wherefore it came to pass [NULL >+ *that* 1 | *that* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] in the first year that Ether dwelt in the cavity of a rock there was many people . . .

On the other hand, the 1830 compositor added a *that* after "it came to pass" only once:

> Alma 58:14
>> and it came to pass [01 | *that* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] on the morrow
>> that when the Lamanites saw that we were in the borders by the wilderness
>>> which was near the city
>> that they sent out their spies round about us
>> that they might discover the number and the strength of our army

Most of the time, *that* immediately follows "it came to pass" in the text (about nine times more frequently than cases where the *that* is lacking). Thus the occurrence of *that* after "it came to pass" in 3 Nephi 1:22 is favored, but not conclusively. When comparing Oliver Cowdery's copy-work with the 1830 compositor's typesetting, we find that the odds of Oliver omitting the *that* after "it came to pass" is somewhat greater (if we include his initial errors) than the compositor adding the *that* in that same context. This difference is consistent with the general tendency in Book of Mormon copywork of omitting small words more frequently than adding them (as discussed in volume 3). The critical text will therefore accept the 1830 reading with the *that* here in 3 Nephi 1:22.

There are two other passages in this part of the text (where both 𝓟 and the 1830 edition are firsthand copies of 𝓞) that involve the loss or addition of *that* after "it came to pass":

> 3 Nephi 8:5
>> and it came to pass [*that* 1 | ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
>> in the thirty and fourth year in the first month
>> in the fourth day of the month
>> there arose a great storm

> Mormon 1:8
>> and it came to pass [*that* 1 | ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] in this year
>> there began to be a war

Both of these show the opposite variation as here in 3 Nephi 1:22; see under each of these passages for discussion.

Summary: Accept in 3 Nephi 1:22 the 1830 reading with the occurrence of *that* in "and it came to pass **that** from this time forth there began to be lyings sent forth"; the reading in 𝓟 without the *that* is also possible, but statistically the text favors the *that* in this context.

■ **3 Nephi 1:22**

and it came to pass that from this time forth
there began to be lyings sent forth among the people by Satan to harden their hearts
to the intent that they might not believe in **those** *signs and wonders which they had seen*
but notwithstanding [*those* 1PS | *these* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOQRT] *lyings and deceivings*
the more part of the people did believe and were converted unto the Lord

Here in 3 Nephi 1:22, the printer's manuscript has "**those** lyings and deceivings", but the 1830 edition has "**these** lyings and deceivings". The determiner in 𝓟, *those,* was restored to the RLDS text in the 1908 RLDS edition. The LDS text has maintained the 1830 determiner, *these.*

There are quite a few examples in the history of the text where *these* and *those* have been mixed up. There is clear evidence that Oliver Cowdery sometimes wrote *those* instead of the correct *these,* with some as momentary errors and others as permanent errors:

> Alma 25:1 (change to *those* when copying from 𝓞 into 𝓟)
> and behold now it came to pass that
> [*these* 0 | *those* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] Lamanites were more angry

> Alma 57:20 (change to *those* when copying from 𝓞 into 𝓟)
> behold [*these* 0 | *those* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] two thousand and sixty
> were firm and undaunted

> Helaman 5:49 (initial change in 𝓟 to *those* virtually immediately corrected)
> and there were about three hundred souls
> which saw and heard [*those > these* 1 | *these* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] things

> Helaman 6:25 (initial change in 𝓟 to *those* virtually immediately corrected)
> now behold it is
> [*those > these* 1 | *these* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] secret oaths and covenants
> which Alma commanded his son should not go forth unto the world

On the other hand, there is also clear evidence that the 1830 compositor sometimes set *these* instead of *those:*

> Mosiah 28:1
> that they might with [*those* 1PS | *these* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOQRT]
> whom they had selected go up to the land of Nephi

> Alma 39:19
> for the Lord to send his angel to declare
> [*those* 01 | *these* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] glad tidings unto us

> Alma 50:2 (*these* also initially written in 𝓟 by Oliver Cowdery, but virtually
>   immediately corrected to *those*)
> and upon the top
> of [*those* 0 | *these > those* 1 | *these* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] ridges of earth
> he caused that . . .

> Alma 60:16
> yea were it not for [*those* 01PS | *these* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOQRT] kingmen . . .

Thus the evidence from errors does not strongly favor one reading over the other here in 3 Nephi 1:22.

In the printer's manuscript for 3 Nephi 1:22, the word *those* (in "those lyings and deceivings") is the very first word on the manuscript page (at the beginning of line 1 on page 365). The first few words of the page is a common place for an error to occur since the scribe is forced to keep the text in mind as he switches to a new page. Moreover, the immediately preceding sentence in this passage has "**those** signs and wonders", which could have prompted Oliver Cowdery to write *those* in place of *these,* giving "those lyings and deceivings". The most reasonable solution here is to follow the 1830 reading since the reading in 𝓟 can be readily explained as a scribal error. Obviously, the evidence in favor of the 1830 reading is not overwhelming.

There are two other examples of a mix-up between *these* and *those* for this part of the text (where both 𝓟 and the 1830 edition are firsthand copies of 𝓞):

> 3 Nephi 10:17
>
> and [*these* 1BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST | *those* A] things which testifies of us
> are they not written upon the plates of brass

> 3 Nephi 19:28
>
> Father I thank thee that thou hast purified
> [*these* 01PS | *those* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOQRT] which I have chosen
> because of their faith

The variation is just the opposite here in these two examples, with *these* in 𝓟 and *those* in the 1830 edition. Note that in the second example the word *these* is extant in 𝓞, which means that in that case we can be sure that it was the 1830 compositor who made the change (from *these* to *those*). For analysis and discussion, see under these two passages.

Summary: Accept in 3 Nephi 1:22 the determiner *these* in the phrase "but notwithstanding **these** lyings and deceivings" (the 1830 reading); the reading in 𝓟, *those,* appears to have been influenced by the previous "**those** signs and wonders" and facilitated by distraction as Oliver Cowdery copied the text from 𝓞 onto a new page in 𝓟.

■ **3 Nephi 1:25**

yea the word came unto them that it must be fulfilled
yea that one jot [*nor* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQ | *or* RST] *tittle should not pass away*
till it should all be fulfilled

As explained under 2 Nephi 23:17, the original text has a number of instances where a *nor*-conjunct occurs parenthetically between a preceding positive conjunct and its following negative predicate, thus "one jot—nor tittle—should not pass away". This usage has, for the most part, been removed from the standard text. Here in 3 Nephi 1:25, the *nor* was edited to *or* in the 1920 LDS edition and in the 1953 RLDS edition. The critical text will restore or maintain, as the case may be, the original usage in such passages.

Summary: Restore the original *nor* in 3 Nephi 1:25 ("one jot nor tittle"), the reading of both 𝓟 and the 1830 edition; this kind of usage is found elsewhere in the original text.

■ **3 Nephi 1:26**

and thus the ninety and second year did pass away
bringing glad [*tidings* 01ACEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST | *tiding* BD] *unto the people*

The 1837 edition set "glad tiding". This change was undoubtedly a typo. It was corrected in the 1840 edition and independently in the 1849 LDS edition. Elsewhere in the text, we have only the plural *tidings* (22 times), of which 11 refer to "glad tidings". The King James Bible also has only *tidings* (46 times).

Summary: Maintain the plural usage *tidings* in 3 Nephi 1:26 and throughout the text.

■ **3 Nephi 1:26**

and thus the ninety and second year did pass away
bringing glad tidings unto the people
because of the signs which did come to pass
according to the words of the **prophecy** *of all the holy prophets*

In the discussion under 3 Nephi 1:16, I noted that there are examples of the plural "the words of the prophets" in the original text but never "the word of the prophets". Here we have a related phrase that refers to "the words of the **prophecy** of all the holy prophets". One wonders here if the singular *prophecy* might be an error for the plural *prophecies.* The text otherwise refers to "the prophecies of prophets" (11 times) but never to "the prophecy of prophets"; in fact, one of these fully plural examples is found earlier in this chapter:

> 3 Nephi 1:4
>> and it came to pass that in the commencement of the ninety and second year
>> behold **the prophecies of the prophets** began to be fulfilled more fully
>> for there began to be greater signs and greater miracles wrought among the people

Examples like this one provide internal evidence for emending *prophecy* to *prophecies* here in 3 Nephi 1:26. If there is an error in this passage, it must have occurred as Joseph Smith dictated the text to Oliver Cowdery since for this part of the text both 𝒫 and the 1830 edition are firsthand copies of 𝒪 and agree in having the singular *prophecy.* One problem, however, with this suggested emendation is that there is not one example in the history of text, neither in the manuscripts nor in the printed editions, of any mix-up in the grammatical number for the noun *prophecy.*

One possible way to interpret this passage in 3 Nephi 1:26 is that there was one basic prophecy regarding the coming of Christ and that prophets throughout the ages have made that prophecy, as is claimed elsewhere in the Book of Mormon:

> Jacob 7:11
>> behold I say unto you that none of the prophets have written nor prophesied
>> save they have spoken concerning this Christ

Note, in particular, that Samuel the Lamanite was not the only prophet who predicted the sign of Christ's coming:

> 3 Nephi 2:7
>> and nine years had passed away
>> from the time which **the sign** was given
>> which was spoken of by **the prophets**
>> that Christ should come into the world

In general, then, one can refer to "the prophecy of all the holy prophets". Ultimately, the best solution here in 3 Nephi 1:26 is to maintain the earliest reading since it does work.

Summary: Maintain the singular *prophecy* in 3 Nephi 1:26, the reading of both 𝒫 and the 1830 edition; although we expect the plural *prophecies* with the plural *prophets,* the text here is apparently referring to the prophecy that Christ would be born, an event that prophets throughout the ages (not just Samuel the Lamanite) had prophesied of.

■ **3 Nephi 1:27**

and it came to pass that
the ninety and third year did also pass away in peace
save it were for the Gaddianton robbers
which [*did dwell* 1 | *dwelt* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *upon the mountains*
which **did** *infest the land*

The original manuscript is not extant here, and the spacing between extant fragments is so large (over seven lines of manuscript text) that it is difficult to determine whether the text read *did dwell* (the reading in the printer's manuscript) or *dwelt* (the reading in the 1830 edition). Elsewhere the text has five examples of *did dwell*:

Helaman 3:7	therefore they did build houses of cement in the which they **did dwell**
Helaman 3:9	and the people which were in the land northward **did dwell** in tents and in houses of cement
3 Nephi 3:25	and they **did dwell** in one land and in one body
4 Nephi 1:15	because of the love of God which **did dwell** in the hearts of the people
Ether 11:9	and he **did dwell** in captivity all his days

As explained under 1 Nephi 2:5, the Book of Mormon allows usage like *did dwell*; also see the general discussion under DO AUXILIARY in volume 3. However, the simple past-tense form, *dwelt*, is considerably more frequent than *did dwell*, occurring 22 times elsewhere in the original text.

There are six clear examples in the text where Oliver Cowdery added (or started to add) the auxiliary *do* in his copywork; in two cases, the change was left permanently in the text (each of these permanent changes is marked below with an asterisk):

⁕ 1 Nephi 2:16 (changed to *did cry* when copying from 𝒪 into 𝒫)

wherefore I [*cried* 0 | *did cry* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] unto the Lord
and behold he **did** visit me and **did** soften my heart
that I **did** believe all the words which had been spoken by my father

⁕ 1 Nephi 18:11 (changed to *did suffer* when copying from 𝒪 into 𝒫)

Laman and Lemuel **did** take me and bind me with cords
and they **did** treat me with much harshness
nevertheless the Lord [*suffered* 0 | *did suffer* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] it
that he might shew forth his power

Alma 53:13 (Oliver Cowdery started to write *did bear* in 𝒫)

when they saw the danger and the many afflictions and tribulations
which the Nephites [*did > bore* 1 | *bore* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] for them
they were moved with compassion

Helaman 9:39 (Oliver Cowdery initially wrote *did believe* in 𝒫)

and there were some of the Nephites
which [*did believe >+ believed* 1 | *believed* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
  on the words of Nephi
and there were some also which believed because of the testimony of the five

3 Nephi 11:15 (Oliver Cowdery started to write *did thrust* in 𝒫)

and it came to pass that the multitude went forth
and [*did* > *thrust* 1 | *thrust* ᴀʙᴄᴅᴇꜰɢʜɪᴊᴋʟᴍɴᴏᴘǫʀsᴛ] 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

3 Nephi 17:10 (Oliver Cowdery initially wrote *did bow down* in 𝒫)

and they which were whole
[*did* > ɴᴜʟʟ 1 | ᴀʙᴄᴅᴇꜰɢʜɪᴊᴋʟᴍɴᴏᴘǫʀsᴛ] bow down at his feet
and **did** worship him

For four of the six cases, there are other verbs in the passage that take the *do* auxiliary (as noted above in bold); this nearby use of the *do* could have prompted Oliver to add the *do* auxiliary in those cases. Note in particular that the following relative clause here in 3 Nephi 1:27 also has the *do* auxiliary ("which **did** infest the land").

Besides these six cases, there is another one in this part of the text where it appears that Oliver Cowdery once more added the *do* auxiliary:

3 Nephi 19:12

and he [*did baptize* 1 | *baptized* ᴀʙᴄᴅᴇꜰɢʜɪᴊᴋʟᴍɴᴏᴘǫʀsᴛ] all they
whom Jesus had chosen

For further discussion, see under that passage.

In contrast to Oliver Cowdery's tendency to add the *do* auxiliary, there are no established examples where the 1830 typesetter deleted the *do* auxiliary (there is one case where he added the *do,* in 1 Nephi 17:1). Thus the most probable source for the variation in 3 Nephi 1:27 is the result of Oliver accidentally changing *dwelt* to *did dwell* when he copied the text from 𝒪 into 𝒫. The critical text will maintain the simple past-tense form *dwelt,* the 1830 reading for this passage.

Summary: Maintain the simple past-tense *dwelt* in 3 Nephi 1:27: "save it were for the Gaddianton robbers which **dwelt** upon the mountains" (the 1830 reading); the use of *did dwell* in 𝒫 was probably the result of Oliver Cowdery's tendency to sometimes add the *do* auxiliary when he copied from 𝒪 into 𝒫.

◼ **3 Nephi 1:28–29**

and it came to pass that in the ninety and fourth year
they began to increase in a great degree
because there were many dissenters of the Nephites which did flee unto them
which did cause much sorrow unto those Nephites which did remain in the land
and **there** *was also a cause of much sorrow among the Lamanites*
for behold they had many children which did grow up and began to wax strong in years
that they became for themselves and were led away by some which were Zoramites
by their lyings and their flattering words to join those Gaddianton robbers

One wonders here at the beginning of verse 29 whether the text should read "and **this** was also a cause of much sorrow among the Lamanites", especially since the same dissenters are causing sorrow for both the righteous Nephites and Lamanites.

In clauses that state "X (not) to be a/the cause of something", the X can be a subject pronoun, a noun phrase, a relative pronoun, an interrogative pronoun, or (in one other case besides 3 Nephi 1:29) the existential *there*. Here I list the various possibilities for X (including representative examples) and the number of times that form of the subject occurs in the text:

□ subject pronoun

"**this** was the cause of . . ." (Alma 4:7)	6 times
"**it** was the cause of . . ." (Alma 1:23)	4 times
"**they** had been the cause of . . ." (Alma 22:19)	1 time

□ noun phrase

"**Ammoron and Amalickiah his brother** had been the cause of . . ." (Alma 62:35)	1 time

□ relative pronoun

"**which** was the cause of . . ." (Mosiah 16:3)	8 times
"**that** have been the cause of . . ." (Alma 61:4)	1 time

□ interrogative pronoun

"**what** is the cause of . . ." (Alma 5:10)	2 times

□ existential *there*

"**there** was also a cause of . . ." (3 Nephi 1:29)	2 times

The other case with *there* is nearby:

Helaman 14:28
to the intent that **there** should be no cause for unbelief
among the children of men

Here the negative existential is equivalent to "that there should not be any cause for unbelief".

Since here in 3 Nephi 1:29 the printer's manuscript and the 1830 edition agree (both have *there* in 3 Nephi 1:29), the original manuscript undoubtedly read *there*. Although the text may be referring to the same cause in both verses 28 and 29, it is also possible to see a distinction: the Nephites were sorrowful because so many Nephites were dissenting over to the Gaddianton robbers, while the Lamanites were sorrowful because so many of their own children were joining the Gaddianton robbers. So *there* will work in 3 Nephi 1:29 and will be maintained in the critical text.

Another aspect that makes it doubtful that *there* is an error for *this* here in 3 Nephi 1:29 is that elsewhere in the transmission of the text there are no examples where *there* and *this* have ever been mixed up. Another possible mix-up, pointed out by David Calabro (personal communication) is that *there* could be an error for *they;* that is, the original text may have read "and **they** was also a cause of much sorrow among the Lamanites". The nonstandard *they was* would not be a reason for rejecting this proposed emendation since such usage is found in the original text (see the discussion under 1 Nephi 4:4, where the earliest text read "**they was** yet wroth"). Here in 3 Nephi 1:29, Oliver Cowdery could have misheard an original *they,* referring to the Gaddianton robbers, as *there*. And there is evidence that Oliver sometimes wrote *there* instead of *they* in his manuscript work, if only momentarily:

Alma 30:24 (initial error in 𝒫)
  behold I say
  [*there > these* 0 | *there > they* 1 | *they* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] are in bondage

Alma 50:36 (initial error in 𝒪)
  and upon their covenanting to keep the peace
  [*there > they* 0 | *they* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] were restored
  to the land of Morionton

3 Nephi 3:9 (initial error in 𝒫)
  and [*there > they* 1 | *they* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] are of ancient date

It should be noted that in this proposed emendation for 3 Nephi 1:29 the passage ends up with three different referents for the pronoun *they* (first the Gaddianton robbers, then the righteous Lamanites, and finally the Lamanite children):

3 Nephi 1:29 (suggested emendation)
  and **they** was also a cause of much sorrow among the Lamanites
  for behold **they** had many children which did grow up
    and began to wax strong in years
  that **they** became for themselves

Yet as discussed above, *there* (the reading in both 𝒫 and the 1830 edition) works well enough in this passage, so there is no strong reason to emend *there* to *they*.

Summary: Accept the unusual but acceptable use of *there* in 3 Nephi 1:29: "and **there** was also a cause of much sorrow among the Lamanites"; the *there* here is probably not an error for *this* or *they*.

■ **3 Nephi 1:29**

for behold they had many children
which did grow up and began **to wax strong in years**
that they **became for themselves**

Ross Geddes points out (personal communication, 26 September 2004) that this verse contains two unusual expressions, "to wax strong in years" and "to become for oneself". Although 𝒪 is not extant, both 𝒫 and the 1830 edition read identically, so 𝒪 must have read this way ("and began to wax strong in years that they became for themselves"). The first expression must mean something more than simply 'to grow up', perhaps something more literalistic and specific like 'to become large in number of years'. Although the actual phrase "to wax strong in years" is not found on *Literature Online* <www.chadwyck.com>, this source has comparable examples from Early Modern English that mean something like 'to become large in number of X":

Robert Aylett (1638)
  thus some few great men waxing strong **in factions**

Athanasius Kircher (1669)
  and waxing strong **in its storehouses**

The language in 3 Nephi 7:11 also supports this usage, but with the verb *be* rather than *wax:*
"they were not so strong in numbers" (that is, 'they were not so large in number'). These examples
argue that the expression "to wax strong in years" in 3 Nephi 1:29 is fully intended.

The expression "to become for oneself" means something like 'to become independent' or
'to be on one's own'. Don Brugger (personal communication) has provided the following example
of this expression from a 19th-century translation of Hegel's *Lectures on the History of Philosophy:*

> John Sibree (1857)
> The Athenian people had come into a period of culture,
> in which this individual consciousness **made itself independent**
> of the universal spirit and **became for itself.**

Thus there is some evidence for "they became for themselves" here in 3 Nephi 1:29, and it will be
retained in the critical text, despite its unusualness.

Robert Baer (personal communication, 5 July 1989) suggested emending "**that** they **became**
for themselves" to "**and** they **began to act** for themselves". His emendation creates a parallelism
with the preceding predicate "and **began to** wax strong in years"; in fact, he proposes replacing
the *that* with *and* in order to increase the parallelism. In my mind, the change from an original
began to act to *become* seems rather implausible. If such an error occurred, it must have taken place
when Joseph Smith dictated the text to Oliver Cowdery since both 𝓟 and the 1830 edition agree.

In a later communication (20 July 1989), Baer suggested another possible type of emendation
for the clause "they became for themselves": perhaps the original text had an adjective after *became*
that was accidentally lost during the dictation. Here are some possibilities that Baer proposes:

> 3 Nephi 1:29 (three alternative emendations)
> □ they became **responsible** for themselves
> □ they became **accountable** for themselves
> □ they became **answerable** for themselves

The word *accountable* actually appears in the Book of Mormon text, and words related to the two
other adjectives are used elsewhere in the text in a semantically similar way:

2 Nephi 4:6	that the cursing may be taken from you and be **answered** upon the heads of your parents
Jacob 1:19	taking upon us the **responsibility**
Jacob 1:19	**answering** the sins of the people upon our own heads
Jacob 2:2	according to the **responsibility** which I am under to God
Mosiah 29:30	if these people commit sins and iniquities / they shall be **answered** upon their own heads
Mosiah 29:31	their iniquities are **answered** upon the heads of their kings
Mosiah 29:38	every man expressed a willingness to **answer** for his own sins
Moroni 8:10	this thing shall ye teach : repentance and baptism unto they which are **accountable** and capable of committing sin

Perhaps *accountable* would be the most appropriate emendation of this sort here in 3 Nephi 1:19,
if one is to be made. Another possibility is to interpret "they became for themselves" as meaning
'they became accountable for themselves' but without explicitly stating the adjective *accountable*.

Summary: Maintain in 3 Nephi 1:29 the agreed reading of both 𝓟 and the 1830 edition, including both of its unusual expressions, "to wax strong in years" and "to become for oneself"; the former means something like 'to become large in number of years' and the second 'to become independent for oneself' or 'to become accountable for oneself'.

■ **3 Nephi 1:29**

that they became for themselves and were led away by some which were Zoramites
by their [lieings 1 | lyings ABCDEFIJLMNOPQRST *| lying* GHK] *and their flattering words*
to join those Gaddianton robbers

Here the 1858 Wright edition accidentally replaced the plural *lyings* with the singular *lying*. The correct plural reading was restored to the RLDS text in 1908. The critical text will follow the earliest reading, with its plural *lyings*. For a complete discussion of cases showing variation between *lying* and *lyings* in the text, see under Alma 12:1, 3.

Summary: Maintain in 3 Nephi 1:29 the plural *lyings,* the reading of both 𝓟 and the 1830 edition ("by their lyings and their flattering words").

■ **3 Nephi 1:30**

and thus were [the 1ABCEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST *|* D] *Lamanites afflicted also*
and began to decrease as to their faith and righteousness

Here the 1841 British edition accidentally omitted the definite article *the* from before *Lamanites,* thus creating an indefinite reading that is highly unexpected in this context. The subsequent LDS edition (1849) restored the correct reading, "and thus were **the** Lamanites afflicted also".

Summary: Maintain in 3 Nephi 1:30 the definite article *the* before *Lamanites,* the reading of the earliest textual sources (𝓟 and the 1830 edition).

3 Nephi 2

■ **3 Nephi 2:1**

and the people began to forget those signs and wonders which they had **heard**
and began to be less and less astonished at a sign or a wonder from heaven
insomuch that they began to be hard in their hearts and blind in their minds
and began to disbelieve all which they had **heard and seen**

Ross Geddes suggests (personal communication, 23 May 2006) that at the beginning of this passage the original text may have read "those signs and wonders which they had **heard and seen**", just as it does later on in the verse ("all which they had **heard and seen**"). Since 𝓟 and the 1830 edition agree here near the beginning of the verse in having only *heard,* if there is an error it must have occurred as Oliver Cowdery took down Joseph Smith's dictation. The only sign that is given in detail (described in 3 Nephi 1:9–21 as the night that was as bright as day, accompanied by the appearance of a new star) had been physically seen, not heard. These signs and wonders were definitely seen (3 Nephi 1:22), but the later reference in 3 Nephi 2:1 to "all which they had heard and seen" implies that at least some of those signs and wonders had been heard.

Elsewhere the text shows an equal tendency to refer to things that have been perceived by the physical senses as either "seen and heard" (including "heard and seen") or as simply "seen". For instance, in relative clauses that refer to things which have been seen or heard, in the original text there are 17 instances that combine *see* and *hear* (as at the end of 3 Nephi 2:1). On the other hand, there are 18 instances where the verb *see* occurs but the verb *hear* does not. In contrast, there is only one other case of this nature where the verb *hear* occurs without the verb *see*. (For these statistics, I include only those cases where the semantics allows for *see* and *hear* to co-occur even though only one of the verbs may actually occur.) The one other case with only *hear* refers to the conversion of the four sons of king Mosiah and what they saw and heard when the angel of the Lord appeared to them (and to Alma, the son of Alma), yet nearby references to that experience include the word *see;* in fact, we get an example of each possibility (first *hear* and *see* together, then *see* alone, and finally *hear* alone):

Mosiah 27:32
    and now it came to pass that
    Alma began from this time forward to teach the people
    and those which were with Alma at the time the angel appeared unto them
    traveling round about through all the land
(1) publishing to all the people **the things which they had heard and seen**
    and preaching the word of God in much tribulation

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
(2) and publishing **all the things which they had seen**
and explaining the prophecies and the scriptures to all who desired to hear them . . .

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
(3) that they might preach **the things which they had heard**
and that they might impart the word of God to their brethren the Lamanites

Thus the use of *hear* alone near the beginning of 3 Nephi 2:1 is not impossible even though overall the signs and wonders referred to in 3 Nephi 1 were "heard and seen". The critical text will therefore maintain the earliest reading, "and the people began to forget those signs and wonders which they had **heard**", the agreed reading of both 𝓟 and the 1830 edition and the likely reading in 𝓞.

Summary: Maintain in 3 Nephi 2:1 the unexpected statement referring to "those signs and wonders which they had **heard**", in contrast to the phraseology at the end of the verse ("all which they had **heard and seen**"); Mosiah 28:1 has a similar reference to hearing alone in its description of what the sons of Mosiah had both heard and seen when the angel of the Lord appeared to them and to Alma, the son of Alma.

■ **3 Nephi 2:1**

and the people began to forget those signs and wonders which they had heard
and began to be less and less astonished
at a sign or [*a* 1ABCDEFGHIKLMNOPQRST | J] *wonder from heaven*

As discussed under 1 Nephi 16:38, the original text has a number of examples of the repeated *a* in cases of conjoined nouns, such as *sign* and *wonder* here in 3 Nephi 2:1. In this instance, the 1888 LDS edition omitted the repeated *a;* but since that edition never served as a copytext, subsequent LDS editions have maintained the *a.* Similarly, the *a* is repeated in the phrase "a marvelous work and **a** wonder", which occurs twice in the Book of Mormon (in 2 Nephi 25:17 and 2 Nephi 27:26, where the text follows the King James language in Isaiah 29:14). The critical text will retain the repeated *a* here in 3 Nephi 2:1. For a general discussion of this usage, see under CONJUNCTIVE REPETITION in volume 3.

Summary: Maintain in 3 Nephi 2:1 the repeated *a* in the conjoined noun phrase "a sign or **a** wonder from heaven".

■ **3 Nephi 2:7–8**

and nine years had passed away from the time
[*which* >js *when* 1 | *which* A | *when* BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *the sign was given*
which was spoken of by the prophets
that Christ should come into the world
now the Nephites began to reckon their time from this period
[*which* >js *whn* 1 | *which* A | *when* BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *the sign was given*
or from the coming of Christ

In his editing of this passage for the 1837 edition, Joseph Smith replaced two instances of the relative pronoun *which* with *when;* in standard English we expect *when* as the relative pronoun when the referent involves time. As explained under 1 Nephi 19:2, the original text of the Book of Mormon sometimes used *which* (possibly as a Hebraism) in place of the expected *when.* Here in 3 Nephi 2:7–8, the critical text will restore the two original *which*'s that refer to time.

Summary: Restore in 3 Nephi 2:7–8 the two original uses of *which* as the relative pronoun; although standard English prefers *when* in these two cases, the original text of the Book of Mormon allows for either *when* or *which.*

■ **3 Nephi 2:11**

and it came to pass in the thirteenth year there began to be
wars and [*contention* > *contentions* 1 | *contentions* ABCDEFGHIJKLMOPQRST | *contention* N]
throughout all the land

Here we see the tendency to replace the plural *contentions* with *contention,* initially in 𝓟 and later in the typesetting for the 1906 LDS edition. That edition never served as a copytext, so this singular form has not been transmitted into subsequent LDS editions. As explained under the Words of Mormon 1:16, the original text has instances of both singular *contention* and plural *contentions,* even when preceded by *much.* For another example of variation in the number for *contention(s),* see under Helaman 3:19. In general, for each case of *contention(s)* the critical text will follow the grammatical number in the earliest textual sources, thus the plural here in 3 Nephi 2:11.

Summary: Maintain in 3 Nephi 2:11 the plural *contentions,* the 1830 reading as well as the corrected reading in 𝓟.

■ **3 Nephi 2:12**

yea and also to maintain their [*rights* >+ *rites* 1 | *rights* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOQRT | *rites* PS]
and the privileges of their church and of their worship and their freedom and their liberty

As explained under Alma 43:45, the original text had no instances of the word *rite(s),* even though the word *right(s)* was often spelled that way in the manuscripts (and for three readings in some of the printed editions). Here in 3 Nephi 2:12, Oliver Cowdery initially wrote *rights* in 𝓟, but later (with somewhat heavier ink flow) he corrected the word to *rites.* The original manuscript may have read as *rights* or *rites;* for extant portions of 𝓞, there are four with *rights* and

six with *rites*. Except for Hyrum Smith's misspelling in 𝔓 of *wright(s),* the 1830 compositor set instances of *rite(s)* and *right(s)* according to his copytext, which suggests that in 3 Nephi 2:12 𝔒 read *rights.* Of course, the issue here is which reading works best in context, not what 𝔒 read. The 1908 RLDS edition, in accord with the corrected reading in 𝔓, replaced the correct *rights* with *rites.* The critical text will maintain *rights* in 3 Nephi 2:12 and elsewhere in the text. For a complete analysis of these two words in the Book of Mormon text, see under Alma 43:45.

Summary: Maintain in 3 Nephi 2:12 the word *rights,* not the secondary *rites* that occurs as the corrected reading in 𝔓.

■ **3 Nephi 2:12**

yea and also to maintain **their** *rights*
and [*their* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRS | *the* RT] *privileges of* **their** *church*
and of **their** *worship and* **their** *freedom and* **their** *liberty*

The original manuscript is not extant here for "and the(ir) privileges". Spacing between extant fragments is sufficiently large that 𝔒 could have read with either *their* or *the.* Since both the 1830 edition and the printer's manuscript read *their,* 𝔒 also probably read the same. The editors for the 1920 LDS edition emended "their privileges" to "the privileges" since this is what we expect in English.

The word *their* occurs five other times in this infinitive clause, which strongly suggests that Oliver Cowdery accidentally wrote *their* in 𝔒 instead of the correct *the.* (Another possibility is that Joseph Smith himself mistakenly dictated *their* here.) There is considerable evidence that Oliver sometimes wrote *their* instead of *the* in anticipation of a following *their.* Here are six cases of this error on Oliver's part, although all but the first one are momentary errors and were for the most part corrected by Oliver almost immediately:

2 Nephi 7:2 (error when copying from 𝔒 into 𝔓)

I make [*the* 0 | *their* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] rivers a wilderness
and **their** fish to stink

2 Nephi 20:5 (initial error in 𝔓, apparently corrected during proofing against 𝔒)

and [*their* >+– *the* 1 | *the* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] staff in **their** hand
is **their** indignation

Alma 14:5 (initial error in 𝔓, virtually immediately corrected)

and the people went forth and witnessed against them
testifying that they had reviled
against [*their* > *the* 1 | *the* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] law and **their** lawyers

Alma 23:7 (initial error in 𝔓, virtually immediately corrected)

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

Alma 48:5 (initial error in 𝔓, virtually immediately corrected)

they being the most acquainted with the strength of the Nephites
and **their** places of resort
and [*the* 0ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST | *their* > *the* 1] weakest parts of **their** cities

Alma 51:6 (initial error in 𝒫, virtually immediately corrected)

for the freemen had sworn or covenanted to maintain **their** rights
and [*the* 0ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST | *their > the* 1] privileges of **their** religion
by a free government

In fact, the last example shows precisely what is proposed to have happened here in 3 Nephi 2:12, namely, the replacement of the correct "**the** privileges" with "**their** privileges" (although only momentarily in Alma 51:6).

There are no other examples in the text of the kind of redundancy manifested here in 3 Nephi 2:12, namely, "their X of their Y". In fact, in the last three of the errors listed above, the correct text read "**the** X of their Y", but Oliver Cowdery initially wrote the text in 𝒫 as "their X of **their** Y". Similarly, there are no related examples in the entire text like "his X of his Y" or similar redundancies involving other possessive pronouns such as *my, our,* or *your.* Interestingly, there is one case in 𝒪 where Oliver initially wrote "my X of my Y", but almost immediately he replaced the anticipatory *my* with the correct determiner, in this case the indefinite article *a:*

Alma 38:8

and never until I did cry out unto the Lord Jesus Christ for mercy
did I receive [*my > a* 0 | *a* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] remission of **my** sins

In other words, the unique redundancy of "**their** privileges of their church" (the earliest reading in 3 Nephi 2:12) is very likely an error for "**the** privileges of their church". The critical text will therefore accept the 1920 LDS emendation as the reading of the original text for this passage.

Summary: Accept in 3 Nephi 2:12 the 1920 LDS emendation that replaced *their* with *the,* giving "**the** privileges of their church"; the earliest reading, "**their** privileges of their church", is apparently an error that entered 𝒪 when Joseph Smith dictated the text to Oliver Cowdery, probably in anticipation of the following *their* in "of their church"; there are four other instances of *their* in this infinitive clause that may have also influenced the replacement of *the* with *their.*

◼ **3 Nephi 2:17**

nevertheless the people of Nephi did gain some advantage **of** *the robbers*

Lyle Fletcher has suggested (personal communication, 23 August 2006) that the *of* here in "the people of Nephi did gain some advantage **of** the robbers" might be an error for *over.* Perhaps the use of *of* was prompted by the phrase "to take advantage **of** someone", which does occur in the text:

2 Nephi 28:8   take the advantage **of** one because of his words
Ether 12:26   that they shall take no advantage **of** your weakness

Here in 3 Nephi 2:17, both 𝒫 and the 1830 edition agree, so 𝒪 undoubtedly had the *of* in "did gain some advantage **of** the robbers". When we consider all other verbs in the text that have *advantage* as their complement, we find that *over* is the preposition that follows *advantage,* including four more with the verb *gain;* in fact, one is nearby in this same chapter of 3 Nephi (marked below with an asterisk):

Omni 1:24	the Nephites did **obtain** much advantage **over** them	
Alma 51:31	they did **gain** advantage **over** the Lamanites	
Alma 52:19	that they might **gain** advantage **over** them	
Helaman 1:25	this march of Coriantumr's through the center of the land	
	gave Moronihah great advantage **over** them	
* 3 Nephi 2:18	the Gaddianton robbers did **gain** many advantages **over** them	
Mormon 6:4	and here we had hope to **gain** advantage **over** the Lamanites	

Moreover, there are a few cases in ☊ where Oliver Cowdery initially wrote *of* instead of the correct *over* (but these he immediately corrected to *over*):

Alma 43:6

therefore Zerahemnah appointed chief captains
[*of* >% NULL 0| 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] **over** the Lamanites

Alma 45:23

after Helaman and his brethren had appointed priests and teachers
[*of* >% *over* 0| *over* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] the churches . . .

Alma 50:35

and thus ended the twenty and fourth year of the reign of the judges
[*of* >% *over* 0| *over* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] the people of Nephi

So the *of* in 3 Nephi 2:17 could be an error for *over,* at least in theory.

Of course, in current English we do have the phrase "you have the advantage **of** me", so the *of* should not be ruled out here in 3 Nephi 2:17. More significantly, the Oxford English Dictionary states under definition 1b for the noun *advantage* that the preposition can be either *of* or *over* for expressions of the form "to have, gain, get, give advantage of, over" (in fact, in Early Modern English there were also examples with the preposition *on*). The OED cites two instances of "advantage **of**" (both in Early Modern English); in each case, we would expect "advantage **over**" in modern English:

Thomas Becon (1561)

Let his enemy the devil have none avantage **of** him.

2 Corinthians 2:11 (King James Bible, 1611)

Lest Satan should get an aduantage **of** vs.

(Except for the bolding of the *of,* I cite these with their original accidentals as given in the OED.) Thus the use here in 3 Nephi 2:17 of the preposition *of* is acceptable, even though this usage appears to be archaic. The critical text will maintain the *of.*

Summary: Maintain in 3 Nephi 2:17 the preposition *of* in the phrase "did gain some advantage **of** the robbers".

■ **3 Nephi 2:18**

and in the fifteenth year they did come forth [*again* 1APS | BCDEFGHIJKLMNOQRT]
against the people of Nephi

The 1837 edition accidentally deleted *again* here in 3 Nephi 2:18, probably because the immediately following word *against* is so similar. There is nothing wrong with saying that the robbers "did come forth again" since verse 17 describes how the people of Nephi "did drive them back out of their lands into the mountains and into their secret places". Elsewhere the original text has four instances of *again against,* so there is no reason for deleting the *again* here in 3 Nephi 2:18. The 1908 RLDS edition restored the *again* to the RLDS text (most likely by reference to 𝓟); the LDS text has maintained the 1837 reading. For examples of other cases where the word *again* was lost in the 1837 edition, see under Helaman 15:13.

Summary: Restore the *again* in 3 Nephi 2:18 ("they did come forth **again** against the people of Nephi"); the 1837 edition accidentally omitted the *again* because of the immediately following word, the nearly identical *against.*

3 Nephi 3

■ **3 Nephi 3:1**

And now it came to pass that in the sixteenth year from the coming of Christ
[Lachoneas 1 | Lachoneus ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] the governor of the land
received an epistle from the leader and the governor of this band of robbers

Here the printer's manuscript and the 1830 edition disagree on the spelling for the name of the
Nephite governor. 𝓟 has *Lachoneas* while the 1830 edition has *Lachoneus*. However, the earliest
occurrence of this name is in 3 Nephi 1:1, and there both 𝓟 and the 1830 edition have the *u* spelling,
so *Lachoneus* should be taken as the correct spelling. The 1830 typesetter consistently spells this
name with the *u*. Oliver Cowdery's spelling in 𝓟 is usually with the *u* (12 times, including the
case in 3 Nephi 1:1), but twice the *a* shows up (here in 3 Nephi 3:1 and also in 3 Nephi 3:22).
In three other cases in 𝓟, Oliver's vowel could be interpreted as either an *a* or a *u* (in 3 Nephi
3:2, 3, 24). The ultimate difficulty is Oliver's handwriting: his *u*'s sometimes look like *a*'s and
vice versa. For more on this point, see under 1 Nephi 4:35 (where the spelling for the name
Zoram is discussed) or under Mormon 6:2 (where the 1830 spelling *Camorah* is compared with
the manuscript spelling *Cumorah*).

Summary: Maintain the spelling *Lachoneus* for the name of the Nephite governor; the earliest
occurrence of the name (in 3 Nephi 1:1) has the *u* vowel in the printer's manuscript and in the 1830
edition, both firsthand copies of the original manuscript.

■ **3 Nephi 3:1**

Lachoneus the governor of the land received an epistle
from the [leader 1BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST | leaders A] and the governor of this band of robbers

The epistle in 3 Nephi 3:2–10 is from a single person, Giddianhi, so the 1830 reading in the plural,
"the **leaders** and the governor of this band of robbers", is very likely an error. The 1837 edition
restored the singular reading. The use of the singular *leader* is confirmed in 3 Nephi 4:17, where
the text refers (at the death of Giddianhi) to the choosing of a new leader for the band of robbers:

> 3 Nephi 4:17
> now they had appointed unto themselves **another leader**
> whose name was Zemnarihah

Further, in conjuncts like the one here in 3 Nephi 3:1, the singular *leader* is always conjoined with
a singular noun, but the plural *leaders* is always conjoined with a plural noun:

□ *conjuncts of singulars*

Alma 43:44	their chief leader and commander
Alma 47:6	a king and a leader
Alma 47:19	their leader and their chief commander
Mormon 3:11	a commander and a leader of this people

□ *conjuncts of plurals*

Jarom 1:7	our kings and our leaders
Alma 2:14	rulers and leaders
Alma 43:44	their chief captains and leaders
Helaman 11:8	their chief judges and their leaders
3 Nephi 7:14	their chiefs and their leaders
Mormon 8:28	leaders of churches and teachers

Thus all the internal evidence indicates that in 3 Nephi 3:1 the original text read "the **leader** and the governor of this band of robbers". And we also know that in the history of the text, there has been a strong tendency to add the plural *s* as well as to drop it, so it is quite possible here in 3 Nephi 3:1 that the 1830 compositor accidentally set the plural *leaders*. Another example of such a typo, one that is obviously wrong, was made by the compositor for the 1841 British edition:

Alma 46:3

> now the [*leader* 01ABCEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST | *leaders* D] of those
> which were wroth against their brethren
> was a large and a strong man
> and his name was Amalickiah

Summary: Maintain the 1837 restoration of the singular *leader* in 3 Nephi 3:1 ("the leader and the governor of this band of robbers"), the reading in 𝒫.

■ **3 Nephi 3:1–2**

and these [*are* 1PS | *were* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOQRT] *the words*
which **were** *written saying:*
Lachoneus most noble and chief governor of the land
behold I write this epistle unto you . . .

The printer's manuscript has the present-tense *are,* but the 1830 edition has *were.* The reading in 𝒫, *are,* was accepted by the editors for the 1908 RLDS edition. The LDS text has continued with the past-tense *were.*

In every case, the phrase "these are/were the words" refers to either a preceding direct quote (3 times) or a following one (21 times). For the cases where the direct quote precedes, we have one instance of *are* and two of *were:*

Mosiah 5:6	and now these **are** the words which king Benjamin desired of them
Mosiah 27:17	and now it came to pass that these **were** the last words which the angel spake unto Alma

Helaman 5:13   and it came to pass that these **were** the words
which Helaman taught to his sons

On the other hand, when the direct quote follows, *are* dominates. Not counting the case here in 3 Nephi 3:1, there are 19 instances in the original text with *are* and only one with *were*. (There is also an original case of "and **this is** the words which I speak", in Mormon 7:1, which Joseph Smith edited to "and **these are** the words which I speak".) Of the 20 other original cases of "these are/were the words", 11 of them have a restrictive relative clause that is followed by the word *saying* right before the direct quote (just like here in 3 Nephi 3:1). The one instance with the past-tense *were* is in this group (and is marked below with an asterisk). Moreover, in every case except one (3 Nephi 11:24) the relative clause is in the past tense:

	Mosiah 1:10	and these **are** the words which he **spake** unto him saying . . .
	Mosiah 2:9	and these **are** the words which he **spake** and **caused** to be written saying . . .
*	Mosiah 29:4	and these **were** the words that **were written** saying . . .
	Alma 5:2	and these **are** the words which he **spake** to the people in the church . . . according to his own record saying . . .
	Alma 10:1	now these **are** the words which Amulek **preached** unto the people . . . 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 11:24	and now behold these **are** the words which ye **shall say** calling them by name saying . . .
	3 Nephi 24:1	and these **are** the words which he **did tell** unto them saying . . .

Note that for both Mosiah 29:4 and the 1830 reading here in 3 Nephi 3:1 the restrictive relative clause has *were written*. One could argue in both these cases that the original text read "these **are** the words which/that **were** written" but that the *are* was accidentally changed to *were* under the influence of the following *were*. For the nine other cases where the relative clause has a different verb in the past tense, the *are* in "these are the words" is more easily maintained. On the other hand, one could argue that for both instances of "these **were** the words which/that **were** written", the repetition of the *were* is intended; the reading in 𝓟 for 3 Nephi 3:1 could be the result of Oliver Cowdery accidentally replacing an original "these **were** the words" with "these **are** the words" because of the high frequency in the text of the present-tense expression, including four somewhat recent occurrences of it (in Alma 54:4, 54:15, 56:2, and 60:1).

When we consider errors in the early transmission of the text, we find that sometimes Oliver Cowdery initially wrote *are* in place of the correct *were*, but in each case he caught his error:

1 Nephi 10:15 (initial error in 𝓟 virtually immediately corrected)

for I have written as many of them
as [*ware* 0 | *are* > *were* 1 | *were* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] expedient for me
in mine other book

2 Nephi 6:8 (initial error in 𝒪 virtually immediately corrected)
>   for behold the Lord hath shewn me
>   that they which [*are > were* 0 | *were* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] at Jerusalem
>   from whence we came
>   have been slain and carried away captive

Alma 35:6 (initial error in 𝒪 immediately corrected)
>   and it came to pass that after they had found out the minds of all the people
>   those which [*are >% were* 0 | *were* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] in favor
>   of the words which had been spoken by Alma and his brethren
>   were cast out of the land

In the first instance, Oliver may have simply misread scribe 2 of 𝒪's *ware* (his spelling for *were*) as *are*. One point to note here is that we have no example where Oliver permanently replaced *were* with *are* in transmitting the text (except possibly here in 3 Nephi 3:1). On the other hand, we have one case where he permanently replaced an original *are* with *were* as he copied the text from 𝒪 into 𝒫:

Alma 63:8
>   and we suppose that
>   they [*are* 0 | *were* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] drowned up in the depths of the sea

(There is one case in 𝒪 where scribe 3 incorrectly wrote *are,* but Oliver corrected it to *were* when he copied the text into 𝒫; for discussion of that case, see under 1 Nephi 8:21. We do not count this case as an instance where Oliver accidentally replaced a correct *are* with *were.*)

There is also one instance where the 1830 typesetter accidentally replaced *are* with *were,* which shows that he could have made the same mistake here in 3 Nephi 3:1:

Jacob 2:23 (error in typesetting the text from 𝒫)
>   for they seek to excuse themselves in committing whoredoms because of the things
>   which [*are* 1 | *were* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] written concerning David
>   and Solomon his son

More generally, in the printed editions the tendency has been to accidentally replace *are* with *were,* not the other way around:

Alma 9:19 (error in the 1888 LDS edition)
>   he would rather suffer that the Lamanites might destroy all this people
>   which [*is >js are* 1 | *is* A | *are* BCDEFGHIKLMNOPQRST | *were* J] called
>   the people of Nephi

Alma 24:26 (error in the 1852 LDS edition)
>   therefore we have no reason to doubt
>   but what they [*are* 01ABCDEGHKPS | *were* FIJLMNOQRT] saved

Alma 60:17 (error in the 1874 RLDS edition)
>   and this because of the great wickedness of those
>   who [*are* 1ABCDEFGIJLMNOPQRST | *were* HK] seeking for power and authority

Thus overall the odds are greater for replacing *are* with *were.* Oliver's only permanent mix-up of *are* and *were* (in Alma 63:8) was of that type.

Since the overall tendency is to replace *are* with *were* (especially in contrast to the fleeting tendency in the manuscripts to replace *were* with *are*), the critical text will accept the reading in 𝓟 ("these **are** the words") as the more probable reading in 𝓞. To be sure, the 1830 reading ("these **were** the words") is also possible. Even though *were* is more likely the secondary reading here in 3 Nephi 3:1, the critical text will maintain the *were* in Mosiah 29:4 ("these **were** the words") since there is no specific textual evidence from the extant sources there to emend the *were* to *are* in that passage.

David Calabro points out (personal communication) that in the original manuscript the *be* verb could have been accidentally missing here in 3 Nephi 3:1 (that is, 𝓞 read "and these the words which were written saying . . ."). Under this hypothesis, Oliver Cowdery decided to add the present-tense *are* while the 1830 typesetter added the past-tense *were*. Based on usage elsewhere in the text (described above), the original text would more likely have read *are* than *were*. But one could propose even further that the *be* verb was actually lacking in the original text here. Yet there is no support for that usage in the earliest text except for the biblical quotes where the *be* verb was lacking in the original Hebrew and was set in italics in the King James Bible. For discussion of this Hebraism, restricted only to biblical quotes in the Book of Mormon, see the discussion under 2 Nephi 13:14.

Summary: Restore the reading of the printer's manuscript in 3 Nephi 3:1 ("and these **are** the words which were written saying . . ."); it seems less likely that the original manuscript read according to the 1830 reading ("and these **were** the words which were written saying . . ."), although we do have evidence for that reading in Mosiah 29:4 ("and these **were** the words that were written saying . . ."); if 𝓞 read without any *be* verb, it was probably an accidental omission that occurred during the dictation of the text; the original text itself undoubtedly had the *be* verb, and it is more likely that the form of the verb was the present-tense *are* than the past-tense *were*.

■ **3 Nephi 3:2**

yea ye do stand well
as if ye were supported by the hand
of [NULL >+ *a* 1|*a* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
[*God* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQS|*god* RT]

Here in the printer's manuscript, Oliver Cowdery initially wrote "by the hand of God", which is what we expect. Elsewhere in the text there are four instances of the expected phraseology:

Mosiah 1:5   were it not for 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**

Alma 46:24   so shall a remnant of the seed of my son be preserved
         by the hand of God

4 Nephi 1:16   and surely there could not be a happier people among all the people
         which had been created **by the hand of God**

Yet here in 3 Nephi 3:2, the original manuscript undoubtedly read "by the hand of **a** God" since the 1830 edition reads this way (as does the corrected reading in 𝓟). Most likely Oliver added the

indefinite article in 𝔓 when he later proofed 𝔓 against 𝒪 (the supralinearly inserted *a* is written with a duller quill and with somewhat heavier ink flow).

Beginning with the 1920 edition, the LDS text has spelled *God* in this verse without capitalization, as *god*. This makes sense since the reference here is generic. As discussed under Mormon 9:10, the critical text will accept the spelling *god* without capitalization in generic cases. For further discussion of capitalization in reference to deity, see under 1 Nephi 1:9.

Summary: Accept in 3 Nephi 3:2 the indefinite article *a* before *god* as well as the lowercase spelling for this generic reference to a god.

■ **3 Nephi 3:3**

that ye should be so foolish and vain as to suppose
that ye can stand against so many brave men which are at my command
which do now at this time stand in their **arms**
and do await with great anxiety for the word :
go down upon the Nephites and destroy them

The original manuscript is not extant here, but it very likely read "which do now at this time stand in their **arms**" since both the printer's manuscript and the 1830 edition read this way. But one wonders if the original text actually read *armor* (or *armors*) instead of *arms*. The words are close—phonetically, orthographically, and semantically. Perhaps Joseph Smith dictated *armor(s)* but Oliver Cowdery accidentally heard it as *arms;* or perhaps Joseph misread *armor(s)* as *arms*. (For the general possibility of the plural *armors* instead of the singular *armor,* see the discussion under Alma 46:21.)

The question here in 3 Nephi 3:3 is whether the robbers would stand "in their arms" or "in their armor(s)". It is worth noting that these robbers caused great terror because of their appearance; in fact, their armor is specifically referred to in this regard:

> 3 Nephi 4:7
> and great and terrible was the appearance of the armies of Giddianhi
> because of their armor and because of their being dyed in blood

Similarly, Alma 43:21 refers to armor causing fear: "they were exceeding fraid of the armies of the Nephites because of their armor". Unfortunately, only in 3 Nephi 3:3 does the text refer to men "standing in (one's) arms"—or if *armor(s)* is correct, to "standing in (one's) armor(s)".

When we consider other prepositional phrases involving *arms,* we find that the preposition is either *with* or *without,* not *in:*

> Jacob 7:25 (original reading)
> wherefore the people of Nephi did fortify against them **with their arms**

> Mosiah 20:24 – 26 (three times)
> let us go forth to meet my people **without arms** . . .
> they followed the king and went forth **without arms** to meet the Lamanites . . .
> and when the Lamanites saw the people of Limhi that they were **without arms** . . .

One could argue that "stand **in** their arms", if *arms* is correct, should read "stand **with** their arms".

In the example from Jacob 7:25 (listed above), the 1830 typesetter misread *arms* as *armies*. There was a similar mix-up between these two words in 𝒪 (although this is more of a scribal slip than an actual lexical mix-up):

> Alma 50:33
>> therefore Moroni sent
>> an [*arms* > *army* 0 | *army* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] with their camp
>> to head the people of Morionton

On the other hand, there is no independent evidence for *armor(s)* being mixed up with *arms* or *armies*.

Ultimately, usage from English shows that there is nothing inappropriate about "stand in their arms" in 3 Nephi 3:3. *Literature Online* <lion.chadwyck.com> lists examples from Early Modern English up through the 1800s of "to stand in arms", with the meaning 'to be armed ready for battle'. Here are some examples from two well-known authors:

> William Shakespeare, *Richard II* (1597)
>> Harry of Herford, Lancaster, and Derby
>> Am I, who ready here do **stand in arms**
>> To prove by God's grace, and my body's valor,
>> In lists, on Thomas Mowbray, Duke of Norfolk,
>> That he is a traitor, foul and dangerous,
>> To God of heaven, King Richard, and to me—
>> And as I truly fight, defend me heaven!

> John Milton, *Paradise Lost* (1667)
>> For while they sit contriving, shall the rest,
>> Millions that **stand in Arms**, and longing wait
>> The Signal to ascend, sit lingring here
>> Heav'ns fugitives, . . .

The fuller expression "to stand in **their** arms" also occurs, but less frequently, from Early Modern English into the late 1800s, as in the following example found on <www.google.com>:

> Robert Knox, *An Historical Relation of the Island Ceylon in the East Indies* (1681)
>> Here he washes his head. Which when he has done,
>> he comes forth into Public view, where all this Militia **stand in their Arms**.
>> Then the great Guns are fired.

Thus the critical text will accept the reading in 3 Nephi 3:3: "which do now at this time **stand in their arms**". There is no evidence from scribal errors to support a change from a supposed original *armor(s)* to *arms*.

Summary: Accept the expression "stand in their arms" in 3 Nephi 3:3, the reading of both 𝔓 and the 1830 edition; there is considerable support for this expression in earlier English; it is very doubtful that the Book of Mormon reading is an error for "stand in their **armor**(**s**)".

■ **3 Nephi 3:4**

and knowing of **their** *everlasting hatred towards you*
because of [*their* 1 | *the* ᴀʙᴄᴅᴇꜰɢʜɪᴊᴋʟᴍɴᴏᴘǫʀsᴛ] *many wrongs*
which ye have done unto them . . .

Here in the printer's manuscript, the reading with *their* is obviously wrong. Oliver Cowdery acci-
dentally wrote the *their* under the influence of the preceding *their* ("and knowing of **their** ever-
lasting hatred towards you"). Oliver was prone to write *their* in place of *the* in the environment
of *their* (more commonly, when the *their* followed). For a list of cases where Oliver changed *the* to
their under the influence of a following *their,* see nearby under 3 Nephi 2:12. Here in 3 Nephi 3:4,
the critical text will maintain the definite article *the* ("because of **the** many wrongs which ye have
done unto them").

Summary: Maintain in 3 Nephi 3:4 the phrase "because of **the** many wrongs", the reading of the 1830
edition; the use of *their* in 𝒫 for this phrase is an obvious error.

■ **3 Nephi 3:8**

and they shall not stay their hand and shall spare not
but shall slay you and shall let fall the sword upon you
[*yea* 1ᴘs | ᴀʙᴄᴅᴇꜰɢʜɪᴊᴋʟᴍɴᴏǫʀᴛ] *even until ye shall become extinct*

The printer's manuscript has "yea even until", but the 1830 edition lacks the *yea*. The 1908 RLDS
edition restored the *yea* to the RLDS text, but the LDS text has maintained the 1830 reading
without the *yea*. Here it seems that the 1830 compositor accidentally omitted the *yea*.

Typically, the phrase *even until* is not preceded by a *yea,* but there are two occurrences else-
where in the text of "yea even until" and they both occur in the same passage:

> 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
>> and also the fifty and first
>> and the fifty and second
>> **yea** and **even until** fifty and nine years had passed away

Excluding the case here in 3 Nephi 3:8, in the original text there are 48 occurrences of *even until*
without a preceding *yea*. (For one case where *even until* is probably an error for *even unto,* see
under Mosiah 17:10.)

We note here in 3 Nephi 3:8 that the previous clause ends in the pronoun *you* (in the phrase
"and shall let fall the sword upon **you**"), which looks very much like *yea*. We have already seen
examples where *yea* has dropped out of the text when immediately preceded by *you*. In fact, in
two cases the following word was *even,* just like here in 3 Nephi 3:8:

Alma 42:31

and may God grant unto [NULL >– *you* 0| *you* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
[*ye* >% *yea* 0| 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] even according to my words

Alma 54:9

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

But in these two cases, the loss of *yea* occurred when Oliver Cowdery copied from 𝒪 into 𝒫.
Moreover, in each case, Oliver initially omitted the *you* in 𝒪, which seems to have led to difficulty
in copying the following *yea* into 𝒫. Here in 3 Nephi 3:8, on the other hand, we have a case where
the 1830 compositor would be responsible for the omission of *yea*. Even so, the immediately pre-
ceding *you* is visually similar to *yea* and could have led to the omission of the *yea*.

Elsewhere in the early transmission of the text, there is one instance where Oliver Cowdery
accidentally added a *yea*:

1 Nephi 2:20

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

But there is also one instance where the 1830 compositor omitted the *yea*:

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

So here in 3 Nephi 3:8, Oliver could have added a *yea* or the 1830 compositor could have omitted
the *yea*. More generally, however, the tendency in the transmission of the text is to omit small
words rather than to add them. For instance, if we count all clear cases in the transmission of
the Book of Mormon where *yea* has been accidentally omitted from the text or added to it, there
are six instances of omission but only one of addition. (In this count, I ignore all instances of
momentary error in the manuscripts as well as four cases of conscious editing by Joseph Smith,
although nearly all these changes also involve the deletion of the *yea*.) Thus here in 3 Nephi 3:8,
the critical text will accept the reading of 𝒫 with the *yea*. See volume 3 for a complete discussion
of the more prevalent tendency to accidentally omit words rather than add them.

Summary: Restore in 3 Nephi 3:8 the *yea* before *even until,* the reading of the printer's manuscript and
the much less frequent reading in the text; the 1830 compositor probably accidentally dropped the *yea*
when he set the type from the original manuscript, perhaps because the preceding *you* looks like *yea*.

■ **3 Nephi 3:9**

and behold I am Giddianhi and [1 | *I* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *am the governor of this the secret society of Gaddianton*

At first glance it may seem that Oliver Cowdery must have accidentally dropped the pronoun *I* here in 3 Nephi 3:9. Yet internal textual evidence suggests that the 1830 compositor added the *I*. Else-where in the Book of Mormon text, there are two other cases where someone identifies himself by using the expression "I am X and am such-and-such" (where X is a personal name):

| Mosiah 7:13 | for I am Ammon **and am** a descendant of Zarahemla |
| Alma 8:23 | I am Alma **and am** the high priest over the churches of God |

We find evidence for two other types; in one case, there is no *and,* while in the second case, there is no *am:*

□ "I am X / **I am** such-and-such"

Alma 10:2	I am Amulek / **I am** the son of Gidanah
Alma 54:14	I am Moroni / **I am** a leader of the people of the Nephites
Alma 54:16	I am Ammoron the king of the Lamanites /
	I am the brother of Amalickiah

□ "I am X **and** such-and-such"

| Alma 54:23 | I am Ammoron **and** a descendant of Zoram |
| 3 Nephi 5:20 | I am Mormon **and** a pure descendant of Lehi |

But there are no cases of the fully expanded expression "I am X **and I am** such-and-such" (except here in the 1830 edition for 3 Nephi 3:9). Thus internal evidence supports the unexpected reading in 𝓟: "and behold I am Giddianhi **and am** the governor of this the secret society of Gaddianton".

When we consider early transmission errors, we find one clear instance where Oliver Cow-dery omitted the *I:*

1 Nephi 18:2
  now I Nephi did not work the timbers
    after the manner which was learned by men
  neither did [*I* 0ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST | 1] build the ship
    after the manner of men

Here 𝓞 is extant and has the *I*. But the *I* is lacking in 𝓟 and conspicuously so, with the result that the 1830 compositor supplied it. (There is one additional case where it appears that Oliver omitted an *I;* for discussion of that case, see under Mosiah 17:9–10.) So it is possible that Oliver acciden-tally omitted the *I* here in 3 Nephi 3:9.

On the other hand, one could argue that the 1830 compositor added the *I* in 3 Nephi 3:9 because of the awkwardness of "and behold I am Giddianhi and am the governor of this the secret society of Gaddianton". Note, however, that the compositor did not add the *I* in either Mosiah 7:13 or Alma 8:23 (the two earlier instances of this construction). Yet there is evidence that the 1830 compositor intervened more often in the last fourth of his typesetting to remove ungrammatical forms; as an example, see the discussion under Helaman 16:10 regarding the

Hebraistic *and* between initial subordinate clauses and following main clauses. Similarly, an increase in the compositor's sensitivity to the missing *I* may have occurred by the time he got to 3 Nephi 3:9. Yet overall, the evidence from the early transmission of the text is not conclusive here. The critical text will therefore follow the reading that is found elsewhere in the text, namely, the reading in 𝑃 without the repeated *I*.

Summary: Restore in 3 Nephi 3:9 the reading of the printer's manuscript without the *I* in the conjoined predicate: "and behold I am Giddianhi **and am** the governor of this the secret society of Gaddianton"; this reading is supported by usage elsewhere in the text (in Mosiah 7:13 and Alma 8:23), but there is no independent support in the text for the 1830 reading ("and behold I am Giddianhi **and I am** the governor of this the secret society of Gaddianton").

■ **3 Nephi 3:9**

and the works thereof I know to be good
and they are of [1ABDEFIJLMNOPQRST | *an* CGHK] ancient date

The 1840 edition added the indefinite article *an* before *ancient*. This addition is probably an error rather than due to conscious editing on Joseph Smith's part. Perhaps because *ancient* begins with *an,* the 1840 typesetter mistakenly repeated the *an,* thus adding the indefinite article.

Of course, either expression (with or without the *an*) is acceptable for English. In fact, there is a possibility that the original text read "of **an** ancient date" and that Oliver Cowdery accidentally dropped the *an* when writing down the text for the original manuscript. 𝒪 itself most probably read without the *an* since both the 1830 edition and the printer's manuscript read without the *an.* Moreover, there is one other occurrence in the text of "of ancient date" (but none of "of **an** ancient date"):

> Mosiah 8:13 (𝒪 is not extant)
> for he hath wherewith that he can look and translate all records
> that are **of ancient date**

This example thus confirms the earliest reading in 3 Nephi 3:9, "of ancient date".

Summary: In accord with the earliest textual sources, accept the expression "of ancient date" without the indefinite article *an* (in both Mosiah 8:13 and 3 Nephi 3:9).

■ **3 Nephi 3:11**

he was exceedingly astonished because of the boldness of Giddianhi
[*in* 1PS | ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOQRT] *demanding the possession of the land of the Nephites*

The printer's manuscript has the connective preposition *in* before the present participle *demanding.* The 1830 edition lacks this preposition. The *in* was restored to the RLDS text in 1908, but the LDS text has maintained the 1830 reading. The text seems to read more naturally with the preposition. Elsewhere in the Book of Mormon text, in phrases beginning with *because of,* a following present-participle phrase is typically introduced by the connective preposition *in:*

Jacob 3:6
    wherefore because of this observance
→ **in keeping** this commandment
    the Lord God will not destroy them

Alma 49:5
    now at this time the chief captains of the Lamanites were astonished exceedingly
    because of the wisdom of the Nephites
→ **in repairing** their places of security

Alma 49:28
    the people of Nephi did thank the Lord their God because of his miraculous power
→ **in delivering** them from the hand of their enemies

Alma 57:36
    I was filled with exceeding joy because of the goodness of God
→ **in preserving** us that we might not all perish

Alma 59:1
    he was exceedingly rejoiced because of the welfare
    yea the exceeding success which Helaman had had
→ **in obtaining** those lands which were lost

3 Nephi 3:2
    and do give unto you exceeding great praise because of your firmness
    and also the firmness of your people
→ **in maintaining** that which ye suppose to be your right and liberty

3 Nephi 3:10
    that this my people may recover their rights and government
    which have dissented away from you because of your wickedness
→ **in retaining** from them their rights of government

3 Nephi 4:33
    and their hearts were swollen with joy unto the gushing out of many tears
    because of the great goodness of God
→ **in delivering** them out of the hands of their enemies

3 Nephi 9:10
    and the city of Kishkumen have I caused to be burned with fire
      and the inhabitants thereof
    because of their wickedness
→ **in casting** out the prophets and stoning them . . .

Note especially the two examples in 3 Nephi 3 (in verses 2 and 10) that support the occurrence of *in* here in verse 11. Most likely the original manuscript in 3 Nephi 3:11 had the preposition *in* and the 1830 typesetter accidentally omitted it. Here is another example where the 1830 typesetter omitted the preposition *in:*

1 Nephi 14:13
    and it came to pass that I beheld
    that the great mother of abominations did gather together
    [*in* 01PS| ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOQRT] multitudes upon the face of all the earth

For another case where a different typesetter (in this instance, the 1837 typesetter) omitted a connective *in,* see under 1 Nephi 8:37. Oliver Cowdery once inserted an extra *in,* but that was only a momentary error that resulted from him thinking the text read *believe in* rather than just *believe:*

> Alma 33:12
>
> do ye believe [*in >% those* 0 | *those* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] scriptures
> which have been written by them of old

There are no examples where Oliver ever added a connective *in,* even momentarily.

Nonetheless, there are a few cases where the present-participle clause lacks the *in* after the *because-of* phrase; for each of these, the *in* could be added, at least theoretically, although there might be some shift in what the participial clause is referring to:

> Alma 40:13
>
> and this because of their own iniquity
> → **being** led captive by the will of the devil

> Alma 56:10
>
> for behold his army had been reduced by the Lamanites
> because of the enormity of their forces
> → **having** slain a vast number of our men

> Helaman 4:12
>
> yea it was because of their oppression to the poor
> → **withholding** their food from the hungry
> → **withholding** their clothing from the naked
> → and **smiting** their humble brethren upon the cheeks

> Moroni 9:23
>
> and if they perish
> it will be like unto the Jaredites
> because of the willfulness of their hearts
> → **seeking** for blood and revenge

So either reading is theoretically possible here in 3 Nephi 3:11. But since it seems very unlikely that Oliver Cowdery would have added the *in* on his own accord, the critical text will here accept the reading of 𝓟.

Summary: Restore in 3 Nephi 3:11 the connective preposition *in,* the reading of the printer's manuscript: "because of the boldness of Giddianhi **in** demanding the possession of the land of the Nephites".

■ **3 Nephi 3:12**

[*&* 1| ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *now behold*
this Lachoneus the governor was a just man

Here the printer's manuscript has an *and* before *now behold* while the 1830 edition lacks the *and.* Excluding this case, the original text has 113 occurrences of the full "**and** now behold" and 34 of "now behold" (that is, without a preceding conjunction), so either reading is possible. (There is also one instance of "**but** now behold", in Mormon 5:18.)

In the transmission of the early Book of Mormon text, the omission of small words was much more frequent than the addition of words (this point is fully discussed in volume 3 of the critical text). We can see this here in 3 Nephi 3:12 when we compare Oliver Cowdery's copywork with the 1830 compositor's typesetting—namely, there are eight clear cases where the 1830 compositor accidentally omitted an *and,* but there is only one clear case where Oliver ended up adding an *and,* in Alma 38:7. (For another case where Oliver may have added an *and,* see under 2 Nephi 14:2.) Thus the odds are considerably greater here in 3 Nephi 3:12 that the 1830 compositor omitted the *and* from before *now behold.*

No matter how we look at this issue of addition versus omission, we find that *and* is deleted more often in the text than it is added. For instance, the 1830 compositor accidentally added an *and* only twice, in 1 Nephi 3:25 and in Alma 30:37, in comparison to the eight clear cases where he omitted the *and.* Similarly, Oliver Cowdery accidentally omitted the *and* at least five times, in comparison to the one or two cases where he added an *and.* We also find that the 1830 compositor continued to omit the *and* every so often in this part of the text where both 𝔓 and the 1830 edition are set from 𝒪 (from Helaman 13 through Mormon 9). For four other cases like this, see the following: Helaman 16:14, 3 Nephi 1:17, 3 Nephi 4:19, and 3 Nephi 20:46.

Summary: Restore in 3 Nephi 3:12 the *and* before *now behold,* the reading of the printer's manuscript; statistically, more words were omitted from the Book of Mormon text than were added to it during its early transmission, especially with respect to the conjunction *and.*

■ **3 Nephi 3:12**

therefore he did not hearken to the epistle
of [*Giddianhi* 1BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST | *Gaddianhi > Giddianhi* A]

Here the 1830 compositor initially set the name *Giddianhi* as *Gaddianhi,* undoubtedly under the influence of the name *Gaddianton,* which occurs along with the first occurrence of the name *Giddianhi* in the text:

> 3 Nephi 3:9
> and behold I am **Giddianhi**
> and am the governor of this the secret society of **Gaddianton**

As discussed under Helaman 2:4, the name *Gaddianton* ended up being spelled in the printer's manuscript with one *d,* as *Gadianton,* but there is considerable evidence that in the original manuscript the spelling *Gaddianton* prevailed. Since for this part of the text the 1830 edition was set from 𝒪, it is not surprising that the typesetter sometimes allowed *Gaddianton* to affect his spelling of the name *Giddianhi,* namely, as *Gaddianhi.* Here in 3 Nephi 3:12, the 1830 compositor later corrected *Gaddianhi* to *Giddianhi* in an in-press change. He made this same mistake once more in his typesetting:

> 3 Nephi 4:9
> when the armies of [*Giddianhi* 1BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST | *Gaddianhi* A] saw this
> they began to shout with a loud voice because of their joy

Although this second misspelling occurred in the same 1830 signature (number 29) as the first one (in 3 Nephi 3:12), it was never corrected in-press. Otherwise, the 1830 compositor set the name *Giddianhi* correctly (11 times).

Summary: Maintain the spelling *Giddianhi* throughout the text, including the two cases in 3 Nephi 3:12 and 3 Nephi 4:9 where the 1830 compositor mis-set the name as *Gaddianhi* under the influence of the name *Gaddianton*.

■ **3 Nephi 3:14**

and he caused that
[*there should be* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRS| RT] *armies*
—both of the Nephites and of the Lamanites
or of all them which were numbered among the Nephites—
should be *placed as guards round about to watch them*
and to guard them from the robbers day and night

This passage originally had a complex, partially redundant construction ("there **should be** armies . . . **should be** placed as guards"). The editors for the 1920 LDS edition removed the initial "there should be". Another possibility, one more consistent with Book of Mormon usage, would have been to delete the second *should be:*

> 3 Nephi 3:14 (alternative revision)
>   and he caused that **there should be** armies
>   —both of the Nephites and of the Lamanites
>   or of all them which were numbered among the Nephites—
>   placed as guards round about to watch them
>   and to guard them from the robbers day and night

This kind of construction ("there should be" followed by the subject and then a past participle) is quite common in the Book of Mormon text, as in the following example where there is an intervening parenthetical phrase just like here in 3 Nephi 3:14 (although not as long):

> Alma 50:2
>   and upon the top of those ridges of earth
>   he caused that **there should be** timbers
>   —yea works of timbers—
>   **built** up to the heighth of a man
>   round about the cities

Of course, the reason the original Book of Mormon text repeats the *should be* in 3 Nephi 3:14 is because the intervening subject noun phrase is quite long and complex. The critical text will restore the original wording. And there is evidence elsewhere in the original text for similar repetitions of the finite verb when there is an intervening parenthetical phrase or clause:

> Mosiah 10:18
>   for this very cause **hath** king Laman
>   by his cunning and lying craftiness and his fair promises
>   **hath** deceived me

Helaman 9:11

and thus **were** also those judges
which were at the garden of Nephi and heard his words
were also gathered together at the burial

For both of these examples, the verbal redundancy has been removed from the standard text; see the discussion under each example.

Summary: Restore in 3 Nephi 3:14 the original existential phrase "there should be", thus allowing for *should be* to be repeated because of a long intervening parenthetical phrase: "and he caused that **there should be** armies—both of the Nephites and of the Lamanites or of all them which were numbered among the Nephites—**should be** placed as guards round about to watch them"; there is evidence elsewhere in the original text for such verbal redundancy whenever there is a sufficiently long intervening phrase or clause.

■ **3 Nephi 3:15**

yea he said unto them : as the Lord liveth
except ye repent of all your iniquities
and cry unto the Lord

 □ *that they could*   1PS
 □ *that they would*   ABCDEFGHIJKLMN
 □ *that ye will*   O
 □ *ye will*   QRT

in no wise be delivered
out of the hands of those Gaddianton robbers

Here the original text read either "that they **could**" (according to the printer's manuscript) or "that they **would**" (according to the 1830 edition). Later in the LDS text, beginning with the 1907 vest-pocket edition, the third person *they* was changed to the second person *ye* and the conditional *would* was replaced by the future *will*. These two changes made the whole passage read as a direct quote rather than just the first part ("except ye repent of all your iniquities . . . **ye will** in no wise be delivered"). Finally, the 1911 LDS edition deleted the *that* before the *ye will;* this shorter reading has been followed in subsequent LDS editions. Once the entire passage is changed into a direct quote, the subordinate conjunction *that* needs to be removed since in modern English we expect *that* to introduce an indirect quote.

As explained under Helaman 14:4–5, it is possible for only part of a passage to be a direct quote. Thus here in 3 Nephi 3:15 the critical text will not remove the conflict between the initial *except*-clause (which is a direct quote) and the subsequent *that*-clause (which is an indirect quote). Moreover, it is possible here that the direct quote could be considered an emphatic conditional, a Hebrew-like construction that is found in a few other places in the original text. For discussion of the emphatic conditional, see under 1 Nephi 19:20–21 or, more generally, under HEBRAISMS in volume 3.

The crucial textual issue here in 3 Nephi 3:15 is whether the original manuscript read "that they **could** in no wise be delivered" (the reading in 𝓞) or "that they **would** in no wise be delivered"

(the 1830 reading). If 𝕆 read *would,* then Oliver Cowdery must have changed *would* to *could* when he copied from 𝕆 into 𝕇. On the other hand, if 𝕆 read *could,* then the 1830 typesetter must have changed *could* to *would.* When we examine the mix-ups in the history of the text between *could* and *would,* we find that there are only two instances:

> Helaman 9:41 (Oliver Cowdery's initial error in 𝕇)
> > for except he was a god
> > he [*would* > *could* 1 | *could* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] not know of all things
>
> Mormon 6:2 (change in the 1852 LDS edition)
> > and there we [*would* 1ABCDEGHKPS | *could* FIJLMNOQRT] give them battle

Since Oliver caught his error in Helaman 9:41, there isn't any example of him (or the 1830 type-setter, for that matter) ever permanently mixing up these two modals.

Ultimately, it appears that we will have to rely on internal evidence (usage elsewhere in the text) to determine for 3 Nephi 3:15 whether the original text read *would* or *could.* When we examine other passages that refer to people being delivered from something or someone, we find that there are no other examples of this type in the passive (as either "would be delivered" or "could be delivered", the phraseology here in 3 Nephi 3:15). But there are a few cases in the active where either *would* or *could* will work. And in those cases where variation is possible, the evidence supports *would* over *could* when referring to the Lord delivering people from something or someone:

> Mosiah 23:27   but that they should remember the Lord their God
> > and he **would** deliver them
>
> Alma 48:16   and by so doing the Lord **would** deliver them
>
> Alma 56:47   that if they did not doubt that God **would** deliver them
>
> Alma 60:11   and because of the exceeding goodness of God
> > ye could do nothing and he **would** deliver you

In contrast, there are three cases of "could deliver" where the Lord is negatively specified as the only one that can deliver the people, but it is always in contrast to everyone else being unable to do so:

> Mosiah 23:23   and none **could** deliver them but the Lord their God
>
> Mosiah 24:21   and none **could** deliver them except it were the Lord their God
>
> Alma 36:2   and none **could** deliver them except it were the God of Abraham
> > and the God of Isaac and the God of Jacob

From the Lord's point of view, the issue in delivering people deals with whether he wants to deliver them; he is always able to do so. Thus the modal *would* is appropriate when referring to the Lord delivering people. With humans, however, the issue is whether they are able to deliver the people, not whether they want to, not only in the three examples listed above, but also in the following example that refers to Mormon's inability to deliver his people:

> Mormon 5:1
> > and they gave me command again of their armies
> > for they looked upon me as though I **could** deliver them from their afflictions

The problem in 3 Nephi 3:15, however, is that the sentence is in the passive and the agent is left unexpressed. One can interpret "would be delivered" as implying that the Lord would deliver

them. On the other hand, "could be delivered" can be interpreted as implying that anyone (humans as well as the Lord) could deliver them. Thus it is very difficult to decide here between *would* and *could*. Perhaps *would* should be favored because the preceding text refers to the Lord and implies that if the people will repent they will be delivered by the Lord ("as **the Lord** liveth / except ye repent of all your iniquities and cry unto **the Lord** . . ."). The critical text, on this slightest of differences, will therefore restore the 1830 reading with *would* since the context suggests that the Lord would be the one delivering the people.

Summary: Restore in 3 Nephi 3:15 the 1830 reading with the modal *would* and the indirect quote (with the subordinate conjunction *that* and the third person plural pronoun *they*): "**that they would** in no wise be delivered out of the hands of those Gaddianton robbers"; the evidence for the indirect quote is firm since that is also the reading in 𝓟; the preceding direct quote ("as the Lord liveth / except ye repent of all your iniquities and cry unto the Lord . . .") suggests that if the people repent and cry unto the Lord, then they would be delivered, presumably by the Lord, thus making *would* (the 1830 reading) favored over *could* (the reading in 𝓟), given usage elsewhere in the text.

■ **3 Nephi 3:16**

and so great and marvelous were
the [*word* 1 | *words* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *and prophecies of Lachoneus*
that they did cause fear to come upon all the people

The 1830 edition has the plural *words,* the printer's manuscript the singular *word.* The probable reading of the original manuscript was the plural *words.* Note, for instance, the use of the plural *words* later on in this verse:

> 3 Nephi 3:16
> and they did exert themselves in their might
> to do according to the **words** of Lachoneus

Similarly, in verse 25 we have "and they did fear the **words** which had been spoken by Lachoneus". There is one other instance in the text where *words* is conjoined with *prophecies:*

> Helaman 4:21
> yea they began to remember the **prophecies** of Alma and also the **words** of Mosiah

As noted under 1 Nephi 16:24, the Book of Mormon text typically uses the plural *words* to refer to the word(s) of a person.

Nearby, in 3 Nephi 1:16, we have a case where 𝓟 reads *words* and the 1830 edition reads *word.* We have the opposite situation here in 3 Nephi 3:16, with 𝓟 having *word* and the 1830 edition having *words.* When we consider mix-ups in the early transmission of the text, we can find considerable evidence of Oliver Cowdery writing *word* in place of *words.* There are 12 instances in the manuscripts where he initially wrote the singular *word* instead of the correct plural (for some examples, see under Alma 42:31). And there is one clear case where he did not catch his error as he copied from 𝓞 into 𝓟:

> 1 Nephi 16:24
>> for they had humbled themselves
>> because of my [*words* oᴛ | *word* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRS]

He apparently made the same error in 𝒫 for Alma 42:31, although the evidence there is more complicated (see the discussion under that passage). In contrast, we have three instances where the 1830 typesetter accidentally replaced the singular *word* with the plural *words:*

> 1 Nephi 17:22 (Oliver Cowdery also made the same error initially in 𝒫)
>> because we would hearken
>> unto his [*word* 0GHKPS | *words > word* 1 | *words* ABCDEFIJLMNOQRT]

> 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 course—carry us beyond this vale of sorrow
>> into a far better land of promise

> Helaman 11:16
>> and if so O Lord thou canst bless them
>> according to thy [*word* 1 | *words* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
>> which thou hast said

Since the error could have been in either direction here in 3 Nephi 3:16, we will rely on internal evidence (that is, usage elsewhere in the text) in order to determine the more appropriate reading. And that evidence supports the plural *words,* the 1830 reading.

Summary: Accept in 3 Nephi 3:16 the 1830 reading in the plural ("the **words** and prophecies of Lachoneus") since this reading is more consistent with usage elsewhere in the text than is the reading in 𝒫 ("the **word** and prophecies of Lachoneus").

■ **3 Nephi 3:17–19**

(1) *and it came to pass that Lachoneus did appoint* **chief captains** *over all the armies of the Nephites to command them at the time that the robbers should come down out of the wilderness against them*
(2) *now the chiefest among all the* [*chief* 1PST | ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOQR] *captains and the great commander of all the armies of the Nephites was appointed and his name was Gidgiddoni*
(3) *now it was the custom among all the Nephites to appoint for their* **chief captains** *—save it were in their times of wickedness— some one that had the spirit of revelation and also of prophecy therefore this Gidgiddoni was a great prophet among them and also was the chief judge*

The 1830 edition and the printer's manuscript agree here in verse 18 by having *great* modify *commander.* But there is disagreement over whether the plural word *captains* is preceded by *chief.* The use of *chiefest* along with *chief captains* (the reading in 𝒫) seems somewhat odd, which may have led the 1830 typesetter to drop the *chief* in front of *captains* (giving "the chiefest among all the captains"). One could argue that Oliver Cowdery accidentally added *chief* before *captains*

because of the preceding *chief captains* in verse 17 (listed above as 1). On the other hand, one could argue that *chief captains* is correct because it is otherwise used throughout this passage (not only in verse 17 but also in verse 19, listed above as 3). The longer expression ("the chiefest among all the **chief** captains") was restored in the 1908 RLDS edition and in the 1981 LDS edition, in both cases under the incorrect assumption that for this part of the text the 1830 edition derived from 𝒫 rather than from 𝒪.

The original manuscript is not extant here, but spacing between extant fragments suggests that Oliver Cowdery initially wrote in 𝒪 a text shorter by one word (probably with either *chief* or *great* initially missing). The fact that the 1830 edition is missing the word *chief* suggests that the original manuscript probably had *chief* inline and that the word *great* was supralinearly inserted. Usually if 𝒪 has a supralinearly inserted word, that word is faithfully copied into 𝒫 (and into the 1830 edition for this part of the text from Helaman 13 through Mormon 9). If *chief* had been initially missed in 𝒪 and then supralinearly inserted, the 1830 edition would probably not have dropped it. Moreover, the term *great commander* does seem odd for modern English readers, and there is an example in his copywork where Oliver permanently omitted the word *great* before a title:

> Alma 58:4
>
> and it came to pass that I thus did send an embassy
> to the [*great* 0| 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] governor of our land

There are also a few cases in 𝒫 where Oliver initially omitted *great* in his copywork:

> Alma 43:43
>
> yea never had the Lamanites been known to have fought
> with such exceeding [*great* 0ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST|NULL > *great* 1]
>   strength and courage

> Alma 49:25
>
> and it came to pass that they returned to the land of Nephi
> to inform their king Amalickiah who was a Nephite by birth
> concerning their [*great* 0ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST|NULL >+ *great* 1] loss

> Alma 62:1
>
> his heart did take courage and was filled
> with exceeding [NULL > *great* 1|*great* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] joy

So it is quite possible that Oliver dropped the *great* here in 3 Nephi 3:18 when he initially wrote down the text in 𝒪. In any event, the expression "the **great** commander of all the armies of the Nephites" is acceptable (see the discussion under Alma 58:4).

Even though one might think that there could be only one chief captain at a time, Book of Mormon usage clearly indicates that there were many chief captains at a time. In fact, the plural *chief captains* occurs more frequently in the text than the singular *chief captain* (in the original text, there are 22 instances of the plural, 8 of the singular). Most occurrences of the singular *chief captain* refer to the commander of the whole army:

Zoram	Alma 16:5
Moroni	Alma 43:16 (twice), Alma 60:36, Alma 61:2
Zerahemnah	Alma 43:44

Mormon, realizing the possible confusion in terminology for the last of these examples, distinguished between chief captains in general and the chief captain who led the whole Lamanite army by adding a corrective *or*-phrase at the end of the sentence:

> 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

In the two other singular cases, *chief captain* refers to a local commander:

> Alma 49:16
> and behold Moroni had appointed Lehi
> to be chief captain over the men of that city

> Alma 57:29
> now Gid was the chief captain over the band
> which was appointed to guard them down to that land

In fact, there is a whole hierarchy of captains:

> Alma 2:13
> and there was appointed **captains** and **higher captains** and **chief captains**
> according to their numbers

> Alma 2:16
> now Alma he being the chief judge
> and the governor of the people of Nephi
> therefore he went up with his people
> yea with his **captains** and **chief captains**
> yea at the head of his armies against the Amlicites to battle

In all, there are four types of captains in the Book of Mormon text: captains, higher captains, chief captains, and the chief captain (or chief commander) over the whole army.

Summary: Maintain in 3 Nephi 3:18 the reading of the printer's manuscript, "the chiefest among all the **chief** captains"; there is a hierarchy of captains, so that referring to the chiefest of the chief captains is not a redundancy.

■ **3 Nephi 3:19**

now it was the custom among all the Nephites
to appoint for their chief captains
save it were in their times of wickedness
some one that had the spirit of revelation
and also [of 1A | BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *prophecy*

The original manuscript undoubtedly had the repeated *of* here in 3 Nephi 3:19 ("the spirit of revelation and also **of** prophecy"). Both the 1830 edition and the printer's manuscript have the

repeated *of.* The 1837 edition (probably accidentally) omitted the repeated *of.* The Book of Mormon text has examples of this construction both with and without the repeated *of:*

title page	written . . . by the spirit of prophecy and **of** revelation
Alma 4:20	according to the spirit of revelation and prophecy
Alma 8:24	according to the spirit of revelation and prophecy
Alma 23:6	according to the spirit of revelation and **of** prophecy
Alma 43:2	according to the spirit of prophecy and revelation
Helaman 4:12	denying the spirit of prophecy and **of** revelation

There is one example that involves a different preposition, and in that case the preposition is repeated:

| 3 Nephi 29:6 | the Lord no longer worketh by revelation or **by** prophecy |

Since either reading is theoretically possible for 3 Nephi 3:19, the repeated *of* should be restored. It should also be noted that the phrase "and also of X" occurs 27 other places in the Book of Mormon, so there is nothing wrong with having *also* before the repeated *of*.

Summary: Restore in 3 Nephi 3:19 the repeated *of* in "the spirit of revelation and also **of** prophecy", the reading of both 𝒫 and the 1830 edition.

■ **3 Nephi 3:19**

therefore this Gidgiddoni was a great prophet among them
[1|, ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
[& 1|and ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQS|as RT] *also was the chief judge*

It would appear that the editors for the 1920 LDS edition recognized that this verse could be misinterpreted as meaning that Gidgiddoni was also the chief judge, so they changed the conjunction *and* to *as*. Of course, the correct interpretation involves ellipsis, as if the text read "and also was the chief judge Lachoneus a great prophet among them". This kind of construction (conjoining a subject noun phrase at the end of a complete clause) is a Hebraism that is found quite often in the Book of Mormon text, as in the following example:

> 1 Nephi 3:28
> and it came to pass that Laman was angry with me and also with my father
> [01|; ABCDGIJLMNOQRT|, EHKPS|, >; F]
> **and also was** Lemuel
> for he hearkened unto the words of Laman

See the discussion under 1 Nephi 3:28 for further instances of the delayed conjoined subject (for a more general list, see under HEBRAISMS in volume 3). In each case, the critical text will maintain or restore, as the case may be, all original instances of the delayed conjoined subject. In cases of possible confusion, perhaps the best solution would be to place a dash immediately before the delayed conjoined subject:

> 1 Nephi 3:28 (revised punctuation)
> and it came to pass that Laman was angry with me and also with my father
> —and also was Lemuel

3 Nephi 3:19 (revised punctuation)
therefore this Gidgiddoni was a great prophet among them
—and also was the chief judge

Summary: Restore in 3 Nephi 3:19 the original *and* that connected the delayed conjoined subject to the preceding clause: "therefore this Gidgiddoni was a great prophet among them—**and** also was the chief judge"; there are many examples of this kind of construction in the original (and current) text of the Book of Mormon.

■ **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*   1APS

◻ NULL   BCDEFGHIJKLMNOQR

◻ *and the land which was between the land Zarahemla*   T

and the land Bountiful

In setting the type for the 1837 edition, the compositor's eye skipped from the second *and the land* to the third one, thus omitting "and the land which was between the land of Zarahemla". The 1908 RLDS edition restored the original text to the RLDS text. Except for the preposition *of* before *Zarahemla,* the 1981 LDS restored the original reading to the LDS text. The *of* seems to have been accidentally omitted, perhaps because there is no *of* in the conjoined "and the land Bountiful". As discussed under 1 Nephi 17:7, the Book of Mormon text definitely favors "the land Bountiful", although there are a few occurrences with the *of.* On the other hand, in the original text of the Book of Mormon there are no instances of "the land Zarahemla" (see the discussion under Alma 2:15). Instead, we always get "the land **of** Zarahemla" (105 times). Thus the *of* should be restored here in 3 Nephi 3:23.

Summary: Restore the original preposition *of* to the phrase "the land **of** Zarahemla" in 3 Nephi 3:23; the shorter phrase "the land Zarahemla" never occurred in the original text of the Book of Mormon; in this passage, the compositor for the 1837 edition skipped from the second instance of *and the land* to the third instance, thus omitting the entire phrase "and the land which was between the land of Zarahemla"; the critical text will maintain the longer reading.

■ **3 Nephi 3:23**

and the land which was appointed was the land of Zarahemla

(1) *and the land which was* **between** *the land of Zarahemla and the land Bountiful*

(2) *yea to the line which was* [*betwixt* 1 | *between* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
the land Bountiful and the land Desolation

Here the 1830 edition has the preposition *between,* but the printer's manuscript has *betwixt.* In the Book of Mormon text, *between* is considerably more common than the archaic *betwixt,* 32 to 5 (the count here excludes the case here in 3 Nephi 3:23 as well as a conjectured *between* in Alma 22:32,

mentioned below). There is some evidence of Oliver Cowdery initially mixing up these two words as he copied from 𝓞 into 𝓟:

> Alma 35:13
> and thus commenced a war
> [*betwixt* 0ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST | *between > betwixt* 1]
> the Lamanites and the Nephites

> Alma 40:21
> there is a space [*between* 0ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST | *betwixt >% between* 1]
> death and the resurrection of the body

The original manuscript exists for both of these passages. In each case, Oliver initially wrote the wrong alternative in 𝓟 but then caught his error and corrected it. In one case, he replaced an original *betwixt* with the more expected *between* (Alma 35:13); but in the other case, he did just the opposite: he replaced the expected *between* with the archaic *betwixt* (Alma 40:21). So we see that Oliver could make a mistake in either direction. We also see that it is Oliver who seemed to have difficulty with the transmission of these two words, not the 1830 typesetter. Of course, Oliver corrected his mistakes in these two cases; if the typesetter made any such mistake, he must have caught it during composition or in proof.

Here in 3 Nephi 3:23, there is the preceding instance of *between* in "the land which was **between** the land of Zarahemla and the land Bountiful". So one could argue that the parallel phraseology could have prompted the 1830 typesetter to replace an original *betwixt* with *between,* especially since *betwixt* would have been the less expected preposition. Moreover, in the one case where Oliver Cowdery initially replaced *between* with the more difficult *betwixt* (in Alma 40:21, listed above), there was an earlier use of *betwixt* in that chapter that could have prompted Oliver's momentary error in verse 21:

> Alma 40:6
> and now there must needs be a space
> **betwixt** the time of death and the time of the resurrection

In fact, Alma 40 has four instances that refer to what happens between death and the resurrection; *betwixt* is used the first time, then *between* for the following three:

Alma 40:6	a space **betwixt** the time of death and the time of the resurrection
Alma 40:9	a space **between** the time of death and the resurrection
Alma 40:11	the state of the soul **between** death and the resurrection
Alma 40:21	a space **between** death and the resurrection of the body

However, the occurrences of *between* in verses 9 and 11 were not affected by the earlier instance of *betwixt* in verse 6, but the one in verse 21 may have been.

In the case of 3 Nephi 3:23, there is no nearby *betwixt* that could have prompted Oliver Cowdery to change *between* to *betwixt.* Nor does the preceding phrase with *between* ("and the land which was **between** the land of Zarahemla and the land Bountiful") mean that the following *yea*-phrase must use *between.* The nearly identical expressions in Alma 40 essentially differ only in the choice of *betwixt* and *between,* so there is no overriding reason why we can't have the same difference here in 3 Nephi 3:23, with *between* in the first instance and *betwixt* in the second.

In terms of Book of Mormon usage, it should be noted that *betwixt* does not otherwise occur in describing fixed geographical locations, as can be seen when we list every example of *betwixt* in the original text (the first example comes from Isaiah 5:3 in the King James Bible):

2 Nephi 15:3	judge I pray you **betwixt** me and my vineyard
Mosiah 15:9	standing **betwixt** them and justice
Alma 35:13	and thus commenced a war **betwixt** the Lamanites and the Nephites
Alma 40:6	and now there must needs be a space **betwixt** the time of death and the time of the resurrection
Moroni 9:17	and the armies of the Lamanites are **betwixt** Sherrizah and me

The last example refers to the location of the armies of the Lamanites; namely, they are between Sherrizah (a city or a land) and the armies of Mormon. This use of *betwixt* involves geography only partially and refers to the position of Mormon's army, which is not fixed. In references to fully fixed locations, we otherwise get only the preposition *between* (including one more here in 3 Nephi 3:23):

Alma 22:32	there being a small neck of land **between** the land northward and the land southward
Alma 27:23	we will set our armies **between** the land Jershon and the land Nephi
Alma 50:11	fortifying the line between the Nephites and the Lamanites / **between** the land of Zarahemla and the land of Nephi
Alma 50:14	and they also began a foundation for a city **between** the city of Moroni and the city of Aaron
Alma 52:20	desiring him that he would come out with his armies to meet them upon the plains **between** the two cities
3 Nephi 3:23	and the land which was **between** the land of Zarahemla and the land Bountiful

There is also an example in Alma 22:32 where the *between* is conjectured, namely, in the phrase "on the line **between** the land Bountiful and the land Desolation", yet in the discussion regarding that passage I note that this phrase could have originally read "on the line **betwixt** the land Bountiful and the land Desolation". Of course, the number of examples of geographical description is relatively small, and the distinction is a fine one that depends upon positions between two fixed geographical locations, so *betwixt* is still a viable possibility for the conjectured reading in Alma 22:32. Moreover, the Oxford English Dictionary under *betwixt* cites instances of *betwixt* being used for geographical description, as in the following example from Middle English (here *Tuede* refers to the river Tweed):

Robert Manning of Brunne (about 1330)
 ouer alle þe londes bituex Douer & Tuede
 'over all the lands betwixt Dover and [the] Tweed'

The OED points out that *betwixt* is "now somewhat archaic in literary English and chiefly poetical" but that it is "still in colloquial use in some dialects".

The King James Bible shows a similar lack of use for *betwixt* when compared with *between*, with *between* being much more common than *betwixt* (232 to 16). Most cases of *betwixt* are used

in phrases involving persons, like "and it shall be a token of the covenant **betwixt** me and you" (Genesis 17:11). But location can also be specified: "then they fled and went forth out of the city by night by the way of the king's garden by the gate **betwixt** the two walls" (Jeremiah 39:4).

It is possible that *betwixt* was an alternative in Oliver Cowdery's own speech and that he could have accidentally replaced *between* with *betwixt* without being prompted by a nearby instance of *betwixt.* But note that in Alma 35:13, where Oliver initially replaced *betwixt* with *between* in 𝒫, the nearest preceding instance of *between* is in Alma 28:9 ("and also the wars **between** the Nephites and the Lamanites"), over 17 pages earlier in the printer's manuscript. In other words, the initial error of *between* in Alma 35:13 seems to be due simply to Oliver's preference for *between.* This makes one doubt whether *betwixt* in 3 Nephi 3:23 could be due to a dialectal preference on Oliver's part for that preposition. The only time he initially replaced *between* with *betwixt* was when there was a preceding instance of *betwixt* that could have prompted the error (in Alma 40).

Here in 3 Nephi 3:23, the textual evidence basically supports *betwixt* as the original reading. Although we have no specific evidence that the 1830 typesetter ever mixed up *betwixt* and *between,* Oliver Cowdery's errors argue that *betwixt* would have been the marked reading and thus subject to replacement by *between,* especially given the immediately preceding use of *between* in 3 Nephi 3:23. As noted in the discussion regarding Alma 40, there can be parallel expressions that essentially differ only in their use of *betwixt* and *between.* The critical text will therefore restore *betwixt* here in 3 Nephi 3:23.

Summary: Restore in 3 Nephi 3:23 the archaic preposition *betwixt* (the reading in 𝒫) for the phrase "yea to the line which was **betwixt** the land of Zarahemla and the land Desolation"; the *between* that occurs in the 1830 edition appears to be a regularization made by the 1830 typesetter under the influence of the *between* in the immediately preceding phrase ("and the land which was **between** the land of Zarahemla and the land Bountiful").

■ **3 Nephi 3:23**

yea to the line betwixt the land Bountiful
and [1|*the* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *land Desolation*

The definite article *the* appears to be required here. For all other instances of *land Desolation,* there is a determiner and it is always *the* (seven times). Here in 3 Nephi 3:23, Oliver Cowdery seems to have omitted the necessary *the* in 𝒫, although it is possible that he omitted it originally in 𝒪 and that the 1830 compositor supplied it when he set the type. There are a couple of examples in 𝒪 where Oliver initially omitted the definite article *the* before the word *land:*

　　Alma 27:22

　　　and this land Jershon is
　　　[NULL > *the* 0|*the* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] land
　　　which we will give unto our brethren for an inheritance

　　Alma 52:18

　　　Moroni did arrive with his army
　　　to [NULL > *the* 0|*the* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] land of Bountiful

For further examples of where Oliver omitted *the* in the manuscripts, if only momentarily, see under 2 Nephi 13:23 and Alma 14:5. The critical text will maintain the necessary *the* here in "the land Desolation".

Summary: Maintain the definite article *the* before *land Desolation* in 3 Nephi 3:23; Oliver Cowdery accidentally omitted the *the* here, either in 𝒪 or in P.

■ **3 Nephi 3:26**

and they were exceeding sorrowful
because of their [*enemies* 1T | *enemy* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRS]

Here the printer's manuscript has the plural *enemies,* while the 1830 edition has the singular *enemy.* The 1981 LDS edition restored the plural reading in 𝒫, but under the incorrect assumption that the 1830 edition was set from 𝒫 for this part of the text.

From 3 Nephi 3:22 to 3 Nephi 7:12, we otherwise get seven occurrences of *their enemies,* but none of *their enemy.* Two of these examples occur just before in verse 25:

> 3 Nephi 3:25
>> and they did fortify themselves against their **enemies**
>> and they did dwell in one land and in one body . . .
>> and they did put up their prayers unto the Lord their God
>> that he would deliver them in the time
>> that their **enemies** should come down against them to battle

One possibility here in verse 26 is that Oliver Cowdery changed an original singular *enemy* to the plural under the influence of these preceding plurals.

Elsewhere there are 43 instances of *their enemies* in the Book of Mormon text but only a couple of *their enemy:*

> Alma 26:32
>> for behold they had rather sacrifice their lives
>> than even to take the life of their **enemy**
>> and they have buried their weapons of war deep in the earth

> Alma 27:3
>> and they suffered themselves to be slain
>> according to the desires of their [*enemy* 0 | *enemies* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]

In the first example, the singular *enemy* is appropriate given the singular *life* in this phrase ("to take the **life** of their **enemy**"). Interestingly, in the second example, Oliver Cowdery changed the singular *enemy* to the plural *enemies* when he copied the text from 𝒪 into 𝒫. Thus we have clear evidence that Oliver could have accidentally replaced a singular *enemy* here in 3 Nephi 3:26 with the plural *enemies,* especially given the preceding occurrences of *enemies* in verse 25. There is also one more instance in the manuscripts where Oliver mixed up *enemy* and *enemies,* although in that case he caught his error and the mistake is in the opposite direction, from the plural to the singular:

Alma 49:28

> because of his miraculous power in delivering them from the hands
> of their [*enemy* >% *enemies* 0 | *enemies* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]

On the other hand, there is no evidence of the 1830 typesetter ever mixing up *enemy* and *enemies*. On this basis, it seems more likely here in 3 Nephi 3:26 that 𝒪 read *enemy*, the 1830 reading and the less expected reading. (One possibility that should be kept in mind is that 𝒪 may have incorrectly read *enemy* and that Oliver happened to correctly change it to *enemies* when he copied the text from 𝒪 into 𝒫.)

As far as usage goes, there are two other instances in the text of "because of one's enemy/ enemies", and they show one case of the singular and one of the plural:

2 Nephi 4:27   why am I angry because of mine **enemy**
2 Nephi 4:29   do not anger again because of mine **enemies**

These two examples are found in the same passage, so variation is possible, and the use of the singular *enemy* in the 1830 reading for 3 Nephi 3:26 is possible (as is the plural reading in 𝒫, *enemies*).

Summary: Restore in 3 Nephi 3:26 the singular *enemy,* the unexpected but possible 1830 reading ("and they were exceeding sorrowful because of their **enemy**"); although the plural *enemies* (the reading in 𝒫) is a possibility, we have independent evidence (in Alma 27:3) that Oliver Cowdery tended to replace the singular *enemy* with the plural *enemies* when he copied from 𝒪 into 𝒫.

■ **3 Nephi 3:26**

and Gidgiddoni did cause
that *they should make weapons of war of every kind*
[*that* 1ABCDGHKPS | *and* EFIJLMNOQRT] *they should be strong*
with armor and with shields and with bucklers

Here the 1849 LDS edition replaced the subordinate conjunction *that* with the coordinating conjunction *and*. Both the 1830 edition and the printer's manuscript have the *that,* which means that the original manuscript undoubtedly did too.

The earliest text here in 3 Nephi 3:26 implies that "Gidgiddoni did cause . . . that they should be strong with armor and with shields and with bucklers". In other words, there is a second *that*-clause asyndetically connected to the first *that*-clause, which means that Gidgiddoni ordered the Nephites to protect themselves (1) by making weapons of war and (2) by making themselves strong with various kinds of protective armor.

Modern speakers of English expect *and that* in this passage. In fact, it is possible that Joseph Smith dictated *and that* but that while taking down Joseph's dictation Oliver Cowdery accidentally dropped the *and*. There are a number of examples in the Book of Mormon text where the verb *cause* is followed by *that*-clauses conjoined by means of a coordinating conjunction:

2 Nephi 5:17

> and it came to pass that I Nephi did cause my people
> **that** they should be industrious
> **and that** they should labor with their hands

Alma 22:26

he caused **that** Aaron and his brethren should stand forth in the midst of the multitude
and that they should preach the word unto them

Alma 58:16

behold I caused **that** Gid with a small number of men should secrete himself
    in the wilderness
and also that Teomner should with a small number of men secrete himself
    also in the wilderness

Alma 58:26

I caused **that** my men should not sleep
but that they should march forward by another way towards the land of Manti

Ether 9:33

and it came to pass that the Lord did cause the serpents
that they should pursue them no more
but that they should hedge up the way

However, in the original text it is also possible to have conjoined *that*-clauses without a connector. In the following case, later editing replaced the second *that* with an *and* (just like here in 3 Nephi 3:26):

1 Nephi 15:34 (second *that* emended to *and* by Oliver Cowdery in 𝓞)

but behold I say unto you
that the kingdom of God is not filthy
[𝓟2 *that* >+ 𝓟1 & 𝓞| & 1| *and* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] there cannot
any unclean thing enter into the kingdom of God

Thus the earliest textual sources show that conjoined *that*-clauses without a conjunction can occur. The critical text will therefore restore the original reading in 3 Nephi 3:26 without an *and* before the second *that*-clause.

Summary: Restore in 3 Nephi 3:26 the original second *that* without an *and:* "and Gidgiddoni did cause that they should make weapons of war of every kind / **that** they should be strong with armor and with shields and with bucklers"; such asyndetic conjoining of *that*-clauses can be found elsewhere in the original text.

■ **3 Nephi 3:26**

that they should be strong with armor and with shields and with bucklers
after the manner of his [*instructions* 1PS| *instruction* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOQRT]

The printer's manuscript has the plural *instructions,* while the 1830 edition has the singular *instruction.* The 1908 RLDS edition restored the plural reading to the RLDS text, while the LDS text has maintained the 1830 reading.

Usage elsewhere in the text argues for the plural *instructions.* There are a couple occurrences of the singular *instruction,* but these refer to general instruction and not to specific instructions:

1 Nephi 19:3
>> and that the things which were written
>> should be kept for the **instruction** of my people

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 . . .

When the text refers to someone's specific instructions on how to do something, we get the plural *instructions:*

Alma 49:8
>> now they were prepared for the Lamanites to battle
>> after the manner of the **instructions** of Moroni

Ether 2:16
>> and built barges after the manner which they had built
>> according to the **instructions** of the Lord

We note that the Alma 49:8 example, like the one here in 3 Nephi 3:26, has the phraseology "after the manner of someone's instructions". Even the example from Ether 2:16 has the nearby phrase "after the manner". Thus internal evidence suggests that the plural reading in the printer's manuscript ("after the manner of his instructions") is the correct reading in 3 Nephi 3:26.

In Alma 49:8 (listed above), Oliver Cowdery initially wrote the plural *instructions* in 𝒫 as *instruction,* which he later corrected to the plural by inserting the plural *s* inline; 𝒪 is extant in that case and reads in the plural. This example shows Oliver miswriting the correct plural as a singular, the opposite of what we need here in 3 Nephi 3:26. It appears that the 1830 typesetter made that mistake when he changed an original plural to the singular in this passage.

Summary: Restore the plural *instructions,* the reading in 𝒫, for 3 Nephi 3:26 since this is what we get elsewhere in the text when the reference is to the specific directions from someone.

3 Nephi 4

■ **3 Nephi 4:1**

and it came to pass [*that* 1ABCEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST | D]
in the latter end of the eighteenth year
those armies of robbers had prepared for battle

Here the 1841 British edition omitted the subordinate conjunction *that* after "it came to pass".
The subsequent LDS edition (1849) restored the *that*. Both 𝓟 and the 1830 edition have the *that*,
so most likely 𝓞 did too. The critical text will maintain the *that* here. For another example of the
loss of the *that* after the phrase "come to pass", see nearby under 3 Nephi 4:5.

Summary: Maintain in 3 Nephi 4:1 the *that* after "it came to pass", the reading of the earliest text.

■ **3 Nephi 4:1**

those armies of robbers had prepared for battle
and began to come down . . . and began to take possession of the lands
both which [*was* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNPS | *were* OQRT] *in the land south*
and which [*was* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNPS | *were* OQRT] *in the land north*
and began to take possession of **all the lands** *which had been deserted by the Nephites*

For the larger passage to make sense, there must be multiple lands both "in the land south" and
"in the land north". Note the use of "all the lands" later on in the verse. In the following passage,
we have another example in the text where a larger land is made up of distinct separate lands:

> Alma 54:6 (original text)
> behold I would tell you something concerning the justice of God
> and the sword of his almighty wrath which doth hang over you
> except ye repent and withdraw your armies
> into your own **lands**—or the **lands** of your possessions—
> which is the **land** of Nephi

Therefore, the change in 3 Nephi 4:1 from the singular *was* to the plural *were* in the 1907 LDS
vest-pocket edition is appropriate from a semantic (and grammatical) point of view. The 1911
LDS edition also made the change, perhaps independently of the 1907 edition. For some discussion
of subject-verb agreement in the original text, see under 1 Nephi 4:4; for a general discussion, see
under SUBJECT-VERB AGREEMENT in volume 3. For each case of agreement (or nonagreement),
the critical text will follow the earliest textual sources; thus *was* will be restored twice here in
3 Nephi 4:1.

Summary: Restore the two original uses of the singular *was* in 3 Nephi 4:1: "and began to take possession of the lands / both which **was** in the land south and which **was** in the land north"; the land south has multiple lands as does the land north, but the original text frequently allowed plural subjects to take the singular *was* as the verb form.

■ **3 Nephi 4:1**

and began to take possession of all the lands which had been deserted by the Nephites
and the cities [*of* >+ NULL 1| ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *which had been left desolate*

In the printer's manuscript, Oliver Cowdery originally wrote "and the cities **of** which had been left desolate". Later, with heavier ink flow, Oliver crossed out the *of*. The 1830 edition lacks the *of*. One possibility is that Oliver removed the *of* when he proofed 𝔓 against 𝔒. But another possibility is that 𝔒 had *of,* but since the *of* is unexpected here the 1830 typesetter omitted it and Oliver later decided to cross out the *of* in 𝔓. In any event, the correct reading is very likely without any *of,* even if 𝔒 had it, simply because the Book of Mormon expression is for "X to be desolate", not for "X to be desolate **of**", as in these other examples referring to places being left desolate:

Alma 16:10	but behold in one day it was left desolate
Helaman 15:1	except ye shall repent your houses shall be left unto you desolate
3 Nephi 4:3	for the Nephites had left their lands desolate
3 Nephi 8:14	and the places were left desolate

In the first example, the pronoun *it* refers to the city of Ammonihah. Here in 3 Nephi 4:1 the extra *of* initially written in 𝔓 was probably a momentary slip.

David Calabro points out (personal communication) that not every verbal example with *desolate* is of the simple form "X to be desolate". There is one example where *desolate* takes a prepositional complement, namely, in the expression "X to be desolate **for** Y", as in "no part of the land was desolate save it were **for** timber" (Helaman 3:6). In this case, *for* means something like 'with respect to'.

Don Brugger suggests (personal communication) another way to explain the original *of which* in 𝔓: namely, the relative pronoun *which* in *of which* could refer to the earlier noun phrase *the Nephites* rather than to the immediately preceding *the cities*. This kind of circumlocution for "and the cities **of the Nephites** which had been left desolate" seems unlikely. The expected expression here in 3 Nephi 4:1 for this proposed interpretation would be simply "and **their** cities which had been left desolate", not the convoluted "and the cities **of** which had been left desolate".

Summary: Maintain in 3 Nephi 4:1 the 1830 reading and the corrected reading in 𝔓—that is, without the preposition *of* before *which* in "and the cities which had been left desolate".

■ **3 Nephi 4:1**

and the cities which had been left [*desolates* 0| *desolate* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]

The plural *desolates* in 3 Nephi 4:1 (the reading in 𝔒) may be the reading of the original text, where *desolates* means 'desolate places'. On the other hand, there is evidence that the plural form

desolates was a rather persistent error made by Joseph Smith when he dictated *desolate*. As discussed under Helaman 3:5–6, the critical text will accept the singular form *desolate* here in 3 Nephi 4:1 and elsewhere in the text.

■ **3 Nephi 4:5**

and it came to pass [1|*that* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
in [NULL >+ *that* 1| ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *the nineteenth year*
Giddianhi found that it was expedient that he should go up to battle against the Nephites

Here in the printer's manuscript, Oliver Cowdery initially omitted the subordinate conjunction *that* after *it came to pass*. Later he supplied the *that,* but in the wrong place (after the preposition *in* rather than before it); the level of ink for the supralinear correction is heavier, so Oliver's correction probably occurred when he proofed 𝔓 against 𝔒. The 1830 edition has the *that* (and in the right place), so undoubtedly 𝔒 did too. For another example of the loss of *that* after the phrase "come to pass", see nearby under 3 Nephi 4:1.

Summary: Maintain in 3 Nephi 4:5 the subordinate conjunction *that* after *it came to pass,* the reading in the 1830 edition and the implied reading in 𝔓 (where *that* is supralinearly inserted in the wrong place).

■ **3 Nephi 4:5**

for there was no way [*that* 1ABCDEFGIJLMNOPQRST| HK] *they could subsist*

The 1874 RLDS edition dropped the adverbial relative pronoun *that* here in 3 Nephi 4:5, probably accidentally. The 1908 RLDS edition restored the *that.* Elsewhere in the text, for similar expressions the *that* is never omitted after *no way:*

Mosiah 21:5	and there was no way **that** they could deliver themselves out of their hands
Alma 4:19	seeing no way **that** he might reclaim them
Alma 58:1	but behold there was no way **that** we could lead them out of the city by our small bands

The critical text will maintain the *that* in all these cases, including here in 3 Nephi 4:5.

Summary: Maintain in 3 Nephi 4:5 and elsewhere in the text the adverbial relative pronoun *that* whenever it occurs after *no way* in the earliest text.

■ **3 Nephi 4:7**

and they had a lambskin about their loins

Here is a clause where the word *girded* might have originally occurred: "and they had a lambskin **girded** about their loins", as in other cases in the text where *girded* could be removed without much difference in meaning:

Enos 1:20	with a short skin **girded** about their loins
Alma 3:5	save it were a skin which was **girded** about their loins
Alma 43:20	save it were a skin which was **girded** about their loins

Since both 𝓅 and the 1830 lack the word *girded* here in 3 Nephi 4:7, then undoubtedly 𝓞 also lacked it. So if the original text had *girded* here, it must have been lost as Joseph Smith dictated the text to Oliver Cowdery. Yet there may be a good reason for why *girded* is missing here in 3 Nephi 4:7: namely, the immediately preceding clause has the word: "and they were **girded** about after the manner of robbers". Moreover, the reading "they had a lambskin about their loins" is possible, so it looks like what we have in the Book of Mormon text is a case of variation, three times with *girded* and once without. The critical text will maintain the earliest extant reading here in 3 Nephi 4:7 since it will work without *girded*.

Summary: Maintain 3 Nephi 4:7 without the word *girded* since neither 𝓅 nor the 1830 edition have it; presumably 𝓞 did not have *girded* either, nor is it required; perhaps *girded* is lacking here because the preceding clause already has *girded*.

■ **3 Nephi 4:8**

when they saw the appearance of the army
of [*Giddianhis > Giddianhi* 1 | *Giddianhi* ᴀʙᴄᴅᴇꜰɢʜɪᴊᴋʟᴍɴᴏᴘǫʀsᴛ]

As discussed under Alma 46:24, there are a few cases in the original text of the double genitive (that is, possessive phrases of the form "X of Y's"), namely:

Alma 46:24	even as this remnant of garment of my **son's**
Alma 55:4	a man which was a descendant of **Laman's**
Alma 62:6	and uniting his forces with that of **Parhoron's**
Helaman 1:25	this march of **Coriantumr's** through the center of the land

But there are also several cases where Oliver Cowdery initially added the possessive *s* to create a double genitive that was not in the original text. In each of those cases, he caught his error. (All these cases, both the original and the momentary ones, are listed under Alma 46:24.) Here in 3 Nephi 4:8, Oliver had almost finished writing the possessive *Giddianhis;* just as he started to write the possessive *s,* he aborted it and overwrote the incomplete *is* with an *i.* (Oliver typically did not supply apostrophes. For discussion of this aspect of his scribal practice, see under the phrase "three days' journey" in the 1 Nephi preface.) In each possible case of the double genitive, the critical text will follow the earliest reading, thus "the army of Giddianhi" here in 3 Nephi 4:8.

All other instances in the text of "the army of X" (where X is a personal name) support this reading; there are no instances elsewhere in the text of "the army of X's", even as a scribal slip. In all, there are 25 other instances of "the army of X", such as "the army of Moroni" (6 times), "the army of Coriantumr" (6 times), "the army of Antipus" (4 times), and "the army of Shiz" (3 times).

Summary: Maintain in 3 Nephi 4:8 the phrase "the army of Giddianhi" rather than the double genitive that Oliver Cowdery started to write in 𝓅, "the army of Giddianhi's"; elsewhere in the text there are examples of only "the army of X", never "the army of X's" (where X is a personal name).

■ **3 Nephi 4:12**

behold the Nephites did beat them
insomuch that they did **fall** *back*
[NULL > *from* 1 | *from* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *before them*

The original text manuscript undoubtedly read "from before them". Oliver Cowdery, when he initially wrote the text into the printer's manuscript, accidentally skipped the *from,* but virtually immediately he caught his error and supralinearly added the word (there is no change in the level of ink flow); moreover, the 1830 edition, a firsthand copy of 𝒪, has the *from.*

But one wonders here if the verb might be *flee* rather than *fall*—that is, "they did **flee** back from before them". Even if *fall* is an error, it would have been in 𝒪 since both the 1830 edition and 𝒫 agree here. The verbs *flee* and *fall* are consonantally identical, so it is possible that Oliver Cowdery might have misheard Joseph Smith's dictation. Or Joseph himself could have misread an original *flee* as *fall* because of the visual similarity between the two words.

In support of this emendation, there are quite a few occurrences of "flee from before X" elsewhere in the text:

1 Nephi 4:28	and they fled from before my presence
1 Nephi 4:30	he began to tremble and was about to flee from before me
Mosiah 17:4	but he fled from before them
Mormon 2:24	insomuch that they did not flee from before the Lamanites
Mormon 2:25	that they did flee from before us
Mormon 4:20	and they fled again from before them
Mormon 4:22	the Nephites did again flee from before them
Ether 13:22	but he fled from before them

And there is even one occurrence of "flee **back** from before X":

Alma 2:32	but the king of the Lamanites fled **back** from before Alma

Of course, maybe this last passage is an error for "but the king of the Lamanites **fell** back from before Alma"!

In the King James Bible, there are six instances of "flee from before X", as in 1 Samuel 31:1: "and the men of Israel fled from before the Philistines". But there are no biblical examples of "back from before". In other words, there are no examples in the King James Bible of either "**flee** back from before X" or "**fall** back from before X". In the Book of Mormon, based on the earliest textual sources, there is one example of each type (that is, when *back* occurs with "from before", there is one example with the verb *flee* and one with *fall*). The critical text will leave the text as it is in both Alma 2:32 and 3 Nephi 4:12; either reading is possible.

Summary: Keep the unique occurrence of *fall back* in "did **fall back** from before them" (3 Nephi 4:12) as well as the unique occurrence of *flee back* in "**fled back** from before Alma" (Alma 2:32).

■ **3 Nephi 4:13**

and it came to pass that Gidgiddoni commanded that his armies should pursue them
as far as [to 1A | BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] the borders of the wilderness

Both the 1830 edition and the printer's manuscript have "as far as **to** the borders of the wilderness"—
that is, with the preposition *to*. The 1837 edition dropped the *to,* probably accidentally since Joseph
Smith did not mark this change in 𝒫 when he edited the text for the 1837 edition.

There are no other occurrences of "as far as" in the Book of Mormon text, so we are unable to
check whether the preposition *to* is otherwise expected after "as far as" in the Book of Mormon.
However, we do have five occurrences of "as far as" in the King James Bible, two of which have
the preposition *to* and three of which have no following preposition:

Luke 24:50	and he led them out as far as **to** Bethany
Acts 11:19	now they . . . traveled as far as Phenice and Cyprus and Antioch
Acts 11:22	and they sent forth Barnabas that he should go as far as Antioch
Acts 28:15	they came to meet us as far as Appii forum and the three taverns
2 Corinthians 10:14	for we are come as far as **to** you also in *preaching* the gospel of Christ

Since the King James Bible does allow for "as far as to" followed by a place-name (that is, *Bethany*
in Luke 24:50), the original *to* in 3 Nephi 4:13 is an acceptable reading. The critical text will restore
the *to* since it is the earliest reading. Even though it sounds archaic, it is undoubtedly intended.

Summary: Restore the preposition *to* after "as far as" in 3 Nephi 4:13; the original manuscript very
likely read this way, and such usage is found in the King James Bible.

■ **3 Nephi 4:15**

and it came to pass that this nineteenth year did pass away
*and the robbers did not come **again** to battle*
neither did they come [1PS | again ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOQRT] in the twentieth year

Here the printer's manuscript does not repeat the *again,* but the 1830 edition does. The use of the
repeated *again* does sound strange, and this could explain why Oliver Cowdery might have dropped
it when copying the text into 𝒫. But it is also possible that the 1830 typesetter added the *again*
simply because it occurred in the previous clause ("and the robbers did not come **again** to battle").

There are a few other times in the Book of Mormon text where *again* occurs in a negative
clause referring to battle:

Mormon 3:1	the Lamanites did not come to battle **again** until ten years more had passed away
Ether 13:31	that he did not go to battle **again** for the space of two years
Ether 15:18	desiring that he would not come **again** to battle

There is also considerable evidence that Oliver Cowdery occasionally added or deleted *again*
when he copied the text from 𝒪 into 𝒫. For instance, in 1 Nephi 11:30–36 Oliver added *again* to

the text three times, probably because he did not trust what the unidentified scribe 3 of 𝒪 had written while taking down Joseph Smith's dictation (see the discussion under 1 Nephi 11:30 for all three of those cases). But more significant are five cases where Oliver, in his copying, initially omitted an *again,* then somewhat later corrected the text by supralinearly inserting the *again:*

> 2 Nephi 27:22
>> wherefore when thou hast read the words which I have commanded thee
>> and obtained the witnesses which I have promised unto thee
>> then shalt thou seal up the book
>> [NULL >+ *again* 1 | *again* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
>> and hide it up unto me

> Mosiah 10:21
>> and it came to pass that we returned **again** to our own land
>> and my people [NULL >+ *again* 1 | *again* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] began
>> to tend their flocks and to till their ground

> 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
>> [NULL > *again* 1 | *again* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
>> to go to battle against the Nephites

> Alma 47:29
>> now when the servants of the king saw an army pursuing after them
>> they were frightened [*again* 0ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST | NULL > *again* 1]
>> and fled into the wilderness

> 3 Nephi 11:8
>> and it came to pass as they understood
>> they cast their eyes up [NULL >+ *again* 1 | *again* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
>> towards heaven

The case in Mosiah 10:21 is particularly relevant here because it has a repeated *again* (just like here in 3 Nephi 4:15); in other words, Oliver sometimes eliminated repeated *again*'s. On the other hand, the 1830 typesetter never once added or deleted an *again.* Thus the evidence argues that in 3 Nephi 4:15 𝒪 probably had the repeated *again* and that Oliver accidentally omitted it when he copied from 𝒪 into 𝒫.

Summary: Maintain in 3 Nephi 4:15 the repeated *again* despite its strangeness; Oliver Cowdery was prone to omit *again* in his copywork, although he normally caught this error.

■ **3 Nephi 4:15–16**

> *and it came to pass that this nineteenth year did pass away*
> *and the robbers did not come again to battle*
> *neither did they come again in the twentieth year*
> [*but* 1 | *but* > *and* A | *and* BCDEFGHK | *And* IJLMNOPQRST]
> *in the twenty and first year they did not come up to battle*
> [*but* 1BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST | *but* > *and* > *but* A]
> *they came up on all sides to lay siege round about the people of Nephi*

The printer's manuscript consistently has *but* for the first two main clauses in 3 Nephi 4:16. Similarly, the 1830 compositor also initially set *but* both times, but later he decided that there was some mistake, that the first *but* should be an *and.* When he made the in-press change in the type, he initially corrected the wrong *but,* namely, the one in the line below. After some more sheets had been printed, he discovered this error in his in-press change and restored the second *but* and changed the first *but* to an *and.* In other words, for the printed sheets of the 29th signature, we get the following three states for lines 33–34 on page 461 of the 1830 edition:

(1) twentieth year; **but** in the twenty and first year they did not
     come up to battle, **but** they came up on all sides to lay siege

(2) twentieth year; **but** in the twenty and first year they did not
     come up to battle, **and** they came up on all sides to lay siege

(3) twentieth year; **and** in the twenty and first year they did not
     come up to battle, **but** they came up on all sides to lay siege

The question here is: how did the original manuscript read? Since originally both the 1830 edition as well as 𝓟 read *but… but* for this passage, 𝓞 probably did as well. This would mean that the 1830 compositor was consciously trying to edit the first *but* to an *and* (and he did finally get it right).

When we compare "but in the twenty and first year they did not come up to battle" with the preceding verse ("the robbers did not come again to battle / neither did they come again in the twentieth year"), there seems to be no reversal in sense unless *but* is referring to the decision to lay siege. This is what the text is trying to say: "they did not come up to battle / but [instead] they came up on all sides to lay siege round about the people of Nephi". In other words, the negative scope of the first *but* extends through to the end of the second *but*-clause:

> 3 Nephi 4:16
>   **but** in the twenty and first year
>   they did not come up to battle
>   **but** they came up on all sides to lay siege round about the people of Nephi

The tendency is for the reader to interpret both *but*-clauses as occurring at the same syntactic level, with the scope of the first *but* extending only through the first clause:

>   **but** in the twenty and first year
>   they did not come up to battle
>   **but** they came up on all sides to lay siege round about the people of Nephi

But this particular interpretation does not work, as the 1830 compositor recognized. The critical text will restore the original *but . . . but,* but with the understanding that the negative scope of the first *but* extends through the second one.

There are other examples in the text where editors have changed *but* to *and* and vice versa; Joseph Smith is responsible for one of them (marked below with an asterisk); the others are the result of editing for the 1920 LDS edition:

     * Alma 4:2
        [& >js *but* 1 | *and* A | *but* BCDEFGHK | *But* IJLMNOPQRST]
        the people being afflicted . . .

     Alma 42:30
        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

     Alma 43:20
        they had only 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

     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

     Ether 6:23
        and now behold this was grievous unto them
        [*but* 01 | *But* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQS | *And* RT] the brother of Jared said
           unto them . . .

Note especially the example in Alma 42:30 where the *but* that was emended to *and* is a repeated *but,* just like here in 3 Nephi 4:16. Under Alma 42:30, I list other cases in the text of the repeated *but,* ones that have not been edited out.

It should be pointed out that Oliver Cowdery sometimes mixed up these two conjunctions. For a list of these, see the discussion regarding *straight* and *strait* under 1 Nephi 8:20. For another instance of variation between *and* and *but* in this part of the text (where both 𝓟 and the 1830 edition are firsthand copies of 𝓞), see under 3 Nephi 19:6.

Summary: Restore in 3 Nephi 4:16 the original sequence of two *but*'s, but with the understanding that the second *but* is within the negative scope of the first one.

■ **3 Nephi 4:16**

for they did suppose that
if they **should** *cut off the people of Nephi from their lands*
and **should** *hem them in on every side*
and if they **should** *cut them off from all their outward privileges*
that they [*could* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMOPQRST | *should* N] *cause them*
to yield themselves up according to their wishes

The 1906 LDS edition replaced the modal *could* with *should,* undoubtedly because there are three *should*'s in the preceding text. The 1906 edition never served as a copytext for subsequent LDS editions, so the secondary *should* was not transmitted into any other edition. In addition, the modal *could* is perfectly appropriate here in the resultive *that*-clause that follows the listing of those conditional statements (the conditional *should* is appropriate there). Both 𝓟 and the 1830 edition read *could* here in the last instance, which undoubtedly means that 𝓞 also read this way.

Summary: Maintain the modal *could* in the resultive *that*-clause in 3 Nephi 4:16.

■ **3 Nephi 4:16**

that they could cause them
to yield themselves [1 | *up* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *according to their wishes*

As discussed under 1 Nephi 19:10, the Book of Mormon text uses the adverb *up* in the phrase "to yield oneself (up)" when surrendering to an opponent in war:

Helaman 1:32	and the Lamanites did yield themselves **up** into the hands of the Nephites
3 Nephi 3:7	yield yourselves **up** unto us
3 Nephi 4:27	and there were many thousands which did yield themselves **up** prisoners unto the Nephites

But the *up* is lacking when voluntarily yielding to someone else's power:

1 Nephi 19:10	yea the God of Abraham . . . yieldeth himself . . . as a man into the hands of wicked men to be lifted up
Alma 5:20	when you have yielded yourselves to become subjects to the devil
Alma 10:25	why will ye yield yourselves unto him
Helaman 3:35	because of their yielding their hearts unto God
Helaman 16:21	if we will yield ourselves unto them
3 Nephi 7:5	because they did yield themselves unto the power of Satan

Consistent with this distinction, the 1830 reading with *up* in 3 Nephi 4:16 is very likely the correct reading.

This conclusion is supported by errors in the early transmission of the Book of Mormon text. On the one hand, we find considerable evidence that Oliver Cowdery frequently omitted the *up;* see under Alma 27:3 for a list of five clear examples, three that were momentary and two that were permanent. On the other hand, there are no cases where the 1830 typesetter accidentally

added an *up* (although in two cases he accidentally omitted it, in Alma 62:22 and in Ether 13:8). In other words, the odds are high here in 3 Nephi 4:16 that Oliver is the one responsible for the variation. The critical text will therefore maintain the *up* in the phrase "to yield themselves up".

Summary: Maintain in 3 Nephi 4:16 the *up* in the verb phrase "to yield themselves up" (the 1830 reading); Oliver Cowdery was prone to omit the adverb *up,* but the 1830 typesetter never added it; usage elsewhere in the text shows that the *up* in the phrase "to yield oneself (up)" is expected when surrendering in war.

■ **3 Nephi 4:18**

but behold this was an advantage
[*unto* 1A | *to* BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *the Nephites*

Here both the 1830 edition and the printer's manuscript have the preposition *unto.* The 1837 edition changed the preposition to *to.* This change seems to be unintentional; it was not marked by Joseph Smith in the printer's manuscript. In four other instances, the 1837 edition accidentally changed the archaic *unto* to the expected *to:*

> 2 Nephi 26:27
> and he hath commanded his people that they should persuade all men
> [*unto* 1A | *to* BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] repentance

> Alma 16:13
> and Alma and Amulek went forth preaching repentance
> [*unto* 1A | *to* BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] the people

> 3 Nephi 18:11
> and this shall ye always do
> [*unto* 1APS | *to* BCDEFGHIJKLMNOQRT] those who repent

> Moroni 6:3
> save they took upon them the name of Christ
> having a determination to serve him
> [*unto* 1A | *to* BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] the end

Clearly, the 1837 typesetter tended to replace *unto* with *to.*

There are no other occurrences in the text of *advantage* followed by *unto* or *to.* Either *unto* or *to* works in 3 Nephi 4:18, so the original reading will be restored in the critical text.

Summary: Restore the original preposition *unto* in 3 Nephi 4:18 ("this was an advantage **unto** the Nephites"), the reading of both 𝓟 and the 1830 edition.

■ **3 Nephi 4:18–19**

for it was impossible for the robbers to lay siege sufficiently long
to have any effect upon the Nephites because of their much provision which they had laid up in store
[& 1| ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOQR | *and* PS | *And* T] *because of the scantiness of provisions*
    among the robbers
for behold they had nothing save it were meat for their subsistence

The printer's manuscript has an *and* connecting the two *because-of* phrases. The 1830 edition is missing this *and,* but it was restored in the 1908 RLDS edition and in the 1981 LDS edition. Since the greater tendency in the transmission of the text from 𝓞 into 𝓟 was to accidentally omit small words rather than to add them, the original manuscript probably had the ampersand here. More specifically, there are many more examples of the 1830 typesetter omitting *and* than of Oliver Cowdery adding *and;* for some statistics, see under 3 Nephi 3:12.

Elsewhere in the original text there are seven examples where the text reads "because of X **and** because of Y"; six of these are cases of conjoined *because-of* prepositional phrases (the exception is marked below with an asterisk):

1 Nephi 15:4
    and now I Nephi was grieved **because of** the hardness of their hearts
    and also **because of** the things which I had seen

1 Nephi 16:35
    and it came to pass that
    the daughters of Ishmael did mourn exceedingly
    because of the loss of their father
    and because of their afflictions in the wilderness

* 2 Nephi 28:11–12
    yea they have all gone out of the way
    they have become corrupted
    [1|. ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
    because of pride
    [1|, ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
    and because of false teachers and false doctrine
    their churches have become corrupted

        [As discussed under 2 Nephi 28:11–12, the phrase "because of pride" actually belongs to the sentence ending verse 11, while the phrase "because of false teachers and false doctrine" belongs to the following sentence. So this is not a case of conjoined *because-of* prepositional phrases.]

Jacob 5:59
    and this I do that perhaps the roots thereof may take strength
    because of their goodness
    [1|; ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
    and because of the change of the branches
    that the good may overcome the evil

        [As discussed under Jacob 5:59, there should be no punctuation, not even a comma, between the two conjoined *because-of* prepositional phrases in this passage.]

3 Nephi 4:7
and great and terrible was the appearance of the armies of Giddianhi
because of their armor
and because of their being dyed in blood

3 Nephi 16:7
behold **because of** their belief in me / saith the Father
and because of the unbelief of you / O house of Israel
in the latter day shall the truth come unto the Gentiles

4 Nephi 1:28
and this church did multiply exceedingly
because of iniquity
and because of the power of Satan which did get hold upon their hearts

On the other hand, there is one case elsewhere in the text where a conjoined *because of* lacks a connector:

Mormon 2:27
and my heart did sorrow
because of this the great calamity of my people
because of their wickedness and their abominations
but behold we did go forth against the Lamanites and the robbers of Gaddianton

We should note that there is one other instance of "because of X / because of Y" in the text, but in this case the second *because-of* prepositional phrase could be interpreted as modifying the first one (that is, the text may be explaining that the source of the Nephites' pride was their riches):

Helaman 4:12
and it was **because of** the pride of their hearts
[1|, ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
because of their exceeding riches
yea it was because of their oppression to the poor . . .

In general, we expect the *and* before the conjoined *because of* here in 3 Nephi 4:19, although the asyndetic case is also possible. Since transmission errors favor the loss of *and* by the 1830 typesetter, the critical text will maintain the *and* in this passage.

Summary: Retain the *and* at the beginning of 3 Nephi 4:19 since elsewhere the text nearly always conjoins *because-of* prepositional phrases with the conjunction *and;* in this passage it appears that the 1830 typesetter accidentally omitted the *and;* the chances are considerably greater for small words to be lost rather than added in the early transmission of the Book of Mormon text.

■ **3 Nephi 4:22**

and thus it became the desire of the people of Zemnarihah to withdraw from their design
because of the great destruction which [come 1ABC | came DEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] upon them
by night and by day

The earliest textual sources have the present-tense form *come*. The 1841 British edition and the 1858 Wright edition changed *come* to the past-tense *came*. Since both the 1830 edition and the

printer's manuscript read *come,* the original manuscript most probably read *come,* which seems to be an error. But the question is: an error for what?

One possibility is that the original text read in the past perfect, as *had come,* and that in copying down Joseph Smith's dictation Oliver Cowdery accidentally skipped the *had*. As discussed under Helaman 16:1, there are three cases in the manuscripts where Oliver omitted the perfect auxiliary *had,* once initially in 𝒪, once initially in 𝒫, and once permanently in copying from 𝒪 into 𝒫 (for these examples, see under Helaman 16:1).

A second possibility here in 3 Nephi 4:22 is that Oliver Cowdery miswrote the simple past-tense *came* as *come*. And Oliver made this error more frequently than he omitted the *had,* with one case initially in 𝒪, three cases initially in 𝒫, and six cases in 𝒫 without any correction (each of the permanent ones is marked below with an asterisk):

* 1 Nephi 11:27 (error in 𝒫; in 𝒪 the *a* in *came* could be misread as an *o*)
   I beheld the heavens open
   and the Holy Ghost [*came/come* 0 | *come* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNPQRST | *came* O]
      down out of heaven
   and abode upon him in the form of a dove

* 2 Nephi 7:2 (error in 𝒫; Isaiah 50:2 reads *came*)
   wherefore when I [*came* 0BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST | *come* >js *came* 1 | *come* A]
   there was no man

* Mosiah 11:17 (error in 𝒫)
   and the Lamanites [*come* 1 | *came* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] upon them
   and killed them and drove many of their flocks out of the land

   Mosiah 19:13 (initial error in 𝒫)
   and it [*come* > *came* 1 | *came* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] to pass that
   those that tarried with their wives and their children . . .

   Alma 35:8 (initial error in 𝒪)
   desiring them that they should cast out of their land all those
   which [*come* > *came* 0 | *came* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] over from them
      into their land

   Alma 43:5 (initial error in 𝒫)
   and it came to pass that
   the Lamanites [*came* 0ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST | *come* > *came* 1]
   with their thousands

* Helaman 11:34 (error in 𝒫)
   now this great evil
   which [*come* 1 | *came* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] unto the people . . .

* 3 Nephi 6:23 (error in 𝒫)
   that the knowledge of their death
   [*come* 1 | *came* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] not unto the governor of the land

   3 Nephi 6:25 (initial error in 𝒫)
   therefore a complaint [*come* > *came* 1 | *came* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] up
   unto the land of Zarahemla

* Moroni 7:26 (error in 𝓟)
   and after that he [*come* 1 | *came* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
   men also were saved by faith in his name

The variation in 3 Nephi 6:23 is precisely like the one here in 3 Nephi 4:22: 𝓟 has an uncorrected *come,* the 1830 edition has the correct past-tense form, *came,* and both 𝓟 and the 1830 edition are firsthand copies of 𝓞.

Early transmission errors thus support either *came* or *had come* as the original reading in this passage. For the construction found here in 3 Nephi 4:22 (namely, "because of <noun phrase> <relative clause>"), there are examples of relative clauses in the simple past tense (21 times) and in the past perfect (23 times). So in theory the simple past and the past perfect are about equally possible. But since miswriting *came* as *come* is more frequent than the loss of *had* before *come,* the odds are higher that the original reading here in 3 Nephi 4:22 was simply *came.* The critical text will therefore accept the 1841 (and 1858) emendation of *come* to *came* in this passage.

There is a third possibility that should be mentioned: namely, the original text read *had came,* which would mean that in writing down *come* in 𝓞 instead of *had came* there would have been two changes, the loss of *had* and the replacement of *came* with *come.* The change of *had came* to *come* seems less likely than the change of *had come* to *come* or the change of *came* to *come.* (In extant portions of 𝓞, there are examples of both *had come* and *had came,* eight of the first and seven of the second. For discussion of the competition between *had come* and *had came* in the original text, see under 1 Nephi 5:1, 4; also see the general discussion under PAST PAR-TICIPLE in volume 3.)

Summary: Accept *came* in 3 Nephi 4:22 as the most probable reading of the original text for what was apparently miswritten by Oliver Cowdery as *come* in the original manuscript; that is, the original text probably read "because of the great destruction which **came** upon them by night and by day".

■ **3 Nephi 4:23**

and it came to pass that Zemnarihah did give command
unto [his 1ABCDEGHKPRST | *the* FIJLMNOQ] *people*
that they should withdraw themselves from the siege

Here the 1852 LDS edition changed *his* to *the,* apparently unintentionally. The 1920 LDS edition restored the original *his.* For another example where *his people* was replaced by *the people* (but in the 1840 edition), see under Alma 51:29. Here in 3 Nephi 4:23, the critical text will maintain *his people,* the reading of 𝓟 and the 1830 edition.

Summary: Maintain the determiner *his* in 3 Nephi 4:23: "Zemnarihah did give command unto **his** people".

■ **3 Nephi 4:23**

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

The printer's manuscript (which has the infinitive marker *to*) conjoins an infinitival noun clause ("to march into the farthermost parts of the land northward") to a preceding nominal *that*-clause ("that they should withdraw themselves from the siege"). On the other hand, the 1830 edition (which lacks the *to*) conjoins two verb phrases ("they should withdraw themselves from the siege and march into the farthermost parts of the land northward"). From a prescriptive point of view, the 1830 reading is preferred since it conjoins the same kind of structure.

But actually the Book of Mormon text has a good number of passages where an infinitival noun clause is combined with a completely different kind of structure, including one just like 3 Nephi 4:23 (and marked below with an asterisk):

> 1 Nephi 22:23 (noun phrase + noun phrase + infinitival clause)
>> and they which seek the lusts of the flesh and the things of the world
>> and **to do** all manner of iniquity . . .

> * Alma 8:25 (*that*-clause + infinitival clause)
>> but behold I have been commanded
>> that I should turn again and prophesy unto this people
>> yea and **to testify** against them concerning their iniquities

> Alma 37:9 (prepositional *to* + infinitival *to*)
>> they brought them to the knowledge of the Lord their God
>> and **to rejoice** in Jesus Christ their Redeemer

> Helaman 10:4 (noun phrase + infinitival clause)
>> and thou hast not feared them and hast not sought thine own life
>> but hath sought my will
>> and **to keep** my commandments

> Helaman 15:7 (prepositional *to* + infinitival *to*)
>> that as many of them as are brought to the knowledge of the truth
>> and **to know** of the wicked and abominable traditions of their fathers

The example in Alma 8:25 is structurally like 3 Nephi 4:23, and both deal with being commanded:

Alma 8:25	*3 Nephi 4:23*
I have been **command**ed	Zemnarihah did give **command** . . .
that I should turn again and prophesy . . .	**that** they should withdraw themselves . . .
yea **and to** testify against them	**and to** march into the farthermost parts

In the transmission of the Book of Mormon text, the chances were almost always greater for a word to be accidentally deleted than added. For instance, when we consider cases of conjoined infinitival clauses, there are ten instances in the history of the text where the infinitival *to* was omitted (including three initially by Oliver Cowdery). It should be noted that in all these cases the infinitival clause is conjoined to a preceding infinitival clause rather than to a different type of structure:

Jacob 7:2 (loss in the 1892 RLDS edition)
>> he began to preach among the people
>> and [*to* 01ABCDEFGHIJLMNOPQRST | K] declare unto them
>> that there should be no Christ

Alma 12:4 (loss in the 1840 edition)
>> that thou mightest set them against us
>> to revile us and [*to* 1ABDEFIJLMNOPQRST | CGHK] cast us out

Alma 16:2 (loss in the 1837 edition)
>> for behold the armies of the Lamanites had come in on the wilderness side
>> into the borders of the land even into the city of Ammonihah
>> and began to slay the people
>> and [*to* 1APS | BCDEFGHIJKLMNOQRT] destroy the city

Alma 52:13 (initial loss in 𝒫)
>> and thus he was endeavoring to harass the Nephites
>> and [*to* 0ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST | NULL > *to* 1] draw away
>> a part of their forces to that part of the land

Alma 62:45 (initial loss in 𝒫)
>> which did cause them to repent of their sins
>> and [*to* 0ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST | NULL >+ *to* 1] be baptized
>>> unto the Lord their God

Alma 62:48 (initial loss in 𝒫)
>> and the people of Nephi began to prosper again in the land
>> and began to multiply
>> and [*to* 0ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST | NULL > *to* 1] wax exceeding strong again
>>> in the land

Helaman 7:5 (loss in the 1830 edition)
>> and moreover to be held in office at the head of government
>> to rule and [*to* 1 | ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] do according to their wills

3 Nephi 1:14 (loss in the 1837 edition)
>> behold I come unto my own to fulfill all things which I have made known
>>> unto the children of men from the foundation of the world
>> and [*to* 1APRST | BCDEFGHIJKLMNOQ] do the will
>>> both of the Father and of the Son

3 Nephi 6:4 (loss in the 1892 RLDS edition)
>> and they began again to prosper
>> and [*to* 1ABCDEFGHIJLMNOPQRST | K] wax great

Ether 6:18 (loss in the 1840 edition)
>> they began to spread upon the face of the land
>> and [*to* 1ABDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST | C] multiply
>> and to till the earth

And for one of these cases, the 1830 edition is responsible for the loss of the *to* (in Helaman 7:5).
On the other hand, there is not one example in the history of the text where the infinitival *to* has

been added to a conjoined infinitival clause. Thus here in 3 Nephi 4:23, the odds are high that the *to* was lost when the 1830 edition was set, not added by Oliver Cowdery when he copied from 𝓞 into 𝓟. The critical text will therefore restore the *to* in this passage.

Summary: Restore the infinitival *to* in 3 Nephi 4:23 ("and **to** march into the farthermost parts of the land northward") since the odds of accidentally dropping the *to* for a conjoined infinitival clause are much greater than accidentally adding the *to;* in addition, the text allows for different types of structures to be conjoined with an infinitival clause.

■ **3 Nephi 4:23**

that they should withdraw themselves from the siege and to march into the [*farthar most* 1 | *farthermost* A | *furthermost* BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *parts of the land northward*

As discussed under Mosiah 19:23, the critical text allows for either *farther* or *further* in referring to distance. Here in 3 Nephi 4:23, both 𝓟 and the 1830 edition read *farthermost* (spelled *farthar most* in 𝓟). 𝓞 probably read with an *a* (as *farthermost* or some variant spelling). Here in 3 Nephi 4:23, the 1837 edition replaced *farthermost* with *furthermost.* The critical text will restore the earliest extant reading, *farthermost.*

Summary: Restore *farthermost* in 3 Nephi 4:23, the reading of the earliest extant sources (𝓟 and the 1830 edition).

■ **3 Nephi 4:24**

therefore he did send out **his** *armies in the nighttime and did cut off the way of* **their** *retreat and did place* [*their >+ his* 1 | *his* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *armies in the way of* **their** *retreat*

As discussed nearby under 3 Nephi 2:12, Oliver Cowdery sometimes wrote *their* in place of a different determiner in the environment of *their.* Here in 3 Nephi 4:24, Oliver initially wrote *their armies* in the printer's manuscript because of the *their* in the preceding and the following "the way of **their** retreat". Oliver later caught his error, crossing out the *their* and supralinearly writing the correct *his;* the correction may have occurred when Oliver proofed 𝓟 against 𝓞 (the correction is written with somewhat heavier ink flow). The *his* occurs in the 1830 edition, which is also a firsthand copy of 𝓞 for this part of the text, so 𝓞 must have read *his armies.* And earlier in the verse we have an instance of the correct *his armies* ("he did send out his armies in the nighttime").

Summary: Maintain in 3 Nephi 4:24 the determiner *his* for *armies,* the 1830 reading and the corrected reading in 𝓟.

■ **3 Nephi 4:25**

and this did they do in the nighttime
and [*gat/got* 1 | *got* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *on their march beyond the robbers*

It is difficult to tell if the printer's manuscript reads *gat* or *got*. Occasionally, Oliver Cowdery's *o*'s looks like *a*'s and vice versa. Here the 1830 compositor set *got*. The simple past-tense form *gat* (for *got*) is now archaic, but it is found in the King James Bible (along with *got*). As discussed under Alma 10:32, there is indeed evidence for *gat* in the original text of the Book of Mormon. Although the 1830 compositor set the word as *got* here in 3 Nephi 4:25, this does not mean that 𝒪 read *got* since the compositor regularly replaced *gat* and *forgat* with *got* and *forgot* when he set the text for the 1830 edition (see the examples listed under Alma 10:32). Since here in 3 Nephi 4:25 the printer's manuscript appears to read *gat* (just as 𝒪 appears to read *gat* in Alma 10:32), the critical text will accept *gat*. For a similar instance of *a* versus *o* in past-tense forms, see the discussion regarding *drave* and *drove* under Alma 2:33.

Summary: Restore in 3 Nephi 4:25 the archaic past-tense *gat,* the apparent reading in 𝒫; although the 1830 edition reads *got,* the 1830 compositor regularly replaced *gat* and *forgat* with their standard forms, *got* and *forgot.*

■ **3 Nephi 4:28–29**

and when they had hanged him until he was dead
(1) *they did* [*fall* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQ | *fell* RST] *the tree to the earth*
and did cry with a loud voice saying:
may the Lord preserve his people in righteousness and in holiness of heart
(2) *that they may cause to be* [*fell* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNP | *felled* OQRST] *to the earth*
all who shall seek to slay them because of power and secret combinations
(3) *even as this man hath been* [*fell* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNP | *felled* OQRST] *to the earth*

In 3 Nephi 4:28–29, the original text had three examples of the causative verb *fall* (with the meaning 'to cause to fall'), all of which have now been edited in the LDS text to the overtly causative verb *fell*. The two passive uses in verse 29 ("to be **fell** to the earth" and "this man hath been **fell** to the earth") were first changed from *fell* to *felled* in the 1907 LDS vest-pocket edition and then later in the 1911 LDS edition (perhaps independently). The active use in verse 28 of the causative verb *fall* ("they did **fall** the tree to the earth") was changed to *fell* in the 1920 LDS edition. In the RLDS text, all three forms of *fall* were changed to their appropriate *fell* forms in the 1953 RLDS edition.

The Oxford English Dictionary lists under definition 51c for the verb *fall* the causative meaning 'to cut down (trees)', with citations from Middle English on. The OED states that this particular transitive use of *fall* is now restricted to dialectal speech in the United States, Australia, and New Zealand; here are two examples from Early Modern English (with accidentals regularized):

John Fitzherbert (1523)
to fall the underwood

Colonial Records of Pennsylvania (1685)
a penalty to be laid upon such as cut or fall marked . . . trees

Thus the use of *fall* instead of the standard *fell* is textually acceptable here in 3 Nephi 4:28–29 and will be restored in the critical text.

There is one additional case of *fell* in the text where one could interpret the meaning as the causative 'felled' rather than the intransitive 'fell':

> 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

Nonetheless, the text of the Book of Mormon otherwise refers to people falling in combat (as in 16 other examples where the text refers to falling by a sword or by some other means), but never to "being felled" (or "being fell") in combat. In other words, in this context the intransitive *fall* is expected, not the transitive *fall*. And as explained under Enos 1:23, the use of the past-tense *fell* in Alma 43:38 is perfectly acceptable; such usage is generally found in the construction "there was (not) something <past-tense verb form>". The verb *fell* in "there was now and then a man **fell** among the Nephites" undoubtedly represents the past-tense form of the intransitive verb *fall* rather than the past-tense form of the causative *fall*.

Summary: Restore in 3 Nephi 4:28–29 the three original instances of the causative verb *fall* with the meaning 'to fell' (that is, 'to cause to fall'); such usage can be found in earlier English and in dialectal usage.

■ **3 Nephi 4:33**

and their hearts were swollen with joy
unto the [*yielding* >+ *gushing* 1 | *gushing* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
[*up* > *out* 1 | *out* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *of many tears*

Apparently Oliver Cowdery did not expect the expression *gushing out* here, and so he initially wrote *yielding up* in 𝓟. After referring to the hearts of the people as being "swollen with joy", perhaps Oliver expected a reference to the joy resulting from the people yielding themselves to God in humility, as in the following passage:

> Helaman 3:34–35
>> now this was a great evil
>> which did cause the more humble part of the people to suffer great persecutions
>> and to wade through much affliction
>> nevertheless they did fast and pray oft
>> and did wax stronger in their humility
>> and firmer and firmer in the faith of Christ
>> unto the filling their souls **with joy** and consolation
>> yea even to the purifying and the sanctification of their hearts
>> which sanctification cometh because of **their yielding their hearts** unto God

(I wish to thank Don Brugger for this reference.) Of course, it is very doubtful that this specific passage led to the momentary error here in 3 Nephi 4:33. More likely, four instances of "to yield up" earlier in 3 Nephi 3–4 prompted the initial error here in 𝓟:

3 Nephi 3:6	that ye would **yield up** unto this my people your cities . . .
3 Nephi 3:7	**yield** yourselves **up** unto us
3 Nephi 4:16	that they could cause them to **yield** themselves **up** according to their wishes
3 Nephi 4:27	and there were many thousands which did **yield** themselves **up** prisoners unto the Nephites

In any event, Oliver caught his error here in 3 Nephi 4:33, correcting the *up* to *out* almost immediately and then somewhat later correcting *yielding* to *gushing* (the level of ink flow for the *out* is unchanged, but the ink flow for *gushing* is somewhat heavier). Since the 1830 edition also has *gushing out,* this must represent the reading of the original manuscript.

Except for an Isaiah quote in 1 Nephi 20:21 ("and the waters gushed out"), there is no other use of the verb *gush* in the Book of Mormon text. But interestingly, there is a passage in Jeremiah with phraseology much like 3 Nephi 4:33:

> Jeremiah 9:18 (King James Bible)
>> and let them make haste
>> and take up a wailing for us
>> that our eyes may run down with tears
>> and our eyelids **gush out** with waters

Summary: Despite the unusual use of *gush* in 3 Nephi 4:33, the original text undoubtedly read this way; the critical text will maintain *gushing out,* the 1830 reading and the corrected reading in 𝒫.

3 Nephi 5

■ **3 Nephi 5:1**

and now behold there was not a living soul among all the people of the Nephites
which did doubt in the least [*thing* >js NULL 1|*thing* A| BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
[*in* >js NULL 1|*in* A| BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *the words of all the holy prophets*

For the 1837 edition, Joseph Smith made two editorial changes here in 3 Nephi 5:1. He deleted the word *thing,* reducing "in the least thing" to the more normal English expression "in the least"; he also deleted the word *in* that immediately precedes *the words.* Since both 𝒫 (prior to Joseph's editing) and the 1830 edition read "which did doubt in the least **thing in** the words of all the holy prophets", 𝒪 probably read this way as well (for this part of the text, both 𝒫 and the 1830 edition are firsthand copies of 𝒪).

Although "in the least" (with no noun following) is common enough in modern English, the original Book of Mormon text has only one example of it:

> Helaman 7:4
>> having usurped the power and authority of the land
>> laying aside the commandments of God
>> and not **in the least** aright before him
>> doing no justice unto the children of men

The King James Bible also has a single example: "and he that is unjust **in the least** is unjust also in much" (Luke 16:10). In both of these cases, "in the least" is semantically equivalent to "in the least thing".

Yet there is one other case in the Book of Mormon where "in the least" precedes a noun:

> Alma 42:30
>> do not endeavor to excuse yourself
>> **in the least point** because of your sins

In this example Joseph Smith did not edit out the word *point,* although he could have without making any difference in meaning.

Another example of this usage with a noun can be found in a revelation given through Joseph Smith to Martin Harris in March 1830 (about a year after the time that Joseph had been translating the Book of Mormon):

> Book of Commandments 16:21
>> wherefore I command you again by my almighty power
>> that you confess your sins
>> lest you suffer these punishments of which I have spoken
>> of which in the smallest—yea even **in the least degree**—
>> you have tasted at the time I withdrew my Spirit

(A revised version is found in Doctrine and Covenants 19:20 but still with the phrase "in the least degree".) Thus there is nothing wrong with the more specific expression "in the least <noun>". In his editing of 3 Nephi 5:1, Joseph wanted to simplify the entire construction, thus he deleted the *thing* as well as the *in*. Perhaps he deleted *thing* because it seemed too general or perhaps because he wanted to avoid two nouns phrases in a row ("the least thing the words").

The case for restoring the preposition *in* after the phrase "in the least thing" is more problematic. Normally, in modern English the verb *doubt* takes a direct object as its complement, not a prepositional phrase, but the Oxford English Dictionary cites examples in earlier English where the verb *doubt* took a prepositional phrase as its complement. The OED records two early examples where the preposition was *in,* one in Middle English and the other in Early Modern English (original spellings retained here):

> *Cursor Mundi* (about 1300)
> lange he dutid in þe richte
> 'long he doubted **in** the right'

> John Bourchier (1523)
> there was none that ought to dout **in** hym

In modern English, when we have a noun *doubt,* the occurrence of a following *in* is perfectly acceptable. For example, we can have a sentence like "he expressed no doubt **in** his brother's word". But when we use *doubt* as a verb, the use of *in* is unexpected if not unacceptable. For instance, "he doubted **in** his brother's word" seems strange compared to the normal "he doubted his brother's word". Still, the use of the *in* with the verb *doubt* is understandable since *in* can follow the noun *doubt*. Quite possibly, the earliest text's use of *in* as part of the complement for the verb *doubt* was allowed because of the intervening phrase "in the least thing". Of course, one could argue, contrariwise, that this *in* was an error prompted by the *in* at the head of the phrase "**in** the least thing". The critical text will restore the *in* since its occurrence here isn't that objectionable and it may have been fully intended in the original text, especially given its use in Early Modern English.

Summary: Restore in 3 Nephi 5:1 the noun *thing* as well as the following preposition *in;* Early Modern English permitted the expression "to doubt **in** something", so its occurrence in this passage may have been fully intended.

■ **3 Nephi 5:1**

the words of all the holy prophets
[*which* 1A | *who* BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
had [*been* 1 | ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *spoken*

The printer's manuscript reads "which had been spoken", where the relative pronoun *which* refers to *the words*. The 1830 edition reads "which had spoken". In the latter case, the original relative pronoun *which* would refer to *all the holy prophets*. This reading led to the grammatical editing of *which* to *who* for the 1837 edition.

The original manuscript most probably read like the printer's manuscript—that is, with the passive relative clause, which would mean that the 1830 edition accidentally dropped the word *been*.

As has been noted throughout this section of the text, in general the chances are much greater in the early transmission of the text for a small word to be lost rather than added (this finding is fully discussed in volume 3). Although there are no other examples of either adding or omitting *been,* there are instances where other forms of the auxiliary verb *be* were lost from the early text (but there are no instances where forms of the auxiliary verb *be* were ever added to the early text):

> Mosiah 27:16 (loss of *be* by scribe 2 of 𝓟)
>> that their prayers may [1 | *be* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] answered

> Alma 4:18 (loss of *being* by scribe 2 of 𝓟, supplied by Oliver Cowdery)
>> now Alma did not grant unto him the office
>> of [𝓢2 NULL > 𝓢1 *being* 1 | *being* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] high priest
>> over the church

> Alma 5:62 (loss of *be* by scribe 2 of 𝓟, supplied by Oliver Cowdery)
>> come and [𝓢2 NULL >+ 𝓢1 *be* 1 | *be* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] baptized
>> unto repentance

> Moroni 7:42 (initial loss of *be* by Oliver Cowdery in 𝓟)
>> for without faith
>> there cannot [NULL >+ *be* 1 | *be* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] any hope

In the early editions, there are two instances where *be* was omitted. In the first case, it is difficult to tell whether the omission was accidental or intentional; in the second case, the omission appears to be intentional:

> Helaman 14:5 (omission of *be* by the 1830 typesetter)
>> and behold there shall [*be* 1CGHKPS | ABDEFIJLMNOQRT] a new star arise

> Ether 2:11 (omission of *be* in the 1837 edition)
>> until the fullness [*be* 1A | BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] come

In contrast to these early changes, there are two instances in 20th-century editions where *be* was added:

> Alma 46:13 (addition of *be* in the 1953 RLDS edition)
>> so long as there should [01ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRT | *be* S]
>> a band of Christians remain to possess the land

> Ether 6:5 (addition of *be* in the 1905 LDS edition)
>> the Lord God caused that there should [1ABCDEFGHIJKLNOPS | *be* MQRT]
>> a furious wind blow upon the face of the waters towards the promised land

In both of these cases, the addition of the *be* appears to be a conscious emendation to the text (probably as an attempt to lessen the complexity of the expression "there should <noun phrase> <bare infinitive verb phrase>").

Internal evidence in the text also supports the conclusion that *been* was original to 3 Nephi 5:1. Elsewhere the Book of Mormon text never uses a relative clause to state that prophets have spoken; there are only examples of the relative clause stating that the words of prophets have been spoken:

1 Nephi 3:20	the words which have **been** spoken by the mouth of all the holy prophets
3 Nephi 29:2	the words of the Lord which have **been** spoken by the holy prophets
Ether 15:3	the words which had **been** spoken by the mouth of all the prophets

We note from the second example that *the words* does not have to immediately precede the relative pronoun ("the words of the Lord which have been spoken"). Thus the original *which* in 3 Nephi 5:1 can refer to *the words* rather than to the immediately preceding *all the holy prophets*.

We could extend this list of passive examples to include other relative clauses where the antecedent is not *word(s)*, but the *which* still refers to what has been spoken by the prophets:

Mosiah 2:34	the prophecies which hath **been** spoken by the holy prophets
Mosiah 18:19	the things . . . which had **been** spoken by the mouth of the holy prophets
Alma 18:36	the records and the holy scriptures of the people which had **been** spoken by the prophets
Alma 30:6	the prophecies which had **been** spoken by the prophets
Alma 40:22	those things of which have **been** spoken by the mouths of the prophets
Alma 40:24	the restoration of which has **been** spoken by the mouths of the prophets
Helaman 15:11	the time . . . which hath **been** spoken of by our fathers and also by the prophet Zenos and many other prophets
3 Nephi 1:13	all that which I have caused to **be** spoken by the mouth of my holy prophets
3 Nephi 2:7	the sign . . . which **was** spoken of by the prophets
3 Nephi 10:11	the scriptures . . . which had **been** spoken by the prophets
Moroni 8:29	the prophecies which **was** spoken by the prophets

Thus both internal and external evidence support the reading in 𝓟 for 3 Nephi 5:1, namely, the passive usage in "the words of all the holy prophets which had **been** spoken" rather than the active voice in the 1830 edition ("the words of all the holy prophets which had spoken").

Summary: Restore in 3 Nephi 5:1 the reading of the printer's manuscript, with the passive auxiliary *been* and the relative pronoun *which:* "the words of all the holy prophets **which** had **been** spoken"; usage elsewhere in the text supports the passive in relative clauses that refer to what prophets have spoken; the original *which* must be restored since the relative clause refers to words, not to prophets; the odds that the 1830 typesetter omitted the *been* are much greater than the possibility that Oliver Cowdery added it when he copied from 𝓞 into 𝓟.

■ **3 Nephi 5:2**

and because of the things which had come to pass already
they knew [1A | *that* BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *it must needs be*
that all things should come to pass according to that which had been spoken

As discussed under Enos 1:17, the *that* is optional for the phrase "knew (that) it . . .", with most cases having the *that*, but two lacking it: nearby in 3 Nephi 4:33 ("and they knew it was because

of their repentance and their humility") and here originally in 3 Nephi 5:2 where both 𝒫 and the 1830 edition lack the *that* (which means that 𝒪 probably did too). In this case, the *that* was added in the 1837 edition, perhaps unintentionally (Joseph Smith did not insert it in his editing of 𝒫 for that edition). The source for adding the *that* was probably the two preceding instances of "they knew **that** it must (needs) be" at the beginning of this chapter:

> 3 Nephi 5:1–2
>> for they knew **that** it must needs be that they must be fulfilled
>> and they knew **that** it must be expedient that Christ had come

The critical text will restore the earliest reading without the *that* for the third instance here in 3 Nephi 5. For more examples of this kind of variation, see the general discussion under THAT in volume 3.

Summary: Restore the earliest text near the end of 3 Nephi 5:2 where *that* is lacking after the past-tense verb form *knew:* "they **knew** it must needs be that all things should come to pass"; although for most cases in the Book of Mormon of "knew (that) it . . ." the *that* is present, there are a couple of cases where it is lacking.

■ **3 Nephi 5:3**

therefore they did forsake all **their** *sins*
and [*their* 1ABCDEFGIJLMNOPQRST| HK] *abominations*
and **their** *whoredoms*

Here the 1874 RLDS edition omitted one of the repeated *their*'s; the 1908 RLDS edition restored it. Such repetition of the determiner is characteristic of the Book of Mormon text, as in these examples of multiple conjunction:

> Mosiah 11:20
>> for I have seen **their** abominations and **their** wickedness and **their** whoredoms

> Alma 37:29
>> and only **their** wickedness and **their** murders and **their** abominations
>> shall ye make known unto them

> Alma 50:21
>> yea **their** murderings and **their** plunderings and **their** idolatry
>> and **their** whoredoms and **their** abominations which were among themselves
>> which brought upon them their wars and their destructions

For a general discussion of this usage, see under CONJUNCTIVE REPETITION in volume 3.

Summary: Maintain the repeated *their*'s in 3 Nephi 5:3 ("all their sins and **their** abominations and **their** whoredoms"); such usage is characteristic of the Book of Mormon text.

■ **3 Nephi 5:5**

but as many as there were who did not enter into a covenant
and who did still continue to have
[*their >+ those* 1 | *those* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *secret murders in* **their** *hearts*

> Here the original manuscript undoubtedly read "**those** secret murders", the 1830 reading and the
> corrected reading in 𝔓. Oliver Cowdery initially wrote "**their** secret murders" in 𝔓, undoubtedly
> in anticipation of the following *their* ("in their hearts"). For further discussion of this tendency
> on Oliver's part, see under 3 Nephi 2:12 (where *the* was replaced by *their*) and under 3 Nephi 4:24
> (where *his* was replaced by *their*).

> *Summary:* Maintain the determiner *those* before *secret murders* in 3 Nephi 5:5, the reading of the
> earliest textual sources.

■ **3 Nephi 5:6**

and thus they did put an end to all those wicked and secret and abominable combinations
in the which there [*were* 1A | *was* BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *so much wickedness*
and so many murders committed

> Here both 𝔓 and the 1830 edition had the plural *were* in the relative clause. Grammatically, the
> plural is correct since the delayed subject is semantically plural ("there were so much wickedness
> and so many murders committed"). In the 1837 edition, the *were* was changed to *was,* perhaps
> unintentionally since the change was not marked by Joseph Smith in 𝔓. The singular *was* was most
> likely the result of considering as the subject only the immediately following singular noun phrase,
> "so much wickedness". The original text allowed for both *was* and *were* with plural subjects; for
> discussion of this, see under 1 Nephi 4:4 (as well as more generally under SUBJECT-VERB AGREE-
> MENT in volume 3).

> *Summary:* Restore in 3 Nephi 5:6 the original plural *were* ("in the which there **were** so much wicked-
> ness and so many murders committed"); in this case, the plural form is grammatically correct.

■ **3 Nephi 5:8**

and there had many things transpired which in the eyes of some would be great and marvelous
(1) *nevertheless they* [*could not* 1 | *cannot* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOQRT | *can not* PS] *all be written*
in this book
(2) *yea this book* [*cannot* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOQRT | *can not* PS] *contain*
even a hundredth part of what was done
among so many people in the space of twenty and five years

> Here the printer's manuscript reads *could not* in the first case, then *cannot* in the second case,
> whereas the 1830 edition has *cannot* in both cases. The use of the *yea*-clause supports the parallel
> use of *cannot* in both clauses, but of course one could argue that in the 1830 edition an original
> *could not* was replaced with *cannot* precisely because of the following *cannot.*

Elsewhere in the text, given the passive *be written,* we have 13 examples with the modal *can,* but none with the modal *could;* all of these also occur in negative statements (like the two examples here in 3 Nephi 5:8):

1 Nephi 6:3	for they **cannot be written** upon these plates
1 Nephi 9:1	and also a great many more things which **cannot be written** upon these plates
Jacob 3:13	and a hundredth part of the proceedings of this people . . . **cannot be written** upon these plates
Alma 8:1	after having taught the people of Gideon many things which **cannot be written**
Helaman 8:3	yea many things did Nephi speak which **cannot be written**
Helaman 14:1	Samuel the Lamanite did prophesy a great many more things which **cannot be written**
3 Nephi 7:17	and all of them **cannot be written**
3 Nephi 17:15	and the things which he prayed **cannot be written**
3 Nephi 17:17	and no tongue cannot speak neither **can** there **be written** by any man . . .
3 Nephi 19:32	and tongue cannot speak the words which he prayed neither **can be written** by man the words which he prayed
3 Nephi 19:34	so great and marvelous were the words which he prayed that they **cannot be written**
3 Nephi 26:6	and now there **cannot be written** in this book even an hundredth part of the things . . .
Moroni 9:19	yea tongue cannot tell neither **can** it **be written**

In other words, the Book of Mormon text never has a past-tense or conditional *could* in describing what cannot be written, even though that is what modern English readers expect here in this past-tense narrative in 3 Nephi 5. Note that the preceding text reads in the past tense, with *had* and the historical past-tense modal *would:* "and there **had** many things transpired which in the eyes of some **would** be great and marvelous". Thus it seems probable that Oliver Cowdery, the scribe in 𝓟, was prompted to write *could not* rather than *cannot* in the immediately following clause. There is also evidence elsewhere in the text for this kind of mistake on Oliver's part, as in the following case where he introduced a secondary *could* as he copied from 𝓞 into 𝓟:

> 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

Note once more that the replacement of *can* with *could* took place in the environment of a past-tense verb form ("as **was** my pains"). There is one other case where Oliver wrote *could;* in this instance, he started to write a clause as an indirect quote in the past tense (with *could*) rather than as a direct quote in the present tense (with *can*):

Helaman 16:6

> therefore when they saw that they could not hit him
> with their stones and their arrows
> they cried out unto their captains saying :
> take this fellow and bind him
> for behold he hath a devil
> and because of the power of the devil which is in him
> [*they could* > *we can not* 0 | *we cannot* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOQRT | *we can not* PS]
> hit him with our stones and our arrows
> therefore take him and bind him and away with him

Summary: In 3 Nephi 5:8 the first *cannot,* the 1830 reading (and the reading of all subsequent editions), is probably the correct reading ("they **cannot** all be written in this book"); the *could not* of the printer's manuscript apparently represents a copy error that resulted from the preceding past-tense usage in the verse ("and there **had** many things transpired which in the eyes of some **would** be great and marvelous"); elsewhere the text consistently uses the modal *can* to refer to what cannot be written.

■ **3 Nephi 5:9**

but behold there are records which do contain all the proceedings of this people
and a [*more short* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQS | *shorter* RT] *but a true account was given by Nephi*

As discussed under Alma 43:24, the original text sometimes used the periphrastic comparative "more <adjective>" in cases where we expect the inflectional ending *-er.* Here in 3 Nephi 5:9, the original text reads "a more short but a true account". The 1920 LDS edition changed *more short* to the standard *shorter.* The critical text will restore the earlier *more short.* Besides the examples of this usage listed under Alma 43:24, here is another example:

> 3 Nephi 8:11–12
>
> and there was a great and terrible destruction in the land southward
> but behold there was a **more great** and terrible destruction in the land northward

Here the comparative *more* includes both *great* and *terrible;* to express the same in standard English, we would be required to change *great* to *greater* and to add *more* before *terrible:* "there was a greater and more terrible destruction". This emendation has been avoided, with the result that "a more great and terrible destruction" remains in 3 Nephi 8:12.

One further example of an unexpected periphrastic comparative in the text is *more angry* (which is found in Alma 10:24, Alma 25:1, and Alma 55:1). In contrast, there are no instances of *angrier* or *angriest* in the Book of Mormon, although Merriam-Webster's Collegiate Dictionary lists these inflectional forms as the standard. On the other hand, it should be pointed out that there are examples of the standard comparative for some adjectives in the original text, such as *stronger* (with six instances) but none of *more strong.* Yet for the superlative form, there are three instances of *strongest* but one of *most strong* in the original text (see the discussion under Alma 49:20).

Summary: Restore in 3 Nephi 5:9 the original periphrastic comparative *more short,* the reading of the earliest textual sources; there is considerable evidence for such usage with other adjectives in the original text, although there are also examples of the regular inflectional ending *-er.*

■ **3 Nephi 5:9**

but behold there are records which do contain all the proceedings of this people
and a more short but [a 1ABCDEFGIJLMNOPQS | HKRT] *true account was given by Nephi*

Here the 1874 RLDS edition omitted the repeated *a* before the conjoined adjective *true*. And later, the 1920 LDS edition independently omitted the repeated *a* (there the omission was definitely intended since it was marked in the 1920 committee copy). As noted in the previous discussion, for that edition the original *more short* was changed to *shorter*. So what we have here in the 1920 edition is a change from "a more short but a true account" to "a shorter but true account". David Calabro points out (personal communication) that a change to "a more short but true account" (that is, the removal of the repeated *a* while maintaining the original *more short*) would have led to a possible misreading regarding the scope of *more,* as if the phrase meant 'a shorter but truer account'.

Elsewhere in the text, there are similar conjunctive constructions for which the repeated *a* has been removed from the text, as in these cases where the first conjunct is a periphrastic comparative with *more:*

Alma 20:30 (loss in the 1902 LDS edition)
it was their lot to have fallen into the hands of a more hardened
and [*a* 1ABCDEFGHIJKMNOPQRST | L] more stiff-necked people

Alma 43:6 (loss in the 1841 British edition and in the 1874 RLDS edition)
and now as the Amlicites were of a more wicked
and [*a* 01ABCG | DEFHIJKLMNOPQRST] murderous disposition
than the Lamanites were . . .

In general, the loss of the repeated indefinite article *a* has occurred fairly frequently in the transmission of the Book of Mormon text (for a list of examples, see under CONJUNCTIVE REPETITION in volume 3). For each case, as here in 3 Nephi 5:9, the critical text will restore the original repeated *a*.

Summary: Restore the original repeated *a* in 3 Nephi 5:9, "a more short but **a** true account".

■ **3 Nephi 5:10**

therefore I have made my record of these things
according to the record of Nephi
which [were >js was 1 | *were* A | *was* BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *engraven on the plates*
which **were** *called the plates of Nephi*

Here in the earliest text, we have two relative clauses where the verb form is the plural *were*. Joseph Smith emended the first of these to *was* in his editing for the 1837 edition; it appears that he interpreted the first relative pronoun *which* as referring to the immediately preceding "the record of Nephi". But it is also possible that this *which* refers to the earlier "these things", which is plural, thus supporting the use of *were* in the first relative clause ("these things . . . which were engraven on the plates"). In fact, there are five other passages in the text that clearly refer to "things" being engraven on plates:

1 Nephi 19:22	I did read **many things** to them which were engraven upon the plates of brass
1 Nephi 22:1	after that I had read **these things** which were engraven upon the plates of brass . . .
2 Nephi 5:30	and thou shalt engraven **many things** upon them
2 Nephi 5:31	I Nephi . . . went and made these plates upon which I have engraven **these things**
Jacob 1:1	Nephi gave me Jacob a commandment concerning these small plates upon which **these things** are engraven

It is even possible that the *were* here still refers to "the record of Nephi" since plural references to a singular *record* can be found elsewhere in the text (for some examples and discussion, see under 1 Nephi 5:21).

A couple of other emendations suggest themselves here in 3 Nephi 5:10: (1) the original text may have read *which was* for the first relative clause; but under the influence of the second *which were,* Oliver Cowdery accidentally wrote down *which were* in the first instance; (2) the original text may have read "the **records** of Nephi" but was accidentally changed to "the **record** of Nephi" under the influence of the preceding "my **record** of these things". But since the earliest extant reading (the reading in 𝓟 and the 1830 reading) works here in 3 Nephi 5:10, the critical text will restore the original *were* in the first relative clause.

It should be noted here in 3 Nephi 5:10 that the record Mormon is making on his own plates is being taken from the large plates of Nephi ("the plates which were called the plates of Nephi"). This Nephi is the original Nephi, the son of Lehi, who made the plates (as described in 1 Nephi 9:1–4). On the other hand, Mormon's account here in 3 Nephi 5:10 is based on "the record of Nephi" (that is, the record of the Nephi in 3 Nephi). In other words, the two Nephi's mentioned in this passage are not the same person.

Summary: Restore the original *were* in the first relative clause in 3 Nephi 5:10: "I have made my record of these things according to the record of Nephi which **were** engraven on the plates which were called the plates of Nephi"; the phrase "according to the record of Nephi" intervenes between "these things" and the first relative clause ("which were engraven on the plates"), thus making it appear that the relative pronoun *which* refers to "the record of Nephi".

■ **3 Nephi 5:11**

and behold I do make [*the >+ this* 1 | *the* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOQRT | *this* PS] *record on plates which I have made with mine own hands*

The previous verse refers to Mormon making his record ("I have made my record of these things according to **the** record of Nephi"), so it is possible that here in 3 Nephi 5:11 the original text read *the record.* The 1830 edition has *the,* and Oliver Cowdery initially wrote *the* in the printer's manuscript. Later, with distinctly heavier ink flow, he corrected the *the* to *this* by overwriting the *e* with *is*. The 1908 RLDS edition followed the corrected reading in 𝓟, but the LDS text has continued with the 1830 reading.

One possibility is that 𝓞 had *the record* but that this was an error for *this record*. In that case, the change from an original *this* to *the* would have occurred during the dictation of the text. As already noted, the preceding verse with its phrase "according to **the** record of Nephi" could have prompted the change in verse 11 to "I do make **the** record". Moreover, there is considerable evidence that Oliver Cowdery could have made a mistake like this in 𝓞 (namely, writing down *the* instead of *this*). Under Helaman 14:20, I list seven clear cases where Oliver mistakenly wrote *the* instead of *this* in the manuscripts. In almost all cases, the error was corrected; but in one case (in 2 Nephi 1:8), Oliver permanently replaced the *this* with *the* as he copied the text from 𝓞 into 𝓟.

Of course, these errors on Oliver Cowdery's part show that he could have changed an original *this* in 𝓞 to *the* in 𝓟. Similarly, there is evidence that the 1830 typesetter could have replaced an original *this* with *the;* there is one clear example, in Mosiah 1:10, where he made such an error. (For an example where he seems to have intentionally changed a *this* to *the,* see under 2 Nephi 10:23; also see the discussion regarding *this* versus *the* under 3 Nephi 5:12.) So there is some possibility that both the 1830 typesetter and Oliver could have misread an original *this* in 𝓞 as *the*. Again one could argue that the preceding phrase in verse 10, "according to **the** record of Nephi", led to the error in verse 11. Under this interpretation of the variation, Oliver later caught his error when he proofed 𝓟 against 𝓞 (thus explaining the heavier ink flow for the correction in 𝓟), but the corresponding error in the 1830 text was never caught during proofing. Yet the odds of both Oliver and the 1830 typesetter making the same mistake seems somewhat unlikely, especially since comparatively speaking there is only minor evidence for the 1830 typesetter accidentally changing *this* to *the*.

Another possibility is that the change of *the* to *this* by Oliver Cowdery in 𝓟 was the result of conscious editing on his part. The correction in 𝓟, with its distinctly heavier ink flow, could be interpreted this way. Moreover, when we consider other occurrences of "make this record" or "make the record", we note that *the record* is consistently postmodified by a restrictive relative clause:

> 1 Nephi 1:3
> > and I know that **the record** which I make to be true

> The Words of Mormon 1:1
> > and now I Mormon being about to deliver up
> > **the record** which I have been making
> > into the hands of my son Moroni . . .

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

On the other hand, there is no postmodification for *this record:*

> Mormon 6:6
> > therefore I made **this record** out of the plates of Nephi

> Mormon 8:5
> > behold my father hath made **this record**
> > and he hath written the intent thereof

> Ether 13:14
> > and as he dwelt in the cavity of a rock
> > he made the remainder of **this record**
> > viewing the destructions which came upon the people by night

These results support the reading *this record* in 3 Nephi 5:11, either as the reading in ◐ or as the reading of the original text. On the other hand, one could argue that Oliver Cowdery expected *this record,* with the result that he later decided on his own to emend *the record* to *this record* in ℗.

Nonetheless, this regularity applies only to the specific phrase "to make this/the record". More generally, the singular *the record* is postmodified most of the time:

followed by an *of* prepositional phrase	28 times
followed by a relative clause	8 times
followed by *thereof*	1 time

But in at least six cases in the original text, there is no postmodification for *the record:*

1 Nephi 7:11	and also that we should obtain **the record**
Omni 1:9	and after this manner we keep **the record**
Mosiah 8:6	now as soon as Ammon had read **the record** . . .
3 Nephi 8:1	for behold it was a just man which did keep **the record**
4 Nephi 1:21	and his son Amos kept **the record** in his stead
4 Nephi 1:47	and his brother Ammaron did keep **the record** in his stead

Thus *the record* will work here in 3 Nephi 5:11 since there is an earlier reference to Mormon's record in verse 10 (as *my record*). My suspicion is that the corrected *this record* in ℗ was the result of conscious editing on Oliver Cowdery's part. Thus the critical text will retain the less expected but possible reading, *the record,* in 3 Nephi 5:11.

Summary: Follow in 3 Nephi 5:11 the 1830 reading, *the record* (which is also what Oliver Cowdery originally wrote in ℗); ◐ most likely read *the record,* but later Oliver emended ℗ to read *this record,* which is what he expected here since *the record* was not postmodified; specific usage elsewhere in the text supports *this record,* but more general usage shows that *the record* is possible.

■ **3 Nephi 5:12**

and behold I am called [1ABCDEFGHIJKLNOPQRST | *the* M] *Mormon*
being called after the land of Mormon
the land [inthewhich 1 | *in the which* ABCDEFGHIJKLNOPS | *in which* MQRT]
Alma did establish the church among this people

In the 1905 LDS edition, the typesetter seems to have unintentionally omitted the *the* from the phrase "in the which". In proofing, the error must have been caught, but when the typesetter inserted the *the,* he accidentally placed it in the preceding line, thus ending up with the anomalous "I am called **the** Mormon". It is possible that the handwritten *the* that had been inserted in the proofsheet looked as if it was inserted before *Mormon* in the preceding line (which happened to be the first line on the typeset page). The 1911 LDS edition removed the extra *the* before *Mormon,* an obvious error, but left the shortened phrase "in which" since this is what we expect in modern English. There is one other place, in Jacob 5:17, where the 1905 edition replaced "in the which" with "in which" (see the discussion under that passage); in that instance, however, the change was first made in the 1902 LDS edition, so there is a possibility that the 1905 reading derives from that earlier edition.

In his editing for the 1837 edition, Joseph Smith made that emendation to "in which" for many of the original instances of "in the which" (see the discussion under 1 Nephi 3:2). Subsequent editions have generally left the remaining instances of "in the which" in the text; there are only a few cases in the textual history where the *the* in "in the which" has been removed in editions dating after 1837 (such as this one in the 1905 LDS edition for 3 Nephi 5:12). Of course, the critical text will restore the original "in the which" in this and all other instances, providing it is supported by the earliest textual sources. For a complete discussion of the editing of "in the which", see under IN THE WHICH in volume 3.

Summary: Restore in 3 Nephi 5:12 the definite article *the* in the phrase "in the which"; the 1905 typesetter accidentally omitted the *the* when he first set the type; when he corrected his error as part of his proofing, he accidentally inserted the *the* in the preceding line, before *Mormon* (an obvious error that was removed in the 1911 LDS edition).

■ **3 Nephi 5:12**

and behold I am called Mormon / being called after the land of Mormon
the land in the which Alma did establish the church
among [*this* 1PS | *the* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOQRT] *people*
yea the first church which was established among them after their transgression

Here the printer's manuscript reads "among **this** people", whereas the 1830 edition reads "among **the** people". The 1908 RLDS edition adopted the reading in 𝒫. A similar instance of *this* versus *the* occurs nearby in verse 11; there Oliver Cowdery initially wrote *the* in 𝒫 but later, it would appear, emended it to *this,* while the 1830 compositor set *the*. As argued under 3 Nephi 5:11, "I do make **the** record" will be accepted as the original reading.

As already noted under Helaman 14:20, there has been a strong tendency in the transmission of the text to mix up *this* and *the,* with the majority of instances involving the replacement of *this* with *the*. More specifically, we find the following cases where Oliver Cowdery replaced an original *the* with *this* (of which only one change was left uncorrected, marked below with an asterisk):

> Alma 50:28 (initial error in 𝒪, immediately corrected by erasure)
> [*this* >% *the* 0 | *the* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] people of Morionton

> Alma 52:10 (initial error in 𝒪, immediately corrected by erasure)
> that quarter of [*this* >% *the* 0 | *the* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] land

> * Alma 56:17 (error in copying from 𝒪 into 𝒫)
> [*the* 0 | *this* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] little force which I brought with me

> Helaman 13:15 (initial error in 𝒫, virtually immediately corrected)
> [*this* > *the* 1 | *the* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] city of Gideon

And we also have the nearby case in 3 Nephi 5:11 where it appears that Oliver consciously decided to change *the record* to *this record*.

On the other hand, we have two cases where the 1830 compositor set *the* instead of *this* (of course, both of these changes were permanent):

2 Nephi 10:23

> to choose [*this* 1 | *the* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] way of everlasting death
> or **the** way of eternal life

Mosiah 1:10

> among all this people . . .
> which dwell in [*this* 1PS | *the* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOQRT] land

The first of these appears to be due to editing on the part of the 1830 compositor (see the discussion under 2 Nephi 10:23). So when we compare the number of permanent changes (including cases that could have involved editing), we find that there are two instances where Oliver Cowdery replaced *the* with *this* and two where the 1830 compositor changed *this* to *the*. Thus there is no strong evidence from errors in transmission that favors either *this* or *the* here in 3 Nephi 5:12.

Neither reading ("among this people" or "among the people") is completely satisfactory. It should be noted that Mormon's specific statement about the church being established "among them after their transgression" apparently refers to the original people of Alma, who had broken away from the people of Noah (as described in Mosiah 18). The transgression mentioned refers either to the general apostasy of the people under king Noah or, more specifically, to the execution of Abinadi, a prophet of God, by the king and his people (king Limhi's characterization in Mosiah 7:24–26). The use of *this* seems to be what Mormon intended, but then realizing that his use of *this* might be confusing, he added the *yea*-clause to explain what he meant by "the church among this people" (namely, "the first church which was established among them after their transgression"). One could further argue that the reference here in 3 Nephi 5:12 to Alma establishing the church "among **this** people" is based on the language in Mosiah 26:17: "and blessed art thou because thou hast established a church among **this** people" (here the Lord is speaking to Alma). Based on internal evidence, the slightly more probable reading for the original manuscript in 3 Nephi 5:12 is "among **this** people".

Summary: Restore the reading of the printer's manuscript in 3 Nephi 5:12 ("among this people") since the use of *this* is more specific and helps to explain why Mormon wrote the following *yea*-clause, "yea the first church which was established among them after their transgression".

■ **3 Nephi 5:17**

and then [*do I* 1PS | *I do* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOQRT] *make a record of the things which I have seen with mine own eyes*

The printer's manuscript has the inverted order "and then **do I** make", while the 1830 edition has the noninverted order "and then **I do** make". It is possible that the 1830 typesetter accidentally switched the order since the preceding verse has the noninverted order:

3 Nephi 5:16

> therefore **I do** make my record from the accounts
> which hath been given by those which were before me

Elsewhere in the text, when a sentence begins with *and then,* we find examples of both word orders. For instance, in cases where no modal verb occurs, there are 9 examples with the inverted order

and 11 with the noninverted order. None of these examples involve the auxiliary *do*. For sentences involving the auxiliary *do* and an initial *then* (but without a preceding *and*), there are only two examples, and each has the inverted order. In fact, both examples are found in the same passage:

> Alma 29:10
>> then **do I** remember what the Lord has done for me
>> yea even that he hath heard my prayer
>> yea then **do I** remember his merciful arm which he extended towards me

This passage thus supports the reading of the printer's manuscript in 3 Nephi 5:17.

When we consider errors in the early transmission of the text, we find that the 1830 typesetter was prone to change the text to the noninverted order:

> Alma 3:16
>> and again [*will I* 1 | *I will* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] set a mark upon him
>> that fighteth against thee and thy seed

> Alma 41:6
>> even so [*shall he* 01CGHKPS | *he shall* ABDEFIJLMNOQRT] be rewarded
>>   unto righteousness

> Ether 1:38
>> and if he will drive us out of the land
>> cry unto him whither [*shall we* 1 | *we shall* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] go

The first example is due to conscious editing, the second is accidental, while the third could be either (see under each of these passages). But there are no examples of the 1830 typesetter making a change towards the inverted order. Of course, the reading in 𝓟 for Alma 3:16 is probably an error that scribe 2 of 𝓟 made when he copied the text from 𝓞 to 𝓟 (from an original "and again **I will** set" to the incorrect "and again **will I** set"); see the discussion under Alma 3:16. As far as Oliver Cowdery's scribal practice is concerned, we have instances in 𝓟 of him changing towards the noninverted order, although only initially:

> Helaman 15:3
>> yea in the days of their iniquities
>> [*he > hath* 1 | *hath* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] he chastened them
>> because he loveth them

> 3 Nephi 18:32
>> for unto such
>> [*ye shall >+ shall ye* 1 | *shall ye* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] continue to minister

There is also one example in 𝓞 where Oliver initially wrote the noninverted order, although that error may have been a momentary one made by Joseph Smith as he dictated the text to Oliver:

> 2 Nephi 25:16
>> and then at that time
>> [*will the day >+ the day will* 0 | *the day will* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] come
>> that it must needs be expedient that they should believe these things

Ultimately, Oliver never made any permanent errors towards the inverted order (nor towards the noninverted order, for that matter). Thus the early errors in the textual transmission support the reading in 𝓟, the inverted order, as the original order in 3 Nephi 5:17. The noninverted order in the 1830 edition is probably secondary. The critical text will therefore restore the inverted order "and then **do I** make" in this passage.

Summary: Restore the inverted order "and then **do I** make" in 3 Nephi 5:17 (the reading of the printer's manuscript); the noninverted order of the 1830 edition ("and then **I do** make") is probably an error influenced by the noninverted order in the preceding verse ("therefore **I do** make"); the error tendency in the early text was to replace the inverted order with the noninverted.

■ **3 Nephi 5:19**

and now I make an end of **my saying** *which is of myself*
and proceed to give my account of the things which hath been before me

We may have an error here of "my saying" for "my sayings". Elsewhere in the text, there are three references to "making an end of my sayings" but none of "making an end of my saying" (there are also four instances with "these sayings"):

2 Nephi 30:18	and now my beloved brethren I must make an end of **my sayings**
Mosiah 1:15	after king Benjamin had made an end of **these sayings** to his son . . .
Mosiah 13:25	after Abinadi had made an end of **these sayings** . . .
Alma 24:17	when the king had made an end of **these sayings** . . .
3 Nephi 10:19	therefore for this time I make an end of **my sayings**
3 Nephi 18:36	when Jesus had made an end of **these sayings**
3 Nephi 26:12	and now I Mormon make an end of **my sayings**

Here in 3 Nephi 5:19, however, there is a following relative clause that modifies *saying* and the verb for that clause is in the singular ("and now I make an end of my **saying** which **is** of myself"). None of the other examples have such a postmodifying relative clause for *sayings*. Yet one could argue that the following singular *is* led the scribe in 𝓞, Oliver Cowdery, to accidentally write "my saying" instead of the correct "my sayings". As discussed under 1 Nephi 4:4, such examples of number disagreement can be found in the original text, as originally in Alma 18:35: "according to **my faith and desires** which **is** in God" (in that case the *is* was grammatically emended to *are* by Joseph Smith in his editing for the 1837 edition).

Despite these arguments for "my sayings" here in 3 Nephi 5:19, the singular *saying* is possible. Such usage is found, for instance, in the King James Bible in reference to Jesus's sayings:

John 8:51	if a man keep **my saying** / he shall never see death
John 8:52	if a man keep **my saying** / he shall never taste of death
John 15:20	if they have kept **my saying** / they will keep yours also

It should also be noted that there is one parallel instance with the plural "my sayings":

John 14:24	he that loveth me not keepeth not **my sayings**

In these New Testament examples, the phrase "my saying" could have been alternatively translated as "my word(s)", as in the Revised Standard Version. For these four biblical examples, the word for *saying(s)* in the Greek is a regular count noun, namely, *logos* 'word', just as in John 1:1 ("in the beginning was the word"). In the three sentences with the singular *saying,* Jesus is not referring to any particular teaching of his, but rather to his teaching as a whole (just as in John 14:24, where the plural is used). On the other hand, here in 3 Nephi 5:19 one could argue that the word *saying* is acting as a gerund, which would not at all allow for the plural form *sayings*. Equivalently, Mormon could have said "and now I make an end of my **writing** which is of myself" or "and now I make an end of my **speaking** which is of myself". Thus the singular *saying* will work in 3 Nephi 5:19, and the critical text will maintain it despite its uniqueness.

Summary: Maintain in 3 Nephi 5:19 the singular *saying,* which appears to be a gerund rather than a singular count noun.

■ **3 Nephi 5:20**

and no one knew it save it were himself
and those which he brought out of [*that* 1ABCDEFIJLMNOPQRST | *the* GHK] *land*

Here the 1858 Wright edition replaced *that* with *the* in the phrase "out of **that** land". The 1908 RLDS edition restored the correct determiner to the RLDS text. Elsewhere in the text, if we have *the* before *land* in the expression "to bring someone out of a land", *land* is always followed by a post-modifying prepositional phrase headed by *of* (18 times), thus "to bring someone out of **the** land **of** X" but never "to bring someone out of **the** land" alone. On the other hand, there is one other example of *that* before *land* in this expression (and it too lacks postmodification):

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

Thus the determiner *that* is supportable here in 3 Nephi 5:20, but *the* is not since there is no postmodification.

Summary: Maintain in 3 Nephi 5:20 the original determiner *that* ("those which he brought out of **that** land").

■ **3 Nephi 5:22**

and [*in as much* 1 | *insomuch* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *as the children of Lehi*
    hath kept his commandments
he hath blessed them and prospered them according to his word

The printer's manuscript reads "in as much as", but the 1830 edition has "insomuch as". The use of *insomuch* appears to be an error. As discussed under 2 Nephi 1:20, the text otherwise systematically uses *inasmuch* when referring to keeping the commandments of God (19 times); there are

no other instances where *insomuch* is used in this context. Moreover, there is evidence in the transmission of the text for accidentally replacing *inasmuch* with *insomuch:*

> 2 Nephi 1:20 (Oliver Cowdery's initial error in 𝒪, corrected virtually immediately)
> [*in so much > in as much* o | *inasmuch* 1ABCDEFGILMNOQ | *Inasmuch* HJKPRST]
> as ye shall keep my commandments
> ye shall prosper in the land

> Helaman 11:25 (error in the 1874 RLDS edition)
> receiving daily an addition to their numbers
> [*in as much* 1 | *inasmuch* ABCDEFGIJLMNOPQRST | *insomuch* HK]
> as there were dissenters that went forth unto them

But there are no examples in the text of change in the other direction, from *insomuch* to *inasmuch.* To be sure, there is not a lot of evidence from transmission errors involving *inasmuch* and *insomuch.* For a third case where an original *inasmuch* may have been replaced by *insomuch,* see under 2 Nephi 9:15. As explained under that passage, various syntactic and semantic generalizations favor *inasmuch* over *insomuch* in contexts like the one here in 3 Nephi 5:22. Therefore, the critical text will here accept *inasmuch,* the reading in 𝒫, as more probable than *insomuch,* the 1830 reading.

Summary: Restore in 3 Nephi 5:22 the reading of the printer's manuscript, "**inasmuch** as the children of Lehi hath kept his commandments / he hath blessed them"; the reading with *inasmuch* rather than the 1830 reading with *insomuch* is supported by usage elsewhere in the text as well as by the tendency to replace *inasmuch* with *insomuch* in the history of the text.

■ **3 Nephi 5:24**

and [*as* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLNOPRST | MQ] *surely as the Lord liveth*
will he gather in from the four quarters of the earth all the remnant of the seed of Jacob

Here the 1905 LDS edition omitted the *as* from the LDS text. The 1911 LDS edition, set from the 1905 edition, maintained the shorter reading, but the 1920 LDS edition restored the *as* by reference to the earlier editions. The Book of Mormon text has only one instance of *surely as* without a preceding *as,* in 2 Nephi 24:24 (an Isaiah quote from the King James Bible): "surely as I have thought / so shall it come to pass". The original Book of Mormon has two instances of "as surely as" (in Helaman 15:17 and here in 3 Nephi 5:24). And there are two more instances of "as surely as" in the current LDS text that derive from original "assuredly as" (see the discussion under Alma 37:45 and Moroni 7:26). In each case, the critical text will follow the earliest sources, thus "as surely as" here in 3 Nephi 5:24.

Summary: Maintain the expression "as surely as" in 3 Nephi 5:24, the reading of the earliest textual sources (𝒫 and the 1830 edition).

3 Nephi 6

■ **3 Nephi 6:3**

and they granted unto those robbers
which had entered into a covenant to keep the peace
of the [*land* 1PST | *band* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOQR]
[1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOQR | , PST]
which were desirous to remain Lamanites
[1 | , ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
lands according to their numbers
that they might have with their labors wherewith to subsist upon

There are several complications in this passage. First, the printer's manuscript has "the peace of the **land**", but the 1830 edition has "the peace of the **band**". The 1908 RLDS edition and the 1981 LDS edition restored the word *land,* which makes more sense than *band.* Here in 3 Nephi 6:3, these robbers have forsaken their band and are promising to keep the peace; in other words, they no longer belong to the band. Most probably, the 1830 typesetter misread an original *land* in 𝓞 as *band.* Here is another example in the text where *land* was apparently misread as *band:*

> 1 Nephi 12:1
> and I looked and beheld
> [*the land* 0 | *the band* > NULL 1 | ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
> the land of promise

In this instance, Oliver Cowdery initially wrote *the band* in 𝓟 instead of *the land.*

Another complication in 3 Nephi 6:3 is the unique use of the preposition *of* in the phrase "the peace of the land". Elsewhere we have many references to peace "**in** the land" (24 times), plus three references to peace "**through**(**out**) the land" and one to peace being restored "**to** the land" (Alma 62:11). Nonetheless, "the peace **of** the land" works; and in support of this usage there are also examples referring to "the peace **of** this people" (Mosiah 29:10) and "the peace **of** my people" (3 Nephi 9:9).

A third complication in this passage is its syntax. The first relative clause ("which had entered into a covenant to keep the peace of the land") is restrictive, while the second relative clause ("which were desirous to remain Lamanites") can be interpreted as either restrictive or nonrestrictive. Recent editors have chosen to make the second one nonrestrictive by surrounding it with commas, thus making it easier to interpret the following *lands* as the direct object for the verb *granted:* "and they granted unto those robbers . . . lands according to their numbers". Still, this sentence is difficult to process, but no additional change in the punctuation will guarantee that readers will correctly parse this sentence, at least on its initial reading.

Grant Hardy, in *The Book of Mormon: A Reader's Edition* (Urbana, Illinois: University of Illinois Press, 2003), follows the text of the 1920 LDS edition and therefore retains the use of *band* (the 1830 reading). But Hardy repunctuates the passage so that the prepositional phrase of *the band* postmodifies the earlier *those robbers:*

> 3 Nephi 6:3 (the text of the 1920 LDS edition, repunctuated)
> And they granted unto **those robbers**
> who had entered into a covenant to keep the peace,
> **of the band** who were desirous to remain Lamanites,
> lands according to their numbers,
> that they might have, with their labors, wherewith to subsist upon.

Under this interpretation, the prepositional phrase "of the band" is delayed by a rather long relative clause. We can find evidence elsewhere in the text for delayed *of*-initial prepositional phrases, although in the other cases the intervening text is considerably shorter:

> Alma 40:20 (that is, "the souls and the bodies of the righteous")
> **the souls and the bodies** are reunited **of the righteous**
> at the resurrection of Christ and his ascension into heaven
>
> Alma 56:57 (that is, "a part of those men of Antipus")
> therefore we sent them to the land of Zarahemla
> and **a part of those men** which were not slain **of Antipus** with them
>
> Helaman 13:10 (that is, "those of the fourth generation of your enemies")
> and there shall be **those of the fourth generation** which shall live **of your enemies**
> to behold your utter destruction
>
> 3 Nephi 27:31 (that is, "them of this generation")
> for I mean **them** which are now alive **of this generation**
> and none of them are lost

In 3 Nephi 6:3, the reading in 𝔓 (with the phrase "the peace of the land") works much more straightforwardly. Morever, the phraseology "robbers of the band" is anomalous; elsewhere the text has examples of only "band(s) of robbers" (nine times).

Summary: Accept in 3 Nephi 6:3 the reading of the printer's manuscript for the phrase "the peace of the **land**"; the use of *band* in this phrase (the reading of the 1830 edition) makes the reading even more complicated; also maintain the preposition *of* in this phrase, despite the uniqueness of this phrase in the text; keep the current punctuation with its commas around the relative clause preceding the direct object *lands* since those commas mitigate the difficulty of the reading.

■ **3 Nephi 6:4**

and they began again **to** *prosper and* [*to* 1ABCDEFGHIJLMNOPQRST | ᴋ] *wax great*

The 1892 RLDS edition omitted the repeated infinitival *to* in this passage; the 1908 RLDS edition restored it to the RLDS text. For further discussion regarding the repeated *to* in infinitive clauses,

see under 3 Nephi 4:23. Also see under Jacob 7:2 for another instance where the 1892 RLDS edition omitted the repeated infinitival *to*. For further discussion of the repetition of the *to* in infinitival conjuncts, see under CONJUNCTIVE REPETITION in volume 3.

Summary: Maintain the repeated infinitival *to* in 3 Nephi 6:4, "to prosper and **to** wax great" (the reading of the earliest extant text).

■ **3 Nephi 6:5**

and now there was nothing in all the land to hinder the people from prospering continually
except they should fall into [*transgressions* 1PS | *transgression* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOQRT]

The 1830 edition has the singular "fall into transgression", whereas the printer's manuscript has the plural "fall into transgressions". In accord with 𝒫, the 1908 RLDS edition changed the RLDS text to read in the plural. The LDS text has maintained the 1830 reading.

Either the singular or the plural will work, although the singular seems more natural. Elsewhere, the text has 15 instances of the singular "to fall into transgression" but none of "to fall into transgressions". But when combined with *sin(s),* the conjoined *transgression(s)* always agrees in number with the preceding *sin(s)*:

Alma 9:19   if it were possible that they could fall into **sins** and **transgressions**
Alma 24:30   and then have fallen away into **sin** and **transgression**

So the plural "to fall into transgressions" is possible but statistically less likely than the singular "to fall into transgression".

As far as 3 Nephi 6:5 is concerned, there is considerable evidence from other examples of "fall into transgression(s)" that scribes and typesetters have tended to change the singular *transgression* to the plural *transgressions:*

Jarom 1:10 (1907 LDS edition)
    that if they did not keep the commandments but should fall
    into [*transgression* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNPQRST | *transgressions* O]

Mosiah 7:25 (1953 RLDS edition)
    for if this people had not fallen
    into [*transgression* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRT | *transgressions* S]

Mosiah 15:13 (1858 Wright edition)
    yea and are not the prophets
    every one that has opened his mouth to prophesy that has not fallen
    into [*transgression* 1ABCDEFIJLMNOPQRST | *transgressions* GHK]

Alma 9:23 (scribe 2's error in 𝒫, corrected by Oliver Cowdery)
    that if they should fall into [*s*2 *transgressions* > *s*1 *transgression* 1 |
        transgression ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]

To these four clear examples, we can add this example from 3 Nephi 6:5 where Oliver Cowdery, it would appear, accidentally changed *transgression* to *transgressions*. The critical text will assume as much and continue the 1830 reading.

Summary: Accept in 3 Nephi 6:5 the 1830 reading with the singular *transgression* ("except they should fall into transgression").

■ **3 Nephi 6:10**

and some were lifted up [*unto* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLNOPRST | *into* MQ] *pride and boastings*

The 1905 LDS edition accidentally replaced *unto* with *into;* the subsequent 1911 LDS edition, set from the 1905 edition, followed this secondary reading, but the 1920 LDS edition restored the correct *unto.* Elsewhere the text has instances of only "lifted up **unto** X":

1 Nephi 18:9	yea they were lifted up **unto** exceeding rudeness
Alma 31:25	their hearts were lifted up **unto** great boasting
Alma 38:11	see that ye are not lifted up **unto** pride

The critical text will therefore maintain the preposition *unto* here in 3 Nephi 6:10.

Summary: Maintain in 3 Nephi 6:10 the preposition *unto* ("and some were lifted up **unto** pride and boastings"), the reading of the earliest textual sources; the use of *unto* in this expression is consistently supported by usage elsewhere in the text.

■ **3 Nephi 6:12**

and the people began to be distinguished by ranks according to their riches
and their [*chance* 1 | *chances* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *for learning*

The printer's manuscript has the singular "their **chance** for learning", whereas the 1830 edition has the plural "their **chances** for learning". Elsewhere in the text, there is no occurrence of the plural *chances.* But there are six occurrences of the singular *chance:*

Mosiah 27:9	giving **a chance** for the enemy of God to exercise his power over them
Mosiah 29:38	that every man should have **an equal chance** throughout all the land
Alma 12:21	that there was **no possible chance** that they should live forever
Alma 49:22	that they might have **an equal chance** to fight
3 Nephi 4:4	there were **no chance** for the robbers to plunder and to obtain food
Mormon 3:3	that it was the Lord that had spared them and granted unto them **a chance** for repentance

The last example is somewhat similar to the case here in 3 Nephi 6:12 (both are followed by a modifying prepositional phrase headed by *for*). Still, these six examples are each preceded by either the indefinite article *a/an* or the negative determiner *no,* so none of these examples are precisely like the case here in 3 Nephi 6:12 where *chance(s)* is preceded by *their.* The plural *chances*

is what we expect in modern English, but the singular does work. Probably what happened here in the transmission of the text is that the 1830 compositor was influenced by the preceding reference to plural individuals in this sentence ("and **the people** began to be distinguished by ranks according to **their** riches and **their** . . ."); perhaps the compositor was also influenced by the preceding conjoined plural *riches* to set *chances* rather than *chance*. It seems less likely that Oliver Cowdery would have replaced the expected *chances* with the unexpected *chance*. The critical text will accept the unexpected but possible singular as the more probable reading here in 3 Nephi 6:12.

Summary: In accord with 𝓟, restore the singular *chance* in 3 Nephi 6:12; in this sentence, preceding plurals seem to have influenced the 1830 compositor to replace an original *chance* with *chances;* the plural reading is what modern English readers expect in this passage.

■ **3 Nephi 6:14**

and thus there became a great [*unequality* 1 | *inequality* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
in all the land

As explained under Mosiah 29:32, the original Book of Mormon text consistently uses the word *unequality* instead of the standard *inequality*. The critical text will restore *unequality* here in 3 Nephi 6:14.

■ **3 Nephi 6:14**

for they were firm and steadfast and immovable
willing with all diligence to keep
the [*commands* 1 | *commandments* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *of the Lord*

Here the printer's manuscript has "the commands of the Lord", but the 1830 edition has "the commandments of the Lord". As explained under Alma 30:7, there are three clear cases where Oliver Cowdery accidentally changed "the commandments of God" to "the commands of God" as he copied the text from 𝓞 into 𝓟 (and in one case he did not catch his error, in Alma 30:7):

> 1 Nephi 4:17
> according to his [*commandments* 0BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST |
>   *commands > commandments* 1 | *commmandments* A]

> Alma 30:7
> for it was strictly contrary
> to the [*commandments* 0 | *commands* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] of God

> Helaman 7:4
> laying aside the [*commands > commandments* 1 |
>   *commandments* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] of God

On the other hand, there are no examples where the 1830 typesetter ever mixed up these two words. Therefore, it is very likely here in 3 Nephi 6:14 that Oliver Cowdery is the one responsible for the variation, replacing an original *commandments* with *commands*.

Elsewhere in the text, the use of *commands* in reference to God's commandments appears to be restricted to Jacob, the brother of Nephi (Jacob 2:10, 2:16, 4:5, and 7:27). Of course, there are examples in the text of military commands (four of them); but in reference to God's commands, the word *commandment* is what the text otherwise uses. For further discussion of this point, see under Jacob 2:10.

Summary: Accept the 1830 reading "the commandments of the Lord" in 3 Nephi 6:14; there is some evidence that Oliver Cowdery tended to replace *commandments* with *commands,* thus explaining why 𝒫 reads "the commands of the Lord" in this passage.

■ **3 Nephi 6:15**

now the cause of this iniquity of the people was this :
Satan had great power unto the stirring up of the people to do all manner of iniquity
and to the [*buffeting* 1 | *puffing* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *them up with pride*
tempting them to seek for power and authority and riches and the vain things of the world

The printer's manuscript uses the word *buffeting,* which really doesn't make much sense here. The verb *buffet* means 'to beat or to strike' and, if correct here, would imply a punishment from Satan. In fact, the word *buffet* is never used elsewhere in the Book of Mormon text, although it does occur five times in the King James Bible (all in the New Testament). And there the meaning is, as expected, 'to beat or to strike' (although used figuratively when referring to Satan's or the Lord's buffeting).

On the other hand, the 1830 edition has *puffing* here in 3 Nephi 6:15, which does make sense. There are nine references in the text to people being puffed up, of which four refer to being puffed up in pride:

2 Nephi 28:12	because of pride they are puffed up
2 Nephi 28:13	because in their pride they are puffed up
2 Nephi 28:15	O the wise and the learned and the rich that are puffed up in the pride of their hearts
Alma 5:53	yea can ye be puffed up in the pride of your hearts

Except for the one case here in 3 Nephi 6:15, the verb "to puff up" is not used in the active voice in the Book of Mormon. This same finding basically holds for "to puff up" in the New Testament of the King James Bible; there are six instances of the verb in the passive ("to be puffed up"). But there is one instance, in 1 Corinthians 8:1, where the verb is in the active voice: "knowledge puffeth up but charity edifieth" (that is, knowledge causes one to be puffed up). Thus the text here in 3 Nephi 6:15 can be interpreted as meaning that Satan caused the people to be puffed up with pride.

Internal evidence therefore argues that the correct verb form here in 3 Nephi 6:15 is *puffing* (the 1830 reading). The form *buffeting* (the reading in 𝒫) is visually similar to *puffing,* so Oliver Cowdery could have misread 𝒪 when he copied this passage into 𝒫. It is also possible that this error occurred when Joseph Smith dictated the text, with either Joseph misreading *puffing* as *buffeting* or Oliver mishearing Joseph's *puffing* as *buffeting.* If 𝒪 read *buffeting,* then the 1830 compositor would have been responsible for emending *buffeting* to the correct *puffing.*

Summary: Maintain in 3 Nephi 6:15 the 1830 reading "to the **puffing** them up with pride", which makes sense and was undoubtedly the reading of the original text (if not ⊙ itself); the use of *buffeting* in 𝒫 is apparently the result of either misreading or mishearing the original *puffing* as *buffeting* during the early transmission of the text.

■ **3 Nephi 6:16**

therefore they had [*not* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQS | RT] *enjoyed peace but a few years*

As discussed under 1 Nephi 14:28, the original text allowed for *not* to precede a *but*-phrase. The 1920 LDS edition removed the *not* here in 3 Nephi 6:16, but the critical text will restore it. The motivation for removing the *not* here is not strong, nor has it been consistently applied elsewhere in the text (for instance, not in Jacob 4:1: "and I can**not** write **but** a little of my words"). For a fuller discussion of multiple negation in the original text, see under NEGATION in volume 3.

Summary: Restore the *not* here in 3 Nephi 6:16: "they had **not** enjoyed peace but a few years"; there is evidence elsewhere in the earliest text for this kind of negation.

■ **3 Nephi 6:23**

now there were many of those which testified
of [NULL >+ *the* 1 | *the* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *things pertaining to Christ*

In the printer's manuscript, Oliver Cowdery initially wrote "of things pertaining to Christ"; then somewhat later he supralinearly inserted the definite article *the* before *things* (the ink flow for the *the* is slightly heavier). The 1830 edition also has "of the things", so the word *the* was undoubtedly in the original manuscript.

Elsewhere in the text, there are four examples with *the* before *things* in phrases with the form "pertaining (un)to X" and ten examples without the *the,* so it is not surprising that Oliver Cowdery initially omitted the *the* here in 3 Nephi 6:23. In fact, we have noun phrases of this type that differ in the use of the definite article, as in specific references to "things pertaining (un)to righteousness":

Alma 5:42	as to things pertaining unto righteousness
Alma 12:16	as to things pertaining unto righteousness
Alma 12:32	as to things pertaining unto righteousness
Alma 21:23	concerning things pertaining to righteousness
Alma 35:16	concerning **the** things pertaining unto righteousness
Helaman 11:19	as to things pertaining to righteousness
Helaman 14:18	as to things pertaining to righteousness

Although the occurrence of *the* in these instances is infrequent, there is no reason to reject it. The critical text will maintain the use of *the* before *things* here in 3 Nephi 6:23.

Summary: Accept in 3 Nephi 6:23 the definite article *the* in "of **the** things pertaining to Christ"; not only is *the* possible here, but it is also the reading in the 1830 edition as well as the corrected reading in 𝒫.

■ **3 Nephi 6:25**

therefore a complaint came [*up* 1ABCDEFGHIJLMNOQRT | KPS] *unto the land of Zarahemla*
to the governor of the land against these judges

The 1892 RLDS edition accidentally deleted the adverbial *up* here in 3 Nephi 6:25. The RLDS text
has retained this secondary reading even though the printer's manuscript has the *up* (𝓟 is the
source for most of the textual changes in the 1908 RLDS edition). The *up* is perfectly reasonable
here in 3 Nephi 6:25. Moreover, there is another example in the text that refers to complaints
"coming up" to someone (in this case, cries coming up to the Lord):

> Jacob 2:32
> and I will not suffer saith the Lord of Hosts
> that **the cries** of the fair daughters of this people
> which I have led out of the land of Jerusalem
> shall **come up unto me** against the men of my people

Summary: Accept in 3 Nephi 6:25 the phrasal verb *come up* in "a complaint came up unto the land of
Zarahemla", the reading of the earliest textual sources (𝓟 and the 1830 edition).

■ **3 Nephi 6:25**

therefore a complaint came up unto the **land** *of Zarahemla*
to the governor of the **land** *against these judges*
which had condemned [NULL > *the prophets of the Lord* 1 | *the prophets of the land* A |
    the prophets of the Lord BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *unto death*

In the printer's manuscript, Oliver Cowdery initially omitted the phrase "the prophets of the Lord",
but virtually immediately he supralinearly inserted it (there is no change in the level of ink flow
for the correction). The 1830 edition, on the other hand, reads "the prophets of the **land**", but this
is undoubtedly an error prompted by the two preceding occurrences of *land* in the sentence
("unto the **land** of Zarahemla to the governor of the **land**"). The 1837 edition restored the reading
of the printer's manuscript, "the prophets of the **Lord**". (For an example of the word *land* that
Oliver Cowdery interpreted as *Lord,* see under 1 Nephi 13:24; in that instance, *Land* was the read-
ing in the original manuscript but was a mishearing for *Lamb.*)

Elsewhere the text never refers to "prophet(s) of the **land**", only to "prophet(s) of the **Lord**"
(seven times) or to "prophet(s) of **God**" (three times). The words *land* and *Lord* are, of course,
visually similar; along with the two preceding occurrences of *land,* this visual similarity could
have played a role in the 1830 typesetter's misreading of the original manuscript. Perhaps *Lord*
was spelled in 𝓞 with a lowercase *l* (as *lord*), which would have led more easily to the error *land.*
Such a misspelling of *Lord* as *lord* is fairly rare on Oliver Cowdery's part; even so, there are five
examples in the manuscripts where Oliver wrote a lowercase *lord,* of which two were corrected
in the manuscripts to *Lord.* In the following list, I retain the original spellings in the manuscripts:

1 Nephi 17:41	𝓟	& the **lord** straitened them
2 Nephi 12:6	𝓟	O **lord** thou hast forsaken thy People

Mosiah 10:13	𝒫*	he was favored of the **lord**
Alma 28:14	𝒪*	to labour in the vineyards of the **lord**
Helaman 11:14	𝒫	O **lord** thou didst hearken unto my words

Summary: In 3 Nephi 6:25 the original manuscript undoubtedly read "the prophets of the **Lord**" (the reading in 𝒫), not "the prophets of the **land**" (the 1830 reading); the critical text will maintain the expected reading with *Lord*.

■ **3 Nephi 6:26**

now it came to pass that they were taken and brought up before the judge
to be judged of [*their* 1 | *the* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *crime which they had done*

Here the printer's manuscript has the redundant "**their** crime which they had done", while the 1830 edition has the more acceptable "**the** crime which they had done". Nonetheless, there are at least five passages in the Book of Mormon where the original text had a similar kind of redundant relative clause; in each of these passages, the possessive pronoun before the head noun could be replaced by *the,* thus making an easier reading:

1 Nephi 7:17 (not "according to **the** faith which is in me")

O Lord / according to **my** faith
which is in [𝓈3 *me* >– 𝓈1 *thee* 0 | *thee* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
wilt thou deliver me from the hands of my brethren

2 Nephi 5:24 (not "because of **the** cursing which was upon them")

and because of **their** cursing
which was upon them
they did become an idle people

Alma 55:21 (not "**the** men which were with him", at least originally)

and then he caused [*his* 01 | *the* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] men
which were with him
to withdraw a pace from them

Mormon 6:10 (not "**the** ten thousand which were with me")

and it came to pass that my men were hewn down
yea or even **my** ten thousand
which were with me

Ether 2:15 (not "**the** brethren which were with him")

and the brother of Jared repented him of the evil which he had done
and did call upon the name of the Lord for **his** brethren
which were with him

In the Alma 55:21 passage, the 1830 compositor changed the *his* to *the*. This change provides direct support for the hypothesis that here in 3 Nephi 6:26 the 1830 compositor could have made the same change from the redundant "**their** crime which they had done" to the expected phraseology, "**the** crime which they had done".

The 1830 reading is, of course, what we expect in 3 Nephi 6:26. And usage elsewhere in the original (and current) text supports the definite article *the* in similar phrases referring to a crime that has been committed:

> Mosiah 29:15 (not "**his** crime which he hath committed")
>> him have I punished according to **the** crime which he hath committed

> Alma 1:10 (not "**his** crime which he had committed")
>> and the man who slew him was taken by the people of the church
>> and was brought before Alma to be judged according to **the** crime
>> which he had committed

> Alma 30:11 (not "**his** crimes which he had done")
>> therefore a man was punished only for **the** crimes
>> which he had done

> Helaman 8:1 (not "**his** crime which he hath done")
>> why do ye not seize upon this man and bring him forth
>> that he may be condemned according to **the** crime
>> which he hath done

Consistent with these examples, one could argue that here in 3 Nephi 6:26 the original manuscript read "**the** crime which they had done" (the 1830 reading). Or contrarily, one could argue that this systematic usage elsewhere in the text led the 1830 compositor to make the change from an original but unexpected "**their** crime which they had done" to the expected "**the** crime which they had done".

When we consider the cases where Oliver Cowdery permanently changed an original *the* to *their* and contrast them with the cases where the 1830 compositor changed an original *their* to *the*, we find a nearly equal amount of evidence for both types of change. Oliver permanently changed *the* to *their* in three cases, although in each instance there was a nearby *their* that seems to have prompted the change:

> 2 Nephi 7:2
>> I make [*the* 0 | *their* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] rivers a wilderness
>> and **their** fish to stink

> 3 Nephi 2:12
>> yea and also to maintain their rights
>> and [*their* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQS | *the* RT] privileges of **their** church

> 3 Nephi 3:4
>> and knowing of **their** everlasting hatred towards you
>> because of [*their* 1 | *the* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] many wrongs
>> which ye have done unto them

In the second example, the original text apparently read "and **the** privileges of their church" (see the discussion under 3 Nephi 2:12). Here in 3 Nephi 6:26 there is no following *their*, so there is no direct motivation to change an original *the* to *their*. But one could argue that the following *they* in "which they had done" could have prompted the change.

Here are two instances where the 1830 compositor set *the* in place of a correct *their:*

Mosiah 22:7
>
> and we will pass through the secret pass
> on the left of [*their* 1PST|*the* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOQR] camp
> when they are drunken and asleep

Alma 1:26
>
> and when [*their* 1|*the* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] priests left their labor
> to impart the word of God unto the people
> the people also left their labors to hear the word of God

Overall, either variant in 3 Nephi 6:26 is possible from the viewpoint of textual transmission. But because the 1830 compositor made the specific change from *his* to *the* in Alma 55:21, we have direct evidence that the compositor could have made the specific change from *their* to *the* here in 3 Nephi 6:26. The critical text will therefore restore the difficult reading here, the redundant "to be judged of **their** crime which they had done". Usage elsewhere in the text supports this kind of redundancy, although not in this particular expression.

Summary: Restore the difficult but possible reading in 3 Nephi 6:26 with its use of *their* rather than the expected *the:* "to be judged of **their** crime which they had done"; there is considerable evidence for such redundancy in the original (and current) text.

3 Nephi 7

■ **3 Nephi 7:2–3**

> *and the people were divided one against another*
> *and they did separate one from another into tribes*
> *every man according to his family and his kindred and friends*
> *and thus they did destroy the government of the land*
> *and every tribe did appoint a chief or a leader over them*
> *and thus* **they became tribes and leaders of tribes**

Ross Geddes (personal communication, 6 June 2006) suggests that the noun phrase *tribes* here in 3 Nephi 7:3 may be an error for *chiefs of tribes*. In other words, the original text had a conjoining of two parallel noun phrases: "and thus they became **chiefs of tribes** and **leaders of tribes**". Note that in the immediately preceding clause we have both *chief* and *leader:* "and every tribe did appoint a **chief** or a **leader** over them". If the original text read *chiefs of tribes* in verse 3, then the loss of *chiefs of* must have occurred as Joseph Smith dictated the text to Oliver Cowdery; 𝓞 itself undoubtedly read "tribes and leaders of tribes" since both 𝓟 and the 1830 edition read this way. Geddes points out that there is support for a conjunctive structure involving *their chiefs* and *their leaders,* two parallel noun phrases, later on in this chapter:

> 3 Nephi 7:14
>> and it came to pass in the thirty and first year
>> that they were divided into tribes
>> every man according to his family kindred and friends
>> nevertheless they had come to an agreement
>> that they would not go to war one with another
>> but they were not united as to their laws and their manner of government
>> for they were established according to the minds of them
>> which was **their chiefs** and **their leaders**

3 Nephi 7:2 explains that the people became tribes ("and they did separate one from another into tribes"). There are other references to a people becoming a distinct group:

> Helaman 11:26
>> and thus in time
>> yea even in the space of not many years
>> **they became** an exceeding great band of robbers
>> and they did search out all the secret plans of Gaddianton
>> and thus **they became** robbers of Gaddianton

Therefore the reading in 3 Nephi 7:3 ("and thus they became tribes") is quite possible. But if we emend *tribes* to *chiefs of tribes,* then the subject pronoun *they* can no longer refer to the people or to the tribes (not everyone can be a chief or a leader). In addition, it seems rather implausible, although not impossible, that *chiefs of* would have been lost during the dictation of the text.

Returning to the earliest reading ("tribes and leaders of tribes"), we find a different difficulty with the subject pronoun *they*—namely, the *they* refers to all the people in "they became tribes" but to only part of the people in "and thus **they** became . . . leaders of tribes". This difficulty suggests an alternative emendation for 3 Nephi 7:3: the *they* in "they became tribes and leaders of tribes" could be an error for *there*. In other words, the original text may have read "and thus **there** became tribes and leaders of tribes". Unlike the proposed loss of a noun and its following preposition (that is, *chiefs of*) during the dictation for this passage, there is considerable evidence in the history of the text for mix-ups between *they* and *there*. In fact, most instances involve the change of an original *there* to *they*. In the printed editions, we find examples of only that kind:

> Enos 1:22 (1858 Wright edition)
> > and [*there* 1ABCDEFHIJKLMNOPQRST | *they* G] were exceeding many prophets
> > among us

> Mosiah 26:9 (1849 LDS edition)
> > for [*there* 1ABCDFGHIJKLMNOPQRST | *they* E] were many witnesses against them

> Alma 2:13 (1849 LDS edition)
> > and [*there* 1ABCDGHIJKLMNOPQRST | *they* E | *they* > *there* F]
> > [*was* 1A | *were* BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] appointed captains and higher captains
> > and chief captains according to their numbers

> Alma 48:25 (1837 edition)
> > so long as [*there* 01ACEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST | *they* BD] were any
> > who should keep the commandments of God

> 4 Nephi 1:3 (1841 British edition, also the 1953 RLDS edition)
> > therefore [*there* 1ABCGHKPRT | *they* DEFIJLMNOQS] were not rich and poor
> > bond and free
> > but they were all made free

In Oliver Cowdery's manuscript work, there are three instances where he initially replaced *there* with *they;* there are also two in the opposite direction, where he momentarily replaced an original *they* with *there* (each of the two latter instances is marked below with an asterisk):

> Alma 49:24 (initial error in 𝒪)
> > [*they* > *there* 0 | *there* 1 | *There* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] were
> > about fifty which were wounded

> Alma 50:26 (initial error in 𝒫)
> > therefore [*they* > *there* 1 | *there* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] began
> > to be a warm contention between them

> * Alma 50:36 (initial error in 𝒪)
> > and upon their covenanting to keep the peace
> > [*there* > *they* 0 | *they* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] were restored
> > to the land of Morionton

> * 3 Nephi 3:9 (initial error in 𝒫)
>
> and [*there > they* 1 | *they* ᴀʙᴄᴅᴇғɢʜɪᴊᴋʟᴍɴᴏᴘǫʀꜱᴛ] are of ancient date

> Ether 11:7 (initial error in 𝒫)
>
> wherefore [*they > there* 1 | *there* ᴀʙᴄᴅᴇғɢʜɪᴊᴋʟᴍɴᴏᴘǫʀꜱᴛ] began
> to be wars and contentions in all the land

Thus it is quite possible that Oliver could have mistakenly written *they* instead of *there* in 𝒪 for 3 Nephi 7:3. In fact, in the preceding verse there are two instances of *they* that may have prompted Joseph Smith to dictate *they* or Oliver Cowdery to write down *they* instead of the correct *there:* "and **they** did separate one from another into tribes . . . and thus **they** did destroy the government of the land". Note especially that the second *they,* the nearer one, starts out with *and thus,* just like here in verse 3. So it is quite possible that an original "and thus **there** became tribes and leaders of tribes" could have been mistakenly written down in 𝒪 as "and thus **they** became tribes and leaders of tribes".

In addition, there are two examples in the Book of Mormon text of "there became", both of which are found nearby:

> 3 Nephi 6:14   and thus **there became** a great unequality in all the land
> 3 Nephi 8:10   in the place of the city thereof **there became** a great mountain

Note that the first of these examples begins "and thus there became", just as we would have here in 3 Nephi 7:3 if the original text read "and thus there became tribes and leaders of tribes".

The difficulty of the earliest reading in 3 Nephi 7:3 ("and thus **they** became tribes and leaders of tribes"), plus the evidence from Oliver Cowdery's tendency to replace *there* with *they* in the manuscripts (although all examples are momentary errors), argues that the original text in 3 Nephi 7:3 read "and thus **there** became tribes and leaders of tribes". The critical text will adopt this emendation.

Summary: Emend 3 Nephi 7:3 by replacing *they* with *there,* giving "and thus **there** became tribes and leaders of tribes"; during the dictation of the text, an original *there* was replaced, it would appear, with *they,* most likely prompted by the occurrence of *they* (especially the nearer one) in the preceding verse: "and **they** did separate one from another into tribes . . . and thus **they** did destroy the government of the land".

■ **3 Nephi 7:6**

because of the secret [*combination* 1ᴀʙᴄᴅᴇғɢʜɪᴊᴋᴍɴᴏᴘǫʀꜱᴛ | *combinations* ʟ]
of the friends and the kindreds of them which murdered the prophets

The plural *combinations* is theoretically possible here. The earliest textual sources, 𝒫 and the 1830 edition, read in the singular. Here the 1902 LDS edition made the change to the plural, probably unintentionally. Elsewhere the text has 21 instances of the plural but only 6 of the singular. The two preceding instances in the text of *combination(s)* are in the plural (in 3 Nephi 4:29 and 3 Nephi 5:6) and may have prompted the 1902 change here in 3 Nephi 7:6 to the plural. The 1902 edition was never used as a copytext, so subsequent LDS editions have maintained the singular here in 3 Nephi 7:6. The singular is definitely correct here, given the grammatically singular reading a few verses later:

3 Nephi 7:9

> now **this secret combination**
> which had brought so great iniquity upon the people
> did gather themselves together and did place at their head
> a man whom they did call Jacob

The critical text will therefore maintain the singular *combination* in verse 6.

Summary: Maintain in 3 Nephi 7:6 the singular *combination,* the reading in 𝓟 and the 1830 edition (the two earliest sources for this passage).

■ **3 Nephi 7:6**

> *and the regulations of the government was destroyed*
> *because of the secret combination of the friends*
> *and* [*the* 1| ᴀʙᴄᴅᴇꜰɢʜɪᴊᴋʟᴍɴᴏᴘQʀꜱᴛ] *kindreds of them*
> *which murdered the prophets*

In this passage there is a question whether the determiner *the* should be repeated when *friends* and *kindreds* are conjoined. In the printer's manuscript, the definite article *the* is repeated, but it is lacking in the 1830 edition. In verse 2, when copying from 𝓞 into 𝓟, Oliver Cowdery initially repeated the determiner *his* for the conjoined *kindred* and *friends,* but then somewhat later he crossed out the repeated *his* (the level of ink flow for the crossout is heavier):

> 3 Nephi 7:2
>
> and they did separate one from another into tribes
> every man according to his family
> and his kindred and [*his* >+ ɴᴜʟʟ 1| ᴀʙᴄᴅᴇꜰɢʜɪᴊᴋʟᴍɴᴏᴘQʀꜱᴛ] friends

This scribal error on Oliver's part in verse 2 suggests that he could have accidentally repeated the *the* here in verse 6 but without catching his error. It is possible that Oliver's extra repetition of the *his* in verse 2 may have been the result of him having already repeated *his* before *kindred* ("according to **his** family and **his** kindred and (**his**) friends"). Here in verse 6, on the other hand, *kindreds* is preceded by only one conjunct, namely, *the friends* ("of **the** friends and (**the**) kindreds of them which murdered the prophets"), so the motivation for repeating the *the* would have been weaker than the motivation for repeating the *his* in verse 2.

Elsewhere in the text, when *friends* is immediately conjoined with *kindred(s),* the determiner is never repeated:

Alma 10:4	yea and behold I have **many** kindred and friends
3 Nephi 6:27	those judges had **many** friends and kindreds
3 Nephi 7:4	save he had much family and **many** kindreds and friends
3 Nephi 7:14	they were divided into tribes every man according to **his** family kindred and friends
3 Nephi 10:8	behold they began to weep and howl again because of the loss of **their** kindreds and friends
Ether 8:17	wherefore Akish administered it unto **his** kindreds and friends

The only case where we get the repetition is when *kindred(s)* and *friends* are not immediately conjoined:

> Mosiah 4:4 **my** friends and my brothers / **my** kindred and my people

These examples argue that the correct reading in 3 Nephi 7:6 is without the repeated *the* (namely, "of the friends and kindreds"). Nonetheless, it should be noted that none of the other examples of conjoined *friends* and *kindred(s)* involve the definite article *the* as the determiner.

When we consider transmission errors, we find there is some evidence for the 1830 typesetter accidentally omitting the repeated *the:*

> Enos 1:24
> and I saw wars
> between **the** Nephites and [*the* 1ps| ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOQRT] Lamanites
> in the course of my days
>
> Helaman 6:2
> insomuch that they did reject the word of God
> and all **the** preaching and [*the* 1| ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] prophesying
> which did come among them
>
> Helaman 13:16
> because of **the** wickedness and [*the* 1| ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] abominations
> which is in them

Also see under 3 Nephi 10:10 for another case where the 1830 typesetter may have once more omitted the repeated *the.* On the other hand, there is only one example of Oliver Cowdery adding a repeated *the,* and this one was only momentary and virtually immediately corrected by him (there is no change in the level of ink flow for the crossout):

> Helaman 3:25
> and it came to pass that the work of the Lord did prosper
> unto **the** baptizing and [*the* > NULL 1| ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] uniting
> to the church of God many souls

Thus transmission errors support the longer reading with the repeated *the* in 3 Nephi 7:6. In general, the omission of words is much more common than adding words in the transmission of the early text (see the discussion under volume 3). Moreover, the Book of Mormon has many instances of the repeated determiner where modern English readers prefer the shorter reading without the repetition (see the discussion under CONJUNCTIVE REPETITION in volume 3). Even though the determiner is usually not repeated in instances of conjoined *friends* and *kindred(s),* it seems unlikely that Oliver would have added the repeated *the* on his own here in 3 Nephi 7:6. The critical text will therefore accept the reading in 𝔓 as the correct reading for this passage.

Summary: Restore in 3 Nephi 7:6 the reading in 𝔓 with the repeated *the:* "because of the secret combination of the friends and **the** kindreds of them which murdered the prophets"; transmission errors suggest that here the 1830 typesetter omitted the repeated *the.*

■ **3 Nephi 7:7**

and they did cause a great contention in the land
insomuch that the more **righteous** *part of the people*
although they were nearly all become wicked
yea there were but few righteous men among them

Joel Skousen (personal communication, 8 December 2002) suggests that the word *righteous* may be intrusive here in 3 Nephi 7:7. The text intends to say that "the more part of the people" had become wicked. Both 1830 and 𝒫 agree, so 𝒪 undoubtedly read "the more **righteous** part of the people". If the word *righteous* is intrusive here, it must have been inserted in the text during its dictation.

The larger passage here suggests that *righteous* was probably in the original text. Mormon himself wrote the equivalent of "the more righteous part of the people"; but he immediately realized there was a problem with referring to the righteous part of the people, so he explained that most of them had become wicked—only a few righteous were left. Note further that the following verse explains it all correctly:

> 3 Nephi 7:8
>> and thus six years had not passed away
>> since the more part of the people had turned from their righteousness
>> like the dog to his vomit or like the sow to her wallowing in the mire

In other words, Mormon apparently intended to write the equivalent of "the more part of the people" in verse 7 (not just in verse 8), but he accidentally referred to the righteousness of the people too early, which forced him to cut off his original clause and write a corrective *although*-clause (see the discussion under the next variant).

Summary: Maintain in 3 Nephi 7:7 the incorrect use of *righteous* in the phrase "the more **righteous** part of the people"; Mormon's subsequent corrective reading suggests that he did not want to refer to righteousness here, but having done so, he was forced to contradict what he had just written by adding an *although*-clause.

■ **3 Nephi 7:7**

and they did cause a great contention in the land
insomuch that the more righteous part of the people
[*altho they* 1 | *although they* ABCDEFGHIJKLNPS | *although they* > NULL M | OQRT]
were nearly all become wicked
yea there were but few righteous men among them

The third (corrected) printing of the 1905 Chicago missionary edition (in 1907) removed the subordinate conjunction *although* and the subject pronoun *they* in order to eliminate the original incomplete clause in this passage. Such editing is consistent with other editing in the text, although there are still examples of incomplete sentences in the Book of Mormon (see, for instance, under Enos 1:3 for discussion regarding the incomplete sentence in Enos 1:1−2). The critical text will restore here in 3 Nephi 7:7 this instance of an original incomplete sentence. As explained in the previous discussion, Mormon added the *although*-clause here to reverse the incorrect meaning

that resulted when he accidentally wrote the word *righteous* in the preceding phrase ("insomuch that the more **righteous** part of the people").

Summary: Restore in 3 Nephi 7:7 the words *although they;* these words are part of the original text, even though they create a sentence fragment; here Mormon attempted to immediately correct the noun phrase that he had just written by adding this *although-*clause.

■ **3 Nephi 7:7**

and they did cause a great contention in the land
insomuch that the more righteous part of the people
although they [*were >*js *had* 1 | *were* A | *had* bcdefghijklmnopqrst] *nearly all become wicked*
yea there were but few righteous men among them

As discussed under 2 Nephi 22:2, the original Book of Mormon text had a few cases where the perfect auxiliary for the verb *become* was the archaic *be* rather than the modern *have*. Here in 3 Nephi 7:7, in his editing for the 1837 edition, Joseph Smith changed the perfect *were* to *had*. The critical text will restore the original *were,* giving "although they **were** nearly all become wicked". For examples of this usage in the King James Bible, see under Helaman 13:36.

Summary: Restore the original *were* in 3 Nephi 7:7, an example of archaic English where the perfect auxiliary for the verb *become* was *be* rather than *have*.

■ **3 Nephi 7:11**

and it came to pass that they were not so strong
in [*numbers* 1 | *number* abcdefghijklmnopqrst]
as the tribes of the people which were united together

Here the printer's manuscript has the plural *numbers,* whereas the 1830 edition has the singular *number*. In standard English we expect the singular. And elsewhere in the text, there are eight examples of *in number*. Five of the examples of *in number* involve an actual cardinal number:

Mosiah 18:16	and they were **in number** about two hundred and four souls
Mosiah 18:35	and they were **in number** about four hundred and fifty souls
Alma 62:17	and they were **in number** about four thousand which had not been slain
3 Nephi 17:25	and they were **in number** about two thousand and five hundred souls
Ether 6:16	and the friends of Jared and his brother were **in number** about twenty and two souls

(In all of these cases, the word *about* appears in front of the number, even when the number is precise. As explained under Mosiah 6:4, such usage is not an error.) In two cases, *in number* is used negatively with the word *few:*

Alma 17:34	and they were not **in number** a very few
Alma 17:37	yea and they were not few **in number**

And in one case we get *in number* occurring with *many:*

> 1 Nephi 12:1   and I beheld multitudes of people / yea even as it were
> **in number** as many as the sand of the sea

There are, on the other hand, no examples of *in numbers* per se, but there is an example of "in great numbers":

> Alma 57:14   for behold they would break out **in great numbers**

Excluding the case here in 3 Nephi 7:11, there are 16 instances of the plural *numbers* in the earliest text where the singular *number* could be substituted without any fundamental difference in meaning (here we ignore any subject-verb disagreement resulting from the substitution in number). In this list, there are three cases where a predicate adjective is used to refer to *numbers:*

> 1 Nephi 14:12   and its **numbers** were **few**
> Alma 58:15   we were not **strong** according to our **numbers**
> Mormon 5:6   for so **great** were their **numbers** that they did tread the people
> of the Nephites under their feet

The example from Alma 58:15 is quite similar to the reading of the printer's manuscript here in 3 Nephi 7:11:

> Alma 58:15   we were not   strong according to our numbers
> 3 Nephi 7:11   they were not so strong in   numbers

Moreover, in 3 Nephi 1:29 the text reads "they had many children which did grow up and began to wax **strong in years**", thus providing parallel support for the plural phraseology "strong in numbers" here in 3 Nephi 7:11.

There are only two cases where *number* and *numbers* have been mixed up in the transmission of the text, and both were errors by Oliver Cowdery:

> Alma 30:2 (initial error in 𝒪)
>   because of the greatness
>   of their [*number* >+ *numbers* 0 | *numbers* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]

> Alma 57:13 (error while copying from 𝒪 into 𝒫)
>   notwithstanding the enormity
>   of our [*number* 0 | *numbers* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]

The second example shows that Oliver could have accidentally added the plural *s* to an original *number* in 3 Nephi 7:11. The first example, on the other hand, provides evidence for the opposite change, from *numbers* to *number,* although not by the 1830 typesetter. There is no example of the 1830 typesetter (or the typesetter for any other edition) ever mixing up *number* and *numbers*.

Thus the evidence is somewhat contradictory. Internal evidence (usage elsewhere in the text, in Alma 58:15 and in 3 Nephi 1:29) supports the plural "strong in numbers" here in 3 Nephi 7:11 (the reading in 𝒫) while errors in transmission support the singular "strong in number" (the 1830 reading). But the number of transmission errors is minimal. And here in 3 Nephi 7:11, the singular "strong in number" is the expected reading, so it would not be surprising for the text to change from "strong in numbers" to "strong in number". In this case, the critical text will accept the

more systematic but unexpected reading, "strong in numbers", especially since there is indirect evidence in the text for the plural expression "strong in numbers".

Summary: Restore in 3 Nephi 7:11 the reading in 𝓟, "strong in numbers"; the phraseology "we were not strong according to our **numbers**" in Alma 58:15 supports the plural *numbers* in "they were not so strong in **numbers**".

■ **3 Nephi 7:11**

nevertheless they were enemies
[1|, ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQS|; RT]
notwithstanding they were not a righteous people
[1|; ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQS|, RT]
yet they were united in the hatred of those
who had entered into a covenant to destroy the government

As suggested under Alma 17:15, the *notwithstanding*-clause here in 3 Nephi 7:11 belongs with the following text rather than with the preceding text. The first line refers to these various tribes being enemies to each other, with verse 14 explaining that they had nonetheless refrained from going to war against each other ("nevertheless they had come to an agreement that they would not go to war with one another"). Moreover, there is no opposing relationship between being enemies and not being righteous, while unrighteous people could be united in opposing those who sought to destroy the government. The 1830 typesetter placed a semicolon after the *notwithstanding*-clause, but the editors for the 1920 LDS edition moved it to the front of that clause. The critical text will maintain the 1920 emendation in the punctuation.

Summary: Maintain in 3 Nephi 7:11 the punctuation introduced in the 1920 LDS edition; this revision made the *notwithstanding*-clause belong to the following clause, not to the preceding one, thus providing the correct interpretation for the larger passage.

■ **3 Nephi 7:11**

notwithstanding they were [*not* 1ABCEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST| D] *a righteous people*
yet they were united in the hatred of those
who had entered into a covenant to destroy the government

Here we have a minor error with the negative word *not*. The 1841 British edition omitted the *not* in the *notwithstanding*-clause, an obvious typo that the subsequent LDS edition (1849) corrected by restoring the *not*. Perhaps the 1841 typesetter was not expecting a *not* within a *notwithstanding*-clause. Elsewhere the text generally avoids negatives within *notwithstanding*-clauses, the only other example being "notwithstanding they were so numerous that they could **not** be numbered" (Alma 2:35). Yet even in that example, the main clause itself is positive ("they were so numerous").

Summary: In accord with the reading in 𝓟 and the 1830 edition, maintain in 3 Nephi 7:11 the use of *not* in the *notwithstanding*-clause.

■ **3 Nephi 7:12**

*t*therefore Jacob seeing that
their enemies were more numerous than they
he being the king of the band
therefore he commanded his people that
they should take their flight into the northernmost part of the land
and there build up unto themselves a kingdom
until they were joined by dissenters
—for he flattered them that there would be many dissenters—
and they [*become* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMOPQRST | *became* N] *sufficiently strong*
to contend with the tribes of the people

This is another complex passage with an intervening parenthetical comment. The verb in the last main clause, *become,* is not indicative but subjunctive; and it is conjoined with the preceding ellipted predicate (thus "and there **build** up unto themselves a kingdom . . . and they **become** sufficiently strong to contend with the tribes of the people"). The change to *became* in the 1906 LDS edition could have been intentional, especially if this final clause was interpreted as being conjoined with the immediately preceding *until*-clause ("until they **were** joined by dissenters . . . and they **became** sufficiently strong"). In this *until*-clause, the verb phrase *were joined* is grammatically in the past tense, yet it is a conditional subjunctive. The use of *became* in the 1906 LDS edition could also be viewed as a conditional subjunctive.

Under either interpretation, this passage is difficult to process. But since either reading will work, the critical text will follow the reading of the earliest textual sources, 𝓟 and the 1830 edition: "and they **become** sufficiently strong". Since these two firsthand copies of 𝓞 agree here, 𝓞 itself very likely read *become*. For a list of other cases where *become* and *became* have been mixed up in the transmission of the text, see under Alma 13:9.

Summary: Accept in 3 Nephi 7:12 the use of the present-tense subjunctive *become,* the reading of the earliest text; either the present-tense subjunctive *become* or the past-tense subjunctive *became* (the reading in the 1906 LDS edition) will work here, so the critical text will follow the earliest extant reading.

■ **3 Nephi 7:14**

for they were established according to the [*minds* 1ABCDEFGIJLMNOPQRST | *mind* HK] *of them*
which was their chiefs and their leaders

As explained under Alma 17:6, the plural *minds* is possible in the Book of Mormon text, although modern English speakers expect references to "the **mind** of the people" rather than to "the **minds** of the people". Here in 3 Nephi 7:14, the 1874 RLDS edition made the change to the singular *mind,* but the 1908 RLDS edition restored the plural *minds* (most probably by reference to 𝓟). For each case of *mind(s),* the critical text will follow the earliest reading.

Summary: Maintain the plural *minds* in 3 Nephi 7:14, the reading of both 𝓟 and the 1830 reading (and the probable reading of 𝓞).

■ **3 Nephi 7:15**

and it came to pass that Nephi
having been visited by angels
and also [1EFIJLMNOQRT | *by* ABCDGHKPS] *the voice of the Lord*
therefore having seen angels . . .

Here we have one more case of disagreement between the printer's manuscript and the 1830 edition. 𝒫 lacks the repeated preposition *by* ("having been visited by angels and also the voice of the Lord") while the 1830 edition has it ("having been visited by angels and also **by** the voice of the Lord"). As listed under Alma 2:38, there are four cases in the early transmission of the text where the repeated preposition *by* has been lost, one by the 1830 typesetter and three momentary omissions by Oliver Cowdery in his copywork. There's also an example of this loss in the 1837 edition as well as one in the 1840 edition. In fact, here in 3 Nephi 7:15 we have a seventh instance where the repeated *by* has been lost: namely, in the 1849 LDS edition. The copytext for the 1849 edition was the 1841 British edition (which derives directly from the 1837 edition), and that had the repeated *by*. The subsequent LDS text has continued the reading without the *by*.

In contrast to the tendency to omit the repeated *by,* there are no examples in the transmission of the Book of Mormon text where a repeated *by* has ever been added to a conjunctive prepositional phrase. Thus it seems very unlikely here in 3 Nephi 7:15 that the 1830 reading is the innovative one. Instead, it seems more likely that Oliver Cowdery accidentally omitted the *by* when he copied the text from 𝒪 into 𝒫. The critical text will therefore restore the repeated *by* here in 3 Nephi 7:15.

Usually the Book of Mormon text repeats the *by* in conjunctive prepositional phrases when there is an immediately preceding *also:*

title page	written by way of commandment and **also by** the spirit of prophecy and of revelation
Alma 15:16	he being rejected by those which were once his friends and **also by** his father and his kindred
Helaman 15:11	which hath been spoken of by our fathers and **also by** the prophet Zenos and many other prophets
Mormon 3:10	and they did swear by the heavens and **also by** the throne of God
Ether 8:14	they all sware unto him by the God of heaven and **also by** the heavens and **also by** the earth and by their heads

But in one instance, the *by* is not repeated after *also:*

Alma 2:38	many . . . were devoured by those beasts and **also** the vultures of the air

For discussion of this difficult reading, see under that passage. Also see the general discussion under CONJUNCTIVE REPETITION in volume 3.

Summary: Restore the repeated *by* in 3 Nephi 7:15: "having been visited by angels and also **by** the voice of the Lord"); Oliver Cowdery and the 1849 typesetter both accidentally omitted the repeated *by* in this passage; the omission of the repeated *by* has been fairly common in the history of the text.

■ **3 Nephi 7:15**

and it came to pass that Nephi
having been visited by angels and also by the voice of the Lord
therefore having seen angels and being **eyewitness**
and having had power given unto him that he might know concerning the ministry of Christ
and also being **eyewitness** *to their quick return from righteousness*
    unto their wickedness and abominations . . .

In this verse, we have the only two occurrences of *eyewitness* in the Book of Mormon text. Here it appears that *eyewitness* is being used as an adjective rather than as a noun. If it were a noun, we would expect in modern English a preceding indefinite article *an*. Since both the 1830 edition and the printer's manuscript are lacking the *an* in these two cases, we can be confident that the *an* was not in 𝒪 either. Of course, an original *an* could have been lost when the text was dictated to Oliver Cowdery. But the fact that it would have been twice lost in 𝒪 seems unlikely. Moreover, the use of *eyewitness* without *an* is unexpected, so the odds are that the original text read simply as *eyewitness,* the more difficult reading.

Another possibility, suggested by David Calabro (personal communication), is that *eyewitness* is a mishearing for *a witness*. In this passage, Oliver Cowdery could have twice misheard or misinterpreted Joseph Smith's *a* /ə/ as *eye* /əi/. In earlier English, the /ai/ diphthong was typically pronounced as /əi/. In fact, this centralized pronunciation is still found in dialects of American English, especially among rural and less educated speakers in New England. Elsewhere in the text, there are seven instances of *a witness*, but none of these have shown any tendency to be replaced by *eyewitness*. More generally, there are no scribal mix-ups in the manuscripts involving the sounds /ai/ and /ə/, so this potential error seems unlikely. In addition, *eyewitness* is the unexpected reading (in comparison with *a witness*), so it seems unlikely that an original *a witness* would have been twice replaced by *eyewitness* during the dictation of the text (or that the expected *an eyewitness* would have been twice replaced by the unexpected *eyewitness,* as discussed above).

For discussion of the pronunciation /əi/ in Early Modern English, see pages 104–109 of Charles Barber's *Early Modern English* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 1997). For this and similar pronunciations in New England dialects, see pages 526–527 in volume 3 of J. C. Wells' *Accents of English* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1982). I wish to thank Don Chapman for help in locating these references.

Summary: Accept in 3 Nephi 7:15 the two instances of *eyewitness;* in this passage *eyewitness* acts as an adjective rather than as a singular noun, and thus the expected indefinite article *an* is lacking; *eyewitness* is probably not an error for *a witness* since there is no evidence for mix-ups between the sounds /ai/ and /ə/ elsewhere in the history of the Book of Mormon text.

■ **3 Nephi 7:16**

and began to testify boldly
repentance and remission of sins through faith on the Lord Jesus Christ

There seems to be some word missing here, perhaps the preposition *of,* as if the text should read "and began to testify boldly **of** repentance and remission of sins". In this instance, 𝒪 itself must

have lacked the *of* since both 𝔓 and the 1830 edition are firsthand copies of 𝒪 and read identically in this instance. Elsewhere in the text, there are 32 instances of the expected phraseology, "to testify **of** NP" (where NP is a noun phrase), including two more with the word *boldly:*

> 3 Nephi 6:20
>> and there began to be men inspired from heaven and sent forth
>> standing among the people in all the land
>> preaching and **testifying boldly of** the sins and iniquities of the people
>> and testifying unto them concerning the redemption
>> which the Lord would make for his people
>> or in other words the resurrection of Christ
>> and they did **testify boldly of** his death and sufferings

Another possible emendation here in 3 Nephi 7:16 would be to replace the verb *testify* with a verb like *preach* ("and began to **preach** boldly repentance and remission of sins").

Despite the difficulty of the construction "to testify NP", there is evidence elsewhere in the text of the verb *testify* taking a direct object as its complement—namely, without the preposition *of:*

> Alma 5:44
>> yea I am commanded to stand and **testify** unto this people
>> **the things** which have been spoken by our fathers
>> concerning the things which is to come

> Alma 21:5
>> what is that **that** thou hast testified

> Helaman 8:19
>> and now I would that ye should know
>> that ever since the days of Abraham
>> there hath been many prophets
>> that **hath testified these things**

In the first example, there is an intervening adverbial, the prepositional phrase, "unto this people", just like here in 3 Nephi 7:16 with its intervening adverb *boldly*. In the second example the second *that* was removed in the 1837 edition, but in any event the original text did not have an *of* at the end of the relative clause (that is, it did not read "what is that (that) thou hast testified **of** "). Finally, the third example shows that a noun phrase complement can directly follow the verb *testify*. The critical text will therefore maintain the difficult expression in 3 Nephi 7:16: "and began to testify boldly repentance and remission of sins". Although unusual, such usage is definitely possible in the Book of Mormon text.

Summary: Maintain in 3 Nephi 7:16 the use of "repentance and remission of sins" as the direct object for the verb *testify* (that is, without any *of* preceding the conjunctive noun phrase); there is some evidence elsewhere in the text for the unexpected phraseology "to testify NP".

■ **3 Nephi 7:22**

and as many as had devils cast out from them
and were healed of their [*sicknesses* 1ABCEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST | *sickness* D]
and their infirmities . . .

> The 1841 British edition accidentally replaced the plural *sicknesses* with the singular *sickness.* The 1849 LDS edition restored the correct plural. As discussed under Alma 9:22, either grammatical number is possible for the word *sicknesses(es),* although the Book of Mormon text prefers the plural. For each case of *sickness(es),* we follow the reading of the earliest textual sources.

Summary: Maintain in 3 Nephi 7:22 the plural *sicknesses,* the reading of both 𝓟 and the 1830 edition (the earliest extant sources).

■ **3 Nephi 7:23**

[*&* 1 | *And* A | BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
[*it came to pass that* >js NULL 1 | *it came to pass that* A | BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
thus passed away the thirty and second year also

> For the 1837 edition, Joseph Smith here deleted "it came to pass that" in the printer's manuscript. In his editing for that edition, Joseph removed the phrase "it came to pass" in 48 instances (see the discussion under 1 Nephi 10:17). For a complete list of these deletions, see under COME TO PASS in volume 3. In most cases, Joseph removed "it came to pass" when there was another instance of that phrase close by. Here in 3 Nephi 7:23, however, it appears that he was trying to avoid the repetition of the verb *pass* in "and it came to **pass** that thus **passed** away the thirty and second year also". There is no nearby occurrence of "it came to pass" that could have motivated the deletion of this one. Yet even if the redundancy of "it came to pass that thus passed away" motivated the change here in 3 Nephi 7:23, Joseph never removed 28 other instances of this kind of redundancy from the text, including none of the following examples:

> | Jacob 1:1 | for behold it came to **pass** that fifty and five years **had passed** away |
> | Jacob 5:15 | and it came to **pass** that a long time **passed** away |
> | 3 Nephi 2:1 | and it came to **pass** that thus **passed** away the ninety and fifth year also |
> | 3 Nephi 7:21 | and it came to **pass** that the thirty and first year **did pass** away |
> | 3 Nephi 10:9 | and it came to **pass** that thus **did** the three days **pass** away |

> Note that the example in 3 Nephi 2:1 has precisely the same structure as the original reading here in 3 Nephi 7:23. And the example in 3 Nephi 7:21 is close by. Yet only here in 3 Nephi 7:23 did Joseph remove this particular redundancy.
>
> It should also be noted that in the printer's manuscript, Joseph Smith did not cross out the *and* at the beginning of "it came to pass". Thus 𝓟, as corrected by him, reads "& thus passed away the thirty & second year also". But the 1837 edition ended up omitting the *and,* perhaps accidentally. Of the 48 instances where "it came to pass" was deleted in the 1837 edition, 46 were preceded by *and.* In 40 cases, Joseph marked the deletion of "it came to pass" in 𝓟. And for those cases, we get the following statistics for the editing of the preceding *and:*

□ *consistent editing*

retained in both 𝓟 and the 1837 edition	35 times
deleted in both 𝓟 and the 1837 edition	1 time (1 Nephi 10:17)
changed to *now* in both 𝓟 and the 1837 edition	1 time (Alma 24:21)

□ *inconsistent editing*

deleted in 𝓟 but retained in the 1837 edition	1 time (Mosiah 28:6)
changed to *and now* in 𝓟 but *now* in the 1837 edition	1 time (Alma 14:5)
deleted in the 1837 edition but retained in 𝓟	1 time (3 Nephi 7:23)

The inconsistency in the deletion of *and* for the last three types shows that the variation in the deletion of the *and* in 𝓟 and the 1837 edition may be unintentional, at least in these instances. In any event, the critical text will restore every original instance of "and it came to pass" whenever it is supported by the reading of the earliest textual sources.

Summary: Restore in 3 Nephi 7:23 the sentence-initial *and* and the following instance of "it came to pass that", the reading in the 1830 edition and the original reading in 𝓟 (prior to Joseph Smith's editing of 𝓟 for the 1837 edition).

■ **3 Nephi 7:24**

now I would have you [1s | *to* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRT] *remember also*
that there were none which were brought unto repentance
who were not baptized with water

The construction "I would have you **to** do something" is quite archaic. In modern English we expect "I would have you do something" (providing, of course, we ignore the archaic use of the modal *would* in "I would have"). Thus one would expect the omission of the infinitive marker *to* here in 3 Nephi 7:24. The printer's manuscript lacks the *to,* as does the 1953 RLDS edition, while the 1830 edition has the *to.* The original manuscript probably had the unexpected *to.*

There is one more case in the original text where such a use of the infinitival *to* can be found. In that case, the modal verb is the present-tense form *will* rather than the past-tense form *would:*

1 Nephi 17:40
and he loveth them which will have him **to** be their God

In addition, Joseph Smith created one more instance of this usage in his editing for the 1837 edition:

2 Nephi 5:3
for behold we will not
[*that he shall* >js *have him to* 1 | *that he shall* A |
have him to BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] be our ruler

As explained under 2 Nephi 5:3, the critical text will restore the original "we will not that he shall be our ruler" in that passage.

The Oxford English Dictionary (see definition 18b under *have*) gives examples of this construction with the *to* in Early Modern English (the accidentals are modernized for these examples):

Miles Coverdale, Jeremiah 1:17 (1535)
> I will not have thee **to** be afraid of them.

William Shakespeare, *The Two Gentlemen of Verona* (1594)
> What would your Grace have me **to** do in this?

There are also examples of this usage in the King James Bible:

Acts 9:6
> what wilt thou have me **to** do

1 Thessalonians 4:13
> but I would not have you **to** be ignorant

Thus there is nothing inappropriate about the 1830 reading with the *to* here in 3 Nephi 7:24.

The tendency in the history of the text has been to lose small words, so probably the 1830 reading is the correct one in 3 Nephi 7:24. There are quite a number of cases where the infinitival *to* has been added or lost in the transmission of the text, although most cases involve the repeated *to* in conjuncts of infinitive phrases (for a list of these examples, see under 3 Nephi 4:23). But here in 3 Nephi 7:24, the infinitival *to* is not one of these conjunctive cases. When we consider cases of nonconjunctive infinitival *to,* we find that Oliver Cowdery tended to accidentally omit the *to* but only momentarily; many of his examples created impossible readings, which were readily caught by him and corrected:

Alma 47:13 (initial error in 𝒪)
> Amalickiah desired him
> [NULL > *to* 0 | *to* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] come down with his army

Alma 57:18 (initial error in 𝒫)
> those men which we sent with the prisoners did arrive in season
> [*to* 0ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST | NULL > *to* 1] check them

Helaman 15:2 (initial error in 𝒫)
> for ye shall attempt [*to* 0ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST | NULL > *to* 1] flee

On the other hand, there is one instance where the 1830 typesetter accidentally added a nonconjunctive infinitival *to:*

Mosiah 9:19
> and I myself with mine own hands
> did help [1PS | *to* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOQRT] bury their dead

In theory, then, the *to* could have been lost in 𝒫 or added in the 1830 edition. The critical text will assume that the more probable reading in 𝒪 was the more difficult one with the *to* and that Oliver Cowdery accidentally omitted it when he copied the text from 𝒪 into 𝒫.

Summary: Accept in 3 Nephi 7:24 the use of the archaic *to* in the expression "will/would have someone **to** do something" (thus "now I would have you **to** remember also that . . .").

■ **3 Nephi 7:25**

that all such [*as* 1ABCFGHIJKLMNOPQRST | *has* DE] *should come unto them should be baptized with water . . .*

The compositor for the 1841 British edition set the conjunctive *as* as *has,* giving the impossible reading "all such **has** should come unto them". The compositor may have misread *as* as *has* because the preceding word, *such,* ended in an *h*. Orson Pratt, in his editing of the text for the subsequent 1849 LDS edition, missed this typo; and the compositor for the 1849 edition, closely following his copytext (a copy of the 1841 edition), perpetuated the impossible *has*. But in the next LDS edition (1852), the original *as* was restored to the LDS text.

Summary: Maintain the conjunctive *as* in 3 Nephi 7:25: "all such **as** should come unto them".

3 Nephi 8

■ **3 Nephi 8:1**

And now it came to pass that according to our **record**
—and we know our **record** *to be true—*
for behold it was a just man
which did keep the [*record* 1ABCEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST | *records* D] . . .

Here the 1841 British edition replaced the singular *record* with the plural, despite the preceding two instances of the singular. The following LDS edition (1849) restored the correct singular. As explained under Omni 1:9, the original text allows for either number in the phrase "to keep the record(s)", so in each case we follow the earliest textual sources, thus "which did keep the **record**" here in 3 Nephi 8:1.

Summary: Maintain the singular *record* throughout 3 Nephi 8:1.

■ **3 Nephi 8:5**

and it came to pass [*that* 1 | ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
in the thirty and fourth year in the first month
in the fourth day of the month
there arose a great storm

The question here is whether the original manuscript had *that* after "it came to pass". The printer's manuscript has the *that* while the 1830 edition lacks it. The same variant is found later in this part of the text where both 𝔓 and the 1830 edition are firsthand copies of 𝔒:

> Mormon 1:8
> and it came to pass [*that* 1 | ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
> in this year there began to be a war . . .

In that instance, the scribe in 𝔓 was the unknown scribe 2, while here in 3 Nephi 8:5 the scribe was Oliver Cowdery.

For the phrase "come to pass", we have the following cases in the history of the text where a *that* has been added by the scribe for 𝔓; there are four clear cases, and in each one the addition was momentary:

> 2 Nephi 1:1 (added by Oliver Cowdery in 𝔓)
> And now it came to pass [0ABCDEFGHIJKLNPS | *that* > NULL 1 | *that* MOQRT]
> after I Nephi had made an end of teaching my brethren . . .

3 Nephi 28:29 (added by scribe 2 of 𝒫)

    and it shall come to pass
    when [*that when* > NULL 1| ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] the Lord seeth fit . . .

Ether 6:2 (added by Oliver Cowdery in 𝒫)

    for it came to pass [*that* > NULL 1| ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
    after [NULL > *that* 1|*that* A| BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] the Lord
      had prepared the stones . . .

Ether 10:9 (added by Oliver Cowdery in 𝒫)

    and it came to pass [*that* >+ NULL 1| ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
    after the space of many years . . .

In the second of these cases, scribe 2 of 𝒫 initially wrote the correct *when,* but then he wrote inline *that when.* Here he seems to have become distracted in his copywork, and he ended up repeating the subordinate conjunction *when* and also adding a *that* (virtually immediately scribe 2 crossed out the extra *that when*). In the third case, Oliver Cowdery added the *that* apparently in anticipation of the *that* which originally followed the subordinate conjunction *after* (Oliver initially omitted this particular *that* in 𝒫). The first and fourth cases appear to be straightforward instances of momentary insertion of the *that* by Oliver. Ultimately, the evidence for the scribes adding the *that* is rather meager, especially since all four of these cases were corrected in the manuscript. On the other hand, there are nine clear cases where Oliver Cowdery accidentally omitted the *that* after the phrase "come to pass", of which one was permanent (see the list under 3 Nephi 1:22).

    Turning to the 1830 typesetter's practice, we find that there are two cases where he omitted the *that* after the phrase "come to pass"; in both cases, the text involves an Isaiah quotation:

    2 Nephi 17:21

      and it shall come to pass [*that* 1| ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] in that day
      a man shall nourish a young cow and two sheep

    2 Nephi 24:3

      and it shall come to pass [*that* >jg NULL 1| ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
      in that day that the Lord shall give thee rest . . .

In the second case, John Gilbert consciously removed the *that* (he marked its deletion in 𝒫). In both of these cases, the corresponding Isaiah passage in the King James Bible lacks the *that* immediately after "come to pass":

    Isaiah 7:21

      and it shall come to pass in that day
      that a man shall nourish a young cow and two sheep

    Isaiah 14:3

      and it shall come to pass in the day
      that the LORD shall give thee rest . . .

The evidence suggests that Gilbert consulted his Bible when he decided to omit the *that* in these two cases (see the discussion under 2 Nephi 17:21 and 2 Nephi 24:3–4). Yet otherwise, the 1830 typesetter never deleted a *that* after the phrase "come to pass" (see under Alma 58:14 for one case where

he added the *that*). Thus one can argue that here in 3 Nephi 8:5 and in Mormon 1:8 Gilbert was not responsible for the textual variation. Instead, it is more likely that Oliver Cowdery accidentally added the *that* in 3 Nephi 8:5 and scribe 2 of 𝓟 accidentally added it in Mormon 1:8. Note, by the way, that one could argue that the extra occurences of *that* in 2 Nephi 17:21 and 2 Nephi 24:3 could be transmission errors on the part of Oliver, either in 𝓞 or 𝓟, thus supporting the hypothesis that Oliver added the *that* here in 3 Nephi 8:5. But internal evidence elsewhere in the text actually supports the extra use of the *that* in those two Isaiah quotes, as discussed under those passages.

Elsewhere in the textual history, we can find specific evidence for either adding or deleting the *that* between "come to pass" and a following prepositional phrase headed by *in.* We have, for instance, two cases where Oliver Cowdery initially omitted the *that* in 𝓟:

> 3 Nephi 4:5 (initial loss in 𝓟 by Oliver Cowdery; inserted later in the wrong place)
> and it came to pass [1 | *that* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
> in [NULL >+ *that* 1 | ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] the nineteenth year
> Giddianhi found that it was expedient that . . .

> Ether 13:18 (initial loss in 𝓟 by Oliver Cowdery)
> wherefore it came to pass [NULL >+ *that* 1 | *that* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
> in the first year that Ether dwelt in the cavity of a rock
> there was many people which was slain by the sword

There are also a number of cases of either adding or deleting the *that* in printed editions after the first one (most of these appear to be accidental):

> Alma 30:5 (addition in the 1981 LDS edition)
> and it came to pass [1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRS | *that* T]
> in the commencement of the seventeenth year of the reign of the judges
> there was continual peace

> Helaman 11:3 (loss in the 1874 RLDS edition)
> and it came to pass [*that* 1ABCDEFGIJLMNOPQRST | HK] in this year
> Nephi did cry unto the Lord saying . . .

> 3 Nephi 4:1 (loss in the 1841 British edition)
> and it came to pass [*that* 1ABCEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST | D] in the latter end
> of the eighteenth year
> those armies of robbers had prepared for battle

> Ether 11:12 (addition in the 1920 LDS edition)
> and it came to pass [1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQS | *that* RT]
> in the days of Ethem
> there came many prophets

There is some internal support for the shorter reading in 3 Nephi 8:5. Note that here we have an extended prepositional phrase headed by *in* that specifies the year, month, and day of an event. Elsewhere in the text, when we get such a detailed specification with references to these three time elements, we never get the *that* between "come to pass" and the following complex reference to time:

Alma 16:1

and it came to pass
in the eleventh **year** of the reign of the judges over the people of Nephi
on the fifth **day** of the second **month**
there having been much peace in the land of Zarahemla . . .

Alma 49:1

and now it came to pass
in the eleventh **month** of the nineteenth **year**
on the tenth **day** of the month
the armies of the Lamanites were seen approaching towards the land of Ammonihah

Alma 56:1

and now it came to pass
in the commencement of the thirtieth **year** of the reign of the judges
in the second **day**
on the first **month**
Moroni received an epistle from Helaman

There is also one example involving *month* and *year:* "and now it came to pass in the second month of this year there was brought unto us many provisions" (Alma 56:27). This systematicity argues that in 3 Nephi 8:5 the original text did not have the *that* after "it came to pass" and that Oliver Cowdery added the *that* when he copied from 𝓞 into 𝓟; thus the original text probably read as follows:

3 Nephi 8:5 (proposed original reading)

and it came to pass
in the thirty and fourth **year**
in the first **month**
in the fourth **day** of the month
there arose a great storm

See under Mormon 1:8 for further discussion regarding the lack of *that* after the phrase "come to pass".

This decision in favor of the shorter reading for 3 Nephi 8:5 and Mormon 1:8 (that is, without the *that*) agrees with the statistical preference for the shorter reading elsewhere in the text. Excluding these two cases, we find that in the earliest text, given the phrase "come to pass" and a following prepositional phrase headed by *in,* there are 38 cases with an intervening *that* and 63 cases without it. More specifically, if the prepositional phrase headed by *in* is followed by an existential *there*-clause, we get 11 instances with *that* and 21 without (once more we exclude these two cases from 3 Nephi 8:5 and Mormon 1:8 in the count). In theory, of course, either reading, with or without the *that,* is possible here in 3 Nephi 8:5 and in Mormon 1:8. But the occasional tendency of Oliver Cowdery and scribe 2 of 𝓟 to accidentally add the *that* immediately after the phrase "come to pass" supports the decision here to reject the *that* in these two passages.

Summary: Accept the current reading in 3 Nephi 8:5 without the subordinate conjunction *that* after "it came to pass"; there is some evidence from transmission errors by Oliver Cowdery that he could

have accidentally added the *that* here when he copied from 𝓞 into 𝓟; usage elsewhere in the text supports the lack of *that* when a following adverbial phrase provides a complex reference to the time of the event.

■ **3 Nephi 8:5**

and it came to pass
in the thirty and fourth year
in the first month
[*in* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQS | *on* RT] *the fourth day of the month*

As discussed under Alma 56:1, the original *in* in the phrase "**in** the fourth day of the month" appears to be the reading of the original text here in 3 Nephi 8:5. The 1920 LDS edition changed the *in* to *on,* what we expect in modern English. The critical text will restore the original *in.*

■ **3 Nephi 8:9**

and the city of Moroni did sink into the depths of the sea
and the inhabitants [*thereof* 1ABCGHIJLMNOPQRST | *therfore* D | *therefore* E |
therefore > thereof F | *therof* K] *were drowned*

The typesetter for the 1841 British edition misread the word *thereof* here in 3 Nephi 8:9 as *therefore,* which will actually work from a logical point of view: "and the city of Moroni did sink into the depths of the sea and the inhabitants **therefore** were drowned". The secondary *therefore* was maintained in the 1849 LDS edition and in the first printing of the 1852 LDS edition. The correct *thereof* was restored in the second 1852 printing (most likely by reference to the 1840 edition).

Not counting biblical quotations in the Book of Mormon, *therefore* always comes at the beginning of a clause in the text (with over 600 instances), never within the clause (although sometimes there is a connective *and* or *now* before the clause-initial *therefore*). When the Sermon on the Mount is quoted in 3 Nephi 13, there are five instances where *therefore* appears later in the clause (just as it does in the King James Bible for Matthew 6):

3 Nephi 13:8	be not ye **therefore** like unto them
3 Nephi 13:9	after this manner **therefore** pray ye
3 Nephi 13:22	if **therefore** thine eye be single
	thy whole body shall be full of light
3 Nephi 13:23	if **therefore** the light that is in thee be darkness
	how great is that darkness
3 Nephi 13:34	take **therefore** no thought for the morrow

There is one interesting case in the Book of Mormon's version of the Sermon on the Mount where the *therefore* is at the beginning of the clause but in the King James text the *therefore* occurs later in the clause:

3 Nephi 12:48
therefore I would that ye should be perfect
even as I or your Father which is in heaven is perfect

Matthew 5:48
be ye **therefore** perfect
even as your Father which is in heaven is perfect

There is also a case where the Book of Mormon text has a *therefore* but the corresponding King James text lacks it (namely, in 3 Nephi 12:16). As might be expected, this instance of *therefore* begins the clause.

This usage shows that the secondary reading here in 3 Nephi 8:9 goes against the placement of *therefore* everywhere else in the Book of Mormon text proper. If *therefore* were the correct reading in this passage, it should come after the *and,* thus "and therefore the inhabitants were drowned".

Summary: Maintain the occurrence of *thereof* in 3 Nephi 8:9: "and the inhabitants **thereof** were drowned"; *thereof* is not an error for *therefore* since in the Book of Mormon text proper *therefore* always comes at the beginning of the clause (perhaps after a connective *and* or *now*), never later in the clause.

■ **3 Nephi 8:10**

and the earth was carried up upon the city of Moronihah
that in the place of the city [*thereof* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRS | RT]
there became a great mountain

As discussed under Alma 46:12, there are a number of places in the original text where *thereof* seems to be used vacuously. Such instances were, for the most part, removed from the LDS text in the 1920 edition. The critical text will restore them.

■ **3 Nephi 8:11–12**

and there [*were >+ was* 1 | *was* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
a great and terrible destruction in the land southward
but behold there [*were >+ was* 1 | *was* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
a more great and terrible destruction in the land northward

Here we have two instances in 𝒫 where Oliver Cowdery changed *were* to *was,* while the 1830 edition reads *was* in both cases. In each case, the delayed subject is singular, so *was* is what we expect in standard English. If 𝒪 read *was* in these two cases, then we have two instances where Oliver accidentally wrote *were* and then later corrected the *were* to *was.* Since the level of ink flow for the corrections is somewhat heavier (actually, only slightly heavier in the second case), one could argue that Oliver's corrections were the result of proofing 𝒫 against 𝒪. On the other hand, if 𝒪 read *were* in these two cases, then one could interpret the change to *was* in both sources as the result of editing. The first hypothesis is the simpler one since it involves change in only one source.

As noted under Mosiah 10:14, there is little evidence that Oliver Cowdery consciously emended *was* to *were* or *were* to *was* in his manuscript work; rather than follow the rules of subject-verb agreement, Oliver followed his textual source (what Joseph Smith dictated in the case of 𝒪 or what 𝒪 read when Oliver copied from 𝒪 into 𝒫). On the other hand, there is some evidence that the 1830 typesetter tended to replace *were* with *was* in an attempt to follow the standard rules of subject-verb agreement; however, the examples are found only in 1 Nephi, during the early typesetting:

1 Nephi 14:12

and their [*dominion* 0A | *dominion* >js *dominions* 1 |
dominions BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] upon the face of the earth
[*were* 01BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST | *was* A] small

1 Nephi 17:18

neither would they believe
that I [*were* 01 | *was* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] instructed of the Lord

1 Nephi 17:41

and the labor which they had to perform
[*were* 01 | *was* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] to look

In the first instance, it appears that the original text read "their dominions were small"; for discussion, see under 1 Nephi 14:12.

There is also some evidence that Oliver Cowdery sometimes initially wrote *there were* in place of the textually correct *there was:*

1 Nephi 18:25 (initial *were* in 𝓟 immediately corrected to *was*)

there [*was* 0 | *were* >% *was* 1 | *were* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] beasts
in the forests of every kind

Alma 56:28 (initial error in 𝓞)

and also there [*were* > *was* 0 | *was* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQS | *were* RT] sent
two thousand men unto us from the land of Zarahemla

3 Nephi 1:29 (initial *were* in 𝓟 later corrected to *was*)

and there [*were* >+ *was* > NULL > *was* | *was* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
also a cause of much sorrow among the Lamanites

3 Nephi 4:2

and there [*were* >+ *was* 1 | *was* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] no game
for the robbers
save it were in the wilderness

3 Nephi 7:4

now behold there [*were* >+ *was* 1 | *was* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] no man
among them
save he had much family and many kindreds and friends

Note especially that the last three cases are found here at the beginning of 3 Nephi and that in each case the 1830 edition has *was,* the corrected reading in 𝓟. These nearby corrections in 𝓟 strongly argue that Oliver made two more instances of this mistake in his copywork here in 3 Nephi 8:11–12. In other words, the variation between *was* and *were* in this passage was most likely due to initial errors by Oliver when he copied from 𝓞 into 𝓟, not to editing on the part of both Oliver and the 1830 typesetter. The critical text will maintain the *was* in both these instances.

Summary: Retain in 3 Nephi 8:11–12 the two instances of the singular *was,* the 1830 reading and the corrected reading in 𝓟; it appears that here Oliver Cowdery accidentally wrote *there were* twice, both of which he later corrected to *there was* when he proofed 𝓟 against 𝓞.

■ **3 Nephi 8:12**

for behold the whole face of the land was changed
because of the [*tempests* 1PS | *tempest* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOQRT]
and the whirlwinds and the thunderings and the lightnings
and the exceeding great quaking of the whole earth

Here 𝒫 reads *tempests,* in the plural, while the 1830 edition reads *tempest,* in the singular. The conjoined nouns in this sentence are in the plural ("and the whirlwinds and the thunderings and the lightnings") except for the final one ("and the exceeding great **quaking** of the whole earth"). In addition, there is nearby evidence for the replacement of *tempests* with *tempest* in the early text, although in this case the singular form occurs in 𝒫, if only momentarily, rather than in the 1830 edition:

> 3 Nephi 8:17
>
> and thus the face of the whole earth became deformed
> because of the [*tempest > tempests* 1 | *tempests* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
> and the thunderings and the lightnings
> and the quaking of the earth

In this instance, Oliver Cowdery initially wrote *tempest* in 𝒫 but virtually immediately corrected it to *tempests* (there is no change in the level of ink flow for the inserted *s*). Also note that in this passage we once more have the plural *tempests* conjoined with the plurals *thunderings* and *lightnings,* which is then followed by the singular *quaking.* Further support for the conjoining of plural *tempests* and *whirlwinds* occurs a little later in 3 Nephi:

> 3 Nephi 10:14
>
> he that hath the scriptures
> let him search them and see and behold
> if all these deaths and destructions
> by fire and by smoke
> and by **tempests** and by **whirlwinds**
> and by the opening of the earth to receive them
> and all these things
> is not unto the fulfilling of the prophecies of many of the holy prophets

Thus it seems quite reasonable to assume that the singular *tempest* in the 1830 edition for 3 Nephi 8:12 is an error for *tempests.*

In 3 Nephi 8:19, a little further on in this chapter, we get the singular *tempest,* but it is conjoined with an immediately preceding singular noun, *storm;* interestingly, in this passage we get the plural *quakings* rather than the singular *quaking:*

> 3 Nephi 8:19
>
> and it came to pass that
> when the thunderings and the lightnings
> and the **storm** and the **tempest**
> and the quakings of the earth did cease . . .

Yet here the semantics and syntax are somewhat different than the two cases in 3 Nephi 8:12, 17. For further discussion of variation in the grammatical number for *tempest(s),* see under 1 Nephi 19:11. Also see the case under 3 Nephi 22:11, a biblical quotation from Isaiah 54:11, which gives an example where scribe 2 of 𝒫 miswrote *tempest* as *tempests.*

Summary: Restore the plural *tempests* in 3 Nephi 8:12 (the reading of the printer's manuscript); apparently the 1830 compositor accidentally dropped the plural *s* when he set the type from Ⓞ.

■ **3 Nephi 8:15**

and there were some **cities** *which remained*
but the damage thereof was exceeding great
and there were many [*in* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRS | *of* > *in* T] *them which were slain*

Initially the 1981 LDS edition read "and there were many **of** them who were slain", which doesn't make much sense since the pronoun *them* refers to *cities* ("and there were some cities"), not to people. This error entered the LDS text in some of the later reprintings of the 1920 edition, and it was apparently in the copytext for the 1981 edition. The earliest textual sources (Ⓟ and the 1830 edition) correctly read *in.*

In 1983 several corrections in textual substantives were made to the 1981 LDS text, and this was one of them. See under the following passages for other corrections made in 1983: 2 Nephi 12:1 (the name *Amoz* instead of *Amos*), 2 Nephi 28:16 (the restoration of the pronoun *it*), Mosiah 12:22 (*watchman* changed to *watchmen*), and Mormon 5:20 (removal of a dittography, *the the*).

Summary: Maintain in 3 Nephi 8:15 the preposition *in,* the reading of the earliest text; here the text is referring to many people being slain in the cities that were not completely destroyed.

■ **3 Nephi 8:16**

and there were some which were carried away in the whirlwind
and whither they went no man **knoweth**
save they [*know* 1ABCDEFHIJKLMNOPQRST | *knew* G] *that they were carried away*

Here the 1858 Wright edition replaced the present-tense *know* with the past-tense *knew.* Although the immediately preceding verb, *knoweth,* is in the present tense, all the other verbs in the passage are in the past tense. Perhaps this is why the 1858 compositor set *knew* instead of *know.* In this instance, the 1874 RLDS edition did not follow the 1858 Wright edition but instead the 1840 edition.

The present-tense *know* is the more reasonable reading given that we have two different *they*'s in this passage: the first and the third *they*'s specifically refer to the people who were carried away in the whirlwind ("and whither **they** went" and "**they** were carried away"), while the second *they* is a generic pronoun that refers to the immediately preceding *no man* ("no man knoweth save **they** know that . . ."). Thus it makes sense to have the same tense for both instances of the verb *know.* We can also find evidence elsewhere in the original text for using the plural third person pronoun for generic *man:*

> Alma 1:17
> and now the law could have no power on **any man**
> for [*their* >js *his* 1 | *their* A | *his* BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] belief

> Moroni 7:38
> for **no man** can be saved
> —according to the words of Christ—
> save **they** shall have faith in his name

For further discussion of this issue, see under Alma 1:17. For the case of *every man,* see under
2 Nephi 29:11.

Summary: Maintain in 3 Nephi 8:16 the present-tense *know,* the reading of the earliest text, since
the nearby phraseology is in the present tense (thus "whither they went no man **knoweth** save they
know that . . .").

■ **3 Nephi 8:17**

and [1 | *thus* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
the face of the whole earth became deformed
because of the tempests and the thunderings
and the lightnings and the quaking of the earth

The printer's manuscript lacks the *thus* here, while the 1830 edition has it. This verse summarizes
information found in verses 12 and 13: "for behold the whole face of the land was changed . . .
and the highways were broken up and the level roads were spoiled and many smooth places
became rough". The use of the *thus* here in verse 17 is therefore wholly appropriate, even though
it is not absolutely necessary. In other words, there doesn't seem to be a strong motivation for
adding the word *thus* here, especially since the following verse also describes how the earth was
broken up (that is, deformed):

> 3 Nephi 8:18
> and behold the rocks were rent in twain
> yea they were broken up upon the face of the whole earth
> insomuch that they were found in broken fragments
> and in seams and in cracks upon all the face of the land

And as already noted, the loss of the small words like *thus* is more likely than the addition of
such words (for a complete discussion of this point, see volume 3). Thus the original manuscript
probably had the *thus* here in 3 Nephi 8:17.

When we look at the early transmission of the text, we find that there is one case where
Oliver Cowdery omitted *thus,* although only momentarily:

> Alma 58:4
> and it came to pass that
> I [*thus* 0ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST | NULL > *thus* 1] did send an embassy
> to the great governor of our land

On the other hand, there is one instance where it appears that John Gilbert, the 1830 typesetter,
added a *thus:*

> 2 Nephi 10:3
> for [NULL >jg *thus* 1 | *thus* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
> it behooveth our God

As explained under 2 Nephi 10:3, the *thus* is actually inappropriate for that passage and will be
removed in the critical text. In that case, Gilbert's emendation resulted from a misconception of
how the text should read.

Summary: Maintain the 1830 reading with the *thus* in 3 Nephi 8:17 since it is more likely that Oliver Cowdery would have omitted a single word like *thus* from 𝓟 than the 1830 typesetter would have added it, especially in this context.

■ **3 Nephi 8:17**

and thus the face of the whole earth became deformed
because of the [*tempest > tempests* 1 | *tempests* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
and the [*thunderings* 1ABCDEFGIJLMNOPQRST | *thundering* HK]
and the lightnings
and the quaking of the earth

> There are two instances of variation in grammatical number in this verse. First of all, as discussed nearby under 3 Nephi 8:12, Oliver Cowdery initially wrote *tempest* here in 3 Nephi 8:17 rather than the correct *tempests;* his correction to the plural was virtually immediate. The second change was in the 1874 RLDS edition, where *thunderings* was replaced by *thundering.* The 1908 RLDS edition restored the original plural. Note that all the nearest conjoined nouns are in the plural ("because of the **tempests** and the thunderings and the **lightnings**"). The critical text will therefore maintain the plural *thunderings* in this passage.

Summary: Maintain in 3 Nephi 8:17 the plurals *tempests* and *thunderings,* the reading of the earliest textual sources.

■ **3 Nephi 8:18**

and behold the rocks were rent in twain
[*yea* 1APS | BCDEFGHIJKLMNOQRT] *they were broken up*
upon the face of the whole earth

> The use of *yea* here in 3 Nephi 8:18 is wholly appropriate since the *yea*-clause amplifies the preceding clause (both clauses refer to the breaking up of the rocks). The original manuscript undoubtedly had the *yea* since both the 1830 edition and the printer's manuscript have it. In the 1837 edition, the typesetter, it would appear, accidentally dropped out the *yea;* there seems to be no motivation for deleting it, nor was the deletion marked by Joseph Smith in 𝓟 when he edited the text for the 1837 edition.

Summary: In accord with the earliest textual sources, restore the *yea* in 3 Nephi 8:18: "yea they were broken up upon the face of the whole earth".

■ **3 Nephi 8:20**

and it came to pass that there was thick darkness
upon [*the face of all the land* 1A | *all the face of the land* BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]

> As explained under Helaman 14:20, there are examples in the original text of both "all the face of the land" (24 times) and "the face of all the land" (2 times). There is also one instance of "the face of the whole land" (in Mormon 1:13). One of the two instances of the "the face of all the land"

occurred originally here in 3 Nephi 8:20. The other one is found in Helaman 11:21: "and the church did spread throughout the face of all the land". In the 1837 edition, this second instance of the less frequent phraseology (here in 3 Nephi 8:20) was replaced with the more frequent one, "all the face of the land". This change was probably unintentional since the original phraseology does work and the change was not marked by Joseph Smith in his editing of 𝒫 for the 1837 edition. The critical text will restore the earlier reading, "the face of all the land".

Summary: Restore the original word order in 3 Nephi 8:20: "the face of all the land"; there is evidence for this phraseology elsewhere in the text.

■ **3 Nephi 8:20**

and it came to pass that there was thick darkness upon the face of all the land
insomuch that the inhabitants thereof
which had [NULL >+ *not* 1 | *not* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *fallen*
could feel the vapor of darkness

> Here in the printer's manuscript, Oliver Cowdery initially omitted the *not*. He later supplied it, apparently when he proofed 𝒫 against 𝒪. (The supralinear *not* was written with a duller quill, and the level of ink flow is somewhat heavier.) The 1830 edition, also a firsthand copy of 𝒪, has the *not*. And of course, the *not* is necessary since only those still alive could have felt the vapor of darkness. What is interesting about this error is that it also occurred in 1 Nephi 12:5, where the text refers precisely to this same event at the time of the Savior's death:

> > 1 Nephi 12:5
> > and it came to pass that after I saw these things
> > I saw the vapor of darkness that it passed from off the face of the earth
> > and behold I saw the multitudes
> > which had [*not* 0T | 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRS] fallen
> > because of the great and terrible judgments of the Lord

> In that instance, Oliver did not notice his omission of the *not* as he copied from 𝒪 into 𝒫 (nor during proofing).

Summary: Maintain in 3 Nephi 8:20 the required *not* in "insomuch that the inhabitants thereof which had **not** fallen could feel the vapor of darkness".

■ **3 Nephi 8:25**

and thus were the [*howling* 1 | *howlings* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *of the people*
great and terrible

> The printer's manuscript has the singular *howling,* whereas the 1830 edition has the plural *howlings.* The plural works better with the plural verb *were.* Yet there is evidence, at least in existential statements, for *were* to be followed by a singular count noun, including one case where that count noun takes the verbal ending *-ing:*

Helaman 3:31
> and in this year there [*were* 1ABDEP | *was* CGHIJKLMNOQRST | *were > was* F]
> continual [*rejoiceings >% rejoiceing* 1 | *rejoicing* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
> in the land of Zarahemla

Under Helaman 3:31, I list five other instances of "there were <singular count noun>" in the original text. Such examples suggest that the occurrence of *were* followed by a singular count noun in 𝒫 for 3 Nephi 8:25 is possible ("and thus **were the howling** of the people great and terrible"). Nonetheless, it should be pointed out that here in 3 Nephi 8:25 the reading is not an existential statement; instead, we have two conjoined predicate adjectives ("great and terrible") that act as subject complement to "the howling(s) of the people".

Other examples of *howling(s)* in conjoined noun phrases always agree in number:

3 Nephi 8:23 (singular only)
> and there was great **mourning** and **howling** and **weeping**
> among all the people continually

Ether 15:16 (singular only)
> they took up a **howling** and a **lamentation**
> for the loss of the slain of their people

Ether 15:16 (plural only)
> and so great were their **cries**
> their **howlings** and **lamentations**
> that it did rend the air exceedingly

Ether 15:17 (plural only)
> they did rend the air
> with their **cries** and their **howlings** and their **mournings**

Of course, in 3 Nephi 8:25 *howling(s)* is not conjoined with any noun. But one could argue that Oliver Cowdery accidentally wrote the singular *howling* in verse 25 because of its occurrence two verses earlier in the text: "and there was great mourning and **howling** and weeping" (3 Nephi 8:23).

There are many examples in the early transmission of the text where the grammatical number was mixed up for count nouns taking the verbal ending *-ing*. Here I list a number of cases where Oliver Cowdery wrote a singular form in 𝒫 instead of the plural, two of which he left uncorrected (each of these is marked below with an asterisk):

1 Nephi 13:23
> and it is a record like unto
> the [*engraveings* 0 | *engraveing > engraveings* 1 |
>   *engravings* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
> which are upon the plates of brass

* 1 Nephi 16:25
> and he was truly chastened
> because of his [*murmurings* 0 | *murmuring* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
> against the Lord

     * Mosiah 19:3 (corrected in 𝒫 to the plural by John Gilbert, the 1830 compositor)
        and the lesser part began to breathe out
        [*threatning >*jg *threatnings* 1 | *threatnings* ABCD |
           threatenings EFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] against the king

    Alma 22:14
       but the [*suffering > sufferings* 1 | *sufferings* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
       and death of Christ atoneth for their sins

    Alma 30:22
       why do ye teach this people that there shall be no Christ
       to interrupt their [*rejoiceing > rejoiceings* 1 | *rejoicings* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]

    Moroni 9:25
       and may his [*suffering > sufferings* 1 | *sufferings* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
       and death . . . rest in your mind forever

There are two instances where the 1830 compositor made the opposite change, from a singular count noun taking the verbal ending *-ing* to the plural. For one of these examples, the error is obvious:

    3 Nephi 25:2
       but unto you that fear my name
       shall the Sun of righteousness arise
       with [*healing* 1BCDEFGHIJLMNOPQRST | *healings* AK] in his wings

In this case, we have a biblical quotation from Malachi 4:2, which has the singular *healing.* The 1830 compositor's error, *healings,* may have been the result of him anticipating the following *wings,* which ends in *ings;* also note that this same error of *healings* was made by the compositor for the 1892 RLDS edition.

But there is a second example where the 1830 compositor changed a singular count noun ending in *-ing* to *-ings,* namely, in the example from Mosiah 19:3, listed above, where in the printer's manuscript Oliver Cowdery seems to have accidentally written the singular *threatening* (spelled as *threatning*), which the 1830 compositor, John Gilbert, corrected in 𝒫 to the plural and set as *threatenings* (spelled as *threatnings*) in the printed edition:

    Mosiah 19:3
       and the lesser part began to breathe out
       [*threatning >*jg *threatnings* 1 | *threatnings* ABCD |
           threatenings EFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] against the king

In other words, Gilbert was perfectly willing to correct what appeared to be an obvious error in number. Thus one could argue that the same thing happened here in 3 Nephi 8:25: 𝒪 read "and thus **were the howling** of the people great and terrible", an obvious error in subject-verb agreement, so Gilbert changed *howling* to *howlings*. This is not to say, however, that such a proposed reading in 𝒪 was actually correct. It is very possible that the scribe for 𝒪 (presumably Oliver Cowdery) accidentally omitted the plural *s* from *howlings* when he took down Joseph Smith's dictation. Clearly, we have the evidence listed earlier in this discussion that Oliver could have made such a mistake in 𝒪.

Thus evidence from transmission errors can be found in support of both variants, *howling* and *howlings,* here in 3 Nephi 8:25. Oliver Cowdery could have accidentally changed the plural *howlings* to the singular in 𝓟 (or even in 𝒪), or John Gilbert could have consciously corrected the difficult but possible reading *howling* to *howlings* when he set the type for the 1830 edition.

When we turn to usage elsewhere in the text, we find that when the *be* verb is in the plural we get only plurals for count nouns that take the verbal ending *-ing:*

Mosiah 8:20	yea and how blind and impenetrable **are the understandings** of the children of men
Alma 50:19	how merciful and just **are all the dealings** of the Lord
3 Nephi 8:23	yea great **were the groanings** of the people

In fact, the last example occurs only two verses earlier in this same chapter, and its reference to "the groanings of the people" parallels verse 25's reference to "the howlings of the people" (at least in the 1830 edition). Moreover, all three of these examples have predicate adjectives acting as subject complements, just like here in 3 Nephi 8:25. To be sure, there are cases of plural count nouns ending in the verbal *-ing* where we get the singular form of the *be* verb instead of the plural *were* in the original text; note that these examples also have predicate adjectives acting as subject complements:

1 Nephi 17:2

and so great [*was* 0 | *was* >js *were* 1 | *were* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
the blessings of the Lord upon us
that while we did live upon raw meat in the wilderness
our women did give plenty of suck for their children

Mosiah 23:24

and great [*was* >js *were* 1 | *was* A | *were* BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] **their rejoicings**

But elsewhere in the text there are no sentences involving predicate adjectives where a count noun ending in the verbal *-ing* is in the singular while the associated *be* verb is in the plural. Thus internal evidence supports the 1830 reading here in 3 Nephi 8:25, but not overwhelmingly since there are only a handful of examples. And the evidence from transmission errors is inconclusive. Ultimately, the most significant evidence in favor of the plural *howlings* in verse 25 is the parallel use of the plural *groanings* earlier in verse 23 ("yea great **were** the **groanings** of the people"). The critical text will therefore accept the 1830 reading in verse 25, the expected reading: "and thus were the **howlings** of the people great and terrible". In fact, the use of *thus* here in verse 25 suggests a connection to the previous "great were the groanings of the people". The singular *howling* in 𝓟 therefore appears to be an error resulting from the use of the singular *howling* earlier in verse 23 ("and there was great mourning and **howling** and weeping").

Summary: Maintain in 3 Nephi 8:25 the use of the plural *howlings,* the 1830 reading; although the singular *howling,* the reading in 𝓟, is possible, it seems more likely that the original reading was the expected one, "and thus were the **howlings** of the people great and terrible"; usage elsewhere in the text supports the plural *howlings* in this kind of expression, especially the phraseology earlier in 3 Nephi 8:23: "yea great were the **groanings** of the people".

3 Nephi 9

■ **3 Nephi 9:2**

and it is because of their iniquity
and [*their* > NULL 1 | ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *abominations that they are fallen*

There is some evidence that Oliver Cowdery tended to repeat the determiner *their* in conjunctive structures involving a conjoined *abomination(s)*. Here in verse 2, Oliver initially wrote "their iniquity & their abominations" but virtually immediately crossed out the repeated *their* (there is no apparent change in the level of ink flow for the crossout). The 1830 reading lacks the repeated *their* and thus agrees with the corrected reading in 𝓟. This agreement argues that 𝓞 also lacked the *their* before *abominations*. Later in verse 7, Oliver made the same initial error in 𝓟:

> 3 Nephi 9:7
> to hide their wickedness
> and [*their* >+ NULL 1 | ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] abominations
> from before my face

In this instance, the ink for the crossout of the repeated *their* is somewhat heavier.

Usage elsewhere in this chapter shows that either reading, with or without the repeated *their,* is possible for a conjoined *abominations:*

> 3 Nephi 9:5   to hide their iniquities and **their** abominations from before my face
> 3 Nephi 9:8   to hide their wickedness and abominations from before my face
> 3 Nephi 9:10   concerning their wickedness and **their** abominations
> 3 Nephi 9:11   that their wickedness and abominations might be hid
> 3 Nephi 9:12   because of their wickedness and **their** abominations

So for each case, the critical text will follow the earliest sources. Thus there is a repeated *their* in verses 5, 10, and 12 but not in verses 2, 7, 8, and 11. Overall, there are 13 instances of the repeated *their* for a conjoined *abomination(s)* but 19 without the repeated *their.*

Summary: In 3 Nephi 9:2 there is no repeated *their* for the conjunct *abominations;* for each instance of a conjoined *abomination(s),* we follow the earliest textual sources; thus the repeated *their* occurs in verses 5, 10, and 12 in this chapter but is lacking in verses 2, 7, 8, and 11.

■ **3 Nephi 9:5**

that the blood of the prophets and [*of* 1PS| ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOQRT] *the saints*
shall not come up any more unto me against them

The printer's manuscript has the repeated *of* in this conjoining of *the prophets* and *the saints,* while the 1830 edition lacks the repeated *of.* Following the reading in 𝓟, the editors for the 1908 RLDS edition restored the repeated *of,* while the LDS text has maintained the 1830 reading without the extra *of.*

Although repetition of conjunctive elements is characteristic of the Book of Mormon text (see the discussion under CONJUNCTIVE REPETITION in volume 3), for this particular conjunctive structure we find that elsewhere the *of* is not repeated. All other examples that refer to the blood of prophets and saints come shortly after this first instance of the phrase in verse 5:

> 3 Nephi 9:7
>> that **the blood of the prophets and the saints** shall not come up
>> any more unto me against them

> 3 Nephi 9:8
>> that **the blood of the prophets and the saints** should not come up
>> any more unto me against them

> 3 Nephi 9:9
>> that **the blood of the prophets and the saints** should not come up
>> unto me any more against them

> 3 Nephi 9:11
>> that **the blood of the prophets and the saints** which I sent among them
>> might not cry unto me from the ground against them

The language for the three examples in verses 7–9 is virtually the same as in verse 5 (except for one minor change in word order and the question of whether the modal is *should* or *shall*). In all four cases, there is no repeated *of* in the conjoining of *the prophets* and *the saints*. This finding implies that there should be no repeated *of* in verse 5 either, which is how the 1830 edition reads. So the repeated *of* in the printer's manuscript for verse 5 could very well be an error. On the other hand, if the 1830 compositor is responsible for the variation here in verse 5, then the loss of the *of* was probably independent of the four following instances of "the blood of the prophets and the saints". Instead, the more likely reason for the loss would have been the natural tendency in the history of the text to omit repeated elements in conjunctive structures, especially when such repetition is unexpected in English.

When we look at early transmission errors in the text, the evidence is nearly equally balanced in terms of adding and dropping the repeated *of* in conjunctive structures. Oliver Cowdery, for instance, momentarily added a repeated *of* in two cases:

> Helaman 6:5
>> to be the humble followers **of** God
>> and [*of* > NULL 1| ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] the Lamb

Helaman 6:31

and did build up unto themselves
idols [*of gold & of silver > of their gold & their silver* 1|
   of their gold and their silver ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]

In the second example, Oliver expected the phrase "idols of gold and of silver" (elsewhere the text has seven instances with "of gold and **of** silver" but none with "of gold and silver").

In contrast to these two cases, there is one case where Oliver momentarily omitted a repeated *of:*

Alma 56:11

they have died in the cause **of** their country
and [NULL > *of* 1| *of* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] their God

But it should be noted that there is no evidence of Oliver permanently adding or dropping a repeated *of* in a conjunctive structure.

We can find evidence for the 1830 compositor adding and dropping the repeated *of;* and in his case, the changes are permanent (none of them involve in-press changes). In two cases, he omitted the *of:*

Enos 1:23

and continually reminding them **of** death
and [*of* 1| ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] the duration of eternity

Mosiah 3:8

and he shall be called Jesus Christ the Son of God
the Father **of** heaven
and [*of* 1| ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] earth

And in two cases he added the *of:*

Alma 11:39

yea he is the very Eternal Father **of** heaven
and [1| *of* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] earth

Ether 1:43

and there will I bless thee and thy seed
and raise up unto me **of** thy seed
and [1| *of* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] the seed of thy brother

So in 3 Nephi 9:5, Oliver Cowdery could have added the *of* or the 1830 compositor could have dropped it, but the permanency of the 1830 changes in comparison to Oliver's momentary changes suggests that the odds are somewhat greater that the 1830 compositor is responsible for the variation in this passage. And this would mean that the loss of the *of* was consistent with the general tendency in the text to omit repeated elements in conjunctive structures. The critical text will therefore accept the reading in 𝓟, the more difficult one with the repeated *of,* as the probable reading in 𝓞. This means that there is one instance of "the blood of the prophets and **of** the saints" in the earliest text but four of "the blood of the prophets and the saints". In other words, we have variation for this phrase.

Elsewhere the textual evidence favors the loss of the repeated *of.* As far as scribe 2 of 𝓟 is concerned, there is evidence from two passages of him omitting the repeated *of* (see the discussion

under 3 Nephi 29:8 and under 3 Nephi 30:2). More strikingly, in the subsequent printed editions (from 1837 on), the overwhelming tendency has been to omit the repeated *of,* which is consistent with the general omission of repeated elements in conjunctive structures:

> 2 Nephi 17:4 (1874 RLDS edition)
>> for the fierce anger **of** Rezin with Syria
>> and [*of* 1ABCDEFGIJLMNOQRT | HKPS] the son of Remaliah

> Mosiah 23:23 (1837 edition)
>> yea even the God **of** Abraham
>> and [*of* 1APS | BCDEFGHIJKLMNOQRT] Isaac
>> and **of** Jacob

> Helaman 2:4 (1841 British edition)
>> to carry on the secret work **of** murder
>> and [*of* 01ABCEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST | D] robbery

> Helaman 6:9 (1905 LDS edition)
>> and they did have an exceeding plenty **of** gold
>> and [*of* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLNOPRST | MQ] silver

> 3 Nephi 3:19 (1837 edition)
>> some one that had the spirit **of** revelation
>> and also [*of* 1A | BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] prophecy

> 3 Nephi 10:13 (first printing of the 1852 LDS edition)
>> neither were they overpowered by the vapors **of** smoke
>> and [*of* 1ABCDEGHIJKLMNOPQRST | NULL > *of* F] darkness

> Moroni 9:25 (the 1906 LDS edition)
>> and the hope **of** his glory
>> and [*of* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMOPQRST | N] eternal life

There is only one example where a repeated *of* has been added in an edition published after 1830:

> 3 Nephi 30:2 (1858 Wright edition)
>> and **of** your murders
>> and [1ABCDEFIJLMNOPQRST | *of* GHK] your priestcrafts

Summary: Restore in 3 Nephi 9:5 the more difficult reading with the repeated *of* in the phrase "the blood of the prophets and **of** the saints" (the reading in 𝓟); the 1830 reading without the repeated *of* is more likely an error on the part of the 1830 compositor; Oliver Cowdery, the scribe in 𝓟, never permanently added a repeated *of* in his scribal work, while the 1830 compositor sometimes permanently omitted the repeated *of* in his typesetting.

■ **3 Nephi 9:5**

that the blood of the prophets and of the saints shall not come
[*up up > up* 1 | *up* APS | BCDEFGHIJKLMNOQRT] *any more unto me against them*

Both the printer's manuscript and the 1830 edition have the preposition *up* here in 3 Nephi 9:5 (although initially Oliver Cowdery accidentally wrote the *up* twice). The 1837 edition accidentally

omitted the *up*. The 1908 RLDS edition restored it, but the LDS text has retained the 1837 reading. In this passage there are three other occurrences of this expression, and they have each maintained the *up*:

> 3 Nephi 9:7
>> that the blood of the prophets and the saints shall not come **up** any more unto me against them

> 3 Nephi 9:8
>> that the blood of the prophets and the saints should not come **up** any more unto me against them

> 3 Nephi 9:9
>> that the blood of the prophets and the saints should not come **up** unto me any more against them

The original *up* will, of course, be restored in verse 5.

Summary: Restore the preposition *up* in 3 Nephi 9:5 since it was there in the original text as well as in the three subsequent parallel occurrences of the same basic expression in verses 7–9.

■ **3 Nephi 9:6**

and the inhabitants thereof to be buried up
in the [*debths* 1 | *depths* ABCEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST | *depth* D] *of the earth*

The 1841 British edition changed the plural *depths* to the singular *depth,* probably accidentally. The subsequent LDS edition (1849) restored the plural *depths.* Elsewhere the text has only the plural in references to the depths of the earth (including one more time in this chapter):

> 2 Nephi 26:5   the **depths** of the earth shall swallow them up
> 3 Nephi 9:8   and the inhabitants thereof have I buried up in the **depths** of the earth
> 3 Nephi 28:20   by his power they were delivered out of the **depths** of the earth

For other cases involving *depth* versus *depths,* see under 1 Nephi 8:32 and Alma 62:41.

Summary: Maintain the plural *depths* in 3 Nephi 9:6 ("to be buried up in the **depths** of the earth").

■ **3 Nephi 9:7**

yea and [1ABCDEGHIJKLMNOPQRST | *in* F] *the city of Onihah and the inhabitants thereof*
and the city of Mocum and the inhabitants thereof
and the city of Jerusalem and the inhabitants thereof

Here a completely unnecessary *in* was accidentally inserted in the 1852 LDS edition, probably by the compositor. The error is obvious, and it was therefore removed in the following LDS edition (1879). Perhaps the source of the extra *in* was the frequent use of the word *inhabitants* in the larger passage (nine times in verses 3–10). Yet for each instance of "the city (of) X . . . and the inhabitants thereof ", there is no *in* immediately preceding "the city (of) X".

Summary: Maintain in 3 Nephi 9:7 (and elsewhere in 3 Nephi 9:3–10) the systematic expression "the city (of) X . . . and the inhabitants thereof"—that is, without any *in* immediately preceding "the city (of) X".

■ **3 Nephi 9:7**

> *yea and the city* [*of* 1EFIJLMNOPQRST | ABCDGHK] *Onihah and the inhabitants thereof*
> *and the city of Mocum and the inhabitants thereof*
> *and the city of Jerusalem and the inhabitants thereof*

■ **3 Nephi 9:8**

> *and behold the city of Gadiandi*
> *and the city of Gadiomnah*
> *and the city of Jacob*
> *and the city* [*of* 1ABDEFGIJLMNOQRT | CHKPS] *Gimgimno*
> *all these have I caused to be sunk*

In 3 Nephi 9:6–10, the original text appears to have systematically had the preposition *of* between *the city* and the name of the city (12 times). In verse 7, the *of* is missing in the 1830 edition for the city Onihah, but not in the printer's manuscript. This *of* was restored to the LDS text in the 1849 LDS edition, perhaps intentionally (Orson Pratt, the editor for that edition, may have noticed the systematic use of "the city **of** X" throughout this passage). The 1908 RLDS edition restored the *of* to the RLDS text (most likely by reference to 𝒫).

Oliver Cowdery never added the *of* to the expression "the city X", nor to the parallel expression "the land Y". But he did tend to omit the *of* from "the city **of** X" and "the land **of** Y", usually momentarily; most examples occurred in 𝒫, but there was one in 𝒪 (marked below with an asterisk):

> Alma 27:23 (also omitted in the 1830 edition)
> the land [*of* 0 | NULL > *of* 1 | ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] Jershon

> * Alma 31:3
> the land [NULL > *of* 0 | *of* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] Zarahemla

> Alma 53:2
> the city [*of* 0ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST | NULL >+ *of* 1] Mulek

> Alma 56:14
> the city [*of* 0ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST | NULL > *of* 1] Zeezrom

> Alma 62:30
> the city [NULL > *of* 1 | *of* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] Nephihah

> Helaman 1:22 (also omitted in the 1841 British edition and in three early 20th-century LDS editions)
> the city [*of* 0ABCEGHIJKNOPRST | NULL > *of* 1 | DLMQ | *of of* F] Zarahemla

> Helaman 5:15
> the city [NULL >+ *of* 1 | *of* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] Mulek

There is one case where the *of* appears to have been lost in copying from 𝒪 into 𝒫; for discussion of that case (involving "the land of Bountiful"), see under Alma 50:32.

The 1830 typesetter, on the other hand, tended to both add and delete the *of;* although there are no examples involving "the city (of) X", there are four that involve "the land (of) Y":

> 1 Nephi 17:7 (added in the 1830 edition)
>> the land [01|*of* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] Bountiful

> Alma 27:23 (omitted in the 1830 edition, also initially in 𝓟)
>> the land [*of* 0|NULL > *of* 1| ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] Jershon

> Alma 31:3 (added in the 1830 edition)
>> the land [01|*of* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] Jershon

> Alma 52:15 (omitted in the 1830 edition)
>> the land [*of* 01| ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] Bountiful

(Also see under Mormon 4:1 for an instance where the 1830 typesetter may have omitted the *of* from "the land of Desolation".) These early errors show that it is more likely that the 1830 typesetter is responsible for the variation here in 3 Nephi 9:7. The critical text will therefore maintain the *of* here in 3 Nephi 9:7.

In verse 8, the *of* was accidentally dropped in the 1840 edition for "the city **of** Gimgimno". This shorter reading has continued in the RLDS textual tradition. The typesetter for the 1840 edition also omitted the *of* from "the city **of** Zarahemla" in Alma 61:8. In addition, he twice added the *of,* once to "the city Nephi" (Alma 47:31) and once to "the city Gid" (Alma 55:16). For discussion, see under each of these passages. Thus the 1840 typesetter tended to both add and drop the *of* from "the city (of) X". Here in 3 Nephi 9:8, the critical text will, of course, maintain the *of* in "the city of Gimgimno", the reading of both 𝓟 and the 1830 edition.

Summary: Maintain the consistent use of the preposition *of* for the expression "the city **of** X" throughout 3 Nephi 9:6–10; in verse 7 the 1830 typesetter seems to have omitted the *of* in "the city **of** Onihah"; in verse 8 the 1840 typesetter omitted the *of* in "the city **of** Gimgimno".

■ **3 Nephi 9:8**

that the blood of the prophets and the saints
[*should > shall >+ should* 1|*should* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
not come up any more unto me against them

Throughout this passage Oliver Cowdery tended to write *should* rather than the textually correct *shall,* as we can see earlier in verses 5 and 7 when he initially made this mistake:

> 3 Nephi 9:5
>> that the blood of the prophets and of the saints
>> [*should > shall* 1|*shall* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
>> not come up any more unto me against them

> 3 Nephi 9:7
>> that the blood of the prophets and the saints
>> [*should > shall* 1|*shall* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
>> not come up any more unto me against them

For these two cases, Oliver caught his error virtually immediately (in each case, there is no change in the level of ink flow for the supralinearly inserted *shall*). So here in verse 8, when Oliver wrote *should,* he first thought this must be a mistake (just like the mistake he had initially made in verses 5 and 7), so he corrected the *should* to *shall* (there is no difference in ink flow for this correction). But later, probably when he proofed 𝒫 against 𝒪, he realized that 𝒪 actually read *should,* so he restored the *should* (his second correction is with somewhat heavier ink flow). Note that the 1830 edition here in verse 8 reads *should,* not *shall.* The following verse also has *should:*

> 3 Nephi 9:9
> that the blood of the prophets and the saints
> **should** not come up unto me any more against them

Thus we get variation here in 3 Nephi 9, two instances with *shall* and two with *should.* In each case, the critical text will follow the earliest textual sources.

Summary: Accept the variability between *shall* and *should* in the parallel expressions in 3 Nephi 9:5–9 that refer to the blood of the prophets and the saints not coming up any more unto the Lord; the first two instances read *shall* and the second two *should.*

■ **3 Nephi 9:9**

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

The name of this city seems to be a compound composed of *Jacob* and *Ugath.* (There is the similar proper noun *Ogath* in the Book of Mormon, found in Ether 15:10.) The question here is whether this city name should be spelled as a compound or as a single word. The original spelling in the printer's manuscript *(Jacob Ugath)* suggests a compound spelling, while the 1830 compositor's spelling of this city as *Jacobugath* argues for the single-word spelling. Later in 𝒫, Oliver Cowdery inserted a hyphen between *Jacob* and *Ugath,* giving *Jacob-Ugath;* the level of ink flow for the hyphen is somewhat heavier. It is also possible that this ink stroke was an attempt to connect *Jacob* and *Ugath* into a single word (see the note for line 10 on page 378 of 𝒫 in volume 2 of the critical text).

There are several instances of compound names elsewhere in the Book of Mormon text. Consider first of all the spellings in 𝒫 and in the 1830 edition for the two names that derive from sentences in the original Hebrew, *Shear-jashub* and *Maher-shalal-hash-baz* (Isaiah's names for his sons):

> 2 Nephi 17:3
> [*Shear Jashub* >+ *Shear-Jashub* 1 | *Shearjashub* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOQRT |
>   *Shear-jashub* P | *Shear-jasub* S]

> 2 Nephi 18:1
> [*Maher shalal hash baz* >− *Maher-shalal-hash-baz* 1 |
>   *Maher-shalal-hash-baz* ABCDEFGHIJLMNOQRT | *Mahershalal-hash-baz* KPS]

> 2 Nephi 18:3
> [*Mahershalal hash baz* >+ *Maher-shalal-hash-baz* 1 |
>   *Maher-shalal-hash-baz* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOQPRST]

𝄞 is not extant for either of these two names, but their original spellings in 𝄞 suggest that in 𝄞 there were spaces between the morphemes but no hyphens. For both names, Oliver Cowdery later inserted the hyphens in 𝄞. Note, however, that for the first name the 1830 compositor rejected Oliver's two-word spelling *Shear-Jashub* and set the name as a single word, *Shearjashub*. This example shows that here in 3 Nephi 9:9 the compositor's one-word spelling *Jacobugath* could derive from a two-word spelling in 𝄞, either *Jacob Ugath* or *Jacob ugath*. (It is rather unlikely that the reading in 𝄞 had a hyphen separating the two morphemes since Oliver initially copied the name into 𝄞 with only a space between the two morphemes.) Of course, the 1830 spelling *Jacobugath* could derive directly from an original single-word spelling in 𝄞 (in other words, *Jacobugath*).

The Book of Mormon also has two compound names involving *Lehi* and *Nephi*. The first is the name *Lehi-Nephi,* a land and its capital city. Out of seven occurrences of this name, only the first one (in Mosiah 7:1) is written in 𝄞 with a hyphen (as *Lehi-Nephi*); the remaining six (from Mosiah 7:1 through Mosiah 9:8) are written *LehiNephi* in 𝄞. As expected, the 1830 compositor supplied the hyphens for these six other cases. 𝄞 is not extant for the book of Mosiah, but 𝄞 probably read *LehiNephi* in all seven cases. This conclusion is supported by the consistent manuscript spelling for the second compound name, *Anti-Nephi-Lehi*. This name occurs 12 times in the text, and in each instance it is spelled without any spaces or hyphens in 𝄞 (where extant) and in 𝄞 — that is, as *AntiNephiLehi* (from Alma 23:17 through Alma 43:11). In all 12 cases, the 1830 compositor set the name with hyphens, as *Anti-Nephi-Lehi*.

Probably the most relevant compound name for analyzing the city *Jacob-Ugath* is the name for the village *Ani-Anti:*

> Alma 21:11
> [*Anianti > Ani Anti >+ Ani-Anti* 1 | *Ani-anti* ABCDEGHKPS |
>   *Ani-Anti* FIJLMNOQRT]

As explained under Alma 21:11, the most likely spelling for *Ani-Anti* in 𝄞 was the two-word spelling *Ani anti,* which Oliver Cowdery initially spelled in 𝄞 as one word, *Anianti*. Oliver immediately corrected this one-word spelling to the two-word *Ani Anti* by crossing out *Anianti* and writing inline *Ani Anti*. The space between the two morphemes and the capitalized *A* for *Anti* indicate that Oliver intended this name to be a compound. Later, with somewhat heavier ink flow, Oliver inserted a hyphen between the *Ani* and *Anti*. These corrections in Alma 21:11 argue that here in 3 Nephi 9:9 the name *Jacob-Ugath* probably read *Jacob ugath* in 𝄞, which Oliver initially copied as *Jacob Ugath* into 𝄞 but the 1830 compositor set as *Jacobugath*.

Since there seems to be a connection between the name *Jacobugath* and its founding king Jacob (mentioned here in this verse, also earlier in 3 Nephi 7:9–13), I would recommend showing this relationship more clearly by placing a hyphen between *Jacob* and *ugath*. For compound names where there appears to be an equal conjoining of morphemes, the critical text will capitalize the noninitial morpheme(s) as well as the initial one, thus the names *Lehi-Nephi* and *Anti-Nephi-Lehi*. Following this pattern, the critical text will capitalize the noninitial morpheme *Ugath* in the city name *Jacob-Ugath,* similarly for the noninitial morpheme *Anti* in the village name *Ani-Anti*. The names for Isaiah's two sons derive from sentences in Hebrew and are therefore spelled with hyphens, but for those cases the noninitial morphemes of the compound name are not capitalized

(see under 2 Nephi 17:3 for the name *Shear-jashub* and under 2 Nephi 18:1 for the name *Maher-shalal-hash-baz*).

Summary: Change in 3 Nephi 9:9 the 1830 compositor's spelling *Jacobugath* to *Jacob-Ugath,* in accord with the initial spelling *Jacob Ugath* and the corrected spelling *Jacob-Ugath* in the printer's manuscript; this spelling parallels the spelling of the compound name for the village *Ani-Anti* mentioned in Alma 21:11.

■ **3 Nephi 9:9**

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

We apparently have a primitive error here. The earliest extant reading (in 𝔓 and the 1830 edition) read "the people of the king of Jacob", so quite likely 𝔒 read the same. What the text seems to be saying is that the city Jacob-Ugath was inhabited by the people of king Jacob. This, in fact, is how the editors for the 1920 LDS edition interpreted this passage; they therefore omitted the *of.* Since the use of the definite article *the* before *king Jacob* sounded strange, they removed the definite article *the* as well. This editing is consistent with usage elsewhere in the text, with eight examples of "the people of king X":

"the people of king Noah"	4 times
"the people of king Limhi"	3 times
"the people of king Lamoni"	1 time

But as discussed under Mosiah 19:15, the original text had at least nine instances of "the king X", where X is a personal name, such as "the king Noah" originally in Mosiah 19:15. Most instances of this usage have been retained in the current text, but punctuation has been used to treat the name as an appositive. So "the people of the king Jacob" is possible. Thus here in 3 Nephi 9:9 the critical text will emend the earliest reading to "the people of **the** king Jacob", a minimal emendation that can be supported by usage elsewhere in the text.

This emendation assumes that during the dictation of the text an extra *of* was accidentally inserted between *king* and *Jacob,* perhaps because after *the king* one expects an *of,* given that "the king Jacob" is not standard English. One well-known phrase where a secondary *of* was apparently added during the early transmission of the text is "the Son / the Only Begotten of the Father", found in Alma 5:48 and Alma 13:9. In both these instances, the earliest textual source (the printer's manuscript) reads "the Son **of** the Only Begotten of the Father". For discussion of that case of an extra *of,* see under Alma 5:48.

David Calabro (personal communication) suggests that the earliest reading here in 3 Nephi 9:9 is actually correct if one interprets the phrase "the king of Jacob" as a reference to the king of the city of Jacob. That city is listed in the previous verse: "and behold the city of Gadiandi and the city of Gadiomnah and **the city of Jacob** and the city of Gimgimno / all these have I caused to be sunk". The previous reference to this king Jacob (in 3 Nephi 7:9–13) suggests that he could have founded

a city of Jacob before he fled north to found another city, the city of Jacob-Ugath. Thus here in 3 Nephi 9:9 this king Jacob could be referred to as "the king of Jacob". One problem with this proposal, however, is that the phrase "the people of the king of Jacob" seems quite unnecessary as a circumlocution for "the people of (the) king Jacob". There are no other examples of such usage elsewhere in the text; as noted above, there are eight references to "the people of king X" (where X is a king's name) but none to "the people of the king of Y" (where Y is the name of a city or land). And although king Jacob could very well have been the founder of the city of Jacob, having fled north to found the city Jacob-Ugath, he was probably no longer referred to as the king of Jacob.

Summary: Emend 3 Nephi 9:9 by removing the unnecessary *of* in the earliest reading, "the people of the king **of** Jacob", giving "the people of the king Jacob"; there is considerable evidence for the phraseology "the king X" in the original (and current) text of the Book of Mormon; the 1920 LDS edition removed this *of* from 3 Nephi 9:9 but in addition removed the unusual *the* before *king*, giving "the people of king Jacob".

■ **3 Nephi 9:10**

and behold the city of Laman and the city of Josh and the city of Gad
and the city of **Kishkumen** *have I caused to be burned with fire and the inhabitants thereof*
because of their wickedness in casting out the prophets
and stoning them which I did send to declare unto them
concerning their wickedness and their abominations

As discussed under Helaman 1:9, all the evidence from 𝒪 argues that this name was spelled *Kish-cumen*. Here in 3 Nephi 9:10, 𝒪 is not extant, but both 𝒫 and the 1830 edition have the spelling *Kishkumen*. At this point in the transmission of the text, both Oliver Cowdery (the scribe in 𝒫) and the 1830 typesetter were spelling the name as *Kishkumen*, despite the probability that 𝒪 had the original spelling with the *c*, *Kishcumen*.

Here the presumption is that the city was named after Gaddianton's fellow conspirator, Kishcumen, especially since the inhabitants of this city are identified as being especially wicked. Oliver Cowdery (when he copied the text into 𝒫) and the 1830 typesetter must have made the same assumption.

Summary: Emend the spelling *Kishkumen* for the city listed in 3 Nephi 9:10 to *Kishcumen*, under the assumption that the city was named after Kishcumen (whose name is spelled that way in the earliest textual sources).

■ **3 Nephi 9:21**

behold I have come **unto** *the world*
to bring redemption unto the world
to save the world from sin

Ross Geddes (personal communication, 3 November 2004) suggests that the first "**unto** the world" here in 3 Nephi 9:21 is an error for "**into** the world". The apparent source for such an error would

be the second "**unto** the world". If such an error occurred, it would have happened as Joseph Smith dictated the text to Oliver Cowdery; here both 𝒫 and the 1830 edition were copied from 𝒪 and read identically, so 𝒪 probably had two occurrences of "**unto** the world".

Elsewhere the text consistently refers to Christ as coming "**into** the world", never "**unto** the world":

2 Nephi 9:21	and he cometh **into** the world . . .
Mosiah 16:6	and now if Christ had not come **into** the world . . .
Alma 11:40	and he shall come **into** the world to redeem his people
Helaman 13:6	and faith on the Lord Jesus Christ which surely shall come **into** the world
3 Nephi 1:13	and on the morrow come I **into** the world
3 Nephi 2:7	that Christ should come **into** the world
3 Nephi 11:10	behold I am Jesus Christ of which the prophets testified that should come **into** the world
3 Nephi 27:13	that I came **into** the world to do the will of my Father
Moroni 8:8	behold I came **into** the world / not to call the righteous but sinners to repentance

This usage is also matched by numerous occurrences in the King James New Testament, including ten times in the Gospel of John and other occurrences in 1 Timothy 1:15, Hebrews 1:6, Hebrews 10:5, and 1 John 4:9, all referring in some way to Christ coming into the world or being sent or brought into the world. (Modern translations of John 1:9 add one more example of this usage, as in the Revised Standard Version: "The true light that enlightens every man was coming **into** the world.")

In the Book of Mormon manuscripts, *unto* and *into* were frequently mixed up in copying (with at least 23 occurrences). See the discussion under 1 Nephi 7:2 as well as the list under 2 Nephi 8:23 of ten cases where Oliver Cowdery made the mistake of initially writing *unto* instead of the correct *into* in the manuscripts. Therefore, it seems very reasonable here in 3 Nephi 9:21 to assume that the original text read "I have come **into** the world to bring redemption **unto** the world" and that Oliver Cowdery allowed himself to write "**unto** the world" instead of "**into** the world", probably since he just heard Joseph Smith read off the "**unto** the world" at the end of the sentence. A comparable example with both "into the world" and "unto the world" within the same sentence occurs in 3 Nephi 1:13: "and on the morrow come I **into** the world to shew **unto** the world that I will fulfill all that which I have caused to be spoken by the mouth of my holy prophets". In that case the *into* and *unto* were kept distinct.

Summary: Emend in 3 Nephi 9:21 the first "**unto** the world" to "**into** the world"; elsewhere the text refers to Christ coming "into the world" (nine times), not "unto the world"; in addition, there is strong evidence that Oliver Cowdery tended to mix up *unto* and *into* in his manuscript work.

3 Nephi 10

3 Nephi 10:2

they did cease lamenting and howling for the loss
of their [kindred > kindreds 1 | kindred ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *which had been slain*

Here in the printer's manuscript, Oliver Cowdery initially wrote *kindred;* then virtually immediately he inserted a plural *s* inline (there is no difference in the level of the ink flow for the *s*). The 1830 edition, on the other hand, has the singular *kindred.* The same variation occurs later in this chapter, with *kindreds* in 𝔓 and *kindred* in the 1830 edition:

> 3 Nephi 10:8
> behold they began to weep and howl again because of the loss
> of their [kindreds 1 | kindred ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] and friends

Normally in modern English, we expect the singular *kindred,* even when preceded by *many.* Here in 3 Nephi 10:2, it seems quite probable that Oliver initially wrote "for the loss of their **kindred**" because he expected the singular. The same tendency seems to have led the 1830 typesetter to make the same change, whether intentional or not, twice here in 3 Nephi 10 (in verses 2 and 8). And there is a third place where he made this same change to the singular, one that is obviously wrong:

> 3 Nephi 28:29
> they shall minister unto all the scattered tribes of Israel
> and unto all nations
> [*Kindreds* 1 | *kindred* A | *kindreds* BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
> tongues and people

In 3 Nephi 28:29, like the two instances in 3 Nephi 10, the 1830 edition reads in the singular while 𝔓 reads in the plural (the scribe for 𝔓 in 3 Nephi 28 is the unknown scribe 2). The plural *kindreds* is undoubtedly correct in 3 Nephi 28:29: there are eight other instances in the text of the plural phraseology "all nations **kindreds** tongues and people" but none of "all nations **kindred** tongues and people". The Book of Mormon language is parallel to the phraseology in Revelation 7:9, which has the plural *kindreds:* "nations and **kindreds** and people and tongues". In other words, the evidence argues that it was the 1830 typesetter who was responsible for the singular *kindred* in 3 Nephi 28:29 as well as in 3 Nephi 10:2 and 10:8. The plural *kindreds* is the more difficult reading in 3 Nephi 10:2 and 10:8 (but not in 3 Nephi 28:29), and thus more likely to be correct since there would have been no motivation for Oliver to make this change to the plural. The critical text will restore the plural *kindreds* for both instances in 3 Nephi 10. (For further discussion regarding the variation between *kindred* and *kindreds,* see under Alma 10:4.)

Summary: Restore the plural *kindreds* in 3 Nephi 10:2 and 10:8 (in both cases, the reading in 𝒫); the 1830 typesetter, it appears, replaced the plural form with the singular *kindred,* which is what we expect in modern English; the typesetter made the same change from *kindreds* to *kindred* later in 3 Nephi 28:29.

3 Nephi 10:4

O ye people of these great cities which have fallen
which are [a decendant >js a decendants 1 | a descendant A |
  descendants BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] of Jacob
yea which are of the house of Israel

> The original text had several instances where the phrase "a descendant of X" referred to more than one person; all of these have been edited to the plural "descendants of X". Here in 3 Nephi 10:4, Joseph Smith added a plural *s* to the singular *descendant* in 𝒫 (spelled as *decendant*), but he neglected to cross out the *a* (thus giving the impossible reading "a descendants of Jacob"). The 1837 edition has the full correction, "descendants of Jacob". As explained under 1 Nephi 6:2, the critical text will restore the original "which are a descendant of Jacob" here in 3 Nephi 10:4.

3 Nephi 10:4

O ye people of these great cities which have fallen
which are a descendant of Jacob
yea which are of the house of Israel :

▢	*O ye people of the house of Israel*	1APS
▢	NULL	BCDEFGHIJKLMNOQRT

how oft have I gathered you
as a hen gathereth her chickens under her wings

> Here the 1837 edition omitted the phrase "O ye people of the house of Israel", perhaps unintentionally. Note that the preceding relative clause ends with "of the house of Israel". The 1837 typesetter's eye could have skipped down to the next occurrence of "of the house of Israel", thus omitting this whole phrase. Another possibility, however, is that the omission was intentional (although it was not marked in 𝒫 by Joseph Smith when he edited the text for the 1837 edition). Note that the omitted phrase "O ye people of the house of Israel" restates the language of the preceding text: "O ye people . . . which are of the house of Israel". Of course, the critical text will restore the original phrase "O ye people of the house of Israel" since it is the earliest extant reading (occurring in both 𝒫 and the 1830 edition). The phrase was restored to the RLDS text in 1908, but the LDS text has retained the shorter text.
>
> The specific phrase "O ye (people of the) house of Israel" is used in direct address four times throughout the larger passage here in 3 Nephi 10 (each occurrence is numbered below):

3 Nephi 10:4–6

  (1) O ye people of the house of Israel
      how oft have I gathered you
      as a hen gathereth her chickens under her wings
      and have nourished you

      and again how oft would I have gathered you
      as a hen gathereth her chickens under her wings
  (2) yea O ye people of the house of Israel which have fallen

  (3) yea O ye people of the house of Israel
      ye that dwell at Jerusalem as ye that have fallen
      yea how oft would I have gathered you
      as a hen gathereth her chickens
      and ye would not

  (4) O ye house of Israel whom I have spared
      how oft will I gather you
      as a hen gathereth her chickens under her wings
      if ye will repent and return unto me with full purpose of heart

In fact, each reference to a hen gathering her chickens is associated with the specific phrase "O ye (people of the) house of Israel", including originally in 3 Nephi 10:4.

Don Brugger (personal communication) points out that the loss of "O ye people of the house of Israel" in 3 Nephi 10:4 is probably accidental since the redundancy (or at least what appears to be excessive repetitiveness) later on in verse 5 has been retained:

3 Nephi 10:5

    yea O ye people of the house of Israel which have fallen
    yea O ye people of the house of Israel
    ye that dwell at Jerusalem as ye that have fallen

Summary: Restore in 3 Nephi 10:4 the instance of "O ye people of the house of Israel" that was omitted in the 1837 edition (either accidentally or, less likely, in an attempt to remove a redundancy from the text).

3 Nephi 10:6–7

O ye house of Israel whom I have spared
how oft will I gather you
as a hen gathereth her chickens under her wings
if ye will repent and return unto me with full purpose of heart
but if not / O house of Israel
the [*place* 1|*places* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *of your* **dwellings** *shall become desolate*

The printer's manuscript has the singular *place,* but the 1830 edition has the plural *places.* The use of the plural *dwellings* suggests that the plural *places* is correct. This passage is the only one in the Book of Mormon text where *place(s)* occurs in the same sentence with *dwelling(s).* Interestingly, the King James text has two instances of *dwellings* in the same sentence with *place(s).* In one instance, *place* is in the singular; in the other, it is in the plural:

Job 18:21

> surely such *are* the **dwellings** of the wicked
> and this *is* the **place** *of him that* knoweth not God

Isaiah 32:18

> and my people shall dwell in a peaceable **habitation**
> and in sure **dwellings** and in quiet resting **places**

In the Job example, the poetic parallelism of the two lines argues that the singular *place* in the second line can be semantically associated with the plural *dwellings* in the first line. Even the Isaiah example associates a singular *habitation* in the first line with the plural *dwellings* and *places* in the second line. (In both passages, the distinction in grammatical number is in the Hebrew original as well as in the King James translation.) On the basis of these examples, one could argue that "the place of your dwellings", the reading in 𝔓 for 3 Nephi 10:7, is not impossible.

There is some nearby evidence that Oliver Cowdery sometimes wrote *place* instead of the correct *places,* at least initially:

3 Nephi 9:8

> all these have I caused to be sunk
> and made hills and valleys
> in the [*place* > *places* 1|*places* ᴀʙᴄᴅᴇꜰɢʜɪᴊᴋʟᴍɴᴏᴘǫʀꜱᴛ] thereof

Oliver's correction in 3 Nephi 9:8 was virtually immediate (there is no change in the level of ink flow for the inserted *s*).

In the previous chapter (in 3 Nephi 9:3–12), the voice of the Lord described the many cities that he had destroyed; many of these cities were made desolate by the destruction (note especially the five cities described in verses 9–10 that were burned with fire), so the use of the plural *places* would be appropriate here in 3 Nephi 10:7. Don Brugger points out (personal communication) that Samuel the Lamanite's parallel reference to this destruction earlier in the text clearly favors the plural reading "the places of your dwellings" here in 3 Nephi 10:7:

Helaman 15:1

> and now my beloved brethren
> behold I declare unto you that except ye shall repent
> your **houses** shall be left unto you desolate

Brugger also notes that in both passages there is a preceding reference to repentance—that is, unless the people repent, their dwelling places will become desolate.

David Calabro (personal communication) suggests an alternative solution to the difficulty here in 3 Nephi 10:7: namely, the original text read completely in the singular, as "the **place** of your **dwelling** shall become desolate". In other words, when Joseph Smith dictated this phrase to his scribe (presumably Oliver Cowdery), the singular *dwelling* was misinterpreted as the plural *dwellings.* Note that the following word *shall* begins with the sibilant *sh,* which would have made it very difficult to hear the difference between *dwelling shall* and *dwellings shall.* Later Oliver copied this passage from 𝒪 into 𝔓 without change, but the 1830 typesetter decided to change the singular *place* to *places* to make it agree with the plural *dwellings.* As explained nearby under 3 Nephi 10:13, John Gilbert (the 1830 compositor) was somewhat more prone to change the grammatical number by adding or deleting *s* than Oliver Cowdery was in his copywork.

Calabro also argues that the completely singular "the place of your dwelling" is supported in various ways. In this part of 3 Nephi 10, Jesus has just finished referring to gathering Israel as a hen gathers her chickens. When we consider the two parallel passages in the New Testament where Jesus used the same metaphor to refer to the people of Israel, we find that in both cases the metaphor is followed by a reference to their house being left desolate (here *house* is in the singular):

> Matthew 23:37–39 (similarly, Luke 13:34–35)
>> O Jerusalem Jerusalem
>> *thou* that killest the prophets
>> and stonest them which are sent unto thee
>> how often would I have gathered thy children together
>> even as a hen gathereth her chickens under *her* wings
>> and ye would not
>>
>> behold your **house** is left unto you desolate
>> for I say unto you
>> ye shall not see me henceforth
>> till ye shall say
>> blessed *is* he that cometh in the name of the Lord

Here in 3 Nephi 10, verses 4–6 refer to this metaphorical gathering four times, including a reference to Jerusalem in verse 5 (marked below with an arrow); then at the end, in verse 7, we have the reference to desolation and eventual restoration:

> 3 Nephi 10:4–7
>> O ye people of the house of Israel
> (1) how oft have I gathered you
>> as a hen gathereth her chickens under her wings
>> and have nourished you
>
> (2) and again how oft would I have gathered you
>> as a hen gathereth her chickens under her wings
>> yea O ye people of the house of Israel which have fallen
>>
>> yea O ye people of the house of Israel
> → ye that dwell at Jerusalem as ye that have fallen
> (3) yea how oft would I have gathered you
>> as a hen gathereth her chickens and ye would not
>>
>> O ye house of Israel whom I have spared
> (4) how oft will I gather you
>> as a hen gathereth her chickens under her wings
>> if ye will repent and return unto me with full purpose of heart
>>
>> but if not O house of Israel
>> the place(s) of your dwelling(s) shall become desolate
>> until the time of the fulfilling of the covenant to your fathers

In other words, "the place(s) of your dwelling(s) shall become desolate" parallels the New Testament statement "your house is left unto you desolate". Since the New Testament clause is in the singular, one could argue that the parallel Book of Mormon one should also be in the singular, thus "the place of your dwelling shall become desolate". On the other hand, since the Book of

Mormon text in verses 4–6 refers to the scattered house of Israel in its various dwelling places, not just in Jerusalem, the plural "the places of your dwellings shall become desolate" would be quite appropriate. Calabro points out that the New Testament statement, "your house is left unto you desolate", may be a reference to the temple. Note that in 2 Chronicles 6:2, Solomon in his prayer to the Lord refers to the temple as "a place for thy dwelling forever". Of course, this passage refers to the temple as the Lord's dwelling place, not the people's. On the other hand, the language of 3 Nephi 10:7 seems to refer to the people of the house of Israel and their dwelling places. Even if the Book of Mormon passage refers to the temple, the plural interpretation would still be appropriate since the Nephites had more than one temple (as described, for instance, in Helaman 3:14: "and their building of temples and of synagogues and of sanctuaries").

We should consider here the fourth possibility, namely, that the original text here in 3 Nephi 10:7 read "the **places** of your **dwelling** shall become desolate". Once more, the *s* could have been added to *dwelling* during the dictation of the text, giving "the places of your dwellings" in 𝒪. Under this proposal, the 1830 typesetter faithfully copied this reading when he set the type, while Oliver Cowdery accidentally omitted the plural *s* from *places* when he copied the text from 𝒪 into 𝒫.

Ultimately, it seems unlikely that the reading in 𝒫, with its singular *place* and plural *dwellings,* is correct. The 1830 reading with its plural *places* and *dwellings* will work, as will the two conjectured readings with the singular *dwelling* and either a singular *place* or a plural *places*. Perhaps the easiest solution here is to follow the reading that involves the least amount of change. By accepting the 1830 reading as the original reading, we have only one change, namely, Oliver Cowdery's accidental omission of the plural *s* when he copied from 𝒪 into 𝒫. On the other hand, the two conjectured readings involve first the addition of a plural *s* to *dwelling* during the dictation of the text, followed by either the change of the singular *place* to *places* in the 1830 edition or Oliver's omission in 𝒫 of the plural *s* from *places*. The critical text will therefore accept the 1830 reading; the completely plural reading also fits with the reading of the larger passage in its reference to the scattered people of Israel and their many dwelling places. And perhaps most importantly, the plural *places* is supported by the corresponding plural *houses* in Helaman 15:1 ("your **houses** shall be left unto you desolate").

Summary: Maintain in 3 Nephi 10:7 the 1830 reading with the plural *places* since it makes better sense than the singular *place* (the reading in 𝒫); there is also evidence elsewhere in the text that Oliver Cowdery sometimes wrote *place* instead of the correct *places,* at least momentarily; the plural *places* is also supported by the plural *houses* in Helaman 15:1; the two alternative readings where *dwellings* is replaced with *dwelling* also work but involve one more change (a mishearing during the dictation of the text).

3 Nephi 10:8

behold they began to weep and howl again
because of the loss of their [*kindreds* 1|*kindred* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *and friends*

As explained nearby under 3 Nephi 10:2, the original manuscript probably read *kindreds* here in verse 8 (as in verse 2). Evidence elsewhere suggests that the 1830 typesetter sometimes replaced *kindreds* with the expected singular, *kindred*.

3 Nephi 10:9

> *and the dreadful groanings did cease*
> *and all the tumultuous* [*noise* >+ *noises* 1 | *noises* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *did pass away*

The plural reading *noises* is undoubtedly correct. Oliver Cowdery initially wrote the singular in the printer's manuscript, but later (with heavier ink flow) he supralinearly inserted the plural *s*. The 1830 edition also has the plural *noises*. In 1 Nephi 12:4, Nephi sees in vision this same destruction and there he refers to "all manner of tumultuous **noises**", which further supports the use of the plural *noises* here in 3 Nephi 10:9.

Summary: The plural *noises* in 3 Nephi 10:9 is undoubtedly the reading of the original manuscript, especially since the corrected reading in the printer's manuscript agrees with the reading of the 1830 edition (as well as with the parallel description in 1 Nephi 12:4).

3 Nephi 10:10

> *and their mourning was turned into joy*
> *and their lamentations into* **the** *praise*
> *and* [*the* 1 | ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *thanksgiving*
> *unto the Lord Jesus Christ their Redeemer*

The printer's manuscript repeats the definite article *the* in this conjunctive noun phrase that combines *praise* and *thanksgiving,* while the 1830 edition lacks the repeated *the*. Either way, the expression is awkward, but more so with the repeated *the*.

There are no other cases in the text of the noun *praise* conjoined with the noun *thanksgiving*. But there is one involving the nouns *praise* and *thanks:*

> Mosiah 2:20
>> if you should render all **the thanks** and **praise**
>> which your whole souls hath power to possess
>> to that God who hath created you . . .

Here the definite article *the* is not repeated. In addition, there is one instance of conjoined *praise* and *thanksgiving* in the King James Bible, but without any determiner for either of the conjuncts:

> Nehemiah 12:46
>> for in the days of David and Asaph of old
>> *there were* chief of the singers
>> and songs of **praise** and **thanksgiving** unto God

The Hebrew for this conjunctive structure has no determiners. In fact, this biblical reading suggests that in 3 Nephi 10:10 the easier reading would be without any *the*'s at all: "and their mourning was turned **into joy** and their lamentations **into praise and thanksgiving** unto the Lord Jesus Christ their Redeemer". Usage elsewhere in the Book of Mormon text supports the lack of *the* before *praise* and *thanksgiving* in similar expressions:

1 Nephi 15:15	will they not rejoice and give **praise** unto their everlasting God
Alma 19:14	and began to pour out his soul in prayer and **thanksgiving** to God
Alma 48:12	yea a man whose heart did swell with **thanksgiving** to his God

Yet here in 3 Nephi 10:10, both 𝓟 and the 1830 edition have the *the* before *praise,* so it seems likely that 𝓞 did as well. If the proposed *the* in 𝓞 was an error, then it must have been inserted during the dictation of the text. The following prepositional phrase has a *the* ("unto **the** Lord Jesus Christ their Redeemer"), but it seems unlikely that this *the* would have triggered an extra *the* before *praise.* The critical text will assume that there was a *the* before *praise,* despite its awkwardness. The question still remains whether there was a *the* before *thanksgiving.*

When we consider early transmission errors, we find that in conjunctive structures the stronger tendency is to omit the repeated *the* rather than to add it. We have only one example where Oliver Cowdery added the repeated *the* in a conjunctive structure—and that was only momentary:

> Helaman 3:26 (initial error in 𝓟)
> the work of the Lord did prosper
> unto the baptizing and [*the* > NULL 1| ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] uniting
> to the church of God many souls

But in four cases Oliver omitted the repeated *the,* once initially in 𝓞, once initially in 𝓟, and twice permanently in 𝓟 (each of the latter is marked below with an asterisk):

> * 2 Nephi 5:12
> and also **the** ball
> or [*the* 0| 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] compass

> Mosiah 3:7
> so great shall be his anguish for **the** wickedness
> and [NULL > *the* 1|*the* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] abominations of his people

> Alma 36:2
> except it were **the** God of Abraham
> and [NULL > *the* 0|*the* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] God of Isaac
> and **the** God of Jacob

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

There is also some evidence that Oliver may have initially omitted a repeated *the* in 𝓞 for Alma 49:22 (see under that passage for discussion). The 1830 typesetter, on the other hand, never once added a repeated *the,* but in four cases he omitted it:

> 2 Nephi 12:16
> and upon all **the** ships of the sea
> and upon all **the** ships of Tarshish
> and upon all [*the* 1| ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] pleasant pictures

> Enos 1:24
> and I saw wars between **the** Nephites
> and [*the* 1PS| ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOQRT] Lamanites

Helaman 6:2
> insomuch that they did reject the word of God
> and all **the** preaching
> and [*the* 1| ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] prophesying
> which did come among them

Helaman 13:16
> because of **the** wickedness
> and [*the* 1| ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] abominations
> which is in them

In the first case (in 2 Nephi 12:16), there is a possibility that the 1830 typesetter consciously omitted the *the* after referring to his King James Bible (see the discussion under that passage). For another possible example of the 1830 typesetter omitting a repeated *the,* see the discussion under 3 Nephi 7:6. Overall, the odds are considerably higher that here in 3 Nephi 10:10 the 1830 typesetter omitted the repeated *the* from the difficult expression "into the praise and **the** thanksgiving unto the Lord Jesus Christ", thus creating the less difficult "into the praise and thanksgiving unto the Lord Jesus Christ".

In summary, the evidence from the earliest textual sources (𝓟 and the 1830 edition) supports the occurrence of *the* before *praise* here in 3 Nephi 10:10, while early transmission errors by Oliver Cowdery and the 1830 compositor support the *the* before the conjoined *thanksgiving.* The easiest reading of all would be without *the* before both *praise* and *thanksgiving,* but this reading is not supported by the earliest textual sources. The critical text will therefore accept, despite its difficulty, the reading in 𝓟 for 3 Nephi 10:10: "into **the** praise and **the** thanksgiving unto the Lord Jesus Christ". For further discussion of the repeated *the* for conjoined nouns, see under CONJUNCTIVE REPETITION in volume 3.

Summary: Restore in 3 Nephi 10:10 the reading in 𝓟, which has *the* before both *praise* and *thanksgiving* ("into **the** praise and **the** thanksgiving unto the Lord Jesus Christ"); the first *the* is supported by the earliest textual sources (𝓟 and the 1830 edition) while the second one is supported by the natural tendency in the text to accidentally omit repeated *the*'s.

3 Nephi 10:13

and they were not carried away in the whirlwind
neither were they overpowered
by the [*vapours* >js *vapour* 1| *vapor* ABCDGHJKOPRST | *vapour* EFILMNQ]
of smoke and of darkness

The printer's manuscript originally read "by the vapours of smoke & of darkness", while the 1830 edition has the singular *vapor* in this phrase. In his editing for the 1837 edition, Joseph Smith deleted the plural *s* in 𝓟. His editing was probably not due to grammatical considerations (since either singular *vapor* or plural *vapors* works here in 3 Nephi 10:13); instead, Joseph probably corrected 𝓟 in order to make it agree with the 1830 reading.

Elsewhere, the Book of Mormon text has examples of both *vapor* and *vapors* co-occurring with *smoke:*

1 Nephi 19:11

the Lord God surely shall visit all the house of Israel at that day
some with his voice . . . and others with the thunderings and the lightnings of his power
by tempest by fire and by smoke and **vapor** of darkness

1 Nephi 22:18

these things must shortly come
yea even blood and fire and **vapor** of smoke must come

Mormon 8:29

yea it shall come in a day when there shall be heard of
fires and tempests and **vapors** of smoke in foreign lands

The first example is particularly appropriate since in 1 Nephi 19:11 Nephi is referring to what will happen at the time of the Savior's death—that is, the very events described here in 3 Nephi 10:13. In fact, there are two more instances of the singular *vapor* in the text, and those also refer to these events:

1 Nephi 12:4–5

and it came to pass that I saw a mist of darkness
on the face of the land of promise . . .
and it came to pass that after I saw these things
I saw the **vapor** of darkness
that it passed from off the face of the earth

3 Nephi 8:20

and it came to pass that there was thick darkness upon the face of all the land
insomuch that the inhabitants thereof which had not fallen
could feel the **vapor** of darkness

But the instance of *vapor(s)* here in 3 Nephi 10:13 is different in one regard from all the others; namely, the postmodifying prepositional phrase is conjunctive: "vapor(s) of smoke and of darkness". All the others are of the form "vapor(s) of smoke" (two times) or "vapor of darkness" (three times). The darkness is apparently caused by the smoke, so one could argue that the singular *vapor* is fully appropriate in the single conjunctive case here in 3 Nephi 10:13.

One could also argue that Oliver Cowdery replaced an original singular *vapor* with the plural *vapors* because the conjunctive phrase "of smoke and of darkness" can be interpreted as a plural. Nonetheless, there is no independent evidence for this kind of change in number for similar conjunctive phrases, as in the following examples:

Helaman 2:4   to carry on the secret **work** of murder and of robbery
Mormon 1:13   and the **work** of miracles and of healing did cease

In other words, there has been no tendency in these cases to replace the singular head noun *work* with the plural *works,* even though the plural reading is fully acceptable.

In the other examples having nouns that refer to destruction (listed earlier), the grammatical number of *vapor* agrees with the number of the nearest nouns:

1 Nephi 19:11   by **tempest** by **fire** and by **smoke** and **vapor** of darkness
1 Nephi 22:18   yea even **blood** and **fire** and **vapor** of smoke must come
Mormon 8:29   **fires** and **tempests** and **vapors** of smoke

Perhaps one could argue from this regularity that the singular is appropriate in 3 Nephi 10:13 since earlier in the verse there is a reference to the singular *whirlwind:* "and they were not carried away in the **whirlwind**" (although in this case this singular noun is in a different clause, unlike these three examples).

There is evidence from the King James Bible in support of either the singular *vapor* or the plural *vapors:*

> Psalm 135:7 (similarly in Jeremiah 10:13 and Jeremiah 51:16)
> he causeth the **vapors** to ascend from the ends of the earth
> he maketh **lightnings** for the rain
> he bringeth the **wind** out of his treasuries

> Acts 2:19
> and I will shew wonders in heaven above
> and signs in the earth beneath :
> **blood** and **fire** and **vapor** of smoke

Notice how in both these biblical examples, the nearest nouns agree in number, plural in the first passage and singular in the second. But also note that in the Psalms example there is the singular *wind,* which could provide some support in 3 Nephi 10:13 for the plural *vapors* (the reading in 𝓟), given the singular *whirlwind* in the preceding clause.

Overall, the 1830 compositor mixed up the grammatical number of nouns more frequently than did Oliver Cowdery. In making this comparison, we count only those cases where either number is possible and the change in number was left uncorrected. In other words, we ignore Oliver's numerous initial errors in 𝓞 and 𝓟 as well as any cases of in-press correction during the printing of the 1830 edition (whenever we have evidence of their existence). Basically, we have the following statistics:

> □ Oliver Cowdery
>
> changing a singular to a plural   31 times
> changing a plural to a singular   35 times
>
> □ John Gilbert, the 1830 compositor
>
> changing a singular to a plural   43 times
> changing a plural to a singular   42 times

All other things being equal, the odds are somewhat greater here in 3 Nephi 10:13 that the 1830 compositor made the change in grammatical number. (The statistics include cases of conjecture that have been accepted in the critical text. This means that there is undoubtedly some uncertainty in the actual numbers listed here.)

Of particular interest here is one case where the 1830 compositor changed "the **mists** of darkness" to "the **mist** of darkness":

> 1 Nephi 8:24
> and they did press forward
> through the [*mists* 0 | *mist* > *mists* 1 | *mist* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] of darkness

In this instance, Oliver initially wrote *mist* in 𝓟, but then virtually immediately he corrected it to *mists,* the reading in 𝓞. But the 1830 compositor set *mist* and never corrected it. The most likely source for the change to the singular *mist* in 1 Nephi 8:24 is the two occurrences of "mist of darkness" in the previous verse (see the discussion under 1 Nephi 8:24):

> 1 Nephi 8:23
>> and it came to pass that there arose a **mist** of darkness
>> yea even an exceeding great **mist** of darkness

Here in 3 Nephi 10:13, the 1830 compositor could have changed an original *vapors* in "the vapors of smoke and of darkness" to *vapor,* just like he changed "the mists of darkness" to "the mist of darkness" in 1 Nephi 8:24. Moreover, the examples showing variation for "mist(s) of darkness" show that variation for "vapor(s) of darkness" and "vapor(s) of smoke" is also possible. Since the odds are somewhat less that Oliver would have replaced an original *vapor* with *vapors* when he copied from 𝓞 into 𝓟, the critical text will accept the plural *vapors* in 3 Nephi 10:13 (the reading in 𝓟).

Summary: Restore the plural *vapors* in 3 Nephi 10:13, the reading in 𝓟 ("the vapors of smoke and of darkness"); the 1830 compositor tended to mix up the grammatical number for nouns somewhat more frequently than did Oliver Cowdery, including one case where he changed "the mists of darkness" to "the mist of darkness" (in 1 Nephi 8:24); usage elsewhere in the text favors the reading with the singular *vapor* in 3 Nephi 10:13, but the plural *vapors* is also possible; the conjunctive phrase "of smoke and of darkness" is unique to the text, so in this case internal evidence is of less importance than textual changes in determining the original reading for *vapor(s).*

3 Nephi 10:13

neither were they overpowered by the vapors
of smoke and [of 1ABCDEGHIJKLMNOPQRST|NULL > of F] darkness

The compositor for the 1852 LDS edition omitted the repeated *of* when he set the type for the first printing of that edition. Later, the *of* was restored in the second printing, probably by reference to the 1840 edition. See under 3 Nephi 9:5 for other instances where the repeated *of* has been omitted in the history of the text. The critical text will retain the original instance of the repeated *of* in the phrase "the vapors of smoke and **of** darkness".

Summary: Maintain in 3 Nephi 10:13 the repeated *of* in "the vapors of smoke and **of** darkness", the reading of the earliest textual sources (𝓟 and the 1830 edition).

3 Nephi 10:14

he that hath the scriptures let him search them
and see and behold if all these deaths and destructions
by fire and by smoke and by tempests
and [*by* 1ABDEFIJLMNOPQRST | CGHK] *whirlwinds*
and by the opening of the earth to receive them
—and all these things—
is not unto the fulfilling of the prophecies of many of the holy prophets

The 1840 edition deleted the repeated *by* before *whirlwinds* in this series of conjoined prepositional phrases. This deletion was undoubtedly a typo and not due to editing. The 1908 RLDS edition restored the repeated *by* to the RLDS text. Typically, the Book of Mormon text has long chains of conjoined prepositional phrases where the preposition is systematically repeated. For other examples where the repeated *by* was accidentally omitted, see the discussion under Alma 2:38.

Summary: Maintain the repeated *by* throughout the series of conjoined prepositional phrases in 3 Nephi 10:14.

3 Nephi 10:16

because they testified [*particular* 1ABCPS | *particularly* DEFGHIJKLMNOQRT] *concerning us*

Here we have another example of the bare adverb in the original text of the Book of Mormon, namely, the archaic adverbial form *particular* instead of the expected *particularly*. The compositor for the 1841 British edition added the *-ly* ending, as did the compositor for the 1858 Wright edition (probably independently). Interestingly, the 1908 RLDS edition restored the nonstandard *particular* to the RLDS text, very likely because 𝓟 has *particular*. The critical text will also restore this form without the *-ly* ending. For further discussion of this usage, see under 2 Nephi 25:20 (where the original text has the bare adverb *plain* rather than the standard *plainly*). Also see the general discussion under ADVERBS in volume 3.

The Oxford English Dictionary gives (under section C for *particular*) one example of the adverbial use of *particular* and refers to it as obsolete and rare; the citation dates from Early Modern English (original accidentals retained here):

> Thomas Nashe (1600)
> Innumerable monstrous practises, . . .
> Which t'were too long particuler to recite.

Summary: Restore the bare adverb *particular* in 3 Nephi 10:16: "because they testified particular concerning us"; the original Book of Mormon text allowed for such usage without the expected adverbial ending, *-ly*.

3 Nephi 10:17

> and [*these* 1BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST | *those* A] *things*
> which [*testifies* >js *testify* 1 | *testifies* A | *testify* BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *of us*
> *are they not written upon the plates of brass*
> *which our father Lehi brought out of Jerusalem*

Here the printer's manuscript has *these* while the 1830 edition has *those*. The *these* was restored in the 1837 edition, perhaps by reference to 𝓟 (or perhaps because one expects "these things" in the larger passage, as explained below). In this example, we have the opposite variation of what is found in 3 Nephi 1:22 (there 𝓟 has *those* and the 1830 edition has *these*).

For this variation in 3 Nephi 10:17, we first need to consider those cases where Oliver Cowdery changed an original *those* to *these*. Most of these are only momentary errors, but two were permanent (each of the permanent ones is marked below with an asterisk):

> Alma 35:6 (initial error in 𝓞)
>
> > [*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

> * Alma 37:29 (changed while copying from 𝓞 into 𝓟)
>
> > and ye shall also teach them
> > that [*those* 0 | *these* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] people were destroyed
> > on account of their wickedness and abominations and their murders

> Alma 50:2 (initial error in 𝓟; the same error was made in the 1830 edition)
>
> > and upon the top
> > of [*those* 0 | *these* > *those* 1 | *these* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] ridges of earth
> > he caused that . . .

> Alma 52:4 (initial error in 𝓞)
>
> > that his people should maintain
> > [*these* >% *those* 0 | *those* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] cities
> > which they had taken by the shedding of blood

> Alma 57:11 (initial error in 𝓞)
>
> > therefore it became expedient that we should take
> > [*these* > *those* 0 | *those* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] provisions
> > and send them to Judea

> * Alma 57:16 (changed while copying from 𝓞 into 𝓟)
>
> > it became a very serious matter to determine
> > concerning [*those* 0 | *these* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] prisoners of war

> Alma 58:3 (initial error in 𝓞)
>
> > yea and it became expedient that we should employ our men to the maintaining
> > [*these* > *those* 0 | *those* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] parts of the land

In one other case (in Alma 45:2), Oliver's *those* in 𝓞 looks like *theese,* which he then copied into 𝓟 as *these;* the typesetter corrected the text to *those,* probably the result of proofing the 1830 sheet against 𝓞 rather than 𝓟 (for discussion, see under Alma 42:31 as well as under Alma 45:2).

On the other hand, the 1830 typesetter made two changes of original *these* to *those:*

> Alma 24:10
> and also that he hath forgiven us
> of [*these* 1 | *those* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] our many sins and murders
> which we have committed

> 3 Nephi 19:28
> Father I thank thee that thou hast purified
> [*these* 01PS | *those* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOQRT] which I have chosen
> because of their faith

In the second example, if 𝒪 were not extant, we would have the same kind of early variation as here in 3 Nephi 10:17 (namely, *these* in 𝒫 and *those* in the 1830 edition). Ultimately, the errors made by Oliver Cowdery and the 1830 typesetter show that either reading is possible for 3 Nephi 10:17. If we count only their permanent errors, their error rate is about the same for these particular mix-ups of *these* and *those*.

The demonstrative *those* (the 1830 reading) does seem odd here in 3 Nephi 10:17, especially since all the preceding portion of this passage refers to "these things"; in fact, most of these occur with the verb *testify* (in agreement with the case here in verse 17):

> 3 Nephi 10:14–16
> and see and behold if all these deaths and destructions
> by fire and by smoke and by tempests and by whirlwinds
> and by the opening of the earth to receive them
> —and all **these things**—
> is not unto the fulfilling of the prophecies of many of the holy prophets
>
> behold I say unto you
> yea many have testified of **these things** at the coming of Christ
> and were slain because they testified of **these things**
> yea the prophet Zenos did testify of **these things**
> and also Zenoch spake concerning **these things**
> because they testified particular concerning us
> which is the remnant of their seed

This consistent use of "these things" argues for the same reading in verse 17. Of course, one could argue that in verse 17 Oliver Cowdery changed an original *those* to *these* under the influence of all those preceding occurrences of "these things". But since the evidence from early changes in the text is not decisive here, the critical text will accept the consistent reading, "these things", thus assuming that the 1830 typesetter misread a *these* in 𝒪 as *those*.

We also note that in this passage the earliest text uses the third person singular form *testifies* in referring to the plural *things* ("these things which **testifies** of us"). Not surprisingly, *testifies* was emended to *testify* by Joseph Smith in his editing for the 1837 edition. Note that the following yes-no question, referring to "these things", has the plural verb form: "**are** they not written upon the plates of brass". Although the use of verb forms ending in *-(e)s* with plural subjects is unexpected, there are a few examples of such usage in the earliest text of the Book of Mormon. For an example

where *testifies* originally occurred with *holy scriptures,* see under Alma 34:30. For a list of other cases of this usage in the earliest text, see under INFLECTIONAL ENDINGS in volume 3.

Summary: Maintain the use of "these things" in 3 Nephi 10:17, the reading in 𝒫; this reading is consistent with usage elsewhere in this passage, especially the various references to testifying of "these things" in the preceding text; restore the original third person singular form *testifies* to this verse since this is the reading of the earliest textual sources (𝒫 and the 1830 edition); this kind of usage can be found elsewhere in the earliest text.

3 Nephi 11

■ **3 Nephi 11 preface**

Jesus Christ [*sheweth* 1ABCDEFGHIKLMPS | *showeth* JNOQ | *did show* RT] *himself*
  unto the people of Nephi
as the multitude were gathered together in the land Bountiful
and did minister unto them
and on this wise did he [*shew* 1ABCDEFGHIKLMPS | *show* JNOQRT] *himself unto them*

This preface describing Christ's visit among the Nephites begins with the verb in the present tense ("Jesus Christ **sheweth** himself") but then immediately switches to the past tense ("as the multitude **were gathered** together"). Subsequent statements in this preface use the auxiliary *do* verb in the past tense ("did minister" and "did shew"), which undoubtedly motivated the editors for the 1920 LDS edition to change the present-tense *showeth* at the beginning of the preface to the past-tense *did show* (the archaic *shew* had already been emended to *show* in earlier LDS editions, beginning with the 1888 large-print edition). Another possibility would have been to change the initial verb *showeth* in this preface to the simple past-tense form: "Jesus Christ **showed** himself unto the people of Nephi".

The finite verbs in the Book of Mormon prefaces can be classified according to their use of tense:

□ *only present tense*

2 Nephi preface	rebelleth, warns
Jacob preface	confoundeth, seeketh
Helaman 7 preface	threatens, will, repent, smiteth, repent, turn, prophesies
4 Nephi preface	is

□ *only past tense*

Mosiah 9 preface	left, were
Mosiah 23 preface	was
Alma preface	was
Alma 5 preface	delivered
Alma 7 preface	delivered
Alma 17 preface	rejected, went
Alma 45 preface	kept
3 Nephi preface	was, was, was, was, was, came

□ *a mixture of present and past tense (with the latter set in bold)*

1 Nephi preface	warns, prophesieth, seek, taketh, taketh, returns, take, take, depart, come, rebelleth, confoundeth, buildeth, call, cross, is, **wrote**
Alma 9 preface	**was**, **was**, are, **was**
Helaman preface	**was**, are, is
3 Nephi 11 preface	sheweth, **were**, **did**, **did**

□ *no finite verbs*

Alma 21 preface, Alma 36 preface, Alma 38 preface,
Alma 39 preface, Helaman 13 preface, Moroni 9 preface

The examples with mixture show that the tense can be inconsistent in a preface. In fact, the Alma 9 preface seems rather unusual in its mixture of tenses, yet it has never been edited:

> Alma 9 preface
> The words of Alma and also the words of Amulek
> which **was** declared unto the people
> which **was** in the land of Ammonihah
> and also they **are** cast into prison
> and delivered by the miraculous power of God
> which **was** in them
> according to the record of Alma

The one instance of the present tense in the Alma 9 preface provides a sense of immediacy to that part of the narrative summary. Although different in purpose, there are examples in the original text of the historical present tense being used in past-tense narratives, as in 1 Nephi 2:1: "the Lord **spake** unto my father—yea even in a dream—and **saith** unto him : blessed art thou Lehi". Examples like this one show a mixture of tenses within the same sentence (for further discussion, see under HISTORICAL PRESENT in volume 3). By starting out the 3 Nephi 11 preface in the present tense, Mormon provides a sense of immediacy, while the specific past-tense emendation, *did show,* sounds rather abrupt. In any event, the original use of *sheweth* in this preface appears to be fully intended, and the critical text will restore it.

In the modern LDS text, all instances of the archaic verb form *shew* have been systematically replaced with the modern *show*. If the present-tense form of the verb *show* were restored in the standard LDS text for this 3 Nephi 11 preface, the form corresponding to the original *sheweth* would, of course, be *showeth,* not *shows*. To be sure, neither of the two forms with the *do* auxiliary, *doth show* and *does show,* would be appropriate here since in this case the original preface did not use the *do* auxiliary.

Summary: Restore the original present-tense *sheweth* at the beginning of the 3 Nephi 11 preface: "Jesus Christ **sheweth** himself unto the people of Nephi"; usage in several other prefaces supports the mixture of the present and past tenses in this preface; the critical text will also restore instances of the archaic verb form *shew* whenever they are supported by the earliest textual sources.

■ **3 Nephi 11 preface**

and on this wise did he shew [*himself* 1ABCGHIJKLMNOPQRST | DE | NULL > *himself* F]
unto them

Here the 1841 British edition omitted the direct object reflexive pronoun *himself*. The following 1849 LDS edition and the first printing of the 1852 LDS edition continued this difficult reading ("on this wise did he shew unto them"). The second printing of the 1852 edition restored the *himself,* probably by reference to the 1840 edition. Elsewhere the text has 28 references to Christ showing himself unto people, including one more in this preface: "Jesus Christ sheweth **himself** unto the people of Nephi".

Summary: Maintain in the 3 Nephi 11 preface both instances of the reflexive pronoun *himself* as the direct object for the verb *shew.*

■ **3 Nephi 11:8**

and behold they saw [*a man* 1ACDEFGHIJKLMNOPQS | *man a* B | *a Man* RT]
descending out of heaven

The 1920 LDS edition capitalized the spelling of *man,* which ends up making the text read as if the people already knew that this individual was the Savior when they first saw him descending from heaven; instead, they thought this man might be an angel until he identified himself as Jesus Christ:

> 3 Nephi 11:8–10
> and they durst not open their mouths
> —even one to another—
> and wist not what it meant
> for they thought it was an angel that had appeared unto them
> and it came to pass that he stretched forth his hand
> and spake unto the people saying
> behold I am Jesus Christ

Such capitalization of *man* has not been introduced elsewhere in the text, as in the following relevant example:

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

The context is precisely the same as in 3 Nephi 11:8, yet in 1 Nephi 11:7 *man* has not been capitalized, nor should it be. See under 1 Nephi 1:9 for an example where a twentieth-century LDS edition (in this instance, the 1981) capitalized *one* because of its eventual reference to deity.

Summary: Restore the lowercase spelling for *man* in 3 Nephi 11:8 since initially the Nephites did not realize that this individual was Christ.

■ **3 Nephi 11:10**

behold I am Jesus Christ

  ▫ *of which the prophets testified that should come*   1*A

  ▫ *of whom the prophets testified should come*   1ᶜ PS

  ▫ *of whom the prophets testified shall come*   BCDE

  ▫ *whom the prophets testified shall come*   FGHIJKLMNOQRT

into the world

The original syntax here, despite its unusualness, is definitely intended since it is supported by a similar instance of this syntax later in this chapter:

> 3 Nephi 11:15
> and this they did do / going forth one by one
> until they had all gone forth . . . and did bear record
> → that it was he of whom it was written by the prophets
>   [*that* 1AEFIJLMNOQRT | BCDGHKPS] should come

By lining these two passages up, we can see their original parallelism:

3 Nephi 11:10	*3 Nephi 11:15*
I am Jesus Christ	it was he
of which	of whom
the prophets testified	it was written by the prophets
that should come	that should come

In the printer's manuscript, Joseph Smith edited the first example (in verse 10) to "of **whom** the prophets testified should come" (changing the *which* to *whom* and omitting the *that*). The 1837 edition ended up with a different modal verb, *shall,* in place of the original *should*. This change may have been intentional (although the 1908 RLDS edition, following 𝓟 explicitly, later restored the *should*). In the 1852 LDS edition, the preposition *of* before *whom* was dropped (perhaps intentionally) from the LDS text.

On the other hand, the second example (in verse 15) has basically been left unchanged. The *that* was dropped in the 1837 edition (perhaps unintentionally), but nothing else has been changed in this later example. In fact, the 1849 LDS edition restored the *that* to the LDS text. So in the current LDS text, the second example (in verse 15) remains unchanged from its original reading while the first example (in verse 10) maintains its fully edited form.

Basically, the first relative clause in both these examples can be treated parenthetically and set off by punctuation:

> 3 Nephi 11:10
> behold I am Jesus Christ
> —of which the prophets testified—
> that should come into the world

> 3 Nephi 11:15
> that it was he
> —of whom it was written by the prophets—
> that should come

This means that the *that* in both verses is the relative pronoun *that,* not the subordinate conjunction *that*. This relationship is further supported by usage in the New Testament of the King James Bible. In each of the following similar expressions, the English *he that* and *that* reflect the Greek pronoun *ho,* not the subordinate conjunction *hoti:*

> Matthew 11:3 (also Luke 7:19, 20)
> art thou **he that** should come

> John 6:14
> this is of a truth that prophet
> **that** should come into the world

(Also note the use of *should* in both these King James examples, just like the two examples in 3 Nephi 11.) In other words, the *that* in 3 Nephi 11:10 and 3 Nephi 11:15 should not be interpreted as forming the complement of the verbs *testify* and *write* (which in each case occur in the immediately preceding relative clause). Instead, the relative pronoun *that* refers back to *Jesus Christ* (in verse 10) or to its pronominal equivalent, *he* (in verse 15).

Summary: Restore in 3 Nephi 11:10 the original syntax: "behold I am Jesus Christ—of which the prophets testified—that should come"; maintain in 3 Nephi 11:15 the parallel syntax: "it was he—of whom it was written by the prophets—that should come"; in each case, punctuation can be supplied so that the relative clause referring to the prophets can be kept separate from the main statement that refers to Christ's coming.

■ **3 Nephi 11:15**

and [*this* 1ACEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST | BD] *they did do*
going forth one by one

The 1837 edition omitted the fronted direct object, the pronoun *this*. This obvious typo, however, was maintained in the 1841 British edition, which was set without any editing from the 1837 edition. The 1840 edition restored the correct reading, as did the 1849 LDS edition (the latter by reference to the 1830 or the 1840 edition). The earliest textual sources (𝔓 and the 1830 edition) support the occurrence of *this* here, as does usage elsewhere in the text. Nearby, Oliver Cowdery initially omitted such a *this* in his copywork:

> 3 Nephi 4:25
> and [NULL >+ *this* 1 | *this* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] did they do
> in the nighttime

Summary: Maintain the direct object *this* in 3 Nephi 11:15 (as well as in 3 Nephi 4:25).

■ **3 Nephi 11:15**

that it was he of whom it was written by the prophets
[*that* 1AEFIJLMNOQRT | BCDGHKPS] *should come*

The 1837 edition omitted the relative pronoun *that* in this passage; the 1849 LDS edition restored it to the LDS text. The critical text will, of course, retain the *that*. For discussion regarding this complex construction, see nearby under 3 Nephi 11:10.

■ **3 Nephi 11:16**

and it came to pass that
when [*they had all* 1ABCEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST | *all had* D] *gone forth*
and had witnessed for themselves
they did cry out with one accord saying . . .

Here the compositor for the 1841 British edition accidentally set "when **all had** gone forth" instead of the semantically equivalent (and correct) reading "when **they had all** gone forth". The 1849 LDS edition restored the correct reading.

Summary: Maintain the original reading in 3 Nephi 11:16: "when **they had all** gone forth".

■ **3 Nephi 11:18**

and it came to pass that he spake unto Nephi
for Nephi was among the multitude
and [1 | *he* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *commanded him*
that he should come forth

The printer's manuscript doesn't have the pronoun *he* in the conjoined clause, but the 1830 edition does. The reading with the *he* is, of course, much easier to parse. The pronoun seems necessary because of the intervening clause "for Nephi was among the multitude". When the *he* is missing, one tends to initially interpret Nephi as the subject of the verb *command* ("for Nephi was among the multitude and commanded him that he should come forth"), as if Nephi were commanding Christ to come forward. In fact, one could argue that the 1830 typesetter emended the text by adding the *he* precisely because of this difficulty.

Errors in manuscript copying definitely show that Oliver Cowdery tended to drop the pronoun *he* at the beginning of a conjoined clause, including two cases (each marked below with an asterisk) where the change was permanently made as Oliver copied from 𝓞 into 𝓟:

⁕ 1 Nephi 12:6 (error in copying from 𝓞 into 𝓟)
    and he came down
    and [*he* 0 | 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] shewed himself unto them

  Mosiah 11:27 (initial error in 𝓟)
    he was also wroth
    and [NULL >+ *he* 1 | *he* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] saith . . .

Alma 18:1–2 (error in 𝒪 or initial error in 𝒫)

    and it came to pass that king Lamoni caused that his servants should stand forth
    and testify to all the things which they had seen concerning the matter
    and when they had all testified to the things which they had seen
    and [NULL >p– *he* 1 | *he* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] had learned
        of the faithfulness of Ammon in preserving his flocks . . .

            [In 𝒫, Oliver Cowdery added the *he* lightly in pencil.]

Alma 21:4 (initial error in 𝒫)

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

Alma 46:13 (initial error in 𝒪)

    and he called it the title of liberty
    and [NULL >+ *he* 0 | *he* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] bowed himself
        to the earth

 * Alma 51:25 (error in copying from 𝒪 into 𝒫)

    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

Alma 55:16 (initial error in 𝒫)

    and Moroni had prepared his men with weapons of war
    and [*he* 0ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST | NULL > *he* 1] went to the city of Gid

Ether 14:3 (initial error in 𝒫)

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

Ether 14:17 (initial error in 𝒫)

    and he did slay both men women and children
    and [NULL >+ *he* 1 | *he* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] did burn the cities thereof

On the other hand, there is one instance where the 1830 typesetter consciously inserted a *he* in this context:

    Mosiah 24:11

    and it came to pass that Amulon commanded them
    that they should stop their cries
    and [NULL >jg *he* 1 | *he* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] put guards over them
        to watch them

Interestingly, the sentence in 3 Nephi 11:18, like the one in Mosiah 24:11, has an intervening clause that, if treated parenthetically, allows for a following subject pronoun *he* to be ellipted:

Mosiah 24:11 (original reading in 𝒫)	*3 Nephi 11:18 (reading in 𝒫)*
and it came to pass that	and it came to pass that
Amulon commanded them	he spake unto Nephi
→ that they should stop their cries	→ for Nephi was among the multitude
and put guards over them	and commanded him
to watch them	that he should come forth

Moreover, the resulting difficulty in parsing would have provided strong motivation for the 1830 typesetter to emend the text by inserting the *he* in both these passages. To be sure, Oliver Cowdery could have accidentally omitted the *he* in these two cases, just as he did elsewhere. Here is another example, but in a different context, where the 1830 typesetter felt obligated to supply a subject *he*:

> Alma 12:17
> and then is the time that they shall be chained down to an everlasting destruction
> according to the power and captivity of Satan
> [NULL >jg *he* 1 | *he* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] having subjected them
> according to his will

These examples show that the 1830 typesetter was willing to add a subject *he* when he felt it was necessary. Ultimately, it is difficult here in 3 Nephi 11:18 to decide between the two alternatives (Oliver omitting the *he* in 𝒫 or the 1830 typesetter adding it). In fact, there is a third possibility: the *he* could have been accidentally omitted in 𝒪 itself (when Oliver, the presumed scribe in 𝒪, took down Joseph Smith's dictation).

The reading in 𝒫, without the *he* after *and,* will work providing we explicitly indicate the parenthetical nature of the intervening clause. In fact, the 1830 typesetter placed parentheses around this clause (and all printed editions have retained the parentheses). Note, however, that the parentheses are crucial only if we adopt the reading in 𝒫. The critical text will continue the parenthetical treatment of the intervening clause but with dashes:

> 3 Nephi 11:18 (the reading in 𝒫, with parenthetical punctuation)
> and it came to pass that he spake unto Nephi
> —for Nephi was among the multitude—
> and commanded him that he should come forth

There are other instances where such readings without a conjoined *he* are found in the text (two more are listed under Mosiah 24:11). And as already noted, in Mosiah 24:11 the 1830 typesetter explicitly added the subject pronoun *he* in 𝒫, showing that he was willing to emend readings like these with intervening clauses. The critical text will therefore accept the difficult reading here in 3 Nephi 11:18 (namely, the reading in 𝒫 without the *he*).

For a similar example with this variation (namely, *he* in the 1830 edition but lacking in 𝒫), see under 4 Nephi 1:49. In that case, the scribe in 𝒫 was the unknown scribe 2 rather than Oliver Cowdery. There is also an example where the variation is the opposite (*he* in 𝒫 but lacking in the 1830 edition); for that example, see under 3 Nephi 14:1.

Summary: Accept in 3 Nephi 11:18 the difficult reading without the *he* (the reading in 𝒫); continue the parenthetical punctuation around the intervening clause, "for Nephi was among the multitude", now virtually required for making the resulting conjoining of predicates acceptable ("he spake unto Nephi . . .

and commanded him that he should come forth"); this textual decision means that the 1830 typesetter added the *he* in 3 Nephi 11:18, just as he did in Mosiah 24:11; yet the possibility remains that the *he* was in the original text and that it was accidentally omitted in 𝒪 itself or when 𝒪 was copied into 𝒫.

■ **3 Nephi 11:19**

and Nephi arose
and went forth
and bowed himself before the Lord
and [*he* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQS| RT] *did kiss his feet*

The 1920 LDS edition intentionally deleted the *he* at the beginning of the final conjoined predicate, probably because there is no subject pronoun for the two preceding conjoined predicates ("and went forth and bowed himself before the Lord"). The change is marked in the 1920 committee copy. Another possible reason for the 1920 emendation was to prevent the reader from misinterpreting the *he* as referring to the preceding *the Lord*—as if the Lord himself kissed Nephi's feet! Yet it seems very doubtful that any normal reader would ever misread the text in this way.

The original extra *he* separates Nephi's actions into two parts (first, getting up, going forward, and bowing down before the Lord, and then kissing his feet). There are a few other examples in the current text where the use of *and he did* introduces a division, as in the following example:

> Alma 51:34
> and it came to pass that
> Teancum stole privily into the tent of the king
> **and put** a javelin to his heart
> **and he did** cause the death of the king immediately

Clearly, there is nothing inherently wrong with the pronoun *he* in 3 Nephi 11:19, nor is there really much chance of misinterpreting the pronoun *he* as referring to the Lord. One alternative emendation that the 1830 typesetter could have chosen in order to avoid this minor difficulty would have been to replace the *he* with *Nephi:* "and Nephi did kiss his feet".

Summary: Restore the pronoun *he* in 3 Nephi 11:19 ("and **he** did kiss his feet"); the original use of the full clause appears to separate a group of actions (all dealing with approaching the Lord) from the last one (kissing his feet).

■ **3 Nephi 11:36**

for the Father and I and the Holy Ghost are one

Paul Thomas (personal communication, 5 December 2003) points out that the pronoun *I* is in the wrong place according to the traditional rule of grammar that places the *I* pronoun at the end of a conjunctive noun phrase. Of course, the order here in 3 Nephi 11:36 follows the typical trinitarian order, as elsewhere in the text, including these two in this same chapter:

> 3 Nephi 11:25
> I baptize you in the name
> of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost

3 Nephi 11:27
>> verily I say unto you
>> that the Father and the Son and the Holy Ghost are one

Even so, the trinitarian word order is not always followed in the Book of Mormon text:

Alma 11:44
>> and all shall be brought and be raigned before the bar
>> of Christ the Son and God the Father and the Holy Spirit
>> which is one eternal God
>> to be judged according to their works

Here in 3 Nephi 11:36, the critical text will maintain the word order of all the textual sources, "for the Father and I and the Holy Ghost are one".

David Calabro points out (personal communication) that the Book of Mormon has eight examples where the subject pronoun *I* comes first in a conjunctive subject, as in these examples:

1 Nephi 5:20	thus far I and my father had kept the commandments
1 Nephi 7:22	and after that I and my brethren and all the house of Ishmael had come down unto the tent of my father . . .
Mosiah 9:7	and I and my people went into the land that we might possess it

The King James Bible also has many similar examples, such as these instances that parallel the preceding Book of Mormon examples:

Genesis 37:10	shall I and thy mother and thy brethren indeed come to bow down ourselves to thee to the earth
Exodus 9:27	and I and my people *are* wicked
John 10:30	I and *my* Father are one

The order of the nouns in the King James text follows the order in the original languages (Hebrew for the Old Testament examples, Greek for the New Testament). From this perspective, the word order in 3 Nephi 11:36 is definitely unusual, yet its trinitarian order seems to be fully intended.

Summary: Maintain in 3 Nephi 11:36 the expected trinitarian order, with Christ (here represented by the pronoun *I*) coming second.

■ **3 Nephi 11:39 – 40**
> *verily verily I say unto you that this is my doctrine*
> *and whoso buildeth upon this buildeth upon my rock*
> *and the gates of hell shall not prevail against* **them**
> *and whoso shall declare more or less than this*
> *and* [*establisheth* 1 | *establish* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *it for my doctrine*
> *the same* **cometh** *of evil and is not built upon my rock*
> *but he* **buildeth** *upon a sandy foundation*
> *and the gates of hell* [*standeth* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQS | *stand* RT] *open to receive such*
> *when the floods come and the winds beat upon* **them**

There are two related issues involved in this passage. First of all, one wonders if the use of *them* at the end of each verse isn't a mistake for *him,* especially since the rest of this passage otherwise uses

the singular pronoun *he* for the antecedent *whoso*. Second, the passage has some variation regard-ing whether the present-tense indicative verb forms in this passage should take the *-eth* ending.

We take up the second issue first. Near the beginning of verse 40, the printer's manuscript has *establisheth,* but the 1830 edition has *establish.* The reading of the printer's manuscript, *establisheth,* assumes that this main verb has been conjoined with *shall declare* rather than with *declare* alone. The 1830 reading assumes that the *shall* has been ellipted in the conjoined clause.

When we consider all the other examples of conjoined verbs in *whoso(ever)* noun clauses, we find that in 20 cases whole verb phrases are conjoined. In only one other case is the helping verb ellipted:

> 3 Nephi 21:20
> whosoever **will not repent**
> and **come** unto my beloved Son
> them will I cut off from among my people
> O house of Israel

This one example is different because the negative *not* includes both *repent* and *come;* that is, the meaning is 'whosoever will not repent and will not come unto my beloved Son'.

Typically, when there is a modal verb, that helping verb is repeated in the conjunct:

> 1 Nephi 15:24
> and that whoso **would hearken** unto the word of God
> and **would hold fast** unto it
> they would never perish

> Alma 12:35
> and whosoever **will harden** his heart
> and **will do** iniquity
> behold I swear in my wrath that they shall not enter into my rest

> Alma 62:9
> whosoever **would not take up** arms in the defense of their country
> but **would fight** against it
> were put to death

But there is one important counterexample that occurs later in 3 Nephi:

> 3 Nephi 23:5
> and whosoever **will hearken** unto my words
> and **repenteth**
> and **is baptized**
> the same shall be saved

This example parallels the reading of the printer's manuscript for 3 Nephi 11:40. The first con-junct has the modal verb *will,* but the verb in the second conjunct ends in *-eth*. This example argues that the original manuscript for 3 Nephi 11:40 could have read *establisheth* rather than *establish.* Moreover, the use of *establisheth* is supported by "the same **cometh**", "he **buildeth**", and the original "the gates of hell **standeth** open" later on in the verse. The editors for the 1920 LDS edition changed *standeth* to *stand* in accord with standard English: the present-tense *-eth* ending is supposed to occur with only third person singular subjects. As discussed under the

phrase "Nephi's brethren rebelleth against him" in the 1 Nephi preface, the Book of Mormon had numerous instances of this plural usage in the original text (in fact, some are still in the current text). In each case, the critical text will restore or maintain such usage. Also see the discussion under INFLECTIONAL ENDINGS in volume 3.

When we consider early errors in transmission, we find that Oliver Cowdery sometimes added the *-eth* ending:

> Alma 37:9 (initial error in 𝓞)
>
>> yea I [*sayeth* >% NULL 0| 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] say unto you . . .

> Alma 54:22 (error in copying from 𝓞 into 𝓟)
>
>> but behold these things [*matter* 0RT|*mattereth* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQS] not

On the other hand, there are two instances where the 1830 typesetter removed the *-eth* ending:

> Jacob 2:23
>
>> this people [*begineth* >js *begines* 1|*begin* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
>> to wax in iniquity

> Alma 3:19
>
>> and even so [*doeth* 1HK|*doth* ABCDEFGIJLMNOPQRST] every man that is cursed
>> [*bringeth* 1|*bring* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] upon himself
>>> his own condemnation

(The second of these is complicated by the occurrence of the preceding *doeth,* which was edited to *doth* by the 1830 typesetter. For discussion, see under that passage.) From a transmission point of view, either Oliver or the 1830 typesetter could be responsible for the variation for *establish(eth)* here in 3 Nephi 11:40. So we follow the internal evidence in this case, which supports the reading *establisheth* rather than *establish*. Of course, the earliest textual sources support *standeth*.

We now turn to the question of whether the pronoun at the end of verses 39 and 40 should be *him* rather than *them*. These two object pronoun forms, *them* and *him*, have sometimes been mixed up in the transmission of the text since in colloquial spoken pronunciation both are pronounced as /əm/ (for the manuscript evidence, see under 1 Nephi 10:18–19). Under Mosiah 5:10, I note that for *whoso(ever)* the pronominal referent can be either the singular *he* or the plural *they*. Here in 3 Nephi 11:40, the use of *them* at the end of that verse seems odd since earlier in the verse the reference is to *he* ("but **he** buildeth upon a sandy foundation").

Still, there is the use of *such* in the next clause ("and the gates of hell standeth open to receive such"). In the Book of Mormon, the noun *such* typically implies a plural. In fact, in certain cases the preceding text may use the singular pronoun *he,* but then after an instance of *such* the text uses *they:*

> 3 Nephi 18:32
>
>> nevertheless ye shall not cast **him**
>> out of your synagogues or your places of worship
>> for unto **such** shall ye continue to minister
>> for ye know not but what **they** will return and repent
>> and come unto me with full purpose of heart
>> and I shall heal **them**
>> and ye shall be the means of bringing salvation unto **them**

Moroni 8:20–21

and **he** that saith that little children needeth baptism
denieth the mercies of Christ
and setteth at naught the atonement of him
and the power of his redemption
woe unto **such** for **they** are in danger of death
hell and an endless torment

So at least here in 3 Nephi 11:40 the use of *them* after *such* is acceptable ("and the gates of hell standeth open to receive **such** when the floods come and the winds beat upon **them**").

Also note that other quotations referring to building one's house on a rock or on sand support the use of the plural *them*. We have the following additional example in the Book of Mormon:

3 Nephi 18:13

but whoso among you shall do more or less than these
are not built upon my rock
but **are** built upon a sandy foundation
and when the rain descends and the floods come
and the winds blow and beat upon **them**
they shall fall
and the gates of hell is already open to receive **them**

Note that throughout this later passage *whoso* takes plural forms. We also have the following example from a revelation given to Joseph Smith sometime between the summer of 1828 and April 1829, after the first part of the Book of Mormon translation had been completed:

Book of Commandments 9:18 (Doctrine and Covenants 10:69)

and now behold whosoever is of my church
and endureth of my church to the end
him will I establish upon my rock
and the gates of hell shall not prevail against **them**

This second example starts out with *him* but switches to the plural *them,* thus paralleling the usage in 3 Nephi 11:40.

Consequently, the two occurrences of the plural *them* at the end of 3 Nephi 11:39 and 3 Nephi 11:40 are most probably correct. The critical text will retain both these instances of the plural pronoun, the reading in each case of both 𝓟 and the 1830 edition.

Summary: Maintain at the end of both 3 Nephi 11:39 and 3 Nephi 11:40 the plural pronoun *them;* restore the consistent use of the *-eth* ending in 3 Nephi 11:40, namely, *establisheth* (the reading in 𝓟) and *standeth* (the reading in both 𝓟 and the 1830 edition); evidence elsewhere in the text supports the multiple use of *them* and the *-eth* ending in this passage.

3 Nephi 12

■ **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*

> As discussed under Alma 44:21, the Book of Mormon text prefers *were* when the subject is of the form "the number of X". The 1920 LDS edition edited the *were* to *was* in some cases, including here in 3 Nephi 12:1, but in other cases this edition left the original *were* unchanged. The critical text will, as the case may be, maintain or restore the original *were* in all these cases.

■ **3 Nephi 12:8**

and blessed are [*all* 1ABCDEFHIJKLMNOPQRST | G] *the pure in heart*

□ **Matthew 5:8** (King James Bible)

blessed *are* the pure in heart

> When compared with the Matthew version, the Book of Mormon version has *all* added in five of the Beatitudes (as well as other words, also set in bold in the following):

BOOK OF MORMON TEXT

verse 4	**and again** blessed are **all** they that mourn
verse 6	**and** blessed are **all** they which do hunger and thirst after righteousness
verse 8	**and** blessed are **all** the pure in heart
verse 9	**and** blessed are **all** the peacemakers
verse 10	**and** blessed are **all** they which are persecuted for my name's sake

> More generally, the Book of Mormon Beatitudes all begin with a narrative connector, either *and* (eight times, including one instance of *and again*) or *yea* (one time). The critical text will accept these differences, especially since they are so pervasive and obviously intended.
>
> Here in 3 Nephi 12:8, the typesetter for the 1858 Wright edition accidentally omitted the *all,* perhaps because of his familiarity with the King James version of the Beatitudes. Yet only in this beatitude did he omit the *all*. The RLDS text, beginning with the 1874 edition, has in this case followed the reading of the 1840 edition, thus maintaining the *all*.

Summary: In accord with the reading of the earliest textual sources, maintain the occurrence of the extra *all* in five of the Book of Mormon Beatitudes, including here in 3 Nephi 12:8.

■ **3 Nephi 12:11**

> *and blessed are ye*
> *when men shall revile you*
> *and persecute* [*you* > NULL 1| ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
> *and shall say all manner of evil against you falsely for my sake*

□ **Matthew 5:11** (King James Bible)

> blessed are ye
> when *men* shall revile you
> and persecute ***you***
> and shall say all manner of evil against you falsely for my sake

> In the King James Bible, the object pronoun *you* after *persecute* is in italics (the Greek text does not have an explicit direct object for this verb, but it is implied by the occurrence of *you* as the direct object for the preceding verb, thus equivalently in Greek "shall revile you and shall persecute". Here in the Book of Mormon version, there was apparently no *you* after *persecute* in the original manuscript. When Oliver Cowdery initially wrote this passage in the printer's manuscript, he supplied a second *you,* probably because of his familiarity with the Beatitudes. Virtually immediately, Oliver crossed out this *you* in 𝓟 (there is no observable change in the level of ink flow for the crossout). Since both 𝓟 (in its corrected form) and the 1830 edition agree here, the current text without the *you* should be retained.

> *Summary:* Maintain in 3 Nephi 12:11 the current text without the pronoun *you* after *persecute* since both the 1830 edition and the corrected reading in 𝓟 lack the *you;* in this case, 𝒪 very likely lacked the extra *you;* here the original Book of Mormon text agrees with the Greek text of the Sermon on the Mount; this *you* occurs in the King James version but is in italics.

■ **3 Nephi 12:13**

> *but if the salt shall lose **its** savor*
> *wherewith shall the earth be salted*
> *the salt shall be thenceforth good for nothing*
> *but to be cast out and to be trodden under foot of men*

□ **Matthew 5:13** (King James Bible)

> but if the salt have lost **his** savor
> wherewith shall it be salted
> it is thenceforth good for nothing
> but to be cast out and to be trodden under foot of men

> For this passage all the extant textual sources for the Book of Mormon text read "**its** savor", which is what we expect in modern English. Since both 𝓟 and the 1830 edition here read *its,* it is likely (although not overwhelmingly so) that 𝒪 also read *its.* Interestingly, this same passage from the Sermon on the Mount is cited later in 3 Nephi, and there the original text actually read "his savor":

3 Nephi 16:15

> and they shall be as salt
> that hath lost [*its* > *his* >js *its* 1 | *his* A | *its* BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] savor
> which is thenceforth good for nothing
> but to be cast out and to be trodden under foot of my people / O house of Israel

In that instance, it is clear that 𝓞 read "his savor". Oliver Cowdery initially wrote "its savor" in 𝓟, which he corrected virtually immediately to "his savor" (there is no change in the level of ink flow for the supralinearly inserted *his*). Here the 1830 edition also reads "his savor". This means that even though Oliver had a tendency to write the expected "its savor", he made sure in this later case that he copied "his savor" correctly. The 1830 typesetter also set "his savor". So if in 3 Nephi 12:13 𝓞 had read "his savor", it seems unlikely that both Oliver and the 1830 typesetter would have changed *his* to *its;* both avoided doing so later in 3 Nephi 16:15. (However, in his editing for the 1837 edition, Joseph Smith emended "his savor" to the expected "its savor" in that passage.) Thus we can deduce that 𝓞 likely read "its savor" for the earlier instance. If *its* is an error in 3 Nephi 12:13, it was probably made when the text was originally dictated. Of course, that is a distinct possibility since in 3 Nephi 16:15 Oliver initially wrote *its* instead of *his* in 𝓟. Ultimately, the critical text will follow the earliest reading here in 3 Nephi 12:13 (namely, "its savor"), even though this could be an error for the unexpected "his savor".

In earlier English, *his* stood for both the masculine and the neuter possessive pronoun. The neuter form *its* is an analogical one and is not original in English. So in Matthew 5:13, the *his* actually means 'its'. For discussion of this particular usage here in Matthew 5:13 and elsewhere in Early Modern English, see pages 150–151 of Charles Barber, *Early Modern English* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 1997).

The more general question is whether the Book of Mormon version of the Sermon on the Mount allows for lexical variation. In comparing invariant Book of Mormon readings against the King James text, we find a number of examples where the difference is in the choice of a function word:

	BOOK OF MORMON TEXT	KING JAMES TEXT
3 Nephi 12 / Matthew 5		
verse 14	a city that is set on **a** hill	a city that is set on **an** hill
verse 15	and it giveth light **to** all	and it giveth light **unto** all
verse 18	one jot **nor** one tittle	one jot **or** one tittle
verse 22	**and** whosoever shall say	**but** whosoever shall say
verse 25	**while** thou art in the way	**whiles** thou art in the way
verse 26	**until** thou hast paid	**till** thou hast paid
verse 32	and **whoso** shall marry her	and **whosoever** shall marry her
verse 32	**who** is divorced	**that** is divorced
3 Nephi 13 / Matthew 6		
verse 2	before **you**	before **thee**
verse 17	anoint **thy** head	anoint **thine** head
3 Nephi 14 / Matthew 7		
verse 24	**whoso** heareth these sayings	**whosoever** heareth these sayings

In some of these cases, the Book of Mormon reading is the expected one for modern English. Although all of these Book of Mormon readings could be emended to their corresponding King James readings, the critical text will follow the earliest Book of Mormon sources in each of these cases since there is nothing wrong with the Book of Mormon reading. Therefore, since "its savor" will work here in 3 Nephi 12:13, the critical text will accept it. On the other hand, for 3 Nephi 16:15 the critical text will restore the original "his savor", despite its disagreement with the earliest reading here in 3 Nephi 12:13.

Summary: Maintain in 3 Nephi 12:13 the modern reading "its savor", the reading of the earliest textual sources; in 3 Nephi 16:15, on the other hand, the earliest reading is "his savor", which agrees with the King James text for Matthew 5:13; the critical text will generally maintain an invariant Book of Mormon reading rather than the corresponding King James reading unless there is some evidence that the Book of Mormon reading is textually unacceptable; it is possible, of course, that the original text in 3 Nephi 12:13 read "his savor", like the Matthew passage, but that the scribe in 𝓞 (presumably Oliver Cowdery) accidentally wrote the expected "its savor".

■ **3 Nephi 12:18**

*one jot **nor** one tittle hath not passed away from the law*
but in me it hath all been fulfilled

□ **Matthew 5:18** (King James Bible)

one jot **or** one tittle shall in no wise pass from the law
till all be fulfilled

As discussed under 2 Nephi 23:17, the original text has instances in negative clauses of noun phrases parenthetically conjoined to a preceding noun phrase by the conjunction *nor,* as in this other example dealing with jots and tittles from earlier in 3 Nephi:

> 3 Nephi 1:25
> yea that one jot [*nor* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQ|*or* RST] tittle
> should not pass away till it should all be fulfilled

In that case, the *nor* was emended to *or* in the 1920 LDS edition and in the 1953 RLDS edition. But here in 3 Nephi 12:18, the *nor* has not been emended to *or* (which is the conjunction that the corresponding King James reading has). The critical text will, of course, retain this original use of *nor* since usage elsewhere in the Book of Mormon text supports it.

Summary: Accept the use of *nor* in 3 Nephi 12:18, the reading of all the textual sources; although Matthew 5:18 has *or,* usage elsewhere in the Book of Mormon allows *nor* for this kind of negative expression.

■ **3 Nephi 12:19**

and behold I have given [*unto* 1A | BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *you the law*
and the commandments of my Father

Here the 1837 edition omitted the preposition *unto,* probably unintentionally. It has never been restored to either the LDS or the RLDS text. More generally, for all examples in the text of "give someone commandment(s)" (that is, where the indirect object comes before the direct object), we find an equal number of examples with and without the preposition *unto* in the original text (seven of each possibility). Moreover, in this same chapter there is one more of these where the *unto* was omitted in the textual history:

> 3 Nephi 12:29
> behold I give [*unto* 1ABDEFIJLMNOQRT | CGHKPS] you a commandment
> that ye suffer none of these things to enter into your heart

In this instance, the *unto* was omitted in the 1840 edition, and the subsequent RLDS textual tradition has maintained the shorter reading.

If we consider cases that refer to giving law, all the other examples are in the passive; for this expression, we get even more variety with respect to the preposition (there is one case of *to*):

> 2 Nephi 2:5   and the law is given **unto** men
> Mosiah 13:29   that there should be a law given **to** the children of Israel
> Mosiah 13:30   therefore there was a law given them

There is one instance in 3 Nephi 12–14 where *unto* occurs in the Book of Mormon text but is lacking in the corresponding King James passage:

> *3 Nephi 14:7*   *Matthew 7:7*
> ask and it shall be given **unto** you   ask and it shall be given you

Either reading—with or without *unto*—is possible in the Book of Mormon text, so for each case of *unto,* the critical text will rely on the earliest textual sources in determining whether this preposition should be included or not. Thus *unto* will be restored here in 3 Nephi 12:19.

Summary: Restore in 3 Nephi 12:19 the preposition *unto,* the reading of both 𝓟 and the 1830 edition (thus "I have given **unto** you the law and the commandments of my Father").

■ **3 Nephi 12:20**

therefore come unto me
and be [*ye* 1ABCDEFGHIKLMNOPQRST | J] *saved*

Here the 1888 LDS edition omitted the subject pronoun *ye.* Since this edition never served as a copytext, no subsequent LDS edition has followed this shorter reading. Note here that the preceding imperative clause ("therefore come unto me") has no *ye.* The lack of *ye* in the first clause may have prompted the 1888 loss of the *ye* in the second clause. Here is another passage where the *ye* is not repeated in every imperative clause:

Mormon 3:2
> repent **ye** and come unto me
> and be **ye** baptized and build up again my church

Summary: Maintain the text in 3 Nephi 12:20 where *ye* occurs in the second imperative clause but not in the first one.

■ **3 Nephi 12:21–22**

and whosoever shall kill
shall be in danger of **the** *judgment* **of God**
but I say unto you that
whosoever is angry with **his** *brother*
shall be in danger of **his** *judgment*

□ **Matthew 5:21–22** (King James Bible)

and whosoever shall kill
shall be in danger of **the** judgment
but I say unto you that
whosoever is angry with **his** brother without a cause
shall be in danger of **the** judgment

Here in verse 22, the Book of Mormon text reads "shall be in danger of **his** judgment", while the King James text reads "shall be in danger of **the** judgment". One wonders if the determiner *his* in verse 22 of the Book of Mormon version might be an error for *the* (the King James reading) since the preceding text reads "whosoever is angry with **his** brother". Both 𝒫 and the 1830 edition read "shall be in danger of **his** judgment", so 𝒪 probably did too; if there is an error here in the Book of Mormon text, it would have occurred as the text was dictated.

Nonetheless, the Book of Mormon reading will work. For instance, the specific reference to a brother here in verse 22 ("whosoever is angry with his brother") could mean that this brother might have cause against someone in the day of judgment for having been angry at him. Another possibility, one more plausible in my opinion, is based on the parallelism between the judgment mentioned in verse 21 and the one here in verse 22:

3 Nephi 12:21–22
> and whosoever shall kill shall be in danger of **the judgment of God**
> but I say unto you that whosoever is angry with his brother
> > shall be in danger of **his judgment**

Matthew 5:21–22
> and whosoever shall kill shall be in danger of **the judgment**
> but I say unto you that whosoever is angry with his brother without a cause
> > shall be in danger of **the judgment**

In other words, in the Book of Mormon text the phrase "the judgment" has been revised both times, to "the judgment **of God**" in verse 21 and to "**his** judgment" (that is, to God's judgment) in verse 22. The phrase "his judgment" in verse 22 does not refer to 'the judgment of a brother' but to 'the judgment of God'.

Thus the Book of Mormon reading in verse 22, "his judgment", may be fully intended under either of these two interpretations: *his* can refer to one's brother or, more likely, to God. The critical text will therefore maintain the earliest extant reading in verse 22, "shall be in danger of **his** judgment", since it will work.

We note here in passing that in verse 22 there is a significant textual difference between the Book of Mormon reading and the King James text, namely, the omission of the phrase "without a cause". This phrase is also omitted in some of the earliest New Testament Greek manuscripts, thus providing in this instance support for the Book of Mormon reading. (See the apparatus under Matthew 5:22 in the Nestle-Aland Greek New Testament, *Novum Testamentum Graece*.) But in general, other textual differences between the Book of Mormon text and the King James version of the Sermon on the Mount are not supported by textual variants in the Greek New Testament text.

Summary: Maintain in 3 Nephi 12:22 the determiner *his* in "shall be in danger of **his** judgment"; although the *his* could be an error for *the* (the King James reading), this substitution may very well be intended, especially since the previous verse refers to "the judgment of God" in the Book of Mormon text rather than simply "the judgment" (the King James reading in Matthew 5:21).

■ **3 Nephi 12:23**

therefore if **ye** *shall come unto me or shall desire to come unto me*
and **rememberest** *that thy brother hath aught against thee . . .*

□ **Matthew 5:23** (King James Bible)

therefore if **thou** bring thy gift to the altar
and there **rememberest** that thy brother hath aught against thee . . .

We note here that the first line in the Book of Mormon text avoids any reference to bringing a gift to the altar (since the Mosaic law is no longer in force, as explained by Jesus in 3 Nephi 15:2−8); thus "if thou bring thy gift to the altar" is replaced with "if ye shall come unto me or shall desire to come unto me". But also note, in particular, the shift from the second person singular *thou* to the second person plural *ye*. The remainder of the verse is basically identical with the King James reading, with the result that in the Book of Mormon text the subject pronoun *ye* ends up taking the verb form *rememberest* rather than the expected *remember*. For further discussion of this anomaly, see under 2 Nephi 7:11. For a case of "ye . . . repenteth" in the original text, see under Mosiah 4:22. The critical text will continue with this instance of "ye . . . rememberest" here in 3 Nephi 12:23 since it is the reading of the earliest text. In fact, the verse here has never been grammatically emended to, for instance, "if **thou shalt** come unto me or **shalt** desire to come unto me".

Summary: Maintain the anomalous "ye . . . rememberest" in 3 Nephi 12:23, the reading of all the extant textual sources; this mixture of forms derives from an original revision to the first line of the verse (when compared with the King James reading).

■ **3 Nephi 12:26**

[*verily* 1 | *verily verily* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *I say unto thee*
thou shalt by no means come out thence until thou hast paid the uttermost senine

□ **Matthew 5:26** (King James Bible)

verily I say unto thee
thou shalt by no means come out thence till thou hast paid the uttermost farthing

Here in the printer's manuscript we have a single *verily,* whereas the 1830 edition has a double one, *verily verily.* The corresponding text in Matthew 5:26 has a single *verily,* like the printer's manuscript. In the King James Bible, the double *verily* is found only in the Gospel of John. In the Sermon on the Mount (Matthew 5–7), there are examples of only the single *verily.* And for each of these instances, when quoted in the Book of Mormon, both 𝓟 and the 1830 edition have the single *verily* (except for this case in 3 Nephi 12:26 for the 1830 edition):

BOOK OF MORMON / KING JAMES BIBLE	*common text*
3 Nephi 12:18 / Matthew 5:18	for verily I say unto you
3 Nephi 12:26 / Matthew 5:26	verily I say unto thee
3 Nephi 13:2 / Matthew 6:2	verily I say unto you
3 Nephi 13:5 / Matthew 6:5	verily I say unto you
3 Nephi 13:16 / Matthew 6:16	verily I say unto you

And this same basic reading, with "I say unto thee" following a single *verily,* is what we have in Matthew 5:26 as well as in 𝓟 for 3 Nephi 12:26. What appears to have happened is that the 1830 compositor accidentally doubled the *verily* because he had also been setting *verily verily* in the text. Generally speaking, here in 3 Nephi 12–14, where the corresponding Matthew 5–7 text has no *verily* at all, the Book of Mormon text has the double *verily.* In fact, this includes one case of *verily verily* later on in this same verse 26: "verily verily I say unto you nay". And prior to the first case of "verily (verily)" here in 3 Nephi 12:26, there are instances of both the single and the double *verily:*

3 Nephi 11:23	**verily** I say unto you
3 Nephi 11:27	for behold **verily** I say unto you
3 Nephi 11:29	for **verily verily** I say unto you
3 Nephi 11:31	behold **verily verily** I say unto you
3 Nephi 11:35	**verily verily** I say unto you
3 Nephi 11:39	**verily verily** I say unto you
3 Nephi 12:13	**verily verily** I say unto you
3 Nephi 12:14	**verily verily** I say unto you
3 Nephi 12:18	for **verily** I say unto you
3 Nephi 12:20	for **verily** I say unto you

Notice that the last four instances without any narrative connector (from 3 Nephi 11:35 through 3 Nephi 12:14) have the double *verily,* which may have led the 1830 compositor to accidentally set the same "verily verily I say unto thee" here in 3 Nephi 12:26 instead of the correct "verily I say unto thee" (the King James reading). Since all other King James instances of *verily* in the Sermon

on the Mount are correctly transmitted as a single *verily* into the Book of Mormon text, the critical text will accept the reading in 𝒫 with the single *verily* for 3 Nephi 12:26.

There is one other instance of variation between 𝒫 and the 1830 edition regarding the single and the double *verily.* That case is found later on in this chapter:

> 3 Nephi 12:34
> but [*verily* 1 | *verily verily* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
> I say unto you
> swear not at all

In that instance, there is no *verily* in the corresponding King James passage, but internal evidence suggests that the correct reading is the double *verily;* for discussion, see under 3 Nephi 12:34.

Summary: Accept in 3 Nephi 12:26 the single *verily* (the reading in 𝒫) instead of the double *verily* (the 1830 reading); in this instance, the corresponding King James passage has the single *verily;* elsewhere the King James version of Matthew 5–7 has four other instances of *verily* but none of *verily verily,* and in each of those cases the corresponding Book of Mormon text has the single *verily.*

■ **3 Nephi 12:26–27**

thou [*shalt* 1ABCDEFGHIKLMNOPQRST | *shall* J] *by no means come out thence . . .*
thou [*shalt* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLNOPRST | *shall* MQ] *not commit adultery*

□ **Matthew 5:26–27** (King James Bible)

thou **shalt** by no means come out thence . . .
thou **shalt** not commit adultery

Here we have two instances where LDS editions accidentally replaced *thou shalt* with *thou shall.* In the first case, in verse 26, the 1888 large-print edition made the replacement; in the second case, in verse 27, the 1905 missionary edition made the change. The 1888 edition was never used as a copytext, so this typo was not extended to any subsequent editions. The 1911 LDS edition was set from the 1905, so the typo was extended to that edition; but the 1920 LDS edition restored the original *thou shalt.* In both cases, the corresponding King James text has, as expected, *thou shalt,* as will the critical text. For further discussion of the tendency to replace *thou shalt* with *thou shall,* see under Mosiah 12:11. For another example of this change, see nearby under 3 Nephi 12:33.

Summary: Maintain both instances of *thou shalt* in 3 Nephi 12:26–27, the reading of the earliest Book of Mormon text and the corresponding King James text.

■ **3 Nephi 12:29**

behold I give [*unto* 1ABDEFIJLMNOQRT | CGHKPS] *you a commandment that . . .*

Here the 1840 edition omitted the preposition *unto,* probably unintentionally. This shorter reading has been maintained in the RLDS textual tradition. The LDS text, deriving from the 1837 edition (through the 1841 British edition), has retained the *unto.* As explained nearby under 3 Nephi 12:19,

the Book of Mormon text allows for either reading, with or without the *unto,* in expressions like this. The critical text will maintain the *unto* here since it is the earliest extant reading. In this instance, there is no corresponding reading in the King James version of the Sermon on the Mount.

Summary: Maintain in 3 Nephi 12:29 the preposition *unto,* the reading of the earliest text: "I give **unto** you a commandment".

■ **3 Nephi 12:33**

thou [*shal > shalt* 1 | *shalt* ᴀʙᴄᴅᴇꜰɢʜɪᴊᴋʟᴍɴᴏᴘǫʀꜱᴛ] *not forswear thyself*
but [*shalt* 1ᴀʙᴄᴅᴇɢʜᴋᴘʀꜱᴛ | *shall* ꜰɪᴊʟᴍɴᴏǫ] *perform unto the Lord thine oaths*

□ **Matthew 5:33** (King James Bible)

thou **shalt** not forswear thyself
but **shalt** perform unto the Lord thine oaths

Once more we see the tendency to replace *thou shalt* with *thou shall.* Initially in the printer's manuscript, Oliver Cowdery wrote *shal,* which he soon corrected to *shalt* by inserting the *t* inline (there is no change in the level of the ink flow for the correction). He made the same scribal error in 𝒫 for *shalt* later in 3 Nephi 13:5 (where he ended up writing the correct "thou **shalt** not do as the hypocrites"). But more significantly for this passage, the 1852 LDS edition accidentally changed the second *shalt* in this verse to *shall.* Perhaps this error resulted because the *shalt* here is not immediately preceded by *thou* as it is earlier in the verse. This typo persisted in the LDS text until the 1920 edition restored the original *shalt.* For other instances of this error in the text, see under Mosiah 12:11; for two nearby instances, see under 3 Nephi 12:26–27. Of course, the corresponding passages in Matthew 5 have *shalt* in all these cases.

Summary: Maintain in 3 Nephi 12:33 both cases of *shalt,* the reading of the earliest text as well as the corresponding King James text.

■ **3 Nephi 12:34**

but [*verily* 1 | *verily verily* ᴀʙᴄᴅᴇꜰɢʜɪᴊᴋʟᴍɴᴏᴘǫʀꜱᴛ] *I say unto you swear not at all*

□ **Matthew 5:34** (King James Bible)

but I say unto you
swear not at all

Here we have an instance of variation between the single *verily* and the double *verily.* There is a similar instance of this variation in 3 Nephi 12:26. In both passages, 𝒫 has *verily* while the 1830 edition has *verily verily.* As discussed under 3 Nephi 12:26, internal evidence argues in that case that the original text read *verily* and that the 1830 typesetter added an additional *verily.* In this passage, on the other hand, internal evidence is not as clear, although overall the odds seem to favor the double *verily* as the reading of the original text.

Counting the example here in 3 Nephi 12:34, there are eight cases in the Book of Mormon version of the Sermon on the Mount where the text has a form of *verily* but the King James text has no *verily,* neither single nor double. (Actually, only the singular *verily* is possible in Matthew 5–7 since in the King James Bible the double *verily* is found only in the Gospel of John.) In almost all of these eight cases, the Book of Mormon text has the double *verily:*

	BOOK OF MORMON TEXT	KING JAMES TEXT
3 Nephi 12:13	**verily verily** I say unto you	——
3 Nephi 12:14	**verily verily** I say unto you	——
3 Nephi 12:20	for **verily** I say unto you	——
3 Nephi 12:26	**verily verily** I say unto you nay	——
3 Nephi 12:32	**verily verily** I say unto you	but I say unto you
3 Nephi 12:34	but **verily** (**verily**) I say unto you	but I say unto you
3 Nephi 13:1	**verily verily** I say	——
3 Nephi 14:1	**verily verily** I say unto you	——

In 3 Nephi 12:20, we get the single *verily* in both 𝒫 and the 1830 edition. And here in 3 Nephi 12:34, we get the single *verily,* but only in 𝒫; the 1830 edition has the more expected *verily verily.* Since the clear majority of these cases favor the double *verily,* one could argue that the original reading in 3 Nephi 12:34 was *verily verily.* If that is the case, then Oliver Cowdery, the scribe for 𝒫, must have accidentally reduced *verily verily* to *verily* in this verse.

One of the problems in deciding between *verily* and *verily verily* here in 3 Nephi 12:34 as well as in 3 Nephi 12:26 is that these are the only two instances of variation for "verily (verily)" in the entire Book of Mormon. When we consider all the other cases of "verily (verily) I say (unto you)" in the text (there are 46 of them), we find that the text shows an equal split between the single and double *verily* (23 of each type), yet none of these other cases show any variation between the single and the double *verily.* For the case of variation in 3 Nephi 12:26, it seems fairly clear that the original text had the single *verily,* which means that the 1830 typesetter was responsible for the variation in that verse. If so, then one could argue that this increases the odds that the typesetter was responsible for the variation later on here in 3 Nephi 12:34. Unfortunately, for both these cases of variation we must rely on conjecture. We really have no firm evidence regarding error tendencies for "verily (verily)" in the text.

It is also worth looking at whether there is any connection between any preceding conjunctive element(s) and the occurrence of single versus double *verily.* In the examples listed above, *verily verily* systematically occurs when there is no sentence-initial conjunctive element (six times). In 3 Nephi 12:20, the text has a single *verily;* yet it is preceded by the conjunction *for* ("for **verily** I say unto you"). 3 Nephi 12:34 also has a conjunction, *but;* thus one could argue that the original text here had one *verily* ("but **verily** I say unto you"), just like in 3 Nephi 12:20. However, when we look at the larger use of "verily (verily)" in the text, there is not much support for such a relationship. Excluding the two cases of variation (in 3 Nephi 12:26 and 3 Nephi 12:34), we get the following general statistics for "verily (verily) I say (unto you)" in the Book of Mormon text:

	verily verily	*verily*
but	0	1
for	1	4
behold	3	0
for behold	0	1
and	2	4
yea	1	1
NULL	16	12

Overall, these statistics show that the choice of either the single *verily* or the double *verily* is not determined by what connector precedes the *verily*. Nor does there seem to be any connection between whether or not there is a sentence-initial connector.

It appears that the most salient factor here in 3 Nephi 12:34 is that *verily verily* is strongly favored in the Book of Mormon version of the Sermon on the Mount when there is no corresponding *verily* in the King James version (in Matthew 5–7). The critical text will therefore accept the 1830 reading, *verily verily,* in this passage, thus assuming here that Oliver Cowdery was responsible for reducing the double *verily* to a single *verily* in 𝒫. Even so, the possibility remains that the 1830 typesetter added a second *verily* to this passage, just like he presumably did earlier in 3 Nephi 12:26. On the other hand, the critical text will retain the exceptional instance of the single *verily* in 3 Nephi 12:20 ("for **verily** I say unto you") since both 𝒫 and the 1830, the earliest textual sources, read that way.

Summary: Maintain in 3 Nephi 12:34 the reading of the 1830 edition, the double *verily;* in this case, Oliver Cowdery (the scribe in 𝒫) appears to have accidentally omitted the repeated *verily;* in the Book of Mormon version of the Sermon on the Mount, the *verily* is almost always doubled in the text if there is no corresponding *verily* in the King James version.

■ **3 Nephi 12:34**

for [*it is* 1ACFGHIJKLMNOPQRST | *its* BDE] *God's throne*

□ **Matthew 5:34** (King James Bible)

for **it is** God's throne

The text of the Book of Mormon consistently avoids verbal contractions. Here in 3 Nephi 12:34, the 1837 compositor set *it is* as *its,* which should probably be interpreted as equivalent to *it's* but without the apostrophe. The alternative interpretation, that *its* is the possessive pronoun, seems unlikely here since it is immediately followed by the possessive form *God's.* In addition, if we accepted this second interpretation, there would be no *be* verb in the resulting text.

The 1840 edition restored the correct *it is.* But since the 1841 British edition was set from the 1837 edition, this error continued in the 1841 British edition and even further into the 1849 LDS edition. Finally, the 1852 LDS edition restored the correct *it is* to the LDS text. See under Alma 56:9 for discussion regarding the lack of verbal contractions in the Book of Mormon text.

Summary: Maintain the uncontracted *it is* in 3 Nephi 12:34; the original text (and current text) of the Book of Mormon avoids verbal contractions (like *it's*).

■ **3 Nephi 12:35**

for it [is 1BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST | A] *his footstool*

☐ **Matthew 5:35** (King James Bible)

for it **is** his footstool

Here the 1830 edition lacks the linking verb form *is.* The original Book of Mormon text some-times lacked the linking verb *be,* but only in the Isaiah quotations (see the examples listed under 2 Nephi 13:14). Elsewhere in the text, there has been the occasional loss of this linking verb, as here in 3 Nephi 12:35 where the 1830 compositor, it would appear, omitted it. His eye may have skipped from *is* to the visually similar *his* that immediately follows. Ⓞ probably had the *is,* although there is the possibility that it was lost when the text was dictated. In any event, the printer's manuscript has the expected *is,* as does the corresponding Matthew passage. The 1837 edition restored the correct reading to the printed text. For other examples where a typo has led to a Hebrew-like subject complement structure without the *be* verb, see under Alma 41:13.

Summary: Maintain in 3 Nephi 12:35 the linking verb form *is,* the reading of 𝒫 ("for it **is** his foot-stool"); this reading agrees with the Matthew reading; the 1830 edition lacks the *is,* but this appears to be a typesetting error made by the 1830 compositor.

■ **3 Nephi 12:36**

neither shalt thou swear by [thy 1PST | *the* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOQR] *head*

☐ **Matthew 5:36** (King James Bible)

neither shalt thou swear by **thy** head

The printer's manuscript reads *thy head,* in agreement with the King James reading. The 1830 edition, on the other hand, reads *the head*. There is considerable evidence in the transmission of the text that *thy* can be replaced by *the,* although the other examples appear to be restricted to the manuscripts; for examples, see under 2 Nephi 20:30. The 1908 RLDS edition and the 1981 LDS edi-tion restored the determiner *thy* to this passage. The critical text will also follow the reading in 𝒫.

Summary: Maintain in 3 Nephi 12:36 the possessive pronoun *thy* ("by **thy** head"), the reading in 𝒫; this reading agrees with the King James reading; the 1830 compositor seems to have accidentally replaced the original *thy* with *the* as he set the type for that edition.

■ **3 Nephi 12:36**

because thou canst not make one hair
black [or 1ABCDEFGIJLMNOPQRST | *nor* HK] *white*

☐ **Matthew 5:36** (King James Bible)

because thou canst not make one hair
white **or** black

Here the 1874 RLDS edition changed the *or* to *nor*. When preceded by the negative *not,* either conjunct is possible in standard English. In this particular case, the 1908 RLDS edition restored

the original *or* (probably by reference to 𝒫). For further discussion of the acceptability of either *or* or *nor* in this kind of negative expression, see under Alma 26:11.

It should also be noted here that the order of the conjuncts *white* and *black* differs: "black or white" in the Book of Mormon text, but "white or black" in the King James Bible (and in the original Greek). It is possible that the Book of Mormon order is an error that occurred during the dictation of the text by Joseph Smith. (𝒪 itself probably had the order "black or white" since both the printer's manuscript and the 1830 edition read this way.) On the other hand, the listing of *black* first may be characteristic of Nephite culture or represent the common phraseology of the language itself, as found elsewhere in the text:

> 2 Nephi 26:33
>> and he denieth none that come unto him
>> **black** and **white** / bond and free / male and female

Given this minor evidence, there seems to be no strong motivation to emend the word order in 3 Nephi 12:36.

Summary: Maintain in 3 Nephi 12:36 the conjunctive *or,* the reading of the earliest extant text ("thou canst not make one hair black **or** white"); also maintain the conjunctive order of the adjectives, with *black* before *white,* the reading of both 𝒫 and the 1830 edition; that order also occurs elsewhere in the Book of Mormon (in 2 Nephi 26:33).

■ **3 Nephi 12:37**

*for whatsoever **cometh** of more than these* [*are* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQS | *is* RT] *evil*

□ **Matthew 5:37** (King James Bible)

for whatsoever **is** more than these **cometh** of evil

The Book of Mormon version reorders the words, with *cometh* first and the *be* verb shifted to later in the sentence. However, since the *be* verb is immediately preceded by the plural *these* in the Book of Mormon text, that verb reads in the plural as *are* rather than in the singular as *is*. The 1920 LDS edition made the grammatical change to the singular *is,* thus providing agreement with the preceding singular "whatsoever cometh". As explained under 1 Nephi 4:4, there are instances in the original Book of Mormon text where the verb agrees with the nearest preceding plural noun rather than with the earlier singular noun that acts as the semantic subject:

> Alma 40:22 (*have* edited to *has* in the 1920 LDS edition)
>> yea this bringeth about the restoration of those things
>> of which [*have* 01ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQS | *has* RT] been spoken
>> by the mouths of the prophets

> Alma 49:23 (*were* edited to *was* by Joseph Smith for the 1837 edition)
>> there was not a single soul of the Nephites
>> which [*were* 0A | *were* >js *was* 1 | *was* BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] slain

For further discussion of this issue, see under SUBJECT-VERB AGREEMENT in volume 3.

Summary: Restore in 3 Nephi 12:37 the original plural *are* in "for whatsoever cometh of more than these **are** evil"; such cases of subject-verb agreement based on proximity can be found elsewhere in the original Book of Mormon text.

■ **3 Nephi 12:42**

> give **to** *him that asketh thee*
> *and* [*to* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQS|*from* RT] *him that would borrow of thee*
> *turn thou not away*

□ **Matthew 5:42** (King James Bible)

> give **to** him that asketh thee
> and **from** him that would borrow of thee
> turn not thou away

The 1920 LDS edition emended the second instance of the preposition *to* to *from* in 3 Nephi 12:42 so that it would agree with the King James Bible and the text would make better sense. Since both 𝔓 and the 1830 edition have the preposition *to* here, 𝒪 probably read the same. In other words, 𝒪 seems to have read *to him* twice in this verse. Nonetheless, the second *to him* could well be an error prompted by the preceding occurrence of the first *to him*.

There is one Greek New Testament manuscript that agrees with the earliest reading here in 3 Nephi 12:42. This Greek reading could equivalently be translated as "and **to** him that would borrow / turn thou not away". The manuscript with this reading is the highly idiosyncratic Codex Bezae, dating from the fifth century CE (and represented by the symbol D in the Nestle-Aland Greek New Testament apparatus). But one should not interpret this reading as supporting the text here in 3 Nephi 12:42. Instead, the reading in Codex Bezae may be due to the same error as here in 3 Nephi 12:42: namely, the preceding instance of the Greek equivalent of *to* in "give **to** him that asketh thee" led to the introduction of *to* in the following clause. Another possible source for the Greek textual variant depends on the parallel Latin text in the dual-language Codex Bezae; namely, the Latin noun form *volenti* can be translated as either 'from one wishing' (in the ablative) or 'to one wishing' (in the dative). In other words, one could propose that the Greek text in Codex Bezae was altered to agree with a dative interpretation of the Latin *volenti*. Also note the virtual identity after the word-initial consonant between the Greek *tō t^helonti* 'to the one wishing' and the Latin *velonti* 'to one wishing' (both end in *elonti*). In other words, the Greek reading here in Codex Bezae may be an instance of contamination from the Latin.

There is one example elsewhere in the Book of Mormon text of a mix-up between the prepositions *from* and *to,* although in that instance the momentary change of *from* to *to* was in anticipation of a following *to* rather than prompted by a preceding *to:*

> Alma 21:18 (initial error in 𝔓)
>   and it came to pass that Ammon and Lamoni returned
>   [*to* > *from* 1|*from* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] the land of Middoni
>   **to** the land of Ishmael

Thus there is some manuscript support for analyzing the second occurrence of the preposition *to* in 3 Nephi 12:42 as an error for *from.*

David Calabro points out (personal communication) that one could make sense of the earliest reading here in 3 Nephi 12:42 by interpreting the verb *give* as taking a conjunctive prepositional phrase, followed by an independent imperative:

> 3 Nephi 12:42 (earliest text, with revised accidentals)
> Give to him that asketh thee
> and to him that would borrow of thee.
> Turn thou not away.

Yet there are no other examples in any of the Book of Mormon quotations from the Bible that show this kind of clausal reinterpretation. Words may be added, deleted, or replaced, but without ever shifting a clausal boundary. This consistency elsewhere in the biblical quotations suggests that we have an error here in 3 Nephi 12:42, not a reanalysis of the syntax. The critical text will therefore accept the 1920 LDS emendation as the original reading (which agrees with the King James reading in Matthew 5:42 as well as with the virtually unanimous reading of the Greek New Testament manuscripts). What probably happened in the Book of Mormon text is that during the dictation of 3 Nephi 12:42, the original *from* was replaced by *to* because of the preceding "give **to** him that asketh thee".

Summary: Accept in 3 Nephi 12:42 the 1920 LDS emendation of the second *to him* to *from him,* in conformity with the King James reading; although the earliest text can be reinterpreted so it will work, such a syntactic remaking of the biblical text is not otherwise found in the biblical quotations in the Book of Mormon, much less in 3 Nephi 12–14.

■ **3 Nephi 12:42**

and from him that would borrow of thee
turn **thou not** *away*

□ **Matthew 5:42** (King James Bible)

and from him that would borrow of thee
turn **not thou** away

The Book of Mormon text here has the more expected word order for biblical English ("turn thou not away"). Here in Matthew 5:42, the King James Bible has the decidedly more difficult word order ("turn not thou away").

Elsewhere the Book of Mormon text clearly prefers placing the *not* after the subject pronoun *thou:*

2 Nephi 4:32	wilt **thou not** shut the gates of thy righteousness before me
2 Nephi 4:33	wilt **thou not** place a stumbling block in my way
2 Nephi 8:9	art **thou not** it that hath cut Rahab
2 Nephi 8:10	art **thou not** it which hath dried the sea
Helaman 13:37	canst **thou not** turn away thine anger from us

The two instances from 2 Nephi 8 are quotations from Isaiah 51:9–10, which also has this same word order. Only in one Book of Mormon passage do we get *not* before *thou,* and that is a quotation from Isaiah 14:29 (which also has the order *not thou*):

2 Nephi 24:29	rejoice **not thou**

Here in 3 Nephi 12:42, the Book of Mormon word order, *thou not,* could be a simple error resulting from the substitution of the more expected word order in English. Or the change could be intentional, as it seems to be in various other cases throughout the Book of Mormon version of the Sermon on the Mount (see, for instance, the word variations listed under 3 Nephi 12:13). Both 𝒫 and the 1830 edition have the order *thou not,* so 𝒪 probably did too. If there was a switch in the order, it most likely occurred during the dictation of the text.

Summary: Accept in 3 Nephi 12:42 the more natural word order in "turn **thou not** away" (which is the reading of the earliest extant text); this word order is the normal order found elsewhere in the Book of Mormon text.

■ **3 Nephi 12:43**

thou shalt love **thy** *neighbor and hate* [*thine* 1ABCDEGHKPRST | *thy* FIJLMNOQ] *enemy*

□ **Matthew 5:43** (King James Bible)

thou shalt love **thy** neighbor and hate **thine** enemy

Here the 1852 LDS edition changed the original *thine enemy* to *thy enemy.* This was probably a typo made by the compositor for that edition, perhaps under the influence of the preceding *thy neighbor.* The 1920 LDS edition restored the correct *thine enemy* to the LDS text. The biblical text has, of course, *thine enemy* since *enemy* begins with a vowel. In Early Modern English, vowel-initial words took *thine* while consonant-initial words took *thy* (just like *an* versus *a* in modern English). The Book of Mormon text generally follows this pattern, just as it does with *mine* and *my.* For some cases where *mine* has been changed to *my,* see under Jacob 5:47 and Helaman 13:5. For discussion regarding *thy head* versus *thine head,* see nearby under 3 Nephi 13:17. Here in 3 Nephi 12:43, the critical text will maintain *thine enemy,* the reading of the earliest text as well as the corresponding Matthew passage.

Summary: Maintain in 3 Nephi 12:43 *thine enemy,* the earliest reading as well as the corresponding King James reading.

■ **3 Nephi 12:47**

old things are done away
and all things have [*become* 1ABCDEFHIJKLMNOPQRST | *became* G] *new*

The compositor for the 1858 Wright edition accidentally set *have became* instead of *have become.* Although the original text had some instances of *became* as the past participial form for *become* (see under 1 Nephi 17:43), this particular instance should probably not be considered the result of dialectal speech, but rather a simple typo. The earliest text reads *have become,* as will the critical text.

Summary: Maintain the standard *have become* in 3 Nephi 12:47, the reading of the earliest textual sources (𝒫 and the 1830 edition).

3 Nephi 13

■ **3 Nephi 13:7**

> *but when ye pray*
> *use not vain repetitions as the heathen*
> *for they think that they shall be heard for their much speaking*

□ **Matthew 6:7** (King James Bible)

> but when ye pray
> use not vain repetitions as the heathen **_do_**
> for they think that they shall be heard for their much speaking

The Book of Mormon text agrees with the King James Bible here in 3 Nephi 13:7 except that the word *do* (in italics in the King James text) is lacking in the Book of Mormon text. The 1830 edition and the printer's manuscript agree, so the original manuscript most probably was lacking the *do.* Nonetheless, in writing down the original text, Oliver Cowdery might have dropped the *do.* Or perhaps while dictating, Joseph Smith accidentally dropped it.

There is a similar change in 3 Nephi 13:5 which argues that the omission of *do* in 3 Nephi 13:7 is intentional:

> 3 Nephi 13:5
> > and when thou prayest
> > thou shalt not **do** as the hypocrites

> Matthew 6:5 (King James Bible)
> > and when thou prayest
> > thou shalt not **be** as the hypocrites **_are_**

Here the King James expression "be . . . *are*" has been intentionally changed in the Book of Mormon to "do . . . NULL". And in both Book of Mormon cases, we end up with "as <noun phrase>" at the end of the clause—that is, without a following verb (thus "as the hypocrites" in verse 5 and "as the heathen" in verse 7). The parallel change in 3 Nephi 13:5 strongly suggests that the omission of the *do* in 3 Nephi 13:7 is intentional.

The intentional removal of the *do* in 3 Nephi 13:7 makes it so that every occurrence of "as the heathen" or "as the hypocrites" here in the Book of Mormon version of the Sermon on the Mount occurs without a following verb. Besides the two cases here in verses 5 and 7 of this chapter, we have a third one in verse 16—and in that case the King James Bible agrees by not having an italicized verb *are* after "as the hypocrites":

3 Nephi 13:16

　　moreover when ye fast
　　be not as the hypocrites
　　of a sad countenance

Matthew 6:16 (King James Bible)

　　moreover when ye fast
　　be not as the hypocrites
　　of a sad countenance

All three cases in the Book of Mormon version of the Sermon on the Mount (in 3 Nephi 13:5, 7, 16) agree with the original Greek text, which has no verb after either "as the heathen" or "as the hypocrites" in Matthew 6:5, 7, 16.

There is one more case of "as the hypocrites" in Matthew 6, and it has an actual verb in the Greek (namely, the main verb *do*); in this instance, the Book of Mormon version has maintained the main verb *do* but replaced the definite article *the* with the auxiliary verb *will*:

3 Nephi 13:2

　　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

Matthew 6:2 (King James Bible)

　　therefore when thou doest *thine* alms
　　do not sound a trumpet before thee
　　as **the** hypocrites do in the synagogues and in the streets

Summary: Maintain in 3 Nephi 13:7 the occurrence of "as <noun phrase>" without a following verb (as in 3 Nephi 13:5 and 3 Nephi 13:16).

■ **3 Nephi 13:10**

thy will be done [*in* >js *on* 1 | *in* A | *on* BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *earth*
as it is in heaven

□ **Matthew 6:10** (King James Bible)

thy will be done **in** earth
as *it is* in heaven

In his editing of 3 Nephi 13:10 for the 1837 edition, Joseph Smith changed the preposition *in* to *on* since modern English speakers expect "on earth" rather than "in earth" for this expression. The King James text in Matthew 6:10 has the archaic "in earth". The Book of Mormon text has a few instances of "on earth", of which all but one refer to something being either sealed or loosed "on earth":

2 Nephi 33:15

　　for what I seal **on earth**
　　shall be brought against you at the judgment bar

Helaman 10:7
> behold I give unto you power
> that whatsoever ye shall seal **on earth** shall be sealed in heaven
> and whatsoever ye shall loose **on earth** shall be loosed in heaven

The usage in Helaman 10:7 parallels the language of the King James Bible:

Matthew 18:18 (similarly in Matthew 16:19)
> whatsoever ye shall bind **on earth** shall be bound in heaven
> and whatsoever ye shall loose **on earth** shall be loosed in heaven

The only other use of "on earth" in the original Book of Mormon text is found in 2 Nephi 10:3: "and there is none other nation **on earth** that would crucify their God". On the other hand, there are six other instances of "in earth" in the text, all parallel to the usage here in 3 Nephi 13:10. Five of these take the precise form "in heaven and in earth". The sixth one, like the one in 3 Nephi 13:10, is more complicated:

Helaman 8:24
> both things in heaven
> and all things which are in [1|*the* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] earth

Note that in Helaman 8:24 the 1830 typesetter changed "in earth" to "in **the** earth". And as we might expect, "in the earth" with the meaning 'on earth' also occurs elsewhere in the text:

2 Nephi 29:7	I rule in the heavens above and **in the earth** beneath
Mosiah 12:36	or any likeness of any thing in the heaven above
	or things which is **in the earth** beneath
Mosiah 13:12	or any likeness of things which is in heaven above
	or which is **in the earth** beneath
Alma 18:28	believest thou that this Great Spirit which is God
	created all things which is in heaven and **in the earth**
Alma 18:29	yea I believe that he created all things which is **in the earth**

On the other hand, there are no instances in the Book of Mormon text of "on the earth". Thus all these examples of "in (the) earth" support the original reading "in earth" here in 3 Nephi 13:10 (and this in addition to the fact that the reading of the corresponding King James passage has "in earth").

Summary: Restore the original *in* in 3 Nephi 13:10 ("in earth"), the earliest reading as well as the reading in Matthew 6:10; the use of "in (the) earth" can be found throughout the Book of Mormon text, not just in this biblical quote.

■ **3 Nephi 13:17**

but thou when thou [*fasteth* 1 | *fastest* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
anoint **thy** *head and wash thy face*

□ **Matthew 6:17** (King James Bible)

but thou when thou **fastest**
anoint **thine** head and wash thy face

As explained under 1 Nephi 11:2, the Book of Mormon scribes tended to accidentally use the inflectional ending *-eth* instead of *-est* for the second person singular pronoun *thou*. Here in the printer's manuscript, Oliver Cowdery wrote "thou fasteth", but the 1830 edition reads "thou fastest" (the same as in the corresponding Matthew 6:17). It is possible that 𝓞 itself read "thou fasteth"; even so, that would have still been an error for "thou fastest".

We also note here that the King James text reads "thine head" while the Book of Mormon text reads "thy head", which is what we expect since the *h* of *head* is pronounced in standard modern English. For further discussion of the competition between *thy* and *thine* in the Book of Mormon, see under 3 Nephi 12:43. For other cases where the Book of Mormon version of the Sermon on the Mount uses the more expected language of modern English, see the list under 3 Nephi 12:13.

Summary: Maintain *fastest* and *thy* in 3 Nephi 13:17; the occurrence of *thou fasteth* in 𝓟 represents one of the scribes' typical errors in the Book of Mormon manuscripts (namely, the use of the inflectional ending *-eth* in place of *-est*); since the initial *h* in *head* is pronounced in standard modern English, the occurrence of *thy* rather than the King James *thine* is not surprising.

■ **3 Nephi 13:19–20**

lay not up for yourselves treasures upon earth
where *moth and rust doth corrupt*
→ *and thieves break through and steal*

but lay up for yourselves treasures in heaven
where *neither moth nor rust doth corrupt*
and **where** *thieves do not break through nor steal*

□ **Matthew 6:19–20** (King James Bible)

lay not up for yourselves treasures upon earth
where moth and rust doth corrupt
→ and **where** thieves break through and steal

but lay up for yourselves treasures in heaven
where neither moth nor rust doth corrupt
and **where** thieves do not break through nor steal

The repeated *where* is missing in verse 19 of the Book of Mormon text but is in verse 20:

3 Nephi 13:19–20 / Matthew 6:19–20

> *where*/*where* moth and rust doth corrupt
> and NULL/*where* thieves break through and steal
>
> *where*/*where* neither moth nor rust doth corrupt
> and *where*/*where* thieves do not break through nor steal

The strong parallelism between all these clauses suggests that for verse 19 a second *where* may have been in the original Book of Mormon text. The only difference between the two verses is that one is positive and the other negative. Syntactically, there seems to be no strong reason for why the repeated *where* should be dropped in the positive verse yet kept in the negative one. But the reading without the *where* will work, so the critical text will follow the earliest text in verse 19 (which lacks the *where*). The possibility remains that Oliver Cowdery, the presumed scribe here in 𝓞, dropped the *where* as he was taking down Joseph Smith's dictation (or Joseph omitted it in his dictation). The original manuscript probably didn't have this *where* since both the 1830 edition and the printer's manuscript lack it.

Summary: Since the earliest reading in 3 Nephi 13:19 without the repeated *where* will work, the critical text will maintain this reading; however, the strong parallelism between verses 19 and 20, plus the full parallelism in the corresponding Matthew passage, suggests that there may be a primitive error here in verse 19.

■ **3 Nephi 13:24**

no man can serve two masters
[*or* 1 | *for* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *either he will hate the one and love the other*
or *else he will hold to the one and despise the other*

□ **Matthew 6:24** (King James Bible)

no man can serve two masters
for either he will hate the one and love the other
or else he will hold to the one and despise the other

The preposition *for,* the 1830 reading, is undoubtedly correct here. The printer's manuscript reads *or,* an error that may have occurred as Oliver Cowdery copied the text from 𝓞 into 𝓟. Note that there is an actual *or* in the following clause, which probably prompted the error in transmission. Another possibility is that 𝓞 itself read *or,* the result of an error that occurred when Joseph Smith dictated the text to Oliver. Note that *or* and *for* sound alike, so perhaps Oliver misheard the *for* as *or* (especially if Joseph had just started to dictate the following clause with its beginning *or* as Oliver was supposed to be writing down the earlier *for*). In any event, the sequence "or either" is not really possible here.

Summary: Maintain the conjunction *for* in 3 Nephi 13:24, the 1830 reading and the reading in the corresponding Matthew passage; the *or* in 𝓟 is an early transmission error that produced for this context a virtually impossible reading, "or either".

■ **3 Nephi 13:34**

sufficient **is** *the day* **unto** *the evil thereof*

□ **Matthew 6:34** (King James Bible)

sufficient **unto** the day **is** the evil thereof

The Book of Mormon text switches the positions of *unto* and *is,* which makes for a more accept-able English syntax (although neither expression is especially felicitous). Both seem to be saying about the same thing, although the King James Bible does accurately translate the Greek (essen-tially word for word). The Book of Mormon variant in word order seems to be intentional rather than accidental.

Don Brugger has pointed out (personal communication) that there is some evidence from <www.google.com> for the parallel expression "sufficient **is** the day **for** the evil thereof", at least from the early 1700s on, with examples from William Penn (died 1718) and William Anderson Cawthorne (1846). Of course, the preposition in this expression is *for* rather than *unto* or *to.* But examples like these show that the Book of Mormon reading is possible.

Summary: Maintain in 3 Nephi 13:34 the switch in the placement of *unto* and *is* since it appears to be motivated by an attempt to clarify the original King James word order.

3 Nephi 14

and now it came to pass that
when Jesus had spoken these words
he turned again to the multitude
and [*he* 1| ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *did open his mouth unto them again saying . . .*

In this passage, the printer's manuscript has the repeated pronoun *he*, but the 1830 edition doesn't. We have already discussed a similar problem under 3 Nephi 11:18; there we found that Oliver Cowdery tended to accidentally omit the repeated pronoun *he* in contexts like this one; there are also a few cases where it appears that the 1830 compositor consciously added the *he* in order to make a difficult reading easier to interpret.

Here in 3 Nephi 14:1, we must look at the errors in the opposite direction. We find, for instance, that Oliver Cowdery twice added the repeated *he* in 𝒫 (although only momentarily):

> Mosiah 3:19
>> but if he yieldeth to the enticings of the Holy Spirit
>> and putteth off the natural man
>> and [*he* > NULL 1| ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] becometh a saint
>>> through the atonement of Christ the Lord
>> and becometh as a child

> Alma 52:17
>> therefore he abandoned his designs
>> and [0ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST|*he* > NULL 1] returned again
>>> to the city Bountiful

On the other hand, there is one example (besides possibly here in 3 Nephi 14:1) where the 1830 compositor deleted a repeated *he:*

> Alma 8:22
>> and it came to pass that Alma ate bread
>> and [𝒮2 NULL > 𝒮1 *he* 1| ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] was filled
>> and he blessed Amulek and his house
>> and he gave thanks unto God

In this instance, scribe 2 of 𝒫 also omitted the repeated *he* in his copywork, but Oliver Cowdery, when he proofed 𝒫 against 𝒪, supplied it. Nonetheless, the 1830 compositor omitted it. (The textual issue of whether Oliver should have added the *he* is irrelevant here in Alma 8:22 since the 1830 compositor, on his own, omitted the *he.*) Thus the early transmission of the text provides some

support for both possibilities here in 3 Nephi 14:1: Oliver could have added the repeated *he* when he copied from 𝒪 into 𝒫, or the 1830 compositor could have omitted it when he set the type.

Internal evidence supports the lack of the repeated *he* here in 3 Nephi 14:1. In particular, whenever we have a clause with the verb *turn* and that clause is conjoined with a following clause referring to speech, we find that the subject pronoun is not repeated:

Alma 18:14   therefore **Ammon turned** himself unto the king
                and **saith** unto him . . .

3 Nephi 18:17   **he turned** again unto the multitude and **saith** unto them . . .

3 Nephi 18:26   **he turned** his eyes again upon the disciples whom he had chosen
                and **saith** unto them . . .

3 Nephi 28:4   **he turned** himself unto the three and **said** unto them . . .

The last three examples, as in 3 Nephi 14:1, refer to Christ turning to another audience to say something.

As noted elsewhere (and discussed more fully in volume 3), the normal tendency in the transmission of the early Book of Mormon text was to accidentally omit small words rather than add them. In this particular situation, however, evidence from transmission errors supports either reading, while usage elsewhere in the text supports the shorter reading without the repeated pronoun *he*. The critical text will therefore maintain the 1830 reading here in 3 Nephi 14:1: "and did open his mouth unto them again".

Summary: Maintain in 3 Nephi 14:1 the shorter 1830 reading that lacks the pronoun *he* ("and did open his mouth unto them again"); there is evidence that Oliver Cowdery sometimes added the *he* in such contexts (although only momentarily), although there is also evidence that the 1830 compositor sometimes omitted the repeated *he* in such contexts; usage elsewhere in the text supports the shorter reading without the *he* in this passage.

■ **3 Nephi 14:2**

for with [*what* 1ABCDEFGHIKLMNOPQRST | *that* J] *judgment ye judge*
ye shall be judged
and with [*what* 1ABCDEFGHIKLMNOPQRST | *that* J] *measure ye mete*
it shall be measured to you again

□ **Matthew 7:2** (King James Bible)

for with **what** judgment ye judge
ye shall be judged
and with **what** measure ye mete
it shall be measured to you again

Here the 1888 LDS edition twice replaced *what* with *that,* giving "for with **that** judgment ye judge . . . and with **that** measure ye mete". This change may have been intentional since it was made twice. This change was never transmitted into any subsequent LDS edition, not only because it was an awkward reading (and contrary to the King James reading), but also because the 1888 edition never served as a copytext. The critical text will, of course, retain the original *what* in both instances.

Summary: Maintain both instances of *what* in "for with **what** judgment ye judge . . . and with **what** measure ye mete", the earliest reading in 3 Nephi 14:2 as well as the corresponding reading in Matthew 7:2.

■ **3 Nephi 14:4–5**

let me pull [*out* >js NULL 1 | *out* A | BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *the mote* **out** *of thine eye . . .*
first cast [*out* 1A | BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *the beam* **out** *of thine own eye*
and then shalt thou see clearly
to cast [*out* 1A | BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *the mote* **out** *of thy brother's eye*

□ **Matthew 7:4–5** (King James Bible)

let me pull **out** the mote **out** of thine eye . . .
first cast **out** the beam **out** of thine own eye
and then shalt thou see clearly
to cast **out** the mote **out** of thy brother's eye

For the 1837 edition, Joseph Smith removed the redundant *out*'s from these three sentences. Interestingly, however, the redundant *out*'s are in the literally translated King James Bible, as also in the original Greek (which uses the prepositional verb *ekballein* 'to throw out' along with the preposition *ek* 'out'). The critical text will restore the three redundant *out*'s in this passage. For other examples of redundant adverbs and prepositions in the original Book of Mormon text, see under Jacob 7:8; for another example involving the adverb *out,* see under Alma 62:6.

Summary: Restore the three occurrences of redundant *out* in 3 Nephi 14:4–5, thus restoring the same redundancy that occurs in Matthew 7:4–5.

■ **3 Nephi 14:7**

ask and it shall be given **unto** *you*
seek and ye shall find
knock and it shall be opened **unto** *you*

□ **Matthew 7:7** (King James Bible)

ask and it shall be given you
seek and ye shall find
knock and it shall be opened **unto** you

Here the Book of Mormon text has the preposition *unto* in "ask and it shall be given **unto** you", but the corresponding King James sentence lacks the *unto*. On the other hand, later on in the passage, both the Book of Mormon and the King James text have the preposition *unto* ("knock and it shall be opened **unto** you"). For both sentences, the original Greek uses the same pronominal form in the dative (and without any preposition, of course). In other words, the Greek original shows parallelism in form, as does the Book of Mormon text. As discussed under 3 Nephi 12:19, the critical text will in each case follow the earliest Book of Mormon text with respect to the occurrence of *unto.*

Thus here in 3 Nephi 14:7, the critical text will maintain the *unto* in "ask and it shall be given **unto** you", the reading of both 𝒫 and the 1830 edition (𝒪 also probably read the same).

Summary: Maintain in 3 Nephi 14:7 the *unto* in "ask and it shall be given **unto** you"; the corresponding King James reading lacks the *unto,* but the critical text will follow the earliest Book of Mormon reading and thus maintain the *unto* that occurs in both 𝒫 and the 1830 edition.

■ **3 Nephi 14:7–8**

knock and it shall be [*opened* 1ABCFGHIJKLMNOPQRST | *open* DE] *unto you . . .*
and to him that knocketh it shall be **opened**

□ **Matthew 7:7–8** (King James Bible)

knock and it shall be **opened** unto you . . .
and to him that knocketh it shall be **opened**

Here the compositor for the 1841 British edition accidentally set *open* rather than *opened* in verse 7 but correctly set *opened* in verse 8. This error was repeated in the subsequent 1849 LDS edition, but the 1852 LDS edition restored the correct *opened* in verse 7. The corresponding Matthew passage has *opened* in both instances, as will the critical text. This same error was made in a later passage by the compositor for the 1874 RLDS edition:

> Ether 4:9
> and at my command
> the heavens are [*opened* 1ABCDEFGIJLMNOPQRST | *open* HK]
> and are shut

In this instance, the correct *opened* was restored to the RLDS text in the 1908 RLDS edition.

Summary: Maintain both instances of the past participle *opened* in 3 Nephi 14:7–8, the reading of the earliest text (and in agreement with Matthew 7:7–8).

■ **3 Nephi 14:9**

or what man is there of you
[*whom* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQ | *who* RST] *if his son ask bread*
will [*he* 1ABCDEFGHKPS | IJLMNOQRT] *give him a stone*

□ **Matthew 7:9** (King James Bible)

or what man is there of you
whom if his son ask bread
will **he** give him a stone

The original Book of Mormon text here agrees with the "ungrammatical" King James Bible reading (having the "extra" pronoun *he* as well as *whom* rather than *who*). The 1879 LDS edition removed the pronoun *he,* while the 1920 LDS edition changed the *whom* to *who* (as did the 1953

RLDS edition). The critical text will, of course, restore the original Book of Mormon reading since it agrees precisely with the King James reading in Matthew 7:9.

The original King James Bible reading here in 3 Nephi 14:9 parallels (in part) the syntax of the following verse:

> 3 Nephi 14:10 (Matthew 7:10)
> or if he ask a fish
> will he give him a serpent

Actually, the *whom* in the King James Bible for verse 9 belongs with the following conditional relative clause; that is, the text (as reflected in the original Greek) means 'of whom his son asks bread'. The relative pronoun in the Greek is the accusative *hon* rather than the nominative *ho*, so the *whom* of the King James Bible is actually intended, the result of a too literal translation. A similar example of *whom* rather than *who* is found in the King James text for Matthew 16:13: "**whom** do men say that I the Son of Man am?" (similarly in Mark 8:27). In this case, the corresponding Greek original has the accusative interrogative pronoun *tina* rather than the nominative *tis*.

Summary: Despite its difficulty in modern English, restore the original text in 3 Nephi 14:9: "or what man is there of you **whom** if his son ask bread will **he** give him a stone"; this reading agrees with the corresponding King James reading in Matthew 7:9.

■ **3 Nephi 14:13–14**

> enter ye in at the [*strait* 1OQRST | *straight* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNP] *gate*
> *for wide is the gate and broad is the way*
> *that leadeth to destruction*
> *and many there be which go in thereat*
> *because* [*strait* 1OQRT | *straight* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNP | *stait* S] *is the gate*
> *and narrow is the way*
> *which leadeth unto life*
> *and few there be that find it*

□ **Matthew 7:13–14** (King James Bible)

> enter ye in at the **strait** gate
> for wide *is* the gate and broad *is* the way
> that leadeth to destruction
> and many there be which go in thereat
> because **strait** *is* the gate and narrow *is* the way
> which leadeth unto life
> and few there be that find it

In the manuscripts, the scribes (including Oliver Cowdery) almost always spelled *strait* and *straight* identically, namely, as *strait*. On the other hand, the 1830 typesetter consistently spelled both words as *straight*. Here in this passage, the correct word is *strait,* meaning 'narrow'. Both the current LDS and RLDS editions have the correct *strait,* the King James reading (the word in the original Greek means 'narrow'). Obviously, the wide gate opposes the strait gate, just as the broad

way opposes the narrow way. For a summary discussion regarding *strait* versus *straight* in the Book of Mormon text, see under 1 Nephi 8:20.

Summary: Maintain both instances of *strait* in 3 Nephi 14:13–14; the correct meaning here, as in Matthew 7:13–14, is 'narrow'.

■ **3 Nephi 14:13–14**

for wide is the gate and broad is the way
[NULL > *that* 1 | *that* ABCDEGHKPS | *which* FIJLMNOQRT] *leadeth to destruction*
and many there be which go in thereat
because strait is the gate and narrow is the way
which *leadeth unto life*
and few there be that find it

□ **Matthew 7:13–14** (King James Bible)

for wide *is* the gate and broad *is* the way
that leadeth to destruction
and many there be which go in thereat
because strait *is* the gate and narrow *is* the way
which leadeth unto life
and few there be that find it

Here in verse 13, the 1852 LDS edition changed the relative pronoun *that* to *which;* this change, probably accidental, may have been prompted by the *which* that occurs in the following verse (compare "**that** leadeth to destruction" in verse 13 with "**which** leadeth unto life" in verse 14). In any event, the corresponding King James text has *that* in verse 13 and *which* in verse 14. The critical text will restore the original *that* to verse 13.

The relative clause in each of these verses is restrictive, and "strict grammarians" prefer *that* rather than *which* in restrictive relative clauses (although in actual usage both occur). If we decided to apply such a "rule" in this passage, we would actually need to change the second *which* to *that* rather than the other way around. In any event, both the King James and the Book of Mormon texts show variation between *that* and *which* for this passage. On the other hand, the original Greek exhibits the same feminine relative pronoun for each clause (there is no choice in the Greek). For more on the competition between *that* and *which* in restrictive relative clauses, see the first two entries under *that* in Merriam-Webster's Dictionary of English Usage. Also see the general discussion under WHICH in volume 3 of the critical text.

Summary: Restore the original restrictive relative pronoun *that* in 3 Nephi 14:13, which makes the text agree with the King James reading; the larger passage has *that* in verse 13 but *which* in the parallel sentence in verse 14.

■ **3 Nephi 14:17–18**

even so every good tree bringeth forth good fruit
but a corrupt tree bringeth forth evil fruit
a good tree **cannot** *bring forth evil fruit*
neither *a corrupt tree bring forth good fruit*

□ **Matthew 7:17–18** (King James Bible)

even so every good tree bringeth forth good fruit
but a corrupt tree bringeth forth evil fruit
a good tree **cannot** bring forth evil fruit
neither *can* a corrupt tree bring forth good fruit

In the King James text for Matthew 7:18, the modal verb *can* first occurs negatively (as *cannot*); then the *can* is repeated, but in italics ("neither *can*"), which means that the repeated modal is lacking in the Greek original. The corresponding Book of Mormon reading also lacks the repeated *can*. Since the 1830 edition and the printer's manuscript agree here, it is highly probable that the original manuscript also lacked the *can*. The question is whether the *can* was accidentally dropped from the original text as Joseph Smith dictated the text to the scribe, presumably Oliver Cowdery. Of course, the Book of Mormon text does agree with the original Greek, which does not repeat the modal verb *can*. To be sure, the Book of Mormon phraseology without *can* after *neither* does seem somewhat awkward.

If the lack of the repeated *can* is intended here, then we would have a parallel to an earlier instance in the Sermon on the Mount where the repeated (and italicized) *you* of the King James text is lacking in the Book of Mormon text:

> 3 Nephi 12:11
> and blessed are ye when men shall revile **you**
> and persecute [*you* > NULL 1| ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]

> Matthew 5:11 (King James Bible)
> blessed are ye when *men* shall revile **you**
> and persecute **you**

As discussed under 3 Nephi 12:11, the critical text will maintain the reading without the repeated *you* after *persecute* (this *you* is italicized in the King James text). More generally, italicized King James words are frequently omitted in Book of Mormon quotations from the Bible. For some discussion of the omission of the linking verb *is* in Isaiah quotations, see under 2 Nephi 13:14.

Evidence elsewhere in the Book of Mormon text argues that the *can* is expected in 3 Nephi 14:18. For instance, in six passages we get the same basic kind of construction as in 3 Nephi 14:18, but with the repeated *can* (that is, "cannot . . . neither can"):

> 2 Nephi 31:1
> and I **cannot** write but a few things which I know much surely come to pass
> **neither can** I write but a few of the words of my brother Jacob

Alma 18:3

> but this much we do know
> that he **cannot** be slain by the enemies of the king
> **neither can** they scatter the king's flocks when he is with us

3 Nephi 19:32

> and tongue **cannot** speak the words which he prayed
> **neither can** be written by man the words which he prayed

3 Nephi 19:34

> nevertheless so great and marvelous were the words which he prayed
> that they **cannot** be written
> **neither can** they be uttered by man

Moroni 7:11

> for behold a bitter fountain **cannot** bring forth good water
> **neither can** a good fountain bring forth bitter water

Moroni 9:19

> yea tongue **cannot** tell
> **neither can** it be written

Notice in particular the similarity of the metaphor in Moroni 7:11, with its parallel reference to fountains (comparable to trees) and water (comparable to fruit). Thus, one could argue that the original text in 3 Nephi 14:18 had the *can* but that it was accidentally lost when Joseph Smith dictated the text to his scribe.

In this case, however, the critical text will maintain the earliest extant Book of Mormon text, the reading of both 𝓟 and the 1830 edition: "a good tree **cannot** bring forth evil fruit / **neither** a corrupt tree bring forth good fruit". In other words, the critical text will continue without the *can* that occurs in italics in the King James text. The similar example of the lack of the repeated *you* in 3 Nephi 12:11 supports this decision. In addition, we should note that the editors and typesetters for all of the published editions of the Book of Mormon have maintained the somewhat difficult reading here in 3 Nephi 14:18 without the repeated *can*.

Summary: Maintain in 3 Nephi 14:18 the earliest extant text, "a good tree cannot bring forth evil fruit / **neither** a corrupt tree bring forth good fruit"; despite the marginal difficulty and uniqueness of this reading, it is indirectly supported by usage elsewhere in the Sermon on the Mount where an italicized repeated word in the King James text is lacking in the Book of Mormon text (namely, in 3 Nephi 12:11).

3 Nephi 15

■ **3 Nephi 15:1**

behold ye have heard the things
which I [*have* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQS | RT] *taught*
before I ascended to my Father

The 1920 LDS edition removed the perfect auxiliary *have* from 3 Nephi 15:1. This editing is consistent with standard English, which avoids the perfective when the larger clause has a specific adverb of time (in this case, the subordinate clause "before I ascended to my Father"). It is possible that the *have* here is an error that resulted from the earlier use of the perfect *have* in the verse ("ye **have** heard the things"). The 1920 change was intentional since it is marked in the committee's copy.

There are also two places in the text where the editors for the 1920 edition added the perfect auxiliary *have* (in distinction to its deletion here); for those examples, see under Alma 1:1 and Alma 31:8–9. More generally, there has been considerable variation in the use of the perfect in the history of the Book of Mormon text; some additional examples of this variation are listed under Alma 31:8–9. As explained there, for each of these cases involving the perfect auxiliary the critical text will follow the earliest reading, even if it seems strange to modern English readers. Thus here in 3 Nephi 15:1 the original reading, "which I **have** taught", will be restored.

Summary: Restore in 3 Nephi 15:1 the perfect *have,* the earlier reading ("the things which I **have** taught before I ascended to my Father"); the Book of Mormon text allows for more variation in the use of the perfect than what is expected in modern English.

■ **3 Nephi 15:3**

and he saith unto them
marvel not that I said unto you
that old things had passed [*away > awag* 1 | *away* ABCDEFGIJKLMNOPQRST | H]
and that all things had become new

Here the adverb *away* was accidentally omitted in the 1874 RLDS edition. The need for the word seems obvious given the phraseology "old things had passed **away**" just before in verse 2; thus the subsequent RLDS edition (in 1892) restored the *away* in verse 3. (In the printer's manuscript, Oliver Cowdery accidentally overwrote the original *y* of *away* as a *g,* an obvious scribal slip.)

In this passage, Jesus is referring to his language earlier in 3 Nephi 12:47, where he said "old things are done **away** and all things have become new". Note that the earlier text has a different verb ("are **done** away", not "are **passed** away" or "have **passed** away"). But in both passages, the adverb *away* is there. Here in 3 Nephi 15 nearby references to this topic also use the perfect phrase "have passed away":

> 3 Nephi 15:2
>> for they understood not the saying
>> that old things **had passed away**
>> and that all things had become new

> 3 Nephi 15:7
>> and because I said unto you that old things **hath passed away**
>> I do not destroy that which hath been spoken concerning things which is to come

We also get this same basic language later in the text when Ether prophesies about what will happen when the New Jerusalem is established:

> Ether 13:9
>> and there shall be a new heaven and a new earth
>> and they shall be like unto the old
>> save the old **have passed away**
>> and all things have become new

Clearly, the adverb *away* is correct in 3 Nephi 15:3.

Summary: Maintain the phrase "to pass away" in 3 Nephi 15:3 and elsewhere in the text when referring to old things ceasing to exist.

■ **3 Nephi 15:7**

I do not destroy that which hath been spoken
concerning [*things* 1ABCGHIJKLMNOPQRST | DEF]
which [*is* >js *are* 1 | *is* A | *are* BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *to come*

The earliest text here reads "concerning things which is to come". In his editing for the 1837 edition, Joseph Smith changed the singular *is* to the plural *are*, in accord with standard English. The same kind of editing occurred earlier in the text for another example of this phraseology:

> Alma 5:44
>> yea I am commanded to stand and testify unto this people
>> the things which have been spoken by our fathers concerning the things
>> which [*is* >js *are* 1 | *is* A | *are* BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] to come

For a general discussion regarding subject-verb disagreement in the original Book of Mormon text, see under 1 Nephi 4:4 (as well as under SUBJECT-VERB AGREEMENT in volume 3).

A more significant variant in this passage involves the loss of the noun *things* from the phrase "concerning things which are to come". This error occurred when the compositor for the 1841

British edition set the type for this passage. The two following LDS editions (in 1849 and 1852) retained the difficult shorter reading, "concerning which are to come". Finally, the 1879 LDS edition restored the necessary *things*. Elsewhere in the text there are no examples of "concerning which". Instead, there is always a noun phrase between *concerning* and *which*. We get the following statistics for those cases when the noun phrase is generic in meaning (the count includes the case of "concerning things which" here in 3 Nephi 15:7):

"concerning **that** which"	9 times
"concerning **the things** which"	7 times
"concerning **things** which"	2 times
"concerning **all things** which"	1 time
"concerning **the thing** which"	1 time

The other instance of "concerning things which" occurs in 2 Nephi 6:4: "and now behold I would speak unto you concerning **things** which are and which are to come". The critical text will maintain the instance of "concerning things which" here in 3 Nephi 15:7 (as well as restore the original singular *is* to the relative clause).

Summary: Maintain the generic noun *things* in 3 Nephi 15:7, the reading of the earliest textual sources; consistent with usage elsewhere in the original text, restore the singular *is* in the phrase "concerning things which **is** to come".

■ **3 Nephi 15:8**

for behold the [*covenants* 1 | *covenant* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
which I have made with my people
is *not all fulfilled*

Here the printer's manuscript has the plural *covenants,* but the 1830 edition has the singular *covenant*. The singular verb form *is* (which occurs after the relative clause "which I have made with my people") could be used to argue that the singular *covenant* is correct, although it is possible that the immediately preceding singular *my people* permitted the occurrence of the singular *is*. For some general discussion of subject-verb disagreement in the original text, see under 1 Nephi 4:4; also see the more specific discussion under 1 Nephi 18:15 regarding the original phraseology "the judgments of God **was** upon them". In addition, there is a striking example in the text of *covenants* taking *is* as its verb:

> 1 Nephi 22:6 (the reading of both manuscripts as well as the first two editions)
>> for thus **is** the **covenants** of the Lord with our fathers

The subject-verb disagreement in "thus is the covenants" has been edited to either "thus is the **covenant**" or "thus **are** the covenants"; for discussion of this case, see under 1 Nephi 22:6.

When we examine the references to the Lord's covenant(s) in the Book of Mormon text, we discover that we usually get the plural *covenants* in the small plates of Nephi but the singular *covenant* in the large plates. Excluding the case here in 3 Nephi 15:8, we get the following breakdown according to book:

		covenant	*covenants*
SMALL PLATES	title page	0	1
	1 Nephi	2	11
	2 Nephi	2	10
	Enos	1	0
LARGE PLATES	3 Nephi	23	0
	Mormon	6	0
	Ether	2	0
	Moroni	1	3

Note, in particular, the following examples in 3 Nephi that refer to the covenant that the Lord made with his people, the house of Israel:

3 Nephi 16:5

and then will I fulfill the **covenant**
which the Father hath made unto all the people of the house of Israel

3 Nephi 16:11

and then will I remember my **covenant**
which I have made unto my people / O house of Israel

3 Nephi 20:12

then is the fulfilling of the **covenant**
which the Father hath made unto his people / O house of Israel

3 Nephi 20:29

and I will remember the **covenant**
which I have made with my people

3 Nephi 20:46

and then shall this **covenant**
which the Father hath covenanted with his people
be fulfilled

3 Nephi 21:4

that the **covenant** of the Father may be fulfilled
which he hath covenanted with his people / O house of Israel

3 Nephi 21:7

that the work of the Father hath already commenced
unto the fulfilling of the **covenant**
which he hath made unto the people which are of the house of Israel

3 Nephi 29:3

for behold the Lord will remember his **covenant**
which he hath made unto his people of the house of Israel

For each of these examples, the text could have read in the plural, as it does for instances in the small plates of Nephi:

1 Nephi 14:17

> then at that day the work of the Father shall commence
> in preparing the way for the fulfilling of his **covenants**
> which he hath made to his people which are of the house of Israel

2 Nephi 29:1

> at that day when I shall proceed to do a marvelous work among them
> that I may remember my **covenants** which I have made unto the children of men
> that I may set my hand again the second time to recover my people
> which are of the house of Israel . . .

Thus the 1830 reading of the singular *covenant* in 3 Nephi 15:8 is consistent with the language elsewhere in this part of the text.

When we look at early transmission errors, there is considerable evidence that both Oliver Cowdery and the 1830 typesetter tended to add plural *s*'s or to delete them (for some statistics, see under 3 Nephi 10:13). Either Oliver or the typesetter could have caused the variation in grammatical number for *covenant(s)* here in 3 Nephi 15:8. There is one specific example involving *covenant(s)* where Oliver Cowdery initially wrote the plural in 𝓞 instead of the correct singular (and in this case the singular is obviously correct):

Alma 53:17

> and they entered
> into a [*covenants* >% *covenant* 0 | *covenant* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
> to fight for the liberty of the Nephites

In 3 Nephi 15:8, the critical text will follow the internal evidence, namely, the consistent use of the singular *covenant* for this part of this text (here in 3 Nephi) when the reference is to the Lord's covenant to his people, the house of Israel. The result is that there is no subject-verb disagreement in this passage: "for behold the **covenant** which I have made with my people **is** not all fulfilled".

Summary: Maintain in 3 Nephi 15:8 the singular *covenant* (the 1830 reading) since throughout 3 Nephi the singular *covenant* is what the text uses when referring to the Lord's promise to his people, the house of Israel.

3 Nephi 16

■ **3 Nephi 16:4**

and I command you that ye shall write
these [*things* >+ *saying* > *sayings* 1 | *sayings* ABCDEFHIJKLMNOPQRST | *things* G]

Here we see a tendency to replace "these sayings" with "these things". The first instance occurred when Oliver Cowdery initially wrote down the text in 𝒫. Somewhat later he caught his error, perhaps when he proofed 𝒫 against 𝒪 (the level of ink flow for the supralinear *sayings* is slightly heavier). The 1830 edition, also a firsthand copy of 𝒪, reads *sayings,* thus supporting the corrected reading in 𝒫. Oliver Cowdery tended to mix up *things* and *sayings*. For another instance where he initially wrote *things* instead of *sayings,* see under Mosiah 13:25. For an instance where the opposite error occurred initially in 𝒫, see under Mosiah 6:3. In each case, the critical text will follow the earliest extant reading, thus "these sayings" here in 3 Nephi 16:4.

The second instance of this error in 3 Nephi 16:4 occurred when the compositor for the 1858 Wright edition set the type. In that instance, the subsequent 1874 RLDS edition followed the reading of the 1840 edition, *sayings;* thus the RLDS text has maintained the correct reading.

Summary: Retain *sayings* in 3 Nephi 16:4, the 1830 reading as well as the corrected reading in 𝒫.

■ **3 Nephi 16:6**

and blessed are the Gentiles
because of their belief in me
in and of the Holy Ghost
which [*witness* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQS | *witnesses* RT] *unto them*
of me and of the Father

Here the original verb form *witness* stands for the third person singular present-tense *witnesses*. In Early Modern English, the *-es* ending was sometimes not pronounced for words ending in *-ess;* apparently we have an example of this here in 3 Nephi 16:6. See under 2 Nephi 31:18 for a general discussion of this phenomenon in the original text of the Book of Mormon. The 1920 LDS edition made the change to *witnesses,* the expected verb form in modern English, but the critical text will restore the shortened form *witness* (the reading in 𝒫 and the 1830 edition).

Summary: Restore in 3 Nephi 16:6 the shortened third person singular verb form *witness;* such usage is occasionally found in the original Book of Mormon text.

■ **3 Nephi 16:7**

*in the latter **day** shall the truth come unto the Gentiles*
that the fullness of these things shall be made known unto them

One wonders if the phrase "in the latter **day**" is an error for "in the latter **days**". This is the only occurrence of the singular *day* for this phrase in the text. Elsewhere, we get only the plural form "in the latter days" in the original text (five times), including this one where Oliver Cowdery initially wrote "in the latter day" in 𝓟:

> 1 Nephi 15:13
>> in the latter [*days* 0ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST | *day > days* 1]
>> when our seed shall have dwindled in unbelief . . .

𝓞 is extant here and reads *days*. Thus Oliver could have accidentally written "in the latter day" in 𝓞 for 3 Nephi 16:7.

Usage in the King James Bible also supports the plural phraseology "in the latter days" (with 11 occurrences). There are no instances of "in the latter day" in the King James Bible, but there is one of "**at** the latter day":

> Job 19:25
>> for I know *that* my Redeemer liveth
>> and *that* he shall stand at the latter *day* upon the earth

More generally, we find that the singular phrase "in the latter day" was fairly common in Early Modern English. The Oxford English Dictionary provides this example under definition 3a for the adjective *latter* (original spelling retained):

> Adam King (1588)
>> in the letter day of iudgment

The OED also provides support for the phrase "**at** the latter day", the reading in Job 19:25 (original spelling retained):

> Richard Hooker (1597)
>> that life which shall make them glorious at the later day

Literature Online <lion.chadwyck.com> provides many examples of "in the latter day", as in these two examples from Early Modern English that refer to the resurrection and the judgment that will occur in the last days (original spelling again retained):

> Anne Dowriche (1589)
>> we know that in the latter day with Christ we shall arise

> Thomas Beard (1597)
>> for hee shall come to iudge thee in the latter day

There are also examples of "in the latter day" in the 1800s, although they occur less frequently than in Early Modern English. The critical text will retain the one instance of "in the latter day" in the Book of Mormon text (here in 3 Nephi 16:7). Of course, the possibility remains that this is an error for "in the latter days".

Summary: Maintain in 3 Nephi 16:7 the singular *day* in the phrase "in the latter day", even though elsewhere the Book of Mormon text has instances of only "in the latter days"; usage from Early Modern English up into the 1800s supports the occurrence of "in the latter day".

■ **3 Nephi 16:8**

for notwithstanding [*that* 1A | BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
they have come forth upon the face of this land . . .

As explained under 2 Nephi 25:11, the Book of Mormon text permits a clause coming after *notwithstanding* to be headed by the subordinate conjunction *that,* although in most cases the *that* is lacking (as in modern English). The original text has two instances of the archaic "notwithstanding that <clause>" (in 2 Nephi 25:11 and here in 3 Nephi 16:8). In both cases, the *that* was removed in the editing for the 1837 edition. The critical text will restore both instances of the *that.* For a general discussion regarding *notwithstanding* in the Book of Mormon text, see under Alma 17:15.

Summary: Restore the subordinate conjunction *that* in 3 Nephi 16:8, the reading of the earliest text; this use of *that* is intended and can be found elsewhere in the original text (namely, in 2 Nephi 25:11).

■ **3 Nephi 16:10**

and thus [*commandeth* 1ABCDEFGHIJLMNOPQRST | *commanded* K] *the Father*
that I should say unto you . . .

Here the 1892 RLDS edition replaced the present-tense *commandeth* with the past-tense *commanded.* The 1908 RLDS edition restored the present-tense form. In theory, either tense will work here, so we follow the earliest extant reading, the present-tense *commandeth.*

Summary: Maintain in 3 Nephi 16:10 the present-tense *commandeth,* the reading in 𝓟 and the 1830 edition (the two earliest textual sources for this part of the text).

■ **3 Nephi 16:10**

at that day when the Gentiles shall sin against **my gospel**

   □ **and shall** *reject the fullness of* **my gospel**   1APST
   □ NULL   BCDEFGHIJKLMNOQR

and shall *be lifted up in the pride of their hearts*

The 1837 edition omitted the conjoined predicate "and shall reject the fullness of my gospel", the result of the typesetter's eye skipping down from the first instance of *my gospel and shall* to the second one in the passage. This predicate was restored in the 1908 RLDS edition and in the 1981 LDS edition.

Summary: Maintain in 3 Nephi 16:10 the conjoined predicate "and shall reject the fullness of my gospel"; this reading is found in both 𝓟 and the 1830 edition.

■ **3 Nephi 16:10**

and if they shall do all [*these* 1APS | *those* BCDEFGHIJKLMNOQRT] *things*
and shall reject the fullness of my gospel
behold saith the Father
I will bring the fullness of my gospel from among them

Once more we have an example of *these* being changed to *those* (in this instance, in the 1837 edition). This change was very likely unintended since either reading will work here. The 1908 RLDS edition restored the original *these* to the RLDS text (most likely by reference to 𝓟). The LDS text has retained the 1837 reading. The critical text will restore the original *these*.

There is another case where the 1837 typesetter may have changed *these* to *those:*

> Helaman 13:37
> and this shall be your language
> in [*them* 0A | *them* >js *these* 1 | *those* BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] days

In this case, the original text read "in them days". In his editing for the 1837 edition, Joseph Smith grammatically corrected the *them* to *these* in 𝓟, but the 1837 edition reads *those*. Although this may have been a typo introduced by the 1837 typesetter, it is also possible that Joseph himself changed his mind, deciding that "in those days" would work better than "in these days". There are also two other cases where the 1837 edition introduced a switch between *these* and *those;* see under Helaman 15:3 and 3 Nephi 10:17 for discussion of those two examples.

Summary: Restore the original demonstrative *these* in 3 Nephi 16:10 ("if they shall do all these things"); the 1837 change to *those* appears to have been accidental.

■ **3 Nephi 16:11**

and then [*will I* 1ABCDEGHKPRST | *I will* FIJLMNOQ] *remember my covenant*
which I have made unto my people / O house of Israel

As explained under Mosiah 26:27, the expected word order in the Book of Mormon is "then will I", not "then I will". But in a couple of cases, the inverted word order has been replaced by the non-inverted order, as here in the 1852 LDS edition for 3 Nephi 16:11. The 1920 LDS edition restored the correct order to the LDS text (most likely by reference to one of the earlier editions). The change was marked in the 1920 committee copy.

Summary: Retain in 3 Nephi 16:11 the original inverted order, with the auxiliary verb *will* preceding the subject ("and then **will I** remember my covenant"); usage elsewhere in the original text consistently supports the inverted word order after *then*.

■ **3 Nephi 16:15**

but if they will not [*return* >js *turn* 1 | *turn* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *unto me*
  and hearken unto my voice
I will suffer them—yea I will suffer my people / O house of Israel—
that they shall go through among them and shall tread them down

Here in 3 Nephi 16:15, the question is whether the text refers to the people returning or turning unto the Lord. Originally, the printer's manuscript had *return* and the 1830 edition had *turn*. In his editing for the 1837 edition, Joseph Smith emended 𝓟 to read *turn*, thus making the manuscript agree with the 1830 reading.

In discussions dealing with repentance, the text has references to both returning and turning unto the Lord. Excluding the case here in 3 Nephi 16:15, there are 9 instances of "return (un)to <the Lord>" and 12 of "turn (un)to <the Lord>". (For some discussion whether the preposition should be *unto* or *to,* see under Mosiah 11:23.) And in most of these 21 instances involving *return* or *turn,* the verbs are virtually interchangeable, especially where there is a nearby instance of the verb *repent.* In the following listing of 14 cases, I mark with an asterisk each one that takes the verb *return:*

Mosiah 11:21	and except they **repent** and **turn** to the Lord their God
Mosiah 11:23	except this people **repent** and **turn** to the Lord their God
Alma 3:14	except they **repent** of their wickedness and **turn** to me
* Alma 34:34	that I will **repent** / that I will **return** to my God
Helaman 7 preface	they **repent** and **turn** unto him
Helaman 7:17	O **repent** ye / **repent** ye . . . **turn** ye / **turn** ye unto the Lord your God
Helaman 11:4	and perhaps they will **repent** and **turn** unto thee
* Helaman 13:11	but if ye will **repent** and **return** unto the Lord your God
Helaman 13:11	blessed are they who will **repent** and **turn** unto me
* 3 Nephi 9:13	will ye not now **return** unto me and **repent** of your sins
* 3 Nephi 10:6	if ye will **repent** and **return** unto me with full purpose of heart
* 3 Nephi 16:13	but if the Gentiles will **repent** and **return** unto me
Ether 11:1	except they should **repent** and **turn** unto the Lord
* Moroni 9:22	except they **repent** and **return** unto him

Note, in particular, the case in Helaman 13:11 where both *return* and *turn* are used in the same passage, thus showing their basic equivalence. Also note that in every case but one (namely, 3 Nephi 9:13), the verb *repent* comes first. Thus either *return* (the original reading in 𝓟) or *turn* (the 1830 reading) will work here in 3 Nephi 16:15.

The larger passage here in 3 Nephi 16:13–15 shows a contrastive pair of *if*-clauses; the strong parallelism between the two clauses supports the repetition of the verb *return* in the second *if*-clause:

3 Nephi 16:13 —14

but if the Gentiles **will**
repent and **return** unto me
saith the Father

behold they shall be numbered
among my people
O house of Israel

and **I will** not **suffer my people**
which are of the **house of Israel**
to **go through among them**
and tread them down
saith the Father

3 Nephi 16:15 (the reading in 𝒫)

but if they **will**
not **return unto me**

and hearken unto my voice

I will suffer them
yea **I will suffer my people**
O **house of Israel**
that they shall **go through among them**
and shall **tread them down**

When we look at all the other pairs of explicitly contrastive *if*-clauses in the Book of Mormon, we consistently find that the verb (or some equivalent of the verb) is repeated. Consider 11 other passages that follow the pattern in 3 Nephi 16:13–15, namely, (1) the first *if*-clause is separated from the second one by the negative conjunction *but,* and (2) one of the *if*-clauses has a *not.* The most common case involves the repetition of a single verb. In seven cases, the first *if*-clause is positive while the second is negative; in one case, the first is negative and the second positive (marked below with an asterisk):

2 Nephi 1:28–29
and **if** ye will **hearken** unto him
I leave unto you a blessing / yea even my first blessing
but if ye will **not hearken** unto him
I take away my first blessing / yea even my blessing

Alma 30:9
if he **believed** in God
it was his privilege to serve him
but if he **did not believe** in him
there was no law to punish him

Alma 32:32
therefore **if** a seed **groweth**
it is good
but if it **groweth not**
behold it is not good

* Alma 32:40–41
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
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
and it shall take root

Alma 37:13
>
> **if** ye will **keep** my commandments
> ye shall prosper in the land
> **but if** ye **keep not** his commandments
> ye shall be cut off from his presence

3 Nephi 3:8
>
> **if** ye will **do** this with an oath
> ye shall not be destroyed
> **but if** ye will **not do** this
> I swear unto you with an oath
> that on the morrow month I will command
> that my armies shall come down against you

3 Nephi 13:14 (Matthew 6:14–15)
>
> for **if** ye **forgive** men their trespasses
> your heavenly Father will also forgive you
> **but if** ye **forgive not** men their trespasses
> neither will your Father forgive your trespasses

3 Nephi 27:10–11
>
> and **if** it so be that the church is **built** upon my gospel
> then will the Father shew forth his own works in it
> **but if** it be **not built** upon my gospel
> and is built upon the works of men
> or upon the works of the devil
> verily I say unto you . . .

In addition, there is one case with two verbs in the first *if*-clause (*to repent* and *to be baptized*), yet only the first verb, *repent,* is repeated in the following contrastive *if*-clause:

3 Nephi 18:30–31
>
> and **if** it so be that he **repenteth** and is baptized in my name
> then shall ye receive him and shall minister unto him of my flesh and blood
> **but if** he **repenteth** not
> he shall not be numbered among my people

Of course, if one is unrepentant, the question of being baptized becomes moot.

In another case, no verb is explicitly stated; instead *so* is used both times to stand for a preceding reference to "hardening one's heart in unbelief and being slothful":

Alma 33:21–22 (original text)
>
> if ye could be healed by merely casting about your eyes
> that ye might behold / would ye not behold quickly
> or would ye rather harden your hearts in unbelief and be slothful
> that ye would not cast about your eyes
> that ye might perish
> **if so**
> woe shall come upon you
> **but if not so**
> then cast about your eyes
> and begin to believe in the Son of God

Finally, there is one case where the following *if*-clause has no verb at all nor the word *so*. But this is a case of ellipsis, which implies verbal identity:

> 3 Nephi 10:6–7
>> how oft will I gather you
>> as a hen gathereth her chickens under her wings
>> and **if** ye will **repent** and **return** unto me with full purpose of heart
>> **but if not** / O house of Israel
>> the places of your dwellings shall become desolate
>> until the time of the fulfilling of the covenant to your fathers

These examples argue that the verb in 3 Nephi 16:15 (the contrastive second *if*-clause) should be the same verb as in 3 Nephi 16:13 (the first *if*-clause)—in other words, *return* in both cases. Of course, one could argue that Oliver Cowdery, the scribe in 𝓟, expected such a repetition and thus replaced an original *turn* in verse 15 with *return*.

Another factor to consider in this analysis has been the occasional tendency in the early transmission of the text to either add or delete a prefixal prepositional element for verbs. Here in 3 Nephi 16:15, we have a case where either Oliver Cowdery added *re-* to the verb *turn* or the 1830 typesetter removed the *re-* from *return*. The majority of other cases involve the loss of a prefixal element, but there are also a few cases where such an element has been added to a verb. (For each of the examples listed below, see the discussion under the respective passage.) To begin with, Oliver Cowdery twice omitted the verbal prefix in copying from 𝓞 into 𝓟, but only momentarily:

> Alma 17:18   administer > minister
> Alma 46:40   remove > move

There is also evidence that Oliver may have made the latter error (replacing an original *removed* with *moved*) in 2 Nephi 20:13. Originally, I thought that in Alma 62:15 Oliver might have replaced an original *overtook* with *took,* but now it appears that the original text actually read *took*.

There are also two firm examples where the 1830 typesetter, John Gilbert, consciously deleted the prefixal element from a verb:

> Alma 17:18   administer > minister
> Helaman 8:11   departed > parted

In the first case, however, he later decided to restore the *ad-* prefix, probably because the word *administered* occurred later on in the verse. But these two cases show a conscious tendency on Gilbert's part to either add or delete verbal prefixes, when motivated to do so.

Finally, we have one instance where it appears that Oliver Cowdery added a verbal prefix:

> Alma 55:31   take > partake

In this instance, 𝓞 seems to have read *take* (based on spacing between extant fragments of 𝓞). This example could be taken as support for the possibility that Oliver changed an original *turn* in 3 Nephi 16:15 to *return,* given the occurrence of *return* earlier in 3 Nephi 16:13.

Don Brugger (personal communication) points out another way of resolving the difficulty here in 3 Nephi 16:13–15: namely, the 1830 use of *turn* in verse 15 is correct, but the earlier *return* in verse 13 is an error for *turn*. Under this proposal, the verb for this pair of contrastive *if*-clauses would still be identical, but now it would be *turn* rather than *return:*

3 Nephi 16:13–15 (conjectural emendation)

> but if the Gentiles will repent and **turn** unto me / saith the Father
> behold they shall be numbered among my people / O house of Israel
> and I will not suffer my people which are of the house of Israel
> to go through among them and tread them down / saith the Father
> but if they will not **turn** unto me and hearken unto my voice
> I will suffer them—yea I will suffer my people / O house of Israel—
> that they shall go through among them and shall tread them down

Such a proposal implies that for verse 13, when 𝒪 was dictated, an original *turn* was mistakenly replaced by *return,* either by Joseph Smith as he dictated the text or by Oliver Cowdery (the probable scribe here in 𝒪) as he took down the dictation. For verse 15, on the other hand, the presumption is that 𝒪 correctly read *turn,* but when Oliver copied the text from 𝒪 into 𝒫, he mistakenly wrote *return,* probably because of the incorrect *return* in verse 13. In other words, this conjectural emendation has *turn* being replaced by *return* two times (during the dictation of 𝒪 for verse 13 and during the copying from 𝒪 into 𝒫 for verse 15). Although such a scenario is possible, it is considerably more complicated and less likely than having a single change of *return* to *turn* (in verse 15 by the 1830 typesetter). Another question to consider is what would have motivated the change from *turn* to *return* in verse 13. Perhaps the earlier references in 3 Nephi to returning and repenting (in 3 Nephi 9:13 and 3 Nephi 10:6) could have prompted such a change, although these two passages are quite a bit earlier in the text. Another possibility is the immediately preceding *repent* in 3 Nephi 16:13, with its Latinate prefix *re-*, could have caused "**re**pent and turn" to be changed into "**re**pent and **re**turn". Even so, the chances of mixing up *turn* and *return* in verse 13 seem fairly remote.

Brugger also notes that there is a possible difference in the semantics between *return* and *turn*. One could argue that the verb *return* should be restricted to cases where repentant individuals are returning to their original faith rather than being converted for the first time. (On the other hand, *turn* could be used in either case.) So when the text here in 3 Nephi 16 refers to the Gentiles repenting and (re)turning to the Lord, the question is whether they would be returning to their original faith or being converted for the first time. Clearly, the first case is possible since this chapter explains that the Gentiles, having an incomplete form of the gospel, will eventually have the fullness of the gospel presented to them but will largely reject it because of sin (3 Nephi 16:6–10). Thus after the house of Israel receives the fullness of the gospel (3 Nephi 16:11–12), the Gentiles will get the opportunity of repenting and returning unto the Lord, otherwise they will be "trodden under foot of my people" (3 Nephi 16:13–15). So in both verses 13 and 15, either *return* or *turn* will work semantically.

Ultimately, it is difficult to determine the original reading here in 3 Nephi 16:15. It should first be noted that there are no other examples of variation between *return* and *turn* elsewhere in the history of the text. Changes involving other prefixal verbs in the early text argue that Oliver Cowdery could have added the *re-* prefix to *turn* or John Gilbert, the 1830 typesetter, could have removed it from an original *return*. In particular, Oliver could have made the change under the influence of the preceding *return* in verse 13, while Gilbert may have thought that "return and hearken" was a difficult reading, with the verb order being sequentially or logically wrong: if we return to the Lord, haven't we already hearkened? In other words, "turn and hearken" is an easier reading,

which perhaps explains why Joseph Smith decided to accept this 1830 reading when he edited the printer's manuscript for the 1837 edition. Against the balanced evidence from transitional probabilities, usage elsewhere in the text argues that the verb should be the same in pairs of contrastive *if*-clauses. Thus the critical text here will restore the reading of 𝓟 in verse 15 as the original reading, especially since it involves only one change. Alternatively, both verbs in verses 13 and 15 could have originally been *turn,* but this emendation would involve two changes in the early transmission. Moreover, the odds of replacing an original *turn* with *return* in verse 13 seem small.

Summary: Restore the original reading of the printer's manuscript in 3 Nephi 16:15 ("but if they will not **return** unto me") since the parallel earlier phraseology in 3 Nephi 16:13 uses *return* ("if the Gentiles will repent and **return** unto me"); there seems to be little possibility that the *return* in verse 13 is an error for *turn.*

■ **3 Nephi 16:15**

> *and they shall be as salt*
> *that hath lost* [*its* > *his* >js *its* 1 | *his* A | *its* BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *savor*
> *which is thenceforth good for nothing*
> *but to be cast out*
> *and to be trodden under foot of my people* / *O house of Israel*

□ **Matthew 5:13** (King James Bible)

> but if the salt have lost **his** savor
> wherewith shall it be salted
> it is thenceforth good for nothing
> but to be cast out
> and to be trodden under foot of men

As discussed under 3 Nephi 12:13, the original text here in 3 Nephi 16:15 seems to have read "his savor"—that is, in agreement with the parallel passage in the King James Bible ("his savor"), not the earliest reading in 3 Nephi 12:13 ("its savor", the expected modern usage). Here in 3 Nephi 16:5, Oliver initially wrote *its,* then virtually immediately corrected it to *his* (there is no change in the level of ink flow for the supralinear *his*). In his editing for the 1837 edition, Joseph Smith replaced the archaic *his* with *its.* The critical text will restore the original *his* in this passage.

Summary: Restore the original archaic usage "his savor" in 3 Nephi 16:15, the reading in the 1830 edition as well as the reading of the virtually immediate correction in 𝓟.

■ **3 Nephi 16:15–16**

and they shall be as salt
that [*has* > *hath* 1 | *hath* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *lost his savor . . .*
verily verily I say unto you
thus [*hath* >js *has* 1 | *has* A | *hath* BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]
the Father commanded me . . .

In these two passages, we see some early confusion over whether the verb form should be *hath* or *has*. In the first example (verse 15), the *hath* variant is firm since the corrected reading in the printer's manuscript agrees with the 1830 reading (for this part of the text the 1830 edition is a first-hand copy of 𝓞). In the second example (verse 16), the printer's manuscript originally had *hath,* but the 1830 edition had *has.* In his editing for the 1837 edition, Joseph Smith corrected 𝓟 so that it would agree with the 1830 reading (just as he did in verse 15 when he emended *return* to *turn* in accord with the 1830 reading). But in the 1837 edition itself, Joseph's emendation to *has* in 𝓟 was ignored, probably because the text expects the more biblically sounding *hath* when referring to the Father's commandments, especially given the archaic inverted word order with *thus* ("thus hath the Father commanded me"). The modern form *has* would sound more acceptable if the passage had the normal noninverted word order ("thus the Father has commanded me"). See under Mosiah 12:1 for further discussion regarding the use of *hath* as the biblical style in the Book of Mormon text.

Summary: Maintain in 3 Nephi 16:15–16 the two readings with *hath;* this form is found in the earliest extant text for this passage; moreover, this is the form expected in the biblically styled language appropriate to this passage.

■ **3 Nephi 16:17–18**

and [*when* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQS | *then* RT]
the words of the prophet Isaiah shall be fulfilled which saith :
thy watchmen shall lift up the voice . . .

Here the editors for the 1920 LDS edition changed the *when* to *then,* thus eliminating a sentence fragment. The original manuscript undoubtedly read *when* here since both the 1830 edition and the printer's manuscript have *when.* One could argue that the original text had *then* and that the scribe in 𝓞 (presumably Oliver Cowdery) misheard Joseph Smith's *then* as *when.* Both words are identical except for the acoustically similar voiced continuant at the beginning of the word. Yet it is worth noting that although such a theoretical mix-up is possible, we have no specific evidence elsewhere in the manuscripts where *when* and *then* have ever been switched, even momentarily.

In favor of the 1920 emendation, one could note that later on in 3 Nephi there are other places where Christ quotes a biblical passage (sometimes extensively) that he says will be fulfilled. Each of these passages is introduced by a clause that begins with *then,* and in each case we get the inverted subject-verb word order (where the finite verb precedes the subject):

3 Nephi 20:27 (quoting Genesis 22:18 or, more closely, the King James variant in Acts 3:25)
    and after that ye were blessed
    then *fulfilleth the Father the covenant*
    which he made with Abraham saying :
    in thy seed shall all the kindreds of the earth be blessed

> 3 Nephi 20:36 (quoting from Isaiah 52)
>> and **then** shall be brought to pass that which is written :
>> awake / awake again
>> and put on thy strength O Zion . . .
>
> 3 Nephi 22:1 (quoting from Isaiah 54)
>> and **then** shall that which is written come to pass :
>> sing O barren / thou that didst not bear . . .

Thus here in 3 Nephi 16:17, one could argue that the 1920 emendation represents the original text.

Although this emendation seems reasonable enough, David Calabro (personal communication) argues that *when* is actually correct. In this passage, Jesus starts to refer to the future fulfillment of a prophecy of Isaiah's (namely, Isaiah 52:8–10), which he then quotes. But after quoting the passage, Jesus does not provide any commentary on it. In fact, he cuts it off abruptly, ending up with a sentence fragment ("and when the words of the prophet Isaiah shall be fulfilled which saith : thy watchmen shall lift up the voice . . . and all the ends of the earth shall see the salvation of God"). Jesus, perceiving that his audience has become weak and is no longer able to follow his discourse, decides to put off his explanation of this quotation and to send the people home right then (as explained at the beginning of the next chapter, in 3 Nephi 17:1–4). But then Jesus changes his mind a second time when he has compassion on the people and decides to stay for a little while longer (as explained in 3 Nephi 17:5–8). For the question of Jesus's apparent lack of omniscience in his dealings with these people, also see the discussion under 3 Nephi 19:26.

In support of this analysis, Calabro points out that on the next day, when Jesus comes back, he eventually returns to his previous discourse. This time he does not quote the verses from Isaiah 52. He already did that on the previous day—and besides, the Nephites can read Isaiah's prophecies since they are recorded. Jesus nonetheless refers to the fact that on the day before he had not explicated that passage from Isaiah 52:8–10, and he twice uses the same subordinate conjunction *when* in reference to the fulfillment of that prophecy:

> 3 Nephi 20:10–13
>> and it came to pass that
>> when they had all given glory unto Jesus
>> he saith unto them :
>> behold now I finish the commandment
>> which the Father hath commanded me concerning this people
>> which are a remnant of the house of Israel
>> ye remember that I spake unto you and said that
>> **when** the words of Isaiah should be fulfilled
>> —behold they are written
>> ye have them before you
>> therefore search them—
>> and verily verily I say unto you that
>> **when** they shall be fulfilled
>> then is the fulfilling of the covenant
>> which the Father hath made unto his people . . .

Here Jesus explicitly says he is now going to finish what the Father had earlier commanded him to say about those words of Isaiah. Jesus even reminds his audience that he already quoted the words to them ("ye remember that I spake unto you and said that **when** the words of Isaiah should be fulfilled"). By repeating his earlier language (but not the Isaiah quotation), Jesus once more uses the word *when*. Thus the use of *when* earlier in 3 Nephi 16:17 is almost certainly correct. The resulting fragment in the text is actually intended, and the critical text will restore the *when* to the text, despite its difficulty.

Summary: Restore in 3 Nephi 16:17 the original subordinate conjunction *when,* the reading of both 𝓟 and the 1830 edition; at this point Jesus intends to expound on the fulfillment of Isaiah 52:8–10, which he is about to quote, but after quoting the passage Jesus decides to save his explication for a later time; textually, the resulting fragment is definitely intended.

3 Nephi 17

■ **3 Nephi 17:2**

I perceive that ye are weak
that ye cannot understand all my words
which I am commanded of the Father to speak unto you
at this time

David Chudleigh (personal communication, 13 October 2004) suggests that there needs to be commas around the relative clause "which I am commanded of the Father to speak unto you" so that the sentence-final prepositional phrase "at this time" will refer to the earlier clause "ye cannot understand all my words". One difficulty with this proposal is that the relative clause appears to be restrictive, so placing a comma before *which* might be problematic. The placement of some kind of clausal break before "at this time" appears to be correct, for if the Father had commanded Jesus to speak those words at that time, then Jesus would have. Instead, he will postpone those words for a later visit when the people will be able to understand.

What we have here is an example of a displaced prepositional phrase. The original Book of Mormon text has a good many instances of such prepositional phrases, and in virtually every instance they have been retained in the current text (as here in 3 Nephi 17:2). Here is a similar example involving an intervening restrictive relative clause; in this instance, editors have placed a comma after the relative clause (but not before it):

> 1 Nephi 3:14
> but Laman fled out of his presence
> and told the things which Laban had done
> [01E |, ABCDGHIJKLMNOPQRST | NULL > , F] unto us

There have been some other ways of dealing with displaced prepositional phrases. In the following example from the original text, the phrase "at this time" is positioned in front of the relative clause that it properly belongs to:

> Helaman 9:22 (original text)
> O ye had ought to begin to howl and mourn
> because of the great destruction
> at this time
> which doth await you

Or equivalently, "because of the great destruction which doth await you at this time". In this instance, the editors for the 1920 LDS edition moved the prepositional phrase "at this time" after the *which*, giving "which at this time doth await you" (a minimal change). See under Mosiah 26:23

for an example where the preposition was changed (from *in* to *unto*) so that the prepositional phrase would no longer be displaced since it would be interpreted differently. For a general discussion and a list of examples of this usage, see under DISPLACED PREPOSITIONAL PHRASES in volume 3. Here in 3 Nephi 17:2, the easiest solution would probably be to place a comma after the restrictive relative clause but not before it.

Summary: Maintain in 3 Nephi 17:2 the placement of the preposition phrase "at this time" at the end of the sentence, but add some minimal punctuation (such as a comma after the relative clause) to show that the prepositional phrase belongs to the earlier main clause rather than to the immediately preceding relative clause.

■ **3 Nephi 17:5**

and it came to pass that when Jesus had thus spoken
he cast his eyes round about again on the multitude
and [*behold* 1 | *beheld* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *they were in tears*

The printer's manuscript has *behold,* but the 1830 edition has *beheld.* Usage elsewhere in the text argues that the original manuscript read *behold* and that the 1830 compositor accidentally set *behold* as *beheld.* There are a considerable number of cases in the textual history of mix-ups between *behold* and *beheld* (see, for instance, the extensive discussion under Jacob 5:37). For this particular example here in 3 Nephi 17:5, we first consider whether Oliver Cowdery tended to replace *beheld* with *behold;* there are two instances, one of which was permanent:

> 1 Nephi 8:9 (initial error in 𝒫)
>
> I [*beheld* 0ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST | *behold* > *beheld* 1]
> a large and spacious field

> 1 Nephi 8:26 (error in copying from 𝒪 into 𝒫)
>
> and I also cast my eyes around about
> and [*beheld* 0ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST | *behold* 1]
> on the other side of the river of water
> a great and spacious building

On the other hand, there is no independent evidence of the 1830 compositor ever accidentally mixing up *behold* and *beheld.* When he made such a change, it appears to be a needed correction of an error that the scribes had introduced into the manuscripts (as in 1 Nephi 8:26, where he corrected the *behold* of his copytext, the printer's manuscript, to *beheld*). Thus errors in the early transmission of the text indicate that it is somewhat more likely that Oliver Cowdery created the variant here in 3 Nephi 17:5. Nonetheless, the number of examples showing these two particular types of change is nearly zero (a permanent one by Oliver and none by the 1830 compositor).

Note that the example from 1 Nephi 8:26 is especially similar to the case here in 3 Nephi 17:5. First of all, the initial predicate refers to casting one's eyes (a)round about. Secondly, Oliver Cowdery was the scribe in 𝒫, and he copied the *beheld* in 𝒪 as *behold* in 𝒫. So one could argue that here in 3 Nephi 17:5, Oliver made the same mistake of replacing an original *beheld* with *behold.* Under 1 Nephi 8:9, I discuss the possibility that Oliver's *behold* in 1 Nephi 8:26 is the original Book

of Mormon reading (in other words, that the scribe in ©, the unknown scribe 3, accidentally wrote *beheld* in this passage rather than the correct *behold*). Ultimately, this proposed emendation is rejected, mainly because it would create a *behold*-clause without a verb in 1 Nephi 8:26 ("and behold . . . a great and spacious building"); such usage is not found in the Book of Mormon text.

When we turn to other cases where the initial predicate refers to casting one's eyes in some direction, we find that there are no other examples of "and beheld", only "and behold":

> Mosiah 4:1
>> he cast his eyes round about on the multitude
>> **and behold** they had fell to the earth

> Mosiah 19:6
>> and the king cast his eyes round about towards the land of Shemlon
>> **and behold** the army of the Lamanites were within the borders of the land

> Helaman 5:43 (original text)
>> and it came to pass that when they cast their eyes about
>> and saw that the cloud of darkness was dispersed from overshadowing them
>> **and behold** they saw that they were encircled about—yea every soul—
>> by a pillar of fire

> Helaman 5:48
>> and now when they heard this
>> they cast up their eyes as if to behold from whence the voice came
>> **and behold** they saw the heavens open

> 3 Nephi 11:8
>> they cast their eyes up again towards heaven
>> **and behold** they saw a man descending out of heaven

On the other hand, in cases of past-tense or past-participle *beheld* followed by a direct object clause, we almost always get the subordinate conjunction *that* (43 times), including these three of the form "and beheld":

> 1 Nephi 8:11 (original text)
>> and it came to pass that
>> I did go forth and partook of the fruit thereof
>> **and beheld that** it was most sweet
>> above all that I ever had before tasted

> Helaman 5:30
>> and it came to pass when they heard this voice
>> **and beheld that** it was not a voice of thunder . . .

> Ether 15:33
>> and he went forth
>> **and beheld that** the words of the Lord had all been fulfilled

As explained under 1 Nephi 12:23, there is only one case in the text where the *that* is lacking for a direct object clause after the past-tense verb form *beheld* (namely, in 1 Nephi 12:11: "and I looked and beheld three generations did pass away in righteousness").

Although the current reading "and beheld they were in tears" is possible here in 3 Nephi 17:5, it is not as likely as the conjectured "and beheld **that** they were in tears". But the most likely of all is the reading in 𝒫, "and **behold** they were in tears", especially since the initial clause refers to casting one's eyes in some direction. The critical text will therefore accept the reading in 𝒫 as the original reading in 3 Nephi 17:5. This would mean that the 1830 compositor accidentally set *beheld* instead of the correct *behold*.

Summary: Restore the reading of the printer's manuscript in 3 Nephi 17:5 ("and **behold** they were in tears"); the 1830 reading ("and **beheld** they were in tears") is not as likely a candidate for the original reading, although it still remains a possibility (but with relatively little support from usage elsewhere in the text).

■ **3 Nephi 17:10**

and they did all
both they which had been healed and they which were whole
bow down at his feet and did worship him
and as many as could come **for** *the multitude*
did kiss his feet

The preposition *for* seems strange here. One wonders if the *for* might be an error for some other preposition. The phrase here seems to mean 'because of the multitude' or 'given the multitude'. Interestingly, usage like this is found in the King James Bible. In fact, there is one involving *multitude:*

> John 21:6
> and he said unto them
> cast the net on the right side of the ship and ye shall find
> they cast therefore and now they were not able to draw it **for the multitude** of fishes

Three biblical examples involve the word *press,* which had the meaning 'crowd' or 'multitude of people' in Early Modern English:

> Mark 2:4
> and when they could not come nigh unto him **for the press**
> they uncovered the roof where he was

> Luke 8:19
> then came to him *his* mother and his brethren
> and could not come at him **for the press**

> Luke 19:3
> and he sought to see Jesus who he was
> and could not **for the press**
> because he was little of stature

The Oxford English Dictionary lists this use under definition 22 of the preposition *for.* In other words, 3 Nephi 17:10 states that although everyone was able to come forth and bow down before Jesus, there were limits to how many could kiss his feet (due to the size of the crowd). The critical text will retain the preposition *for* in the phrase "for the multitude" since it works textually.

Summary: Maintain in 3 Nephi 17:10 the preposition *for* that occurs in the phrase "for the multitude"; such usage is found in the King James Bible and means 'because of the multitude' or 'given the multitude'.

■ **3 Nephi 17:12**

so they brought their little children
and [*sat* 1ABCEFGIJLMNOPQS | *set* DHKRT] *them down upon the ground round about him*

As discussed under Jacob 3:10, the original text of the Book of Mormon had a number of cases where the verb *sit* was used transitively, as here originally in 3 Nephi 17:12: "they . . . sat them down". In this particular case, the 1841 British edition, the 1874 RLDS edition, and the 1920 LDS edition have each independently made the change to the standard transitive verb *set.* Earlier the 1849 LDS edition restored the original *sat* to the LDS text, and the 1908 RLDS edition restored the *sat* to the RLDS text. Since 1920, the LDS text has maintained the standard *set.* The critical text will restore the nonstandard *sat* since it is the reading of the earliest text. For further discussion of this usage, see under 1 Nephi 11:1 and, more generally, under SIT in volume 3.

Summary: Restore in 3 Nephi 17:12 the past-tense form *sat* since it is the reading of the earliest text; transitive uses of the verb *sit* occurred several times in the original Book of Mormon text.

■ **3 Nephi 17:12**

and Jesus stood **in the midst**
and the multitude gave way till they had all been brought unto him

A speaker of modern English might wonder if the bare expression "in the midst" isn't a mistake for "in the midst of X" (where X refers to people). Nonetheless, when X refers to a lot of people, the postmodifying prepositional "of X" is frequently left unexpressed in the Book of Mormon:

◻ *'in the midst [of a crowd]'* (four times)

3 Nephi 17:12	and Jesus stood in the midst
3 Nephi 17:13	and Jesus stood in the midst
3 Nephi 19:15	behold Jesus came and stood in the midst
3 Nephi 21:25	and I also will be in the midst

◻ *'in the midst [of fallen soldiers]'* (two times)

Mormon 6:10	and I fell wounded in the midst
Mormon 6:13	and he also in the midst

We find eight instances in the King James New Testament that refer to a person being "in the midst" of a group of people, such as:

Mark 14:60	and the high priest stood up in the midst
John 20:26	*then* came Jesus . . . and stood in the midst

Thus there is nothing wrong with the expression "in the midst" in the Book of Mormon text. Most times, it turns out, the "of X" is expressed (13 times), as in 3 Nephi 27:2: "and Jesus came and stood in the midst **of them**".

Summary: Maintain the bare expression "in the midst" without any postmodification whenever it occurs in the earliest Book of Mormon text (here in 3 Nephi 17:12 and in five other passages).

■ **3 Nephi 17:17**

and no tongue [*cannot* 1 | *can* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *speak*
neither can there be written by any man
neither can the hearts of men conceive so great and marvelous things
as we both saw and heard Jesus speak

Here the printer's manuscript has a multiple negative ("& **no** tongue **cannot** speak"). The 1830 edition, on the other hand, lacks the extra negative ("and **no** tongue can speak"). Elsewhere in this part of the text, where both 𝔓 and the 1830 edition are firsthand copies of 𝔒, we have a similar case where 𝔓 has the multiple negative and the 1830 edition lacks the extra negative:

Helaman 13:28
and then ye will **not** find [*no* 1 | ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] fault with him

In the discussion for that case, I noted that there is only one unambiguous case where Oliver Cowdery accidentally created a multiple negative, but that error was only momentary. On the other hand, there are two clear cases where the 1830 compositor, John Gilbert, removed a multiple negative from the text. (For these examples, see under Helaman 13:28.) Thus the odds are that here in 3 Nephi 17:17 Gilbert is the one responsible for the textual variation.

There is an alternative reading that should be considered here. Perhaps the original text read without the *no* before *tongue:*

3 Nephi 17:17 (proposed emendation)
and tongue cannot speak
neither can there be written by any man
neither can the hearts of men conceive so great and marvelous things
as we both saw and heard Jesus speak

As this passage was dictated, one could argue, either Joseph Smith or Oliver Cowdery (the presumed scribe in 𝔒) could have accidentally added the *no* before *tongue,* giving "and no tongue cannot speak". Usage elsewhere in the text supports the alternative reading "and tongue cannot speak". For instance, there are no other cases of *no tongue* in the text, but there are two other cases of the subject *tongue* followed by a *not:*

3 Nephi 19:32
and **tongue cannot** speak the words which he prayed
neither can be written by man the words which he prayed

Moroni 9:19
yea **tongue cannot** tell
neither can it be written

For both of these examples, there is a conjoined *neither-*clause with the same modal verb *can.* These two passages, as well as the example here in 3 Nephi 17:17, say the same thing: they first refer to the tongue not being able to express something, then refer to the inability to write the words down. So if we are to remove the multiple negative from 3 Nephi 17:17 (say, in the standard text), the more appropriate emendation would be to remove the *no* before *tongue* rather than change the *cannot* to *can.* This argument from usage thus supports the hypothesis here in 3 Nephi 17:17: namely, that the 1830 compositor, John Gilbert, removed the multiple negative—in fact, he removed the wrong negative! Similarly, there is internal evidence that Gilbert removed the wrong negative in the case of Helaman 13:28 (mentioned above); see under that passage for discussion. So the evidence is fairly strong that 𝒪 read as a multiple negative here in 3 Nephi 17:17: "and no tongue cannot tell". There are quite a few examples in the original text of multiple negatives; for additional discussion, see under 2 Nephi 26:32 or, more generally, under NEGATION in volume 3.

Summary: Restore the *cannot* in 3 Nephi 17:17 that the 1830 compositor, John Gilbert, changed to *can* when he set the type for this passage; we have independent evidence that Gilbert occasionally removed multiple negatives from the text, including one other case where he deleted the wrong negative (in Helaman 13:28); on the other hand, Oliver Cowdery apparently never permanently added a multiple negative to the text; for the standard text, the correct emendation (based on parallel examples) would be to remove the *no* before *tongue* from the multiple negative, giving "and tongue cannot tell".

■ **3 Nephi 17:21**

and when he had said these words he wept
and the multitude [*bear* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQS|*bare* RT] *record of it*

In the manuscripts, Oliver Cowdery frequently mixed up the spelling of *bear* and *bare.* In most cases, we are able to readily determine whether the context requires the present-tense *bear* or the past-tense *bare.* But in some cases, either reading will work, at least in theory. In this passage, 𝒪 apparently read *bear* since both 𝒫 and the 1830 read *bear.* In the editing for the 1920 LDS edition, *bear* was emended to *bare.* The same change was made in the following chapter:

> 3 Nephi 18:37
> > and the multitude heard not the words which he spake
> > therefore they did not bear record
> > but the disciples [*bear* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQS|*bare* RT] record
> > that he gave them power to give the Holy Ghost

The nearest other occurrences of bearing witness in this part of 3 Nephi almost always refer to the disciples and the multitude as doing so in the past tense; but in one case there is clear evidence that bearing witness can be expressed in the present tense (marked below with an arrow):

3 Nephi 11:15
>   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

3 Nephi 17:15–16
>   and the multitude **did bear record** which heard him
> → and after this manner **do** they **bear record** :
>   the eye hath never seen
>   neither hath the ear heard before
>   so great and marvelous things
>   as we saw and heard Jesus speak unto the Father

3 Nephi 17:25
>   and the multitude **did** see and hear and **bear record**
>   and they know that their record is true
>   for they all of them did see and hear
>   every man for himself

3 Nephi 18:39
>   and the disciples saw
>   and **did bear record**
>   that he ascended again into heaven

We see from these examples that both "did bear record" and "do bear record" occur. One interesting relationship is that the past-tense "did bear" occurs when the syntactically closest clause is in the past tense:

3 Nephi 11:15	they . . . **did bear** record that it **was** he
3 Nephi 17:15	and the multitude **did bear** record which **heard** him
3 Nephi 17:25	and the multitude **did see and hear and bear** record
3 Nephi 18:39	and the disciples **saw and did bear** record that he **ascended** again into heaven

But in the one case of "do bear", the syntactically closest clause is the subsequent sentence, which is directly linked to the preceding present-tense clause:

3 Nephi 17:16
>   and after this manner **do** they **bear** record :
>   the eye **hath** never seen neither **hath** the ear heard before
>   so great and marvelous things

This correlation in tense between closely associated clauses argues that in 3 Nephi 17:21 and 3 Nephi 18:37 the verb should be in the past tense (in agreement with the 1920 editing):

> 3 Nephi 17:21
>> and when he **had said** these words he **wept**
>> and the multitude **bare** record of it
>
> 3 Nephi 18:37
>> and the multitude **heard** not the words which he **spake**
>> therefore they **did** not **bear** record
>> but the disciples **bare** record that he **gave** them power to give the Holy Ghost

There are two cases in 3 Nephi 19 where a present-tense "do bear" occurs in an otherwise past-tense context, but in both these cases there is a preceding reference in the past tense to what was observed by the same witnesses, with the result that the reference to bearing record can be in the present tense:

> 3 Nephi 19:14 (original text)
>> and the multitude **did** witness it and **do** bear record
>
> 3 Nephi 19:33
>> and the multitude **did** hear and **do** bear record

For both these cases, the present-tense auxiliary verb *do* is firm, while here in 3 Nephi 17:21 and 3 Nephi 18:37 we have the difficulty of deciding between the homophones *bear* and *bare*. But also note that there are two instances in 3 Nephi 17 where the text first uses the past tense to refer to the multitude bearing record and then follows this with a comment in the present tense regarding the continuing nature of their witness:

> 3 Nephi 17:15–16
>> and the multitude **did bear record** which heard him
>> and after this manner **do** they **bear record** . . .
>
> 3 Nephi 17:25
>> and the multitude **did see and hear and bear record**
>> and they **know** that their record **is** true

Thus the critical text will accept the 1920 emendation of *bear* to *bare* in 3 Nephi 17:21 and 3 Nephi 18:37. For further discussion of the two cases in 3 Nephi 19 of "do bear", see under 3 Nephi 19:14; also see the general discussion under BEAR in volume 3.

Summary: Accept the 1920 LDS emendation of *bear* to *bare* in 3 Nephi 17:21 and 3 Nephi 18:37 since the syntactically closest clauses for these two passages occur in the past tense.

■ **3 Nephi 17:24**

and they came down
and encircled those little ones [1ABCDEFIJLMNOPQRST | *round* GHK] *about*
and they were encircled about with fire

Here the 1858 Wright edition added the word *round* before the first *about*. The 1874 and 1892
RLDS editions maintained this secondary reading, but the 1908 RLDS edition removed the intru-
sive *round* from the RLDS text. One wonders if the *round* could have been there in the original
text but was accidentally omitted during the dictation of the text. The word was very likely not
in 𝒪 since it is not in either 𝒫 or the 1830 edition, both firsthand copies of 𝒪.

Usage elsewhere in the text argues that either reading is theoretically possible. In most
instances (21 times), the word *round* does not occur before *about* in the phrase "to encircle round
about". Note, for instance, that *round* is lacking in 3 Nephi 17:24 for the second occurrence of
this phrase: "and they were encircled about with fire". There are, however, three instances in the
original text of "to encircle round about":

Alma 17:33	encircle the flocks **round about** that they flee not
Alma 48:8	and also building walls of stone to encircle them about
	round about their cities
Alma 53:4	until they had encircled the city of Bountiful **round about**
	with a strong wall of timbers and earth

So in each case we follow the earliest reading; thus there is no *round* for either instance of
"encircled about" here in 3 Nephi 17:24.

Summary: Maintain in 3 Nephi 17:24 the two instances of "encircled about" without the word *round;*
although "encircled round about" is possible, the earliest text supports the shorter "encircled about"
in this passage.

3 Nephi 18

■ **3 Nephi 18:3**

> *he took of the bread*
> *and* [*brake* 1BCDEFGHIJKLMNOQRT | *berak* A | *break* PS]
> *and blessed it*

In the 1908 RLDS edition, the archaic simple past-tense *brake* was replaced by the homophonous *break*. The 1953 RLDS edition continued with this incorrect reading. All the verbs in this passage are in the past tense (*took, brake, blessed*), so there is no doubt that *brake* is correct. It appears that the 1830 compositor also intended to set the verb as *break,* but he accidentally placed the *r* and *e* in the wrong order, giving the typo *berak;* it is less likely that *berak* is a typo for *brake.* For further discussion of the tendency of the 1830 compositor to set *brake* as *break,* see under Alma 14:26. The critical text will maintain the simple past-tense form *brake* here in 3 Nephi 18:3.

Summary: Retain in 3 Nephi 18:3 the archaic past-tense form *brake* since the entire passage is in the past tense.

■ **3 Nephi 18:3**

> *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*

One wonders here if the pronoun *it* might have been accidentally dropped after the verb *brake.* When we consider all the Book of Mormon passages that describe the distribution of the sacrament (including this one), we find three passages in the original text where there is no direct object after the transitive verb *give,* in addition to the one case here in 3 Nephi 18:3 where the direct object for the verb *break* is also lacking (in the following list, I represent each of these missing direct objects as NULL):

> 3 Nephi 18:3 (*bread,* NULL, *it,* NULL)
>   he took of the **bread**
>   and brake
>   and blessed **it**
>   and he gave unto the disciples

3 Nephi 18:5 (*bread, it, it*)

> and to him will I give power that
> he shall break **bread**
> and bless **it**
> and give **it** unto the people of my church

3 Nephi 18:6 (*bread, it, it*)

> even as I have broken **bread**
> and blessed **it**
> and gave **it** unto you

3 Nephi 20:3 (*bread, it,* NULL)

> and it came to pass that
> he brake **bread** again
> and blessed **it**
> and gave to the disciples to eat

3 Nephi 20:4–5 (*bread,* NULL, NULL)

> he commanded them that
> they should break **bread**
> and give unto the multitude
> and when they had given unto the multitude . . .

3 Nephi 26:13 (*bread, it, it*)

> and after that he did shew himself unto them oft
> and did break **bread** oft
> and bless **it**
> and give **it** unto them

There is evidence elsewhere in the Book of Mormon text that the *it* after the verb *give* is optional; for discussion, see under Alma 55:31.

When we consider similar passages in the King James Bible, we find the same kind of variation, especially when we note that in the English translation the *it* is in italics, which means that the *it* is missing in the Greek original (in the following, each of these cases is represented as *it*/0):

Matthew 26:26 (*bread, it*/0, *it*/0, *it*/0)

> and as they were eating
> Jesus took **bread**
> and blessed *it*
> and brake *it*
> and gave *it* to the disciples

Mark 14:22 (*bread,* NULL, *it*/0, NULL)

> and as they did eat
> Jesus took **bread**
> and blessed
> and brake *it*
> and gave to them

Luke 22:19 (*bread, it*/0, NULL)

  and he took **bread**
  and gave thanks
  and brake ***it***
  and gave unto them

Luke 24:30 (*bread, it*/0, NULL, NULL)

  and it came to pass
  as he sat at meat with them
  he took **bread**
  and blessed ***it***
  and brake
  and gave to them

John 21:13 (*bread,* NULL)

  Jesus then cometh
  and taketh **bread**
  and giveth them
  and fish likewise

Acts 27:35 (*bread, it*/0)

  and when he had thus spoken
  he took **bread**
  and gave thanks to God in presence of them all
  and when he had broken ***it***
  he began to eat

(The last three New Testament examples, it should be noted, do not involve the Lord's supper. And in the last one, Paul is the agent, not Jesus.) In the Greek original, the direct object pronoun *it* never appears in these verbal conjuncts. In the King James Bible, we get a mixture: sometimes the *it* is supplied, sometimes not. Most important of all, there is one case in the King James text where the *it* is lacking after the verb *break* (in Luke 24:30). The pattern of variation in both the King James Bible and the Book of Mormon argues that the pronoun *it* is intentionally missing here in 3 Nephi 18:3. The same holds for the *it* that is frequently missing after the verb *give* in these Book of Mormon passages. The critical text will therefore follow the earliest reading with respect to these potential instances of the direct object pronoun *it.* Interestingly, there is one case involving the verb *give* (in 3 Nephi 20:4) where the *it* was supplied in the 1840 edition (see under 3 Nephi 20:3–5 for discussion).

It is also worth noting here that in the Gospel accounts Jesus blesses the bread (or gives thanks) before breaking it, but in the Book of Mormon he does the opposite: he breaks the bread first, then blesses it (just as the priests do in the LDS church today).

Summary: Maintain the lack of *it* after the verbs *break* and *give* in 3 Nephi 18:3, 3 Nephi 20:3, and 3 Nephi 20:4–5; in these cases, the direct object pronoun *it* appears to be intentionally missing.

■ **3 Nephi 18:5**

behold there shall [*one be* 1ABCDEFGIJLMNOPQRST | *be one* HK] *ordained among you*

The 1874 RLDS edition switched the position of *one* to after the passive auxiliary *be,* which seems to be the more natural and expected word order in English. The 1908 RLDS edition restored the earlier, more difficult reading. For other cases of *there shall be,* we find that the passive auxiliary *be* comes before the subject noun phrase whenever the subject is relatively short:

>   2 Nephi 26:3
>   and after that the Messiah shall come
>   **there shall be** signs **given** unto my people of his birth
>   and also of his death and resurrection

>   Mosiah 3:17
>   **there shall be** no other name **given**
>   nor no other way nor means
>   whereby salvation can come unto the children of men

>   Helaman 14:23
>   and **there shall be** many mountains **laid** low
>   like unto a valley

>   Mormon 8:32
>   yea it shall come in a day
>   when **there shall be** churches **built** up
>   that shall say . . .

Thus the 1874 RLDS reading in 3 Nephi 18:5 conforms to these examples ("there shall **be** one **ordained** among you"). If the Book of Mormon original text read this way, then the change in word order most probably occurred during the dictation of 𝓞 since both the 1830 edition and the printer's manuscript have the order "there shall **one be** ordained among you".

On the other hand, when the subject is long, the tendency is to keep together the passive auxiliary *be* and its associated verb form, the past participle. There is one case where the subject precedes the *be:*

>   Alma 11:44
>   and even **there shall** not so much as a hair of their heads **be lost**

Other times, when the subject is long and is made up of noun conjuncts, the subject is transposed to the end of the sentence:

>   Mormon 8:29
>   yea it shall come in a day
>   when **there shall be heard** of
>   fires and tempests and vapors of smoke in foreign lands

>   Mormon 8:30
>   and **there shall** also **be heard** of
>   wars and rumors of wars and earthquakes in divers places

From the most general point of view, the earliest word order here in 3 Nephi 18:15 is possible but nonetheless unexpected, given that the subject is simply a single word, *one*. The critical text will maintain the earliest word order, yet the possibility remains that this word order is an error that entered the text as it was being dictated.

We get similar results when we consider the parallel case of *there should be*. There are 12 instances in the text of this existential expression where the subject comes between the *be* auxiliary and the past participial form of the main verb, as in 3 Nephi 2:3: "and they did not believe that **there should be** any more signs or wonders **given**". The only exception to this involves a subject that is so complicated that the *should be* occurs twice in the original text, both before and after the subject:

> 3 Nephi 3:14
> and he caused that **there should be** armies
> —both of the Nephites and of the Lamanites
> or of all them which were numbered among the Nephites—
> **should be placed** as guards round about
> to watch them and to guard them from the robbers day and night

In this case, the editors for the 1920 LDS edition removed the initial *there should be;* for further discussion of this case, see under 3 Nephi 3:14.

The idea that the word order in "there shall **one be** ordained among you" might be a mistake for "there shall **be one** ordained among you" was first suggested in the fall of 1996 by Merilee Knoll, one of the students in my textual criticism class.

Summary: Accept in 3 Nephi 18:5 the unique word order in "there shall **one be** ordained among you" instead of the more expected word order ("there shall **be one** ordained among you"); in this case, we follow the earliest textual sources but recognize that this word order could be an error that entered the text when it was dictated.

■ **3 Nephi 18:6**

even as I have broken bread and blessed it
and [*gave* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLNPS | *gave* > *given* M | *given* OQRT] *it unto you*

The original text here is morphologically ambiguous. One way to interpret the conjunctive series of verbs is that we have a perfect form ("have broken bread") followed by two simple past-tense forms ("and blessed it and gave it unto you"). The alternative reading is that we have three conjoined past-participial verb forms, as if the text read "have broken bread and have blessed it and have gave it unto you". This is how the text was interpreted when it was edited (in 1907) for the third printing of the 1905 LDS missionary edition. Since "have gave" is nonstandard, the *gave* was edited to *given*. The subsequent LDS text has continued with this emendation. See under 1 Nephi 5:8 for further discussion of this kind of editing of conjunctive verb phrases as well as the existence of "have gave" in the original text.

This alternative interpretation is probably correct, given the other references in 3 Nephi to the Lord's sacrament:

3 Nephi 18:5

and to him will I give power that
he **shall break** bread and **bless** it
and **give** it unto the people of my church

[equivalent to "**shall** break bread and **shall** bless it and **shall** give it"]

3 Nephi 20:4

he commanded them that
they **should break** bread
and **give** unto the multitude

[equivalent to "**should** break bread and **should** give unto the multitude"]

3 Nephi 26:13

and after that he did shew himself unto them oft
and **did break** bread oft and **bless** it
and **give** it unto them

[equivalent to "**did** break bread oft and **did** bless it and **did** give it"]

In these three cases, the auxiliary verb (*shall, should,* or *did*) requires that any following conjoined verb take the infinitive form. Similarly, the probable interpretation for 3 Nephi 18:6 is "**have** broken bread and **have** blessed it and **have** gave it", which means that in the standard text the grammatical emendation *given* should be accepted. The critical text will, of course, restore the original *gave,* no matter which interpretation is accepted.

Summary: Restore the original *gave* in 3 Nephi 18:6; in this passage, the *gave* appears to be the nonstandard past-participial form for the verb *give;* usage such as "have gave" occurred in the original text and will be restored whenever the earliest textual sources support it.

■ **3 Nephi 18:8**

and it came to pass that
when he [*had* 1ABCDGHKPS | EFIJLMNOQRT] *said these words*
he commanded his disciples that they should take of the wine of the cup and drink of it

The 1849 LDS edition removed the perfective auxiliary *had* here in 3 Nephi 18:8. This change appears to be accidental since in narratives the text otherwise has examples of only "when X had said" (36 times). There are no examples in Book of Mormon narratives of "when X said". There are, it should be pointed out, two examples without the *had,* but these do not occur in narratives:

Helaman 11:14

O Lord thou didst hearken unto my words **when I said** :
let there be a famine

Mormon 8:26

and it shall come in a day **when it shall be said**
that miracles are done away

In these two cases, the use of the *said* without the perfect *had* is appropriate. The critical text will restore the original "when he **had** said these words" here in 3 Nephi 18:8, thus making the usage consistent in all narrative passages.

Summary: Restore the original text in 3 Nephi 18:8 ("when he **had** said these words") since Book of Mormon narratives consistently use the past-perfect auxiliary *had* with *said* in *when*-clauses.

■ **3 Nephi 18:11**

and this shall ye always do [*unto* 1APS | *to* BCDEFGHIJKLMNOQRT] *those*
who repent and are baptized in my name

As explained under 3 Nephi 4:18, the 1837 compositor tended to accidentally set *to* in place of the archaic *unto*. Here in 3 Nephi 18:11, the 1908 RLDS edition restored the original *unto* to the RLDS text (apparently by reference to the printer's manuscript). On the other hand, the LDS text has retained the secondary *to* in this passage.

The Book of Mormon text definitely prefers the preposition *unto* in the verb phrase "to do something (un)to someone". There are 23 other instances with *unto* but only three with *to* (and the last two occur in a single quote from the Sermon on the Mount):

Mosiah 19:24	and they told Gideon what they had done **to** the king
3 Nephi 14:12	all things whatsoever ye would that men should do **to** you do ye even so **to** them

Thus the use of *unto* here in 3 Nephi 18:11 is wholly appropriate, and the critical text will restore it.

Summary: Restore in 3 Nephi 18:11 the original *unto,* the reading in both 𝔓 and the 1830 edition; the 1837 compositor tended to accidentally replace *unto* with *to.*

■ **3 Nephi 18:13**

and the gates of hell is [*already* 1APS | *ready* BCDEFGHIJKLMNOQRT]
open to receive them

Both the 1830 edition and the printer's manuscript have the adverb *already,* not the adjective *ready.* The 1837 edition replaced *already* with *ready,* probably accidentally. The 1908 RLDS edition restored the *already* to the RLDS text (apparently by reference to 𝔓). The LDS text has retained the secondary *ready.* There are no other examples in the Book of Mormon textual history where *already* and *ready* have ever been mixed up.

Cases where the adjective *ready* is asyndetically conjoined with another adjective do not otherwise occur in the Book of Mormon text (as in "is ready / open to receive them"). On the other hand, there are examples where *already* is followed by a past-participial verb form that acts adjectivally (much like "is already open" here in 3 Nephi 18:13):

1 Nephi 22:4	there are many which are **already lost** from the knowledge of they which are at Jerusalem
Jacob 2:9	to enlarge the wounds of those which are **already wounded**

On the other hand, when *ready* is used as a predicate adjective, we expect it to be followed by an infinitive clause headed by the infinitive marker *to:*

2 Nephi 8:13	as if he were **ready to** destroy
Alma 51:24	and also the people of the city of Lehi . . . were **ready to** receive the Lamanites to battle
Alma 52:1	Teancum was **ready to** give them battle on that day

Thus the original text for 3 Nephi 18:13 ("is already open to receive them") is what we expect, but the secondary "is ready / open to receive them" is definitely a unique construction for the Book of Mormon.

Finally, the passage here in 3 Nephi 18:13 parallels one in 3 Nephi 11:40: "and the gates of hell standeth open to receive such". Since one can refer to the gates of hell as already standing open, the original reading in 3 Nephi 18:13 ("and the gates of hell is **already** open to receive them") is perfectly fine and will be restored in the critical text.

Summary: In accord with the earliest textual sources, restore the original *already* in 3 Nephi 18:13: "and the gates of hell is **already** open to receive them"; this reading is indirectly supported by usage elsewhere in the text.

■ **3 Nephi 18:15**

ye must watch and pray always
lest ye **be** *tempted by the devil*
and ye [*are* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQS | *be* RT] *led away captive by him*

Here there are two conjoined subclauses within the larger *lest*-clause. The editing for the 1920 LDS edition makes both subclausal verbs take the subjunctive infinitival form ("be tempted" and "be led away"). This emended text, although fully grammatical, implies that each of the conjoined subclauses occurs independently as a consequence of not always watching and praying. On the other hand, one can readily interpret the original text as consequential, namely, with the meaning 'lest ye be tempted by the devil and **as a consequence** ye are led away captive by him'. More generally, however, there are instances in the original text of conjoined subjunctive and indicative subclauses that show no particular logical connection between the subclauses. Here is an example of such a mixture of verb forms that has never 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
> and I will forgive him also

For another good example, one that has been edited, see under Alma 22:16. The critical text will restore the original *are* here in 3 Nephi 18:15, no matter how we interpret the relationship between the two conjoined subclauses within the larger *lest*-clause.

Summary: Restore the original indicative *are* in the conjoined subclause in 3 Nephi 18:15 ("and ye **are** led away captive by him"), the reading of the earliest text; usage elsewhere in the original text supports mixtures of the subjunctive and indicative within a larger subordinate clause.

■ **3 Nephi 18:16**

behold I am the light
I have set an example [*before* >js *for* 1| *for* ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *you*

The printer's manuscript has "I have set an example **before** you", while the 1830 edition has "I have set an example **for** you". In his editing for the 1837 edition, Joseph Smith altered the printer's manuscript so that it would agree with the reading of the 1830 edition ("for you").

Elsewhere in the text, when the article for *example* is the indefinite *a* or *an,* the verb phrase "set an example" takes the preposition *for* (just like in the 1830 reading here in 3 Nephi 18:16):

| 1 Nephi 7:8 | yea and set **an** example **for** you |
| Alma 39:1 | behold has he not set **a** good example **for** thee |

On the other hand, when the article for *example* is the definite *the,* the verb phrase "set the example" takes the prepositional *before:*

| 2 Nephi 31:9 | he having set **the** example **before** them |
| Jacob 3:10 | because of **the** example that ye have sat **before** them |

(See under Jacob 3:10 regarding the use of dialectal *sat* rather than standard *set* as the original verb form in that passage.) This minor correlation in usage could be taken as evidence for the preposition *for* in 3 Nephi 18:16. On the other hand, it should be noted that in the one case where the reference is to the Lord setting the example (in 2 Nephi 31:9), the preposition is *before,* thus supporting the use of *before* here in 3 Nephi 18:16. Internal evidence can therefore be used to argue for either preposition.

In theory, then, either *before* or *for* is possible in 3 Nephi 18:16. Yet there are no other examples of mix-ups between *before* and *for* in the history of the text, so there is no evidence from errors in transmission concerning which preposition is correct here. However, for speakers of modern English, *for* is the expected preposition in the phrase "to set an/the example **for** someone", which suggests that the 1830 typesetter accidentally replaced the unexpected *before* in the original manuscript with the more expected *for.* It also seems less likely that an original *for* would have been replaced by the longer and unexpected *before.* Thus the odds are that the more likely reading for 𝓞 was the reading in 𝓟, "I have set an example **before** you". The critical text will therefore accept the preposition *before* in this passage.

Summary: Restore in 3 Nephi 18:16 the less expected, but acceptable, reading of the printer's manuscript, with its preposition *before* ("I have set an example **before** you").

■ **3 Nephi 18:20**

and whatsoever ye shall ask the Father in my name which is right
believing that ye shall receive
[*&* >js NULL 1 | *and* A | BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *behold*
it shall be given unto you

Here we have an example where Joseph Smith, in his editing for the 1837 edition, removed an *and* that originally separated a complex nominal clause (headed by *whatsoever*) from its following main clause. The key here for explaining the extra *and* seems to be the present participial clause that the nominal clause ends in (namely, "believing that ye shall receive"). The original text has quite a few instances where *and* was used to separate a preceding present participial clause from its following main clause, as in these examples where one or more participial clauses form the last part of a complex subject:

> Alma 9:1
>> and again I Alma **having** been commanded of God
>> that I should take Amulek and go forth and preach again unto this people
>> or the people which was in the city of Ammonihah
>> [*and* >js NULL 1 | *And* A | BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] it came to pass
>> as I began to preach unto them
>> they began to contend with me

> Alma 16:21 (the first *having* was edited to *had* in the 1920 LDS edition)
>> and now after the church **having** been established throughout all the land
>> **having** got the victory over the devil
>> and the word of God **being** preached in its purity in all the land
>> and the Lord **pouring** out his blessings upon the people
>> [*&* >js NULL 1 | *and* A | BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] thus ended
>> the fourteenth year of the reign of the judges over the people of Nephi

As in 3 Nephi 18:20, Joseph Smith removed the extra *and* from Alma 9:1 and from Alma 16:21 in his editing for the 1837 edition. The critical text will restore each of these original instances of *and,* which can be considered Hebraisms. For a complete list of the Hebraistic *and* following a present participial clause, see under HEBRAISMS in volume 3.

Summary: Restore in 3 Nephi 18:20 the original Hebraistic *and* that separated the present participial clause (which ends a complex *whatsoever*-clause acting as the subject) from the main clause that completes the sentence.

■ **3 Nephi 18:30–31**

and if it so **be** *that he* **repenteth** *and* **is** *baptized in my name*
then shall ye receive him and shall minister unto him of my flesh and blood
but if he [*repenteth* >js *repent* 1 | *repenteth* A | *repent* BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST] *not*
he shall not be numbered among my people

Here in verse 31 the original text had the indicative *repenteth* in the *if*-clause. In his editing for the 1837 edition, Joseph Smith replaced the indicative form with the subjunctive *repent,* perhaps

because the preceding *if*-clause in verse 30 has the subjunctive *be* ("and if it so **be** that . . ."). Note, however, that the following *that*-clause in the earlier verse has the indicative: "that he **repenteth** and **is** baptized in my name".

Either *repenteth* or *repent* is theoretically possible here in verse 31, so we follow the earliest reading ("but if he **repenteth** not"). For further discussion of the competition between the subjunctive and indicative forms in *if*-clauses, see under Mosiah 2:38.

Summary: Restore the original indicative form *repenteth* in 3 Nephi 18:31: "but if he repenteth not"; in general, the Book of Mormon text allows both subjunctive and indicative verb forms in *if*-clauses, so in each case we follow the earliest text.

■ **3 Nephi 18:32**

for unto such

- □ *ye shall continue to minister*   1*
- □ *shall ye continue to minister*   1ᶜABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST

for ye know not but what they will

- □ *repent and return*   1*
- □ *return and repent*   1ᶜABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST

Here we have two instances in 𝓟 where Oliver Cowdery initially wrote down the words in the wrong order. In each case, Oliver later corrected the reading in 𝓟 (perhaps when he proofed 𝓟 against 𝓞), with the result that the corrected reading is identical to the 1830 reading. 𝓞 undoubtedly read the same way, with the word orders "shall ye" and "return and repent".

In the first case, Oliver Cowdery initially wrote in 𝓟 "for unto such **ye shall** continue to minister", then changing it to "for unto such **shall ye** continue to minister". In other words, he initially wrote the text here with the noninverted order, then replaced it with the inverted order. For other examples of where Oliver made this error in the manuscripts, see under Alma 3:16. Elsewhere the text prefers the noninverted order following a clause-initial *unto such*:

Alma 26:22	unto such **it is** given to know the mysteries of God
Alma 26:22	yea unto such **it shall** be given to reveal things which never have been revealed
Moroni 8:22	and unto such **baptism availeth** nothing

Either order is possible, although the noninverted is favored in the Book of Mormon text. The critical text will follow the inverted order here in 3 Nephi 18:32 ("for unto such **shall ye** continue to minister"), the earliest reading.

In the second case, Oliver Cowdery initially wrote in 𝓟 "for ye know not but what they will **repent** and **return**"; then later, perhaps when he proofed 𝓟 against 𝓞, he corrected the word order to read "return and repent" (the supralinear text is written with somewhat heavier ink flow, at least for part of the correction). Elsewhere in the text, we usually get the verb *repent* before *return*:

| Alma 34:34 | that I will **repent** / that I will **return** to my God |
| Helaman 13:11 | but if ye will **repent** and **return** unto the Lord your God |

3 Nephi 10:6	if ye will **repent** and **return** unto me with full purpose of heart
3 Nephi 16:13	but if the Gentiles will **repent** and **return** unto me
Moroni 9:22	they must perish except they **repent** and **return** unto him

But the other order is possible, although not as common:

3 Nephi 9:13	will ye not now **return** unto me and **repent** of your sins

This order is also found in the King James Bible: "who knoweth *if* he will **return** and **repent** and leave a blessing behind him" (Joel 2:14).

So either order is possible in the Book of Mormon. Here in 3 Nephi 18:32, the order of the current text is firm (even though it is relatively rare); the corrected reading in 𝓟 independently agrees with the 1830 reading and should therefore be followed.

Summary: Accept the earliest reading in 3 Nephi 18:32, with its inverted order in "unto such **shall ye** continue to minister" and the unusual order "return and repent".

■ **3 Nephi 18:34**

and I give you these commandments
because of the disputations which hath been among you
[*before times* >js NULL 1 | *beforetime* A | BCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRST]

The printer's manuscript originally had the form *beforetimes* (but spelled as two words, *before times*); the 1830 edition has the form *beforetime,* without the adverbial *s.* In his editing for the 1837 edition, Joseph Smith removed this archaic expression, although *beforetime* (meaning 'earlier' or 'in times past') is found 11 times in the King James Bible (but only once in the original Book of Mormon text, namely, here in 3 Nephi 18:34). There doesn't seem to be any particularly strong reason to remove *beforetime* from the text; perhaps there was some concern that *beforetime* might be misinterpreted as meaning that something occurred before time existed.

The textual issue here is whether the original text read as *beforetime* (the 1830 reading) or as *beforetimes* (the reading in 𝓟). The King James usage argues for *beforetime* (there are no instances of *beforetimes* in the King James Bible). But the Oxford English Dictionary gives examples of both forms in Early Modern English. Under *beforetime* in the OED, there are six citations of the word (sometimes spelled as *before time*); five of these date from about 1300 through 1614 and one from the 1800s:

Algernon Charles Swinburne (1865)
and no more as the thing **beforetime** seen

Under *beforetimes,* the OED lists two citations, one of which is spelled as *before times* (as in 𝓟 for 3 Nephi 18:34); both these citations (original spellings here retained) are restricted to Early Modern English:

Hugh Latimer (about 1555)
saints that departed in faith out of this world **beforetimes**

William Browne (1647)
in all appearance he was the same man he had been **before times**

The OED lists *beforetimes* as obsolete but does not add this label to *beforetime*. This latter form was still familiar to speakers in the late 1800s (perhaps because of its occurrence in the King James Bible). Statistically, *Literature Online* <lion.chadwyck.com> shows that in the 1800s both *beforetime* and *beforetimes* continued to marginally exist in English, with *beforetime* about three times more frequent than *beforetimes* (statistically, 12 to 4). In today's English, both forms are decidedly archaic. The most likely reading in 𝒪 was the more difficult reading—that is, the less frequent *beforetimes*—which Oliver Cowdery faithfully copied into 𝒫 but the 1830 compositor changed to the more familiar *beforetime* when he set the type.

Summary: Restore in 3 Nephi 18:34 the archaic *beforetimes,* the less expected original reading in 𝒫, rather than the more expected *beforetime,* the 1830 reading.

■ **3 Nephi 18:37**

and the multitude heard not the words which he spake
therefore they did not bear record
but the disciples [*bear* 1ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQS|*bare* RT] *record*
that he gave them power to give the Holy Ghost

Here the 1920 LDS edition replaced the present-tense *bear* with the past-tense *bare*. The same emendation was made nearby in 3 Nephi 17:21. As discussed under that passage, evidence here in 3 Nephi suggests that the past-tense interpretation is correct for both these passages.